DOMINION OF CANADA

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF

DEBATES

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT

12-13 GEORGE V, 1922

IN FOUR VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1015	**Volume II: Pages 1017-2033**
Volume III: Pages 2035-3039	**Volume IV: Pages 3041-3619**

VOLUME CLII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-FIRST DAY OF APRIL TO THE NINETEENTH DAY OF MAY, 1922, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA
F. A. ACLAND
PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1922

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Friday, April 21, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 51 to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Explain.

Mr. McKENZIE: This bill is intended largely to assist local authorities in carrying out provincial temperance legislation. They have made the claim that they require some assistance by way of Dominion legislation to carry out the principle voted upon by the provinces and given effect to by provincial legislation. The present bill is with a view to supplementing the action of the provinces in that regard.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is the Solicitor General's (Mr. McKenzie's) first attempt at introducing legislation, but really I do not think he should be allowed to get away with the explanation he has made. He sates that the bill is to supplement provincial legislation, or to enable the provincial authorities to carry out their temperance aspirations and to do it by amendment to the Canada Temperance Act. Well, there has been much legislation along that line, but what is this legislation for? In what way is it to help the provinces? What is to be amended?

Mr. McKENZIE: It is not usual at this stage to go into detailed explanations, these are generally reserved until the motion for second reading is made. I may say, however, that British Columbia has reserved to itself the right of dealing with the sale of liquor in a certain way, and it claims that its control in dealing with that liquor in the province is particularly interfered with by the promiscuous importation of liquors. The provincial authorities therefore ask this Parliament to say that inasmuch as the general sale of liquor in the province of British Columbia is prohibited by local statute, the importation of liquor into the province shall be confined entirely to the local government or its agents. That is the main purpose of the bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister a question. It was intimated in the Speech from the Throne that the question of the natural resources of the prairie provinces would receive consideration. It is well known that the Premiers of these provinces are here and in conference with the Government. I would ask the Prime Minister, therefore, what progress has been made in dealing with the question.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Premiers of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have been in conference with members of the Government yesterday and to-day, and progress has been made in the discussions we have had. My hon. friend from North Winnipeg (Mr. McMurray) intimated to me that he intended asking this question, and I therefore prepared and have brought with me a memorandum which will indicate the progress which has been made thus far. I may say that Premier Norris of Manitoba is obliged to return to Winnipeg to-night. The Premiers of Alberta and Saskatchewan are remaining. Our conferences so far as these two provinces are concerned will continue with them. As to Manitoba the following satement will indicate what progress has been made, up to date, between the Dominion government and the government of that province:

As between the Government of Manitoba and the Dominion Government it has been agreed,—

(1) That it is desirable and just that such adjustments be made between the Dominion of Canada and the Prairie provinces with respect to their natural resources as will give full recognition to the principle that in this respect they are entitled to be placed in a position of equality with the other Provinces of Confederation.

(2) That the Government of Canada will negotiate an agreement with the Prairie provinces with the above object in view, such agreement to be subject to ratification by Parliament and the respective Legislatures.

(3) That failing agreement on any point as between the Dominion and the Province of Manitoba all such items so in dispute shall be referred to arbitration.

(4) That any awards made by such arbitrators shall be subject to ratification by Parliament and the Legislature of Manitoba.

DATE OF THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I observe that the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) is now in the Chamber. Perhaps he will be able to tell us, approximately at any rate, when we may expect the Budget.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I am afraid I cannot gratify the reasonable curiosity of my hon. friend by mentioning a particular date. I realize that the session is moving on and that we should all like to have the Budget at a not distant date. I will try to bring it forward at a time when my hon. friend will feel the delay has not been unreasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Within the next month?

Mr. FIELDING: It is always embarrassing to tie oneself to dates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was equally embarrassing when the hon. gentleman himself used to insist, and when we complied.

Mr. FIELDING: I think I can make a contract, that I will bring down the Budget this session as early as my hon. friend opposite did a year ago.

SUPPLY

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Department of Agriculture—Live stock, $1,000,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: I desire to take up a few minutes of the time of the House on a matter of great importance to the electors in my district, and, in fact, of great interest to the country as a whole. With the permission of the House I will read a resolution passed unanimously by the County Council of Napierville:

At a regular meeting of the Municipal Council of the County of Napierville, held in the office of the Clerk of the Circuit Court, in the Village of Napierville, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, the eighth of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-two, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Code, at which were present Messrs. Hilaire Lamarre, Esquire, Mayor of the Municipality of the Village of St. Remi; Alfred Marcil, Esquire, Mayor of the Municipality of the Village of St. Michel Archange; Wilfrid Gadouas, Esquire, Mayor of the Municipality of the Village of Napierville; Dosithée Payant, Esquire, Mayor of the Municipality of the Parish of St. Patrice de Sherrington; Edouard Mailloux, Esquire, Mayor of the Municipality of the parish of St. Cyprien de Léry and Warden of the County of Napierville, constituting a quorum under the chairmanship of the Warden.

"It is moved by Mr. Dosithée Payant, seconded by Councillor Alfred Marcil, that a request be made to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, at Ottawa, to place an embargo upon the exportation of manure from Canada to the United States of America: which exportation is calculated to do injury to the gardening industry of this country, to lessen the crops in general throughout Canada; that copies of this request be sent to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, also to the Hon. Roch Lanctot, Federal Member for the County."

Resolution passed.

EDOUARD MAILLOUX, Warden.
JOS. E. DUPONT, Sec. Treas.

A true copy extract from the minute-book of the Municipal Council of the County of Napierville. Given at Napierville, Que., in my office, the 14th March, 1922.

JOS. E. DUPONT, Sec. Treas.

Some ten years ago the farmers of my county, and of the county adjoining, could buy manure in Montreal and have it delivered to their local station for $13 to $15 a car. At the present time we have to pay from $50 to $52 per car. It is true, the freight has increased in that time from $6 a car to $13 a car. Hon. gentlemen will see that the freight charge has more than doubled, but the cost of the manure to us has increased about four-fold. The manure output of Montreal is practically controlled by one man, Mr. LeFebvre. This gentleman was a resident of my own riding for about twenty-five years, but has been in Montreal for a number of years now. For a time he supplied hay to the Canadian Pacific Railway—that is to say, to the Dominion Transport company which performs transport work for the Canadian Pacific in Montreal. Later he built sidings on the several railways at such points as Hochelaga, Point St. Charles, and other freight terminals of Montreal, and erected

platforms to facilitate the loading of manure on the cars. The big cartage concerns that handle the manure of the stockyards can take the manure to the sidings and load it into the cars from Mr. LeFebvre's platforms. In the case of smaller stables whose proprietors have no dump-carts, it is the practice to call up Mr. LeFebvre's office to haul away the manure as it accumulates. For this service Mr. LeFebvre is paid, as any carter would be paid, $1 or $2 a load. I do not complain about that, but what I do complain about is that Mr. LeFebvre is more lucky than any farmer in this Parliament or in Canada, because since he has been in that line of business he has improved his position by having a wider market, in the United States. There is a man not far from Rouse's Point named Mr. Miner, who buys from Mr. LeFebvre any amount of cars of manure for his farm, and I do not think there is a farm in Canada equal to Mr. Miner's farm. He has at least twelve to fifteen thousand acres. I am told he is worth many million dollars, and he wants to improve his land and produce vegetables of all kinds for the big New York market. He has got the money to do it. We farmers in my part of the country cannot afford to compete with Mr. Miner, because we have not got the millions. It is true that, during war-time, we had to buy the manure from Mr. LeFebvre at any price, because we needed it. Potatoes were selling at a very high price for two or three years, and at that time the farmers could afford to pay a big price for manure. But, as we have often been told in this House since the opening of this session, prices of commodities and especially of farm products have declined. At present prices we cannot make the raising of vegetables as profitable as it used to be. What will be the result if we are not able to stop that gentleman sending out the manure that costs him practically nothing? I say it is not the Liberal policy. Some of my friends have remarked that it is not Liberal to put an embargo on manure. Members from the West know very well that we are not now on new land. We are farming on very old land, and we must have manure. We may be asked, Why do you not buy fertilizers? I say that fertilizers cannot replace manure. My father said to me, when I was under his leadership: "Use abundant manure, and then you will succeed as a farmer; if not, you will not succeed." I think that is true.

The riding in which I live lies south of Montreal; it starts a mile from the Victoria bridge and extends southwards. Twenty years ago, we were supplying the Bonsecours market of Montreal with about two per cent of the vegetable requirements of that city. Those who visited Montreal some years ago, and who have visited it again this year or last year, know that not many gardens are to be seen in what was called "the garden of Montreal" twenty years ago. If you leave Windsor station or the Grand Trunk station and go to Ste. Anne, what do you see? You see little bushes of all kinds; wild cherries grow there, I think, and all kinds of weeds; but you do not see what we saw some twenty years ago, namely, melons, cucumbers, cabbages and all other kinds of vegetables with which to supply the city of Montreal. The real estate boom came to Montreal as well as to the West, and made the farmers rich from the sale of their farms.

Mr. McMASTER: Those who got paid.

Mr. LANCTOT: Yes; those who did not get paid are not rich, and I suppose they had to take back their farms. But conditions have changed; in order to have vegetable products with which to feed the people of Montreal, we on the south side of the river St. Lawrence must replace the gardens of the Island of Montreal, and we must go into mixed farming and raising vegetables of all kinds. We have been at that work now for the last ten years or more, and I say, without fear of contradiction, that my constituency to-day raises more vegetables than the whole Island of Montreal. As is well known, we have had and still have a good government in Quebec, and my colleague, the present Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), was Premier of my province for fifteen years or more. He brought about the enactment of good laws and we, the farmers, have profited by those laws. Throughout my riding, there have been constructed good macadam roads, without which it would be impossible to-day to supply the big city of Montreal. Those who live thirty miles from the Victoria bridge are really close to that bridge to-day; twenty years ago they were, comparatively speaking, very far away from it. For, at that time, we had mud roads; nowadays we have good macadam roads, and our farmers, having made money, have purchased two-ton trucks, and to-day they can go to Montreal, at any time during the year except, perhaps, when big snow storms occur in the winter, with sixty

bags of potatoes or a like quantity of any other vegetable products. This is the reason that we are getting along so well. And we want to do better. We have been told on many occasions in this House, and told truly, that there is need of more production and still more production. If manure from the city of Montreal goes to the United States, and we cannot get it for less than $52 a car, its present price, and if we must sell our products at one-half or less what we received during the war, what does that mean? It means that we shall reduce our production. And what does that mean for the people of Montreal? If they do not receive from our part of the country the vegetables they require, they will have to go further away for those products and will have to pay about double what they would pay if we had what is necessary for that sort of cultivation, namely, manure from the city at cost price. This is what the people in my riding and the riding next to mine want. I am not sure if any of my hon. friends in this House think it is bad politics to ask this Government to impose an embargo to prevent shipment into the United States of the most essential requirement for successful farming. I do not know how the western members feel about this matter; but as a farmer myself, as one who has been in this House for quite a number of years and who is still a farmer, I would ask them to help me out on this question, because, as I have said before, in our part of the country we need manure in order to grow, not grain as is grown in the West, but vegetables of all kinds for the benefit of the big population of Montreal—and I think the same thing must apply to Toronto and other big cities. We are situated very close to the boundary line, the distance from Montreal to Rouse's Point being about forty-three miles; and my friend, LeFebvre, who has all the sidings and controls all the manure, takes advantage of this to benefit the United States at Canada's expense. That is to say, if the farmers of my riding and of the riding of the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) refuse to pay $52 a ton f.o.b. delivered at their station, he tells them: "If you do not buy, I will go to the United States and Mr. Miner is open for all the surplus I have." This is the reason why I brought this matter before the House to-day. I do not want to dwell any more on this question. I think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will do all that is possible for the electors and farmers of this country, who at the present time are not too prosperous, and give us the manure we require to raise the best crops.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not wish to prolong this debate nor to delay the passing of the agricultural estimates, but yesterday reference was made to the cattle embargo removal in Great Britain, and I had my attention drawn to-day to a certain article in the press giving statements made by the Hon. P. C. Larkin, High Commissioner for Canada, on this subject. The statements that he made reflect upon the honour, integrity and loyalty of the prairie provinces, and I take exception to them. I wish, furthermore, to place this matter before the Government in order to be informed if they understand that Mr. Larkin is making such threats. We are quite prepared to believe that it is in the interest of all Canadians that the embargo should be removed; but we do not believe that the High Commissioner has a right to make a threat to the British Government at the expense of the prairie provinces. The article reads:

> Representations of the strongest character concerning the effect which failure to remove the embargo on cattle would produce in Canada have been made to the British Cabinet by Hon. P. C. Larkin. The new High Commissioner has assured the Ministers that the Government's failure to redeem its pledge to remove the cattle ban would place a potential weapon of considerable power in the hands of the annexationists of the Prairie provinces—

Why the prairie provinces?

> —and other foes in Canada of the imperial connection. It is understood that he has conveyed to the Cabinet the strong feeling which exists that the decision to leave the question to the free vote of the British Parliament is not regarded by Canada as fully implementing the Government's promise, as given by Lord Ernle during the war. The proposed resolution favoring the lifting of the embargo will probably pass the Commons, and may even pass the House of Lords if Canada makes its demand sufficiently strong, but even then it would be necessary to introduce and pass a bill to carry out the sense of the resolution, and such a measure would be bitterly contested.
>
> Hon. Mr. Larkin has already made a good impression here and the High Commissioner's office seems in a fair way to become the positive force for the advancement of Canada's interests and ends.

Well, if that is the impression that Hon. Mr. Larkin is making, the sooner he is recalled the better. The minister of Agriculture is a loyal citizen of the West and is interested in the prairie provinces, and I call this matter to his attention in the hope that he will not allow it to pass unnoticed by this Parliament. It is a reflection upon

the integrity and loyalty of the prairie provinces; we on this side of the House take great exception to the remarks I have quoted.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I did not gather, from the reading of the article by my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis), the authority for the statement that Mr. Larkin had made the remarks attributed to him. I was one of those who had a final conference with Mr. Larkin, the High Commissioner, before he left Canada, and this question of the embargo was discussed. We were both of the same mind as to the nature of the invocation that might be made in the effort to have the embargo removed, and our common view was precisely that of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) namely, that we should certainly persevere in the matter, but, at the same time, use the light pedal. It was our opinion that we should not go out with the club in hand; as was suggested yesterday, there has been too great a use of that weapon in the past in connection with the embargo, with mighty little prospect of success. That is not the way to approach anybody, but particularly the British public, more especially at this critical time when an election is in the offing. We should not put ourselves in the position of trying to embarrass the British authorities by apparently taking sides in an election which is a matter of entirely domestic concern. And in view of that conversation with Hon. Mr. Larkin I feel quite confident, at least until I have information to the contrary before me, that he never did indulge in such representations to the British government as are attributed to him. That is the position I will take until I have further proof to the contrary. I know what Mr. Larkin's views were, I know what mine are, and I know what opinion the leader of this Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) holds on the subject, and I feel quite satisfied that Mr. Larkin did not use the remarks ascribed to him.

With further reference to the question of embargo, I should say that, having very fully discussed yesterday the desirability of taking off an embargo, it is somewhat embarrassing to be asked to-day to put one on, even though one relates to animals and the other to animal product. The question raised by my hon. friend from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) is, however, a very important one. Apparently in the past he has been able to secure natural fertilizer in the vicinity of Montreal at $13 or $14 per car, for which he now has to pay $53 or $54. There is one obvious solution to that difficulty, and that is to give about a dollar more than the Americans give, so that the commodity will stay in the vicinity of Montreal. I have no doubt, of course, that the reply will be made that that is more than the business would stand. But, inasmuch as the placing of an embargo on even natural fertilizers would involve a government policy, I am not in a position to enunciate one offhand. I will assure my hon. friend, however, that anything that can be done locally will be done. I think that possibly something might be done in regard to freight rates. I understand that our railways carry manures, both natural and artificial, on a cheap rate basis, and possibly some representation might be made to the authorities at Montreal towards solving the problem the hon. member has raised. At all events, we will inquire into this matter before taking the more drastic step of invoking the remedy of an embargo. After all, an embargo is a restraint of trade, and I am sure my hon. friends opposite will sympathise with me when I say that just a little restraint of trade as possible should be brought into play even for such a worthy purpose as this.

Mr. HOCKEN: Will the minister get in touch with the Hon. Mr. Larkin by cable and let the House know, at the first opportunity, whether he did make the statements he is alleged to have made?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: We should have quite a cable bill—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Wait until I am through before you laugh.

Mr. HOCKEN: I will pay the cable myself, if that is the objection.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My hon. friends might reserve their laughter until I have concluded my remarks. If everything that appeared in the press were made the subject of a cable, we should run up a serious bill, and I do not see why we should do that. I have not seen the article in question, and I heard it but indistinctly. I gleaned the substance of it, however, and it did not occur to me that there was any necessity to cable Mr. Larkin asking him whether or not he was the author of these alleged statements. However, the First Minister is present and he may have something to say on the matter. I do not take much stock in these things, and I should not be

a bit surprised if, as a result of the discussion that took place yesterday in this House, some remarkable press statements should appear in the United Kingdom with respect to what transpired in this Chamber.

Mr. LEWIS: I do not care whether the minister communicates with Mr. Larkin by cable or otherwise, but I do think that this press report from the special correspondent of The Gazette in London should be either retracted or confirmed; for if it is authentic it is a reflection on the people of the West. The matter should be cleared up for their sake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister spoke rather hurriedly, or he would not have given utterance to the expression he used, that the matter of cost should intervene as between correcting or not correcting a statement made by the official representative of this Dominion.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is not what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not what my hon. friend said? Then why was the matter of cost introduced if it has no relevancy to the question? Why was it brought in at all?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If you will permit me I will state again what I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will have an opportunity to explain himself, but the matter of cost was introduced by him—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: —in connection with the request that he seek to find out whether or not a representative of this country made certain statements attributed to him. It may be that there are false press reports which the Government does not see fit to correct or to pay any attention to. That is quite true. But Mr. Larkin represents this Dominion in Great Britain, and if there are attributed to him statements which he certainly should not make in that capacity, then it is the duty of the Government, undoubtedly, to ascertain whether or not he did make those statements. If they were uttered they were uttered on behalf of this country. Suppose it turns out that he did not make them. Is it not well that this country should know that its representative did not so misunderstand his duty as to give utterance to such sentiments? The country is entitled to know, yes or no. Consequently the minister should say definitely and at once that he will ascertain whether those statements were or were not made by Mr. Larkin and let the House know accordingly at the first moment.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have not yet seen the report. When I see it, if it appears serious enough I will carry out the suggestion made by my hon. friend and by the member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis). But until I know the source of the report, and the value to be attributed to that source, I do not propose to send cablegrams on information of that kind.

Mr. HOCKEN: Do you want to appoint a royal commission to find out.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The remark I made was that if the Government paid heed to every press report, whether correct or incorrect, a very substantial expense would be incurred for cablegrams. I had not caught the word "annexationist." I do not wonder at the hon. member for Swift Current being exercised over it, inasmuch as the term has been often used against the prairie provinces much nearer home. I will reconsider my decision, Mr. Chairman, and when this estimate is passed I shall take such steps as may be necessary to meet the situation. Yes, it is a very offensive term, and until I get further evidence I shall not be satisfied that it was used by the High Commissioner. But, as I said before, it is often used much nearer home.

Mr. CALDWELL: Mr. Chairman, I was much interested in the hon. minister's statement that he understood the railways carried both natural and artificial fertilizers at reduced rates. I sincerely hope his understanding is correct, but I am afraid it is not.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: They carry natural fertilizers at reduced rates.

Mr. CALDWELL: Did you not include artificial fertilizers?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Possibly not.

Mr. CALDWELL: When the Board of Railway Commissioners ruled that gravel and crushed stone for roadmaking purposes would not be subject to the increased rates, I inquired of them whether ground limestone for agricultural purposes and artificial fertilizers might not come under the same ruling, as I thought it was of more interest to the country at large to have cheap transportation of fertilizers than even of road-making materials. I would urge upon the minister to take up with the

Railway Commission the desirability of low rates on fertilizers.

I asked the minister yesterday afternoon, but did not get any reply, what was his attitude towards establishing an abattoir and cold storage plant for the maritime provinces.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I answered that question, but my hon. friend was out at the time.

Mr. CALDWELL: Pardon me. I did not have time to read Hansard this morning. Mr. Chairman, I crave indulgence to refer to an item that I believe was passed yesterday afternoon while I was absent attending a meeting of the Pensions Committee. —Item 52, Administration of the Agricultural Instruction Act. Have I your permission, Mr. Chairman?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Mr. CALDWELL: This, I imagine, applies largely to the expense of furnishing lecturers to instruct farmers how to farm. If that is so, I would impress upon the minister that it is not necessary to instruct farmers as they have been instructed in the past—

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I might correct my hon. friend. It might be assumed that this item covers the activities of lecturers, but it does not.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think the matter might well be discussed also under the item now before the committee. In times past we have had lecturers advising the farmers in New Brunswick, not to improve their methods, but to adopt different methods of farming. I am not referring to any particular lecturers, but, generally their policy has been to tell us that we have been absolutely wrong in the lines we have been following, and to advise us to adopt other lines which, according to their view, would be much to our advantage. I think money expended on such lectures is thrown away, because a farming community cannot discard their methods and embark on other methods at a moment's notice. If these lecturers are to instruct us in future, I would suggest that natives of the province whose farmers they are to instruct should be employed, in fact men who know the local conditions, because those conditions vary very much. I think it would be money well spent to provide instructors whose policy should be to instruct the farmers to improve the methods of the branch of farming which they are already carrying on. For instance, it is waste of time for lecturers to tell the farmers of New Brunswick to go into wheat growing; and it is possible that advice to embark in dairying would be just as useless, due to the fact that we are too far removed from local markets and have no cheese factories to utilize dairy products. If those lecturers can show us how to carry on our present farming activities to better advantage by improved methods, the money would be well spent. I think the minister gave a reply to my question regarding the establishment of abattoir and cold storage facilities.

Mr. FIELDING: With regard to the statement attributed to Mr. Larkin, I want to be permitted to give two reasons why I am satisfied that he never uttered it. My first reason is, my faith in his sound judgment, good sense and discretion; my second reason is, I read that statement, in almost the exact words, in the press a week ago, but attributed to somebody else, not named, in England. I am quite satisfied that the statement made by somebody else, evidently an irresponsible person, has been improperly attributed to Mr. Larkin.

Mr. CALDWELL: Possibly this is an echo of one of the statements made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) last fall and still ringing down the halls of time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be an echo of deliberate misrepresentation of statements of the leader of the Opposition, circulated for the same purposes that hon. gentlemen opposite circulated assurances that they would give cash grants to soldiers and other like favours; misrepresentations that doubtless were in the mind of the Minister of Agriculture a moment ago when he sought, in a covert way, to convey the impression that others had declared that there were annexationists in the West, but which he won't stand in his place and attribute to any individual in this House.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No words of mine ever reflected in the least degree on the loyalty of western Canada, nor did any newspaper report that I ever read of any assertions of mine attribute such words to me. By the time, however, that they get on the lips of men who are anxious to make political capital, not for the sake of political reforms but for the sake of office, and to carry out in office exactly the things they denounced in opposition,—when they get around to the lips of men like that, they

finally reach the form which perhaps Mr. Larkin might have copied. But, if Mr. Larkin is over there copying misrepresentations, it is time he returned. I am quite ready to accept the judgment of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I cannot conceive that any man of Mr. Larkin's standing could make such a statement as this. I know what it is to be misrepresented, and I am not going to abuse Mr. Larkin until I know exactly what he said.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Taking the last criticism first, Mr. Chairman, I did not even look at the right hon. gentleman when I was speaking about the question of annexation. Why should he be so quick to put the cap on right over his ears without any suggestion on my part that it belonged there?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman quote me when I put the cap on?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: My right hon. friend referred to it and said he had never dealt with it—

Mr. MEIGHEN: No; I said the hon. gentleman would not attribute it to anybody in this House.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, the circumstances I had in mind related to the election campaign of 1911, in which reciprocity was an issue—why the air was blue with it. My hon. friends have very short memories. But let us get back to agriculture for a moment, and to natural fertilizers, not artificial fertilizers.

With regard to cold storage, I may repeat briefly what I said last night in reply to the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). Under the terms of a cold storage act passed many years ago, substantial assistance was given to those engaging in the construction of cold storage plants. Until about 1917 or 1918, thirty per cent of the cost of construction was paid by the federal government as a subsidy to all cold storage plants constructed under plans and specifications laid down by the Department of Agriculture. That law was changed to apply only to municipal cold storages, in order that the burden on the revenues of the country might be decreased. Very few plants—possibly only one or two—have been constructed under the amended law. I would like to have advised the Minister of Finance to revert this year to the original enactment providing for the thirty per cent subsidy, but I did not think I was justified in doing it this year. Possibly we may be able to do so another year when the treasury is less depleted—and I think if we did, it would go a long way toward meeting the situation. Of course, I cannot pledge the Government to that policy. The question of cold storage is becoming a very vital one, not only in my hon. friend's province but in other provinces as well. British Columbia in particular.

The question of lectures has been referred to. I have driven twenty-five miles after dark from Abernethy to Indian Head to hear an agricultural lecture, only to listen to an address by someone who did not know beans when the bag was open. I do not know whether any of the lecturers my hon. friend refers to have been down in his district since the first of January. I am prepared to take responsibility for any shortcomings in that regard, even those which date back to the time prior to my taking office; if these men are there yet, I am responsible for it.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not referring to anything just lately.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: If my hon. friend will inform me confidentially as to some of the gentlemen who do not measure up, we will try to improve matters. There again, of course, I am up against the Civil Service Commission: we can dismiss them, but we cannot appoint others.

I think my hon. friend was correct in saying that the reduced freight rate does apply to the natural fertilizer, and many arguments could be advanced in support of the contention that it should apply to the artificial fertilizer also.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to make a statement in regard to the ground limestone. In New Brunswick ground limestone is very badly needed; acid phosphate has a tendency to make the soil become acid, and the application of ground limestone is necessary to correct that condition, In order to provide our farmers with this limestone the provincial governemnt got a special freight rate from the railway companies which ensured the delivery of ground limestone anywhere in the province at $5 a ton. But when the last increase of freight rates came into effect, the rate on ground limestone was increased by about $2 a ton—I am not positive as to the exact amount, but that was the approximate increase. The result has been almost to prohibit the use of ground limestone in New Brunswick, to the great detriment of production. I

4 p.m.

think that this matter should be brought very forcibly to the attention of the Railway Commission. I have in my feeble way tried to do that, but I was informed in reply that you could produce an argument in favour of a reduction of freight rates on anything. That was a rather flippant way to deal with a question which is of the greatest importance, to us at least. When you increase the price of ground limestone from $5 to $7 or thereabouts, through increased freight rates, it is a very serious thing, and I would like to see some action taken to afford us relief.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I will keep the matter in mind.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): The minister will remember that his predecessor in office met those interested in the production and marketing of bacon through a conference held last fall, with a view of discussing the improvement of the quality of our bacon, both in its raw state and in the finished condition. What results, if any, have come from that conference?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The conference was held in November and was attended by representatives of all the departments of Agriculture as well as by producers and representatives of abattoirs, the idea being to work out a plan of grading of hogs or bacon. Shortly after the new government was formed we started to carry out the conclusions of the conference. The necessary Orders in Council have gone through, and the whole question has got the 'once over'. But it is amazing what an intricate matter it is to get appointments made. It is simply a question now of getting the men for the positions. As my hon. friend knows, advertisement has to be made and applications have to be received. I assume that when the positions are advertised there will be from 150 to 200 applicants for the 20 or 22 positions. It will take about two weeks to advertise the positions; then the receiving of applications will take a little while longer, after which the process of examination must take place, the rating of the applicants, and so on. I cannot, therefore, give my hon. friend any assurance when the actual grading of hogs will be in operation. My deputy tells me that with reasonable luck—because I cannot put it in any other way—we shall be able to put the ball into play about the first of June; we were aiming at starting about the first of May. We would like to commence when the business is slack, so there will be the least possible disturbance to the old order of things in the introduction of the new.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Does the minister's explanation mean that his department is implementing the work done by those conferences?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Might I ask the minister's opinion as to the grading of live hogs? Does he think it will be effective, and what benefit will result to the producer?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Before I answer the first question I may say that provision for paying these men is made in the vote under discussion. Everything has been provided for: Regulations have been drafted, Orders in Council passed, and the matter is now either before the Civil Service Commission or on the point of being sent there—I do know it has got to go to the commission. As to my hon. friend's other question, I was not at the conference referred to, but I have had a discussion with a number of those who were, and the idea is this: As time goes on the tendency in all agricultural countries, owing to the keen competition—not only to secure markets but to retain them—is to put all farm products on the market in a graded condition, and to encourage the buying based upon quality. That is to say, in order to get quality you must encourage quality, in order to encourage quality you must pay on that basis; and—just as the hon. member's wheat, oats, barley or rye out in Last Mountain is paid for on the basis of quality—the hope is that by the grading of hogs, which is certainly difficult but not impossible to carry out, payment will be largely made on the basis of quality and that will encourage quality. Now, the idea of these hog graders is not to grade every consignment that comes in, but rather to grade those that the buyer and the seller disagree on. If my hon. friend were the purchaser of hogs and I the seller, as long as we could agree on the grade there would be no difficulty about the transaction; but if we disagreed then the matter would be referred to this grader or, as it would be more proper to call him, referee. That is the way we propose to start. I think that even the grade my hon. friend and I might agree on should be made the subject of record even though we do not refer to the referee at all, so that we would be able to keep track of how the amount in hogs corresponds with the

amount in first-class bacon the abattoir may turn out. The whole matter, I think, tends in the right direction. It is not desired to disturb the trade any more than is necessary. The grader may be said to be rather a referee. That referee will represent the abattoirs and also the producers and both will abide by his decision. In addition the understanding is that, based upon this quality, the abattoirs will bid in order to play their part and thus incidentally prevent their doors being closed for the want of business, a condition that some of them are in to-day. The abattoirs will bid a premium on all selects, of ten per cent, I think it is. That is the understanding, but it will not be easy to work out the proportion. It may gradually become absorbed into the general price. At any rate, I have explained the object we have in view, and that is the intent of the contract.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I would like to impress upon the minister the hardships that will be suffered by exhibition associations if a reduction of even twenty-five per cent is made in the grants for this purpose. I believe in economy, and I suppose we must think about economizing, but it seems to me that this is just about the last place where we should start that principle. I think we should do everything possible to encourage agriculture, and it seems to me that one of the best ways to do so is to encourage the holding of these fairs. In my constituency we hold an exhibition under the auspices of the Royal Agricultural and Industrial Society, an exhibition that boasts of being the best in the West, and personally I think it is a very good show indeed. We have a splendid display of agricultural exhibits and of live stock; it is a very complete and interesting exhibition. Unfortunately, I believe the exhibition associations have counted on having the full grant this year. I believe they were told that before any reduction was made they would be notified and afforded the opportunity of being heard by the minister. They received no notice whatever that any reduction was to be made this year, and they have made up their prize lists, and based their expenditures, on the expectation of the full grant. Now, I submit to the minister, it is hardly fair that this reduction be made without notice. I would also suggest to him that before his policy in this regard is finally determined he give the fair managers the opportunity of making representations to him. I think they have asked for a conference, and I would suggest in all seriousness to the minister that he might very well consider the advisability of having this conference with the fair managers of the whole Dominion before he finally adopts his policy with regard to exhibition grants.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I think my hon. friend looks so good natured over it that he rather expects this small reduction.

Mr. McQUARRIE: No, not for this year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to ask the minister whether there is to be any change in the vote for the National Live Stock Records. I believe there has been a vote of $20,000 a year for quite a number of years back to assist the National Live Stock Records in carrying on their work. It is well known that the work of the records board has increased very much during the last few years, and the live stock associations of the Dominion find a good deal of difficulty in carrying on at the present time—in fact, some of them have been compelled to increase their registration fees as a result of the increased obligations that they have had to assume. I notice there are twenty-six of these record associations and I will hurriedly run over the list. They are:

Canadian Aberdeen Angus Association, Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association, Can. Belgian Draft Horse Breeders' Ass'n, Canadian Brown Swiss Association, Clydesdale Horse Association of Canada, French Canadian Cattle Breeders' Ass'n, Can. French Coach Breeders' Association, French Canadian Horse Breeders' Ass'n, North American Galloway Association, Canadian Goat Society, Canadian Guernsey Breeders' Association, Canadian Hackney Horse Society, Canadian Hereford Breeders' Association, Canadian Jersey Cattle Club, Canadian Kennel Club, Canadian Percheron Horse Breeders Ass'n, Canadian Pony Society, Canadian Red Polled Association, Canadian Sheep Breeders' Association, Canadian Shire Horse Association, Dominion Shorthorn Breeders' Association, Canadian Silver Fox Breeders' Association, Canadian Standard Bred Horse Society, Canadian Suffolk Horse Society, Canadian Swine Breeders' Association, Canadian Thoroughbred Horse Society.

I think the House will agree as to the importance of keeping the record of the pure-breds of all stock raised in this country. I believe that the outlook for the farmers of Canada depends more upon raising stock of a high standard than upon attempting to supply the demand for inferior animals, and I do not know of anything that will conduce more to the promotion of the interests of the live stock industry in the Dominion than assisting the live stock associations to carry on.

As I pointed out, the grant, I believe, for a number of years has been $20,000 per year, and I believe that for some time past the associations have been making requests of the Government for an increase. In this connection I might point out that the money received by these associations for fees, and for recording pedigrees and transferring records, in 1917 was $111,000 approximately; in 1918 $123,000; in 1919, $147,000; in 1920, $155,000; and in 1921, $171,689. There has been an increase in those five years of $60,615 in the fees they collected, which indicates that the work has spread very rapidly. I think more attention is being paid by the farmers of this country to improving the various breeds and keeping a record as to the purity of the breeds than there has been at any time in the past. I believe the department has endeavoured to do good work along this line for many years, and I am in sympathy with the demands which have been made by the live stock associations in the requests for greater assistance along this line. This item of $1,000,000 is the same amount that has been placed in the Estimates for many years past. The charge is often made that the grants for agricultural purposes are not as large as they might be, and this is one thing that might well receive the favourable consideration of the minister and the Government. I think an increased grant should be given to the National Live-stock Record, because the increase in the salaries which they had to pay has been very great indeed. I understand the salaries paid by the Records Board amounted to somewhere about $50,000 per year, and $20,000 seems a very small amount to vote towards assisting the Live-stock Records Board. I would suggest that the minister consider the requests which have been made by the Records Board and the Live-stock Associations for a more generous contribution toward expenses. The necessity should not be forced upon these associations to increase the registration fees, as the boards have done during the past few years. In the case of some of the boards the registration fees have been doubled during the last year or two as a result of an increased expenditure, and this is not conducive to the maintenance of the purity of the breeds, because in many instances, I believe, animals are allowed to go unrecorded if the fees are too high.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in all he has said. I am not familiar with the details as to the amount of assistance given in past years, but I have in my hand an itemized summary of what we are giving them now. I might point out that not only is this an important branch with respect to preserving the records and pedigrees of animals, but it is also important by reason of the fact that it is taking care of new lines of activity. The work is extending all the time in many lines of work, which, in years past, they did not take care of, and I have no doubt as time goes on their activities will increase and widen in scope:

Grant to the Live Stock records	$20,000 00
Printing	5,944 26
Stationery	500 00
Salaries, for employees, Live Stock Branch	5,840 00
Cartage	120 00
Rent	6,249 00
Taxes	1,359 75
Lighting	239 23
Power	196 00
Water	100 63
Elevator Attendants	1,260 00
Free Postage, estimated as worth	12,000 00
Total	$53,808 00

In addition to what they have been getting last year, they have been given certain printing assistance and also certain additional office accommodation. I do not suppose there is a branch in the whole department where the officials would not tell you they could spend more money to advantage, and this particular activity is similar to the other branches in that respect. It is not spoken of usually as a branch, but it is similar to a branch, I have no doubt they could spend more money to advantage. They require additional office space and printing in addition to what they got last year. That is about the only difference.

Mr. BRETHEN: I belong to a breed association of some two or three thousand members, who are receiving no assistance, but who have had to increase their fees, and I believe this money might be used to better advantage. While I am in favour of the grant to this industry, I am not favourable to devoting the whole grant to the interest of special breeds. I believe this matter might well be taken into consideration in making an additional grant for this purpose. Since coming to this House I have been more or less conversant with the principle of public ownership, but when we have a breed organization which is capable of conducting its affairs to its members' satisfaction at least, and quite as economically as the Government would, I fail to see the advan-

tage of Government ownership in the matter of records. I draw this to the attention of the minister, because it might otherwise be overlooked.

Mr. HARRIS: Last night the minister was good enough to allow this matter to stand over, to give him an opportunity to bring in facts and figures in regard to the hog cholera, and perhaps the impression was left on the House yesterday that the amount of hog cholera was in proportion to the amount of compensation. Some questions were put to the minister and we expected an answer to-day. Before the estimates are passed, I should be glad if the minister would answer these questions, as briefly as possible, so that the House would understand that the amount of compensation is not an index to the amount of hog cholera prevalent in the Dominion, but rather that the number of cases recorded and the number of cases where compensation was not paid would, perhaps, be a better index.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I have been so busy with certain other phases of the live stock question that I am sure I will be excused for not going back to hog cholera until I was asked to do so. However, I have a statement here and I do not know how good my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) will consider the authority. The statement reads:

Reasons for not permitting the use of double treatment for hog cholera in Canada. The double treatment means the simultaneous injection of hogs cholera serum and the active virus of the disease.

1. Double treatment perpetuates the disease. Every double treated hog is a carrier of the virus for an indefinite period after the treatment, and during that time may convey the disease to susceptible hogs.

That is better put than what I said yesterday, but the meaning is the same:

2. Double treatment sometimes causes outbreaks of hog cholera. Experience of the United States shows heavy losses from so-called "breaks" after treatment.

3. Double treatment may disseminate other diseases. During the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the United States in 1914-15, the disease was spread in some instances by this means.

4. Double treatment is unnecessary in Canada as losses from this disease are very small.

There is my authority. I have no doubt the disease is serious in spots. In the West about ten years ago I saw outbreaks that were exceedingly serious. The disease may exist there now, but I have not seen any cases of it recently:

[Mr. Brethen.]

During the past year only 429 hogs were destroyed for hog cholera in all Canada. Compare this with the average annual loss in the United States for three years of $55,000,000.

Of course, we must take into consideration the difference in population. I have not figured that out, neither has Dr. Torrance.

5. Control of hog cholera by immunization when once begun must be kept up indefinitely. All young hogs in double-treated herds must be treated or disease will appear. The cost of this to hog growers in the United States amounts to $7,500,000 a year for serum and virus, not counting payment to veterinarians applying the treatment.

Serum and virus alone cost $7,500,000. Travelling expenses in administering this serum must be enormous.

HOG CHOLERA—SWINE DESTROYED, COMPENSATION, ETC.

	Number of swine destroyed	Compensation
For the years ending—		
March, 31, 1919.. ..	2,163	$23,342 74
March 31, 1920.. ..	1,642	19,001 71
March 31, 1921.. ..	3,354	22,003 33
March 31, 1922.. ..	429	3,055 06

	Number of swine serum treated
For the year ending—	
March 31, 1922..	2,557

	Serum Purchased	Purchase price
For the year ending—		
March 31, 1921-22..	261,000 c.c.	$3,581

There is no regularity in the decrease in number of animals slaughtered; the number varies. This year the number is noticeably larger than that of last year.

Then Dr. Torrance makes this statement:

The method of dealing with hog cholera in Canada is to first control the feeding of garbage on a large scale by strictly enforcing Regulation 88½, which provides for the licensing of all parties feeding garbage collected from other premises; (2) strict supervision of these premises to ensure proper sanitation and early detection of disease; (3) outbreaks are dealt with by promptly destroying all affected hogs, and by serum treating all hogs that have been in direct or indirect contact with them, and (4) by serum treating all hogs returned from public stock yards to farms for breeding or feeding whenever hog cholera makes its appearance in the yards or vicinity.

By these means hog cholera has been kept down to a minimum during the past few years.

I think this is the information that my hon. friend desired most.

Number of swine destroyed for hog cholera, for which there was no compensation paid.

For the year ending—	
March 31, 1919..	206
March 31, 1920..	89
March 31, 1921..	1,341
March 31, 1922..	108

If I have omitted anything, I have done so inadvertently.

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince): I think it would be only fair to give a tabulated statement regarding the different provinces. We would like to know where this hog cholera is. Perhaps the minister has not the information.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I understand that hog cholera is more prevalent in this province and in British Columbia. There is also some in Quebec. I understand there is a little all over; but in some provinces it is almost exterminated, while British Columbia and Ontario have probably more than other provinces, but not to such an extent as to make it pronouncedly conspicuous.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do I understand that, during the year 1920, only 89 hogs were slaughtered for which compensation was refused?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That was for the year ending March 31, 1920. A very small number of hogs were slaughtered that year. These amounts correspond to the totals I have cited; there is a relationship between them. In 1920, the total number of swine destroyed was 1642; the next year the total number was 3,354, twice as many.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The matter which I brought to the minister's attention last night occurred in March, 1920, when over 200 animals belonging to one man were slaughtered and compensation was refused. This must be for a different year.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: All hogs actually slaughtered in one year may not appear in that year's accounts. As fiscal years come together, payment for some hogs slaughtered in one year will appear in the accounts for the following year. That is unavoidable. That is so in the case of the year 1921, where the number slaughtered increases from 89 to 1,341. Should there be a heavy slaughter at the end of one fiscal year, the number will show big at the beginning of the next year.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: It seems remarkable that there should have been so many during the year 1921. The impression prevails in many quarters that it was the policy of the department to discontinue the licensing of people to feed garbage to their hogs; and if the purpose is to stop the spread of the disease, I do not know that it is not a good policy to pursue. Was any effort made in that year to discourage the feeding of garbage by withholding compensation from those who had sustained losses? It has been pointed out to me that a number of people have had their animals destroyed and that the department has refused to issue licenses.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This large increase in hogs that were slaughtered without compensation in 1921 was due to the fact that we had a larger amount of imported bacon. Inasmuch as 90 per cent of hog cholera is traceable to garbage, there was thought to be a relationship between the amount of hog cholera, and the larger amount of importations of American bacon, which proves that that is the source of the contagion. That is good circumstantial evidence, at all events.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Does the minister contend that the importation of American bacon was the chief source of the hog cholera that was introduced into this country?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes. The portion that goes into the swill barrel carries the germ. With regard to the matter of discouraging the licensing of the feeding of garbage, licenses have been refused men who violated the regulations in the past. Such men could not have their licenses renewed, and as a matter of fact they did not get them in the first place until they complied with the conditions laid down. The only change that has been contemplated at all has been the substitution of larger kettles for cooking garbage, so as to avoid the necessity of procuring more expensive boilers. It has been pointed out that if the hog owners were allowed to use larger kettles that could be looked after by unskilled labour, they could feed more cheaply than if they had an expensive boiler that necessitated the services of a semi-expert when the boss was away from home. I have not had an opportunity of looking into the question, but it seems rational enough.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Last night I asked for information with regard to the amount paid by the Department of Agriculture in the way of freight and expenses on carloads of cattle during the year 1921. I think the minister promised to give that information to-day.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The following is a memorandum with regard to the cost of free freight policy for 1921:

Memorandum re Car Lot and Free Freight Policy

Cost of free freight policy for 1921—

Eastern Canada	$ 47 29
Western Canada	22,414 75

Cost of car lot policy for 1921—

Eastern Canada	$ 11 25
Western Canada	9,936 65

The records of the Live Stock Branch show only the movement out from each stock yard and not by provinces. It would take considerable time to compile a definite statement of costs from each yard, but approximately the cost may be divided as follows:

	Per cent
Calgary	65
Edmonton	15
Winnipeg	15
Moose Jaw	5

On Page 21-23 of the Live Stock Branch Estimates will be found a detailed statement of the movement of live stock under these policies since their inception.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: What percentage has been paid during these years in eastern Canada? The minister has given the figures for western Canada. It is necessary that we should have some more light on some of these items in this vote for $1,000,000, which is the most important vote that goes through in connection with the Department of Agriculture. There are many branches of agriculture which receive assistance through it, and it is well that the committee should know where the bulk of the money goes and what results are obtained. In regard to this particular item to which I have referred, it is quite apparent that practically the whole sum is distributed in western Canada. I have also asked what amount was paid in grants for the payment of feed for live stock during the year 1921; and I want some information with regard to the control of the stockyards. The department exercises control over the licensing of commission men or firms who dispose of live stock on the live stock markets. Have any complaints been received from any of the stockyards in regard to these licensed commission men, and have any investigations been held into their operations?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know which of these many questions I shall answer first. I have a memorandum with regard to some features of the question regarding the amounts expended during the last four years in connection with the shortage of feed in western Canada. I shall read it:

With regard to the amounts expended during the last four years in connection with the shortage of feed in Western Canada, particularly in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, the amounts paid out by the Federal Department of Agriculture for the transportation of haymaking machinery from the dry area to points where hay was plentiful and return, of hay and other feed to the dry area from points outside and of live stock from the dry area to feeding grounds outside and return, were as follows:

[Mr. Motherwell.]

1918-19	$ 49,994 78
1919-20	620,135 54
1920-21	309,942 54
1921-22	5,704 45
	$985,777 31

With regard to the complaints about live stock yards, I had a number of resolutions from the Alberta Grain Growers' convention, through its secretary, Mr. Higginbotham, and I also had an interview with a number of members from Alberta. I think we satisfied them that any serious difficulties were just such as might be expected in comparatively newly organized stockyards. In the older stockyards conditions are, I think, satisfactory. In the newer ones, such as those at Moose Jaw and Prince Albert, you cannot expect everything to be in apple-pie order, but they are gradually improving. With respect to the investigations to which my hon. friend has referred, I must ask him to excuse me for the moment. I do not know exactly what particulars he desires. There is a live stock exchange at Winnipeg, and I understand that certain investigations were held there. I presume the hon. member refers to the buyers on those exchanges who are bonded. I believe the bond is for $10,000. The hon. members of the Progressive party will understand the situation in regard to the marketing of wheat, which is similar to this. A man ships a carload of wheat to a commission merchant who defaults, and he loses his money; and the same thing happens in the case of a carload of stock. The commission man's bond runs out, or something happens, and he defaults. A number of cases have happened where men have lost a carload of stock. This is occurring all along the line. Several remedies have been suggested. Before coming here I was in correspondence with gentlemen in various parts of western Canada on the subject. But the remedies so far proposed would create difficulties that probably would be as great as the evils they were intended to correct; in other words, the remedies were worse than the disease. In the shipment of wheat this difficulty can be met by getting as large an advance on your car as possible, and having the bond take care of the balance only; but in the shipment of live stock I understand that that is not so easy to do. I have not been a big shipper of live stock myself, but I do not think it is the practice to get advances on such shipments. It takes so large a bond to cover the business of a live stock com-

mission man that it is a considerable burden to him, and it has not been imposed for fear lest it should increase the cost of buying. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), I have no doubt, could contribute more information in regard to this matter than I can. I know there is the same difficulty in connection with grain, but not to so large an extent. But the difficulty is there, and I have had my attention brought to it in one or two instances where the farmer had lost money as a result. Nothing has been done yet that I know of to correct the trouble.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am afraid the minister misunderstood my question. I was asking if any complaints had been received by the department with regard to those who were licensed to dispose of stock on the live stock markets. Carload lots are consigned to the commissioned men, in many instances the owner does not attend the market at all, and consequently a good deal of confidence must be reposed in those men.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does the hon. member mean complaints from the commission men themselves?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: No, they would not be likely to complain. I refer to complaints from the owners of live stock that the commission men may not have disposed of their stock to proper advantage. My reason for bringing this to the attention of the minister is that rumours to this effect have been in circulation, and I believe that as a result certain commission men have been very much injured. I also have information that the rumours are not correct. It is very easy to start such a rumour, and everyone knows how it will be passed, from one person to another, until it is given widespread circulation. If no such complaints have been made, I think the country should know it, and the commission men should not longer remain under the imputation of dishonesty.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No complaints whatever have been made with the exception of one or two from correspondents in the country, as I have already recited.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: There are also other votes in connection with stallion clubs, representing a considerable amount. It is a new departure on the part of the department, but it has been in practice in the Old Country for some time. What portion of this sum has been given for the purpose to clubs around in eastern Canada and in western Canada.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Mr. Chairman, we are kept pretty busy answering questions both here and in our office, and I think we should try to avoid duplication. This question is on the Order Paper, and we have not even come to it yet. There will be a whole lot of work involved in giving the information, and it will come down in due course. It is now nearly five o'clock, and if we keep on at this rate we are not going to conclude the session until the middle of July. It seems to me that if I give this information once, that should be sufficient. However, I am in the hands of the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Notwithstanding the statement just made by the minister, I think the committees are entitled to know what this vote is for. Because a certain question appears on the Order Paper I do not think that is a very good reason why the information should not be furnished. This afternoon the minister was inclined to adopt a different attitude with regard to another matter that was under discussion, raised, I believe, by the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) relative to an insinuation that appeared in the press this morning. The minister now advocated applying the soft pedal, saying in effect: You cannot accomplish much by using a club. When he made that statement I could not help reflecting on what happened with regard to the British cattle embargo. I think the hon. member for Swift Current was amply justified in his objection; but I think some of our provincial ministers who took such an active part in the embargo agitation overseas had not very good grounds for doing so. I do not think any government in Canada has been negligent of its duty in trying to have that embargo removed.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Does the hon. gentleman know of any case in which I referred to the embargo question in any offensive way? I am not responsible for the action of provincial ministers.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister stated that instead of the hon. member taking exception to the report which appeared in the Montreal Gazette, he might just as well or better have taken exception to the statements of some people nearer home, and later on, by way of justification, he went back to the elections of 1911.

Now what happened? Every administration we have had since the embargo was imposed by the British government has endeavoured to secure its removal. A year ago the matter came up in this House on a motion introduced by an hon. member, and everything indicated that efforts were being put forth by the then Minister of Agriculture to place the matter before the British government. A member of a provincial government in western Canada, and a member of another provincial government in eastern Canada, went over to the Old Country and took an active part in this matter, and during a by-election in Great Britain certain influences were brought to bear, with the result, I am inclined to think, that great difficulties were placed in the way of having the embargo removed. Now, it seems somewhat remarkable that one of those ministers from Alberta on his return home almost immediately afterwards took part in a provincial election in his own province, and instead of receiving the endorsation of his people he was repudiated and turned out of office. A little later another general election came on.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that his remarks are not relevant to the item under consideration.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am referring to the Hon. Duncan Marshall, who is engaged by the Government in connection with a matter which is involved in the item now before the committee.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: What happened the hon. gentleman's own leader?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I am not referring to my own leader; I am referring to a matter which is pertinent to the item we are now considering. Not only was Mr. Marshall rebuked in the provincial election, but he was also rebuked when he was again a candidate for the federal parliament, and the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr. Lewis) does not need to feel that he has suffered very much as a result of the newspaper article which has appeared. The minister says we are going to use the soft pedal now; we are going to get away from tactics of that kind. Last night when this item was before the committee I made some inquiries regarding the operations of this commissioner—I hardly know how to designate him; he is engaged temporarily and cannot be considered as in the permanent service. I have a distinct recollection of the minister stating that Mr. Marshall was to be sent to Terra del Fuego, or Patagonia, or somewhere in the extreme end of South America, in order to develop the live stock business of this country. But when I ask for information with regard to the clubs and associations that are receiving assistance from this grant, the minister says we are taking up too much time; that the information can be furnished later if the vote is allowed to pass. The minister states that Mr. Marshall has been engaged with a view to having a new allocation made of the grant for the instruction of agriculture in this province. Last night we were told that he was engaged in immigration work down in Florida, and that as the result of one speech he made there, the people are coming from that country and advancing into—he did not say where; into western Canada, I assume. I would like to know whether the services of Mr. Marshall, who has been engaged by the minister for agricultural purposes, are to be devoted to the Department of the Interior for immigration purposes which do not come under this vote.

5 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would like to have some further information with regard to what the various provinces are receiving out of these grants for agricultural instruction. We have had a little information to-night, and you see that western Canada has been getting practically the whole of it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The agricultural instruction vote is passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: But the vote covering the operations of Mr. Duncan Marshall is not passed. When he arrives in Patagonia possibly we shall have a better idea of what we are voting this money for. How many pure bred sires were distributed by the Department of Agriculture during the past year? I would like the information by provinces.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: In 1921, 27 bulls were distributed in British Columbia, at a cost of $4,910. I hope that is satisfactory to my hon. friend from Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). I think I should receive some assistance from him during this terrible ordeal; I have always stood by him in a crisis like this.

Mr. TOLMIE: The hon. gentleman was not here last year; I was alone.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: That is a great relief to me; misery likes company. But to proceed with the statistics: in Alberta, 104 bulls were distributed at a cost of $19,980; in Saskatchewan, 113 were distributed, at a cost of $22,090 and in Manitoba, 88, costing $15,340. Ontario seems to have been discriminated against, having received only 31, costing $5,550, while Quebec received 73, costing $11,825. This matter will have to be looked into. New Brunswick did not receive any, and only 5 went to Nova Scotia, at a cost of $435. Here we have the province which sent to Parliament the "solid sixteen" getting only 5, as against Saskatchewan, with only one Liberal representative, getting 113. Surely there is something wrong; I do not wonder that my hon. friend asks questions. Prince Edward Island received 2, at a cost of $290. None of these animals seem to have found their way to the Yukon.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the minister give us the number of stallions distributed in the different provinces?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No stallions were distributed.

Item agreed to.

Department of the Interior—Geodetic Survey of Canada—Investigations, reconnaissance, triangulations, precise levelling, topographical work and geodetic astronomy, etc., $325,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is just one observation I would like to make on this item. It brings up a question that has had some consideration from the House at former sessions, namely whether it would not be well to combine the surveys work and the map work of the various departments in a single department. This work is now being done by four or five different departments, and I am satisfied that there is a great duplication of effort and of expense. Quite an elaborate system is maintained in the Department of Public Works, and there is this fairly elaborate system in the Department of the Interior. Then there is also a branch of the Militia Department which maintains a very highly qualified staff of expert engineers and surveyors. I think that in still another department there is a similar staff. I am told that in the United States all this work is being done under the War Department by the trained officers, engineers and draughtsmen of that department, and I believe the same thing could be done here with a great saving of expense, and I think probably with better results from the point of view of uniformity than we are obtaining at the present time. The Royal Military College, which is maintained very largely at the expense of this Government, turns out annually a very capable body of engineers and scientific draughtsmen. Many of them go into the militia and their services could be made available by any department of the Government. I am satisfied that if the new minister would take that matter up and consult with his colleagues he could evolve a scheme, and bring it to Parliament for the next session, which would do away with a great deal of the duplication of these services which has been going on for thirty or forty years. I only bring the matter before the committee at the present time for the purpose of directing the attention of the minister to this work. I am satisfied there is a possibility of making great economies in this service and that better work will result for the Government.

Item agreed to.

International Boundaries. Expenses connected with the survey and demarcation of International Boundaries, including $1,000 to J. J. McArthur as International Boundary Commissioner, $35,680.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the nature of this work?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Minister of the Interior): This branch deals with the demarcation of the boundaries between Canada and the United States under the direction of the joint commission composed of two commissioners appointed respectively by His Majesty and the Government of United States. The work has practically been completed. The money asked for is required to compile data for the joint reports, the preparation of maps, and resurveying and the resetting of monuments in various places.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): It seems a large sum of money to expend for simply the compilation of data and the arrangement of monuments. However, the minister says the work is practically completed. Is it the minister's intention to continue the work this year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that as soon as the work is completed the whole thing ceases. I have a detailed statement dealing with the monuments set up from the lake of the Woods to the western coast, and with the survey work on the St. Croix river, New Brunswick. Once the work is completed there

will be no further expenditure in connection with it.

Item agreed to.

Government of the Yukon Territory, $160,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the minister tell us why there is an increase of $30,000 in two of the items comprised in this vote?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In the first item, of $65,000, there is an increase of $30,000 as compared with the Main Estimates of 1921-22. A number of changes, including the consolidation of certain positions, were contemplated when the Estimates for 1921-22 were prepared, and the vote was reduced from $70,000 to $35,000. As the changes did not take effect it was impossible to pay the expenses of administration with the sum of $35,000, and a Governor General's warrant for $25,000 additional was obtained, making a total of $60,000 for 1921-22. It may be that this last sum will not be quite sufficient to pay the expenses for that year, and the payment of some of the accounts will no doubt have to be carried into the fiscal year 1922-23. At any rate, the gold commissioner recommends that a vote of $65,000 be obtained. That sum is required to pay salaries, living allowances and expenses connected with travelling, insane patients, printing and stationery, advertising, etc. I may say I have gone over these and I will read them for the benefit of the committee; most of them appear reasonable.

Amount required for salaries is.. ..	$21,660
Amount for living allowance..	15,900
Insane patients, expenses connected with transportation to and maintenance in the insane hospital, the Provincial Mental Hospital at New Westminster, B.C., also for maintenance in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police barracks at Dawson and White Horse..	14,500
Travelling expenses of outside officials to and from Dawson and in the territory..	2,000
Printing and stationery..	1,500
Expenses connected with the collection of export tax by Royal Canadian Northwest Mounted Police officers. They receive 50 cents a day while on that special duty.	1,000
To pay commission of 10 per cent to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police officials on sums collected by them as mining recorders, mining inspectors and Crown timber and land agents..	1,000
To pay legal expenses not included in Vote for costs of litigation..	1,000
Miscellaneous: Freight and express charges, telegrams, telephones, postage and unforeseen expenses.. ...	6,440
Total..	$65,000

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: The only observation that I have to make is this, I understand the population of the Yukon has very rapidly decreased in recent years, and one would expect that the cost of government would decrease accordingly. Last year the vote was only $45,000 for all this service, and a Governor General's warrant became necessary for an additional $25,000, which would make the total amount of last year $60,000. I think I am safe in saying that there are fewer people in the territory than there were last year, but the vote now asked for is $65,000, notwithstanding that last year we were able to get through with $60,000. I think the committee would expect the amount for the coming year to be decreased $5,000 or $10,000 rather than increased by $5,000. Of the amount, $21,000 goes for salaries and $15,000 for allowances. The balance is made up largely of grants for maintenance of institutions for the insane, and the like, to which no great exception can be taken. But surely as time goes on this vote for salaries and allowances should be decreased. I think the minister should content himself this year with what he spent last year, namely $60,000. That would look reasonable to me.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In all probability the objection is well taken, and it is possible that we may get along without that $5,000. If it is possible, I intend to adopt the suggestion made by some of the officials of the department, that an amalgamation of offices shall take place, and probably we can make a larger saving. But the committee will readily understand that one who has recently come into the department would hardly venture to make drastic cuts and expect to carry them out, not knowing just exactly what he might be up against in connection with this saving. The revenues are expected to be in the neighbourhood of $154,000 and we are practically within the revenue in our expenditure. I am not advancing that as a claim for the $65,000 vote by any means, because I agree with the objection taken by my hon. friend, that if an amalgamation of officials took place the cost of government could be reduced; but there is some revenue still coming out of the Yukon territory, and I have discovered a persistent demand for road construction to enable the people engaged in mining to get out the products of the mine. I hope we can present a much reduced estimate on this head next year, when I have had time to

investigate. No more money will be spent than is absolutely necessary during the coming year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am sure the committee is glad of the assurance of the minister in that respect, and I feel sure that he will see that not a dollar more than is necessary will be spent. But the principle upon which Parliament votes money is that an estimate is made, having regard to all the circumstances, of as exact an amount as it is possible to arrive at. That additional $5,000 or $10,000 will have to be obtained by the Minister of Finance by taxing the people of Canada. If the money is not going to be required, and there is a strong probability that it will not be required, it should not be voted. There is another principle that always obtains in voting supply in this House, and I think in every Parliament, namely that we should not vote amounts in excess of actual requirements leaving it to the discretion of the minister or of his department either to spend or not to spend it as they see fit. As a rule, if the moneys are voted, they are spent. Parliament, therefore, should take care, in the first instance, that only actual requirements are covered by the vote. I sympathize with the minister. He has not been very long in his department, and I believe he will apply thoroughly economic methods in the administration of this branch of his department. The revenue is $154,000. The cost of governing the Yukon this year is going to be about $160,000. We are proposing an additional expenditure of some $20,000 on roads. We are not getting much out of it. It may be a necessary expenditure for the miners there. If they are getting all the benefits from it, it might not be unreasonable to make the expenditure on the roads.

Item agreed to.

Salaries of Dominion Lands outside officials, $536,380.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are 423 officials paid from this appropriation, as follows: 366 in the Dominion Lands outside service outside of Ottawa, with a total amount of salaries of $472,725; and 57 at Ottawa, whose duties are directly connected with the Dominion Lands Service, who are not provided for under civil service government, with a total amount of salary of $63,655—a total of $536,380. The amount standing under this heading for 1921-22 was $515,000, so that there is an increase of $21,000 for 1922-23. This is entirely due to statutory increases in salaries and increases due to reclassification.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why are the 57 employees who are at Ottawa not included in the civil government list as detailed in the Estimates?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Their services are part time at Ottawa and part time outside service. There is apparently still going on a reclassification and blanketing in by the Civil Service Commission, and at the moment, a number of Civil Service employees are not in the permanent service. This may, perhaps, be the fault of the Government, because we are endeavouring to get information regarding this matter, but they are regarded as temporary until they are blanketed in as permanent officials. These particular officials, I believe, would not come under the classification in any case as they are not looked upon as permanent.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is there not a contingent appropriation under civil government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This covers the whole appropriation in this connection.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But for the whole Department of the Interior?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are two categories—Civil Service and the outside service. This is the outside service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But I understand the 57 men are at Ottawa.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Part time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the nature of their duties?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are largely temporary employees. They are not permanent in any sense except that many of them are employed during the whole year. I say quite candidly, that I am not yet able to see the difference between a temporary employee employed by the year and one who is a permanent employee; but there is a distinction. You may find a temporary employee on the list for several years, and yet he is temporary. These officials are not civil servants in the sense that they are blanketed in in the Civil Service of the Interior Department or employed for various pur-

poses in the lands branch of the Interior Department.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Are they appointed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. As far as I have been able to learn, all officials who are employed at Ottawa are under the control of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the increase of $21,380 an increase authorized or resulting from some ruling of the Civil Service Commission, or is it by reason of some statute? I understood the minister to say, statutory increases.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume it is the increase that is granted. Perhaps, I can explain it in this way. I find, in some of the branches of the service, that officials are retired probably at the maximum salary of the position, and when the position is filled, the appointee begins at the minimum. Therefore, there is a slight reduction; but all those increases until the officials reach their maximum apparently involve increased considerations annually. I do not know when the end of this reclassification will be reached; I presume it must be nearly reached by this time; but, in many instances, reclassification will probably mean that a very considerable amount must be voted for any individual civil servant affected. I understand the Civil Service Commission are taking the ground that temporary service must be temporary service according to the way that I would understand it—service for a period of three, four, five or six months—and that those who are now designated as temporary will have to be blanketed in in the permanent service.

Mr. MANION: Do those temporary employees get the gradual increases the same as the permanent employees?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Temporary employees do not get statutory increases; the increases in this item apply to the permanent staff. There are about seventy employees on the survey staff, of whom about fifty are blanketed in. The remainder are not, although I find a number of these men have been employed since 1909-10. I imagine difficulties have arisen with individual cases, and they have not yet been taken in. Hence, there are many difficulties to explain; at least, I find it difficult to understand the grading and classification of the Civil Service.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. CHAPLIN: While the minister has his deputy beside him, can he explain what the classification of a temporary employee means?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Supposing I put it in this way: A temporary employee in the real sense, or as I or any one else would understand the matter, would be a beginner in the service under trial.

Mr. CHAPLIN: And he would be there for only a certain short period?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think the difficulty arises because the reclassification is not all completed. I just mentioned one of the difficulties that we are involved in at present in connection with the survey employees, who have undoubtedly been permanent as we would designate them, inasmuch as they have been in the service since 1910. Naturally, we would say that they are permanent. The real classification of a temporary employee should be one who is a beginner, who is on probation until such time as he proves efficient and is taken into the service permanently. But that is not the position these men are in; they are designated as temporary until the final blanketing-in order is put through making them permanent in character.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The explanation of the minister is all right; but is there anything in the printed classification defining a temporary employee?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think there will be, once the reclassification of the whole service is finished. Our difficulty is that the Civil Service Commission has not yet finished with the classification of the service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it is defined in the statute.

Mr. LEWIS: With regard to the first item, I think the time must surely come when the lands of the Dominion will have to be settled and when there will be no necessity to employ these men and pay these salaries out year by year. Most of our lands are already settled, or are being settled, and additional lands are not being found which these men can survey. For that reason I should like to see these amounts gradually decreased rather than increased.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Land Contingencies, etc., $250,000.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister please explain this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The following is a statement of the details of this estimate:

1. Expenses of 52 Homestead Inspectors, including purchase, renewals and repairs of travelling outfits, such as teams, buggies, harness, etc..	$85,000 00
2. Expenses of 17 Timber Inspectors, including, as in above item, purchase, renewals and repairs of travelling outfits, etc..	20,000 00
3. Expenses of 3 Inspectors of Ranches..	8,500 00
4. Expenses of 17 Dominion Land and Crown Timber Agencies and of the offices of the Inspectors, of Dominion Lands and Crown Timber Agencies, these expenses consist in the payment of telegrams, telephone, commission and postage, to sub-agents, clerical assistance of a temporary nature only, janitor service, etc.. ..	40,000 00
5. Travelling Expenses of outside officials, when away on government business, including Superintendent of Western Land Agencies, Assistant Land Agency Inspectors, Travelling Auditor, etc..	25,000 00
6. Printing and Stationery. This item is to cover the cost of printed forms used in transacting public business. The purchase and repairs of typewriters and for all stationery required in the Dominion Land Offices and sub-Land offices..	48,000 00
7. Advertising re sale of Timber Berths; also to cover accounts in connection with lands open for entry, etc.. ..	10,000 00
8. Miscellaneous: — Freight and express charges, Telegrams, etc., paid at Ottawa and for unforeseen expenses during 1922-23..	13,500 00
	$250,000 00

Item agreed to.

Surveys of Dominion Lands, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, etc. $600,000.

Mr. MANION: I do not know much about this subject at all, but it puzzles me to know why these figures remain in the Estimates year after year. I am not criticising the minister by any means, but I cannot understand the continued necessity for these votes. Three years ago this estimate was $700,000. last year $600,000, and this year again $600,000, and I wonder whether these surveys of Dominion lands are never going to cease. It seems that once a vote gets upon Government Estimates it has a tendency to stay there, apart altogether from the question of necessity.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am afraid I cannot give any detailed information in regard to this estimate, nor can I at the moment make any definite statement as to when this work may be regarded as nearing completion. There seems to be, even from the older provinces, a demand, which is growing more insistent, for work of this character as well as for geological work. This work has naturally been confined very largely to the western provinces and the Northwest Territories where the Dominion owns its resources, and almost the whole of this expenditure is for the purposes of the survey parties in that area. I do not know whether or not there should be a reduction, but it appears to me that, as this work is rather interwoven with that of immigration, it would be wise in the western provinces, with which I am thoroughly familiar, to confine our immigration as far as possible to the vacant lands along our existing lines of railway already surveyed. I know that even in Alberta there has been an insistent demand for the continuance of the services of the parties who periodically go into the field there for survey work; and sometimes the demand is for a larger number of men than have been engaged in previous years. I cannot say whether that work is approaching the point of completion; but if the negotiations that are now in progress with the prairie provinces were completed, naturally it would cease, almost in its entirety, and the Dominion would be relieved of a work which everyone will agree is expensive.

Mr. MANION: If it is the fact that the survey work would no longer be necessary in western Canada if those provinces took over their resources, will the minister explain how it is that the older provinces are asking for these surveys?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are not asking for topographical surveys.

Mr. MACLAREN: Was this $600,000 voted last year entirely expended?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. The vote represented the expenses of the various parties, to each of which was allocated a certain sum.

Mr. CAMPBELL: A good deal of the survey work in western Canada is, I think, unnecessary. During the last few years sur-

vey parties have been working between the Thunderhill branch of the Canadian Northern railway and the Prince Albert branch, and others in the vicinity of the part, in districts where the land would not be used for at least fifty years. I regard this as a serious waste of money which could be avoided for the present at any rate.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I myself have made the same complaint, but frequently, in the northern portions of the three provinces, someone goes in and locates a mineral claim which he wants to file, and the difficulty arises in regard to the location. So that we have at least to ascertain some point from which registration can take place. I agree with my hon. friend that it is a mistake to go on with indiscriminate surveying in areas that are not likely to be settled, but we have to meet the difficulty in connection with mining claims.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There are many areas in which there is no evidence of minerals, and it seems to me that conditions are only complicated as a result of these surveys. When you survey land a long distance from the railway, someone immediately files a claim for some of that land and gets possession of it. You then have a small settlement, and immediately there comes a demand for a branch railway. This survey work should be dispensed with entirely in the present state of the country.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I agree with my hon. friend that it has been very expensive to the provincial governments in the past, but it is very difficult to prevent settlers going in and even squatting in these areas; in fact, it is impossible to prevent. I had some notion of recommending to Parliament that we cease granting free homesteads, but again I am met with an insistent demand that it continue. So I am in a quandary. We want people to come into Canada and settle on the land, and I confess it is very difficult to determine what to do. If squatters get in you have difficulties and demands for surveys. I think some of the work might very well be curtailed.

Mr. RYCKMAN: This is one of those large items whose appearance in the right-hand column seems to be justification for its appearing in the left-hand column; in other words, having been voted last year, it must of necessity be voted this year. I believe the minister is as anxious as any of us in these times of stress to practise economy, and I should like him to tell the committee if this is not one of the items where a sizable sum, say $50,000, could be stricken off, and the affairs of the country in this particular be still carried on satisfactorily for the ensuing year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I very much sympathize with the remarks of my hon. friend, but I think he would have been better advised if he had suggested cutting this particular item in two instead of lopping off only $50,000.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I accept the amendment.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of course, I have no knowledge what the requirements of the department were in this respect, but the first request that came to me was $160,000 higher than the amount which now appears in the estimates. But I find the Department of the Interior has very wide ramifications, and I should like to have a few months in order to become acquainted with some of the work carried on by it. I would undertake to say that areas that are not required for settlement should not be surveyed. If a definite policy were adopted in connection with immigration and land settlement, there would be no necessity for any further surveys for a considerable period. But in the meantime I might inform the committee that every dollar of this vote is allocated, and some of the survey parties are already on their way to the scene of operations; therefore, I should very much regret having to curtail the expenditure for this year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The money may be allocated, Mr. Chairman, but it is not yet expended.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Would any serious injury be done to the country if for the present year we had a survey holiday? We hear of naval holidays and armament holidays, so why not a survey holiday? I am inclined to think from what I have heard in this and previous discussions on the subject that the surveyed areas, particularly in the Northwest, are so vast that it will be generations before they are ever settled. I know the policy of the last twenty or twenty-five years has been to go ahead with surveys far in advance of the requirements of settlement, but I was rather surprised when I heard to-day from my friend on the left, I think from Prince Albert, that in the neighborhood of The Pas the surveys are at least fifty years in advance of any

possible requirements. We hear the complaint generally that it is difficult at the present time to get money. Now here is a very substantial item of $600,000. Would any harm be done to the settlement or the progress or prosperity of the country if that item was stricken off by the minister and the survey parties not sent out till next year?

An hon. MEMBER: None at all.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A $600,000 saving is a very substantial amount of money, and I am sure the news of such a reduction would be very gratefully received at the present time by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. And I believe that no harm would be done to the country. We have surveyed lands for a population three or four times what we now have in the western provinces. I believe our surveys cover every reasonable requirement of the mining districts. It may be that some new districts will be developed where surveys will have to be made, but in my judgment if this whole item were left in abeyance and nothing spent this year on further surveys, the burden of taxation on the people would be that much lighter, and no injustice would be done to the settlement of the western country or to the progress and prosperity of the Dominion at large.

Mr. MANION: I do not suppose that any more criticism comes to the Dominion government for unnecessary surveys than comes to the provincial governments. In my own section of Ontario where the lands are in the hands of the provincial authorities, they are continually doing what to my mind looks like unsystematic and unnecessary surveying. I presume exactly the same condition obtains in the Dominion surveys, and it is not perhaps so much a criticism of my hon. friend as of his predecessors. I believe with my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and other hon. members that this is a time when some of this work might be cut down without doing any harm to the country. I know very well that the provincial surveys could be cut down a great deal every year without interfering with the progress of the province, because the authorities carry those surveys on, so far as any one in the neighbourhood can see, without laying out systematically the crown lands of the province. While perhaps it would be asking too much to cut out the item altogether, I believe that the minister himself, judging from the attitude he has taken, would probably half-heartedly agree that a good chunk could be cut from this estimate without doing any harm to the Northwest, especially as hon. members from there, who naturally know much more of this question than I do, appear to be under the impression that none of this work is necessary.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Under Item 286 full provision is made further down for continuing improvement of districts already settled by surveys and inspections in connection with the administration of the Irrigation Act, etc. So that so far as these things are concerned—and I concur in the desirability of the appropriation for those purposes—they are provided for; but I fail to see any necessity whatever for the enormous grant asked for general survey work for the opening up of new land not already surveyed. I would move, Mr. Chairman:

That the item be cut in two; that is, be reduced by the sum of $300,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I second the motion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a matter that as far as I am concerned would rather seriously handicap all the arrangements that have been made. Of course, the natural answer to that is: You should not make those arrangements until you have the money. I quite recognize that. But if survey parties are to take the field, preparation must be made some considerable time ahead. I am unable to say definitely that every one of these crews is required for survey work, but if time is given for investigational work, any that are not required can very readily be dispensed with. As a matter of fact, many members of the staff have been in the employ of the Government for a considerable number of years —I was looking it up the other day; some of them since 1905—and to dismiss them summarily would hardly be a fair method of procedure. I am not arguing altogether on behalf of the staff, but rather for the utility of the survey. Now, my hon. friend from Saskatchewan spoke with a good deal of knowledge with respect to what has happened in his territory. He speaks of the territory of The Pas, In all probability the requirements of the survey in The Pas district are brought about by the necessity for survey of mineral claims, and have nothing to do with survey for settlement. As to the complaint of my hon. friend from Alberta, the survey work he speaks of, namely, the classification of the soil for settlement purposes, is not included in this vote, which is for the parties who will

take the field for topographical work only. So far as I have known in Alberta, projections of base lines are carried out by survey parties in one year, and no subdivision takes place until there is a demand for settlement. That has been the procedure, and I did not make any inquiry whether a departure from it was to be made this year. I doubt, however, that there will be any departure from it. The director of surveys allocates the work where it is being asked for or necessity calls for it. That is the information I have received for a number of years in Alberta when I have made inquiries with respect to the matter of surveys, and while I did not make any inquiry this year, I imagine that is the reason that the—

At six o'clock the House resumed, and then took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 2, to incorporate British Empire Assurance Company.—Mr. Sinclair (Oxford).

Bill No. 7, respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. MacKelvie.

Bill No. 11, respecting La Compagnie du Chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Lafortune.

Bill No. 12, respecting The Interprovinial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Parent.

Bill No. 30 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wentworth Barnes.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 31 (from the Senate), for the relief of Hazel McInally.—Mr. Maclean (York).

Bill No. 32 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edward Lovell.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 33 (from the Senate), for the relief of Elizabeth Lillian Sharpe.—Mr. Hunt.

Bill No. 34 (from the Senate), for the relief of Percival Andrew Jamieson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 35 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frederick Henry Gill.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 36 (from the Senate), for the relief of Blanche Elizabeth Macdonell.—Mr. Clark.

Bill No. 37 (from the Senate), for the relief of Frank Charles Butt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 38 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edward Sidney John Turpin.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 40 (from the Senate), for the relief of Albert Bethune Carley.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 41 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ernest Zufelt.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 42 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harry Johns Leach.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 43 (from the Senate), for the relief of Nellie Berry.—Mr. Church.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 44, to incorporate The General Missionary Society of the German Baptist Churches of North America.—Mr. Hudson.

Bill No. 48, respecting Aberdeen Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

Bill No. 49, respecting Armour Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate The Sisters of Saint Mary of Namur.—Mr. Demers.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): At six o'clock I was endeavouring to bring to the attention of the committee the work of the Surveys Branch. The cost of surveys is detailed as follows:

1	Controller of Survey	$ 3,660
2	Assistant Controllers	5,110
2	Inspectors of Survey	6,000
2	Interprovincial Boundary Commissioners (1/3 share)	3,000
37	Survey Engineers	121,545
1	Topographical Engineer	3,285
26	Assistant Survey Engineers	66,430
16	Articled Pupils, Levellers and Instrument Men	12,800
		$221,830

In order to put before the committee the work that is being carried on I will give a statement as to where it is done. The expenditure by the controller, the assistant controllers, and one inspector, amounts to $14,000; that of two parties of survey of block outlines and initial meridians, $14,000; or a total of $28,000. I do not see how this particular service could be dispensed with, because from the meridian block survey the subdivision eventually takes place. These lines must be projected. There is an expenditure on two parties in the Mackenzie river district, in the Great Slave district, and one party

northwest of The Pas, on controlled traverses and settlement surveys, the figures being, respectively, $18,000, $15,000 and $8,000.

As regards the Mackenzie river survey, I have personal knowledge of the requirements in that district, where it will be necessary to send a party. There are a number of settlements which have been asking for surveys, for settlement and not for agricultural purposes; and the surveys are necessary, too, for the allocation of the oil leases and also in view of the conditions that prevail generally in the district.

Mr. GOULD: In regard to the Mackenzie river survey, I understand that parties have already started on that expedition and that possibly two years' work will be entailed. The members of the party will, I believe, be absent from the city throughout that time. Is that correct?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far no party has remained in the north during the winter and it is doubtful whether this party will do so. The expenditure in connection with one party of subdivision surveys of Alberta and the Peace river block is largely entailed on account of the oil development and the settlement that is going on in the Peace river block of the Dominion lands. Some of the Alberta members will know what the requirements there are. Then there is an expenditure of $8,000 for four parties on resurveys, retracement surveys, and miscellaneous surveys in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and for three parties at $3,500 each, making a total of $18,500. That is general work that will have to be undertaken by some one, and eventually, if the resources go to the provinces, will be paid for by the provinces themselves. The critics of this particular work will agree that it is necessary, and it has all been asked for. There is an expenditure on four parties on examination of land for general settlement, at $5,000 per party. That is investigation work carried on by the engineers for the classification of soils in lands not already settled. In connection with this matter, the information that the Immigration Department gets from intending settlers from the United States is that 90 per cent of the people who decide to come to western Canada come for the purpose of locating on free land. That, apparently, is the inducement that brings them to western Canada, and it is one of the reasons why, this year at all events, I did not recommend to Parliament the cutting out of the free homesteads and offering for sale all lands in the public domain. I am anxious that that should be done, but I realize the necessity for bringing people to the western plains. Now, I am not suggesting that they go on the Crown lands; indeed, I do not believe that a very large percentage will go on those lands when they thoroughly understand the conditions, but that they will rather purchase lands that are convenient to railways, churches and schools. But, needless to say, a free homestead appears to be the lure that draws people to western Canada, and the classification of these lands is of immense value. I was amazed to find how much it meant in connection with soldiers' settlement, and how much has been saved in this connection, although it cost money to do this work.

Mr. McTAGGART: Is it true that certain areas in the western provinces have been withdrawn from homestead entry at the present time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, for soldiers' settlement purposes I am told.

Mr. McTAGGART: For how long, and what is the area withdrawn?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am told that the period of withdrawal is indefinite, and probably will last only so long as the soldiers' settlement requirements continue. But, knowing Alberta as I do, I think I am safe in saying that there is very little crown land of first class, or even of second class character within fifteen miles of a railway.

Mr. McTAGGART: The people in the southwestern part of Saskatchewan whom I have the honour to represent have been led to believe that crown lands in that district were withdrawn from homestead entry because new regulations were to be brought down. Can the minister give us any information in regard to that?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is scarcely correct. Representations have been made to the department by settlers who are desirous of moving, and who have already enjoyed the privilege of securing a homestead, to re-enter for another homestead in the northern part of the province. That is quite agreeable to the department, and, in Saskatchewan, can be arranged through the provincial Department of Agriculture, which takes upon itself the re-

sponsibility of recommending any individual for re-entry.

Mr. McTAGGART: How large is this area?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No area is laid out for that purpose. Choice would have to be made by the individual himself of any crown lands.

Mr. SALES: What becomes of the first entry?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is just the reason why the department does not want to take any responsibility. The indebtedness that undoubtedly will have accrued against the property will have to be looked after by the provincial authorities, and they will have to take the responsibility of recommending to the federal authorities any individual who is to receive that privilege.

Mr. McTAGGART: Possibly the minister misunderstood my last question. I wish to know particularly what are the boundaries of the area which has been withdrawn from homestead entry?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This was an arrangement made by the previous government, and I am told it is an area fifteen miles wide along all existing railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do I understand the minister to say that he has perfected arrangements whereby homesteaders within the province may have second homesteads upon the recommendation of the provincial Department of Agriculture; or is that only within certain areas?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, this matter has not been brought to a definite conclusion yet, but that is the proposal upon which we are now working. No specific area is set apart for that particular purpose. None need be set apart, because one will readily understand that although at first sight it may appear an easy matter to arrange, yet as one looks into it, it becomes somewhat complicated and difficult, as in most cases the applicant for re-entry has assumed financial obligations in respect to his original entry, which renders the transfer very difficult to complete. But if the provincial authorities, who understand the local situation, in their wisdom make the recommendation that the applicant be given a second chance, then we are prepared to get the necessary authority to meet such a situation.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I fully appreciate that the question is surrounded with difficulties, because I have tried lately to think out some satisfactory solution. I hope the minister does not contemplate adopting a policy whereby any one having a homestead in these provinces may, if he secures the approval of the local government, have two homesteads, or abandon his first and get a second homestead, as I am afraid it would be an extension of the patronage system beyond the aspirations of even the most ambitious. I am aware of the difficulties to be encountered, in that homesteaders in these dry areas—and it is the dry areas that the minister must be directing his attention to—are in municipalities to which they owe taxes for schools and other local works, and the municipalities depend upon the contributions of these homesteaders just as they depend upon the contributions of their neighbours, and as a consequence difficulties are encountered which the municipalities and the provincial government will have to arrange between themselves. But let me warn the minister that the responsibility is on his own department, and that the final determination as to whether a second homestead is to be granted or not must rest there. It may be that he can work out a plan whereby responsibility as to local indebtedness will be assumed by the provincial authorities.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no intention of the federal authorities taking that responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be the federal authorities cannot escape some share of responsibility even there. But after the provincial government has given its decision on that point, that must not end the matter; the minister himself must exercise supervision some way as to who are to get second homesteads and who are not. There must be some principle—there must indeed be regulations submitted to this House for parliamentary approval. Above all things, let it not become a matter merely for the imprimatur of provincial governments as to when second homesteads shall be given. And I would say as well, that there necessarily will have to be some geographical limitations in connection with the application of any policy to this subject.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to get into a discussion of the difficulties of southern Saskatchewan or southern Alberta, but I quite agree with the right hon. gentleman that

it is a matter that will have to be undertaken by the respective governments. I think it is generally conceded that if the settlers who now find themselves upon those areas, whether they be large or small, will either have to move of their own volition or be assisted to move to other districts, and that the areas deserted will in due time be turned back to grazing purposes. I see innumerable difficulties, but I do not see very much difficulty with respect to the indebtedness. The individual, however, who spends his all, who has put in years of hard work, will have to sustain the loss of all that he has put in there, plus his work, and it seems to me that if he is willing to continue his residence in the province it would be good business for the provincial government, aided by the federal authority, to get that man upon an area of land where he can carry on agriculture successfully. I am willing, so far and so long as the federal authorities retain control of the crown lands, to recommend that portions of them be used for the purpose of re-establishing these men and keeping them within the provinces in which they have settled. However, we are getting away from the subject under discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under those circumstances I would advise the minister to concentrate on the solution of
9 p.m. the question, because from the meaningless statement made by the Prime Minister this afternoon I have no very lively anticipation that he or his successor will not be responsible for the administration of the crown lands for a long time to come.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Well, there is nothing like being optimistic about it. We were dealing with the expenditure of four parties on examination of lands for general settlement at $5,000 each. Then, there is expenditure of two parties on the survey of water areas on the old subdivisions at $4,000 each—the water areas are constantly receding and giving occasion to controversy. Then, there is the expenditure of two parties on topographical surveys of the Calgary sectional sheet and Cypress Hills Forest Reserve, one party at $4,000 and one party at $5,500. A number of settlers are going into the Cypress Hills, and when I took office I found there was a controversy proceeding there with regard to men who had squatted on some of these areas; it will be necessary to send a survey party there this summer. There is also the expenditure of one party on the survey of group and other lots; expenditure of five parties on topographical survey in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta at $6,000 per party; expenditure of two parties on subdivision surveys on the railway belt, British Columbia, $4,000 each. I had a rather warm time to-day with a delegation from British Columbia with respect to this matter. One of the members from British Columbia and some of the officials of the department were not in entire agreement with regard to the methods employed there, and it will be necessary to have someone in that railway belt in connection with this work. There is also the expenditure of four parties on running lines or levels, one-third share of the expenditure by the Alberta, British Columbia and Provincial Boundary Commission. The government of Alberta have for a considerable number of years been paying for the defining of the boundary line from the international boundary northward. I imagine the work should soon be completed. There is expenditure on surveys of timber berths, and surveys not otherwise provided for, $20,000. That, briefly, is the report, outside of the topographical mapping and the various items that go to make up the balance of this amount. I do not know just where I could cut this down to the extent of one-half. I am convinced that the amount could be reduced another year, but I do think that men who have been in the service of the Government for ten or fifteen years are entitled to at least a year's notice in order that they may look for other employment. Some of these parties are on the way; some partly and some fully equipped for the work they are to carry on this season.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the total for topographical surveys in the three western provinces?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): $30,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would be inclined to doubt the wisdom of that expenditure. The ordinary topographical survey is made for special purposes, usually for military purposes. The Militia Department has for years been conducting a topographical survey of Canada; every year, this year included, there is an amount to provide for that work. A topographical survey shows every hillock, pond, ditch, wall, fence, tree-stump. It is really for military purposes, and what we want it for throughout western Canada, in addition to the work that has been carried on for the last twenty-five or thirty years by the Militia Depart-

ment, I do not know. To my mind, this proposed expenditure of $30,000 is waste money. No doubt the expenditure has been made annually for years back, but it has been emphasized in the House that this is a time to call a halt in unnecessary expenditures. Here is an opportunity to save $30,000 on a single item, and I would ask the minister to consider a reduction of his estimates to that extent at least, and the cessation of the topographical surveys for a few years.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): If the mover of the amendment is agreeable, I am willing to cut the whole estimate by $30,000, but I would not like to apply the reduction to any specific vote.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Although I may frankly say that I am not altogether satisfied with the minister's explanation, I feel that he is not responsible for the present conditions. I think we can be assured of the minister's good intentions and that next year will witness a substantial reduction in this vote. I would therefore be quite willing to accept his suggestion that the amendment be withdrawn, and another amendment substituted providing for a reduction of $30,000. I would, however, offer one suggestion to the minister in connection with the Mackenzie, Peace river, and all the other oil schemes: If a few men are to go out into any of these districts and plot out some oil leases, or whatever they call them, and then it becomes necessary to send out a survey party to map them out, these men should pay the expenses of the survey instead of the department.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So far as regards making the lessees pay for the surveys the department have fairly stringent regulations with respect to the payment of royalties on the product when it is found. If an individual goes in and spends thousands of dollars on development work, as many of them do, whereas the Government has spent no money on such work but charges a fee for the lease and imposes a stiff tax on the product when found—with which I am heartily in accord—I think we will all agree that this particular industry is being taxed fairly heavily. While I am in thorough agreement with that policy, I do think that in the initial stages we should render all the assistance we can for investigational and development work, and, when the product is found, take a fair share for the State out of the production.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much of the $600,000 was actually spent last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed it was all spent last year but I cannot vouch for the statement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not think myself it was very far out. I am sorry that the enthusiasm of my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) for retrenchment was so short lived. I do not know what the transformation is that has taken place since six o'clock but I have still some enthusiasm of my own left. Now the expenditure on surveys some three years ago necessarily increased. Why? It had ranged around $400,000 and $500,000 per year. It increased because of the necessities of the soldier settlement survey. Large amounts were required to take care of surveys that were demanded by reason of the soldier settlement extension work that took place in the year 1919-20, particularly in the year 1919. Last year $100,000 was deducted. It would be because that work was contracted; and going over the estimates with Dr. Deville we arranged for the gathering together of certain surveys under one head and we were able to reduce by $100,000. Now in every respect of policy that counts, every policy that is vital, the Government have paid us the flattery of imitating us exactly save only in the process of retrenching on expenditure. In that they do not seem to be able to follow the good example that we set. Last year $100,000 was taken off in that process. Why can we not do it this year? I have not the least doubt that the contraction of soldiers' settlement work is much more this year than it was last. Furthermore, I cannot remember in detail but there was certain work that we had to do in conjunction with provincial governments —I think the governments of Ontario and Manitoba. We bore, I think, one-third of the cost of some survey work in Manitoba and also some in the province of British Columbia. That work, I think, is over and therefore I know of no reason at all why there should not be this year a reduction of $100,000. In this connection I feel that I ought to say this: The head of this branch of the work of the Interior Department, Dr. Deville, is not only a man of conspicuous capacity, but he is a man who will co-operate with the minister to the full in securing reduction of expenditure if the minister shows a desire to that end. If there is one officer who is ready to co-operate with him more enthusiastically than another it

happens to be the head of the branch who recommends to the minister expenditures under this head. Not only is Dr. Deville a competent official but I think he is one of the very few examples—if not the only one—where the undoubted and admitted head of his profession in this Dominion is, in so far as his profession is concerned, at the head of the service. I do not think there is any one in the Dominion who compares with Dr. Deville in his own profession, and it is fortunate we have him in our employ. I am sure if the minister goes over these estimates with Dr. Deville with this end in view he will be able to co-operate with him, and he can then come back to this committee quite readily and agree to a total expenditure of $500,000 for this service.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Dr. Deville submitted an estimate of $760,000 this year. I am very glad indeed to hear the remarks of my hon. friend eulogizing Dr. Deville and his work because he has already cut the estimate of last year for the simple reason—and I think that reason should be apparent—that we were anxious, as individuals who had no information, that the officials of this department should be able at least to get along with the appropriation of last year instead of asking for an increase. Therefore, Dr. Deville has already cut this appropriation by $160,000. Now I am not able to argue—

Mr. MEIGHEN: But he increased it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): —as to all he had in mind. I am referring the hon. gentleman to what he has just said in praise of this official. Naturally, if all the things he has said of Dr. Deville are true, he is an official who must realize his responsibility when submitting his estimates to the minister; and if he has already cut $160,000 I think it is only fair to say that he has made an honest endeavour to get his estimate to the point where he would be able to render the service that he has been asked for from various parts of Canada. Now possibly Dr. Deville could get along—undoubtedly he could if he had to—on $300,000. There can be no question about that; and unless I am able to ascertain there is a very serious need, when I become more fully acquainted with this department—more fully acquainted with the surveys branch of the department—there can be a very substantial reduction made in the cost of surveys. I cannot agree with the hon. member however that all the added cost came about on account of the surveys necessary for soldier settlement because a very large proportion of the soldier settlement—a very large proportion in the province of Alberta—was made upon the crown lands. There was a fair amount it is true but nothing that would indicate the necessity for an increase from $400,000 to $600,000 of survey work. Therefore I offer to accept the suggestion which has been made for a reduction but I am not prepared to accept any greater reduction.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. member from Bow river desire to reduce the amount in the amendment to $30,000?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand the minister has himself stated his willingness to cut his estimate by $30,000, and I think I might withdraw the motion altogether on that understanding.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that the amendment be withdrawn?

Mr. GUTHRIE: What does the minister say?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I move to reduce the total estimate by $30,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not appreciate the position. Dr. Deville comes to him with his estimates. Last year's was $600,000 reduced from $700,000 the year before. He comes with $760,000. This represents the surveys Dr. Deville has been asked to perform. I would not dispute that probably Dr. Deville is right, and that in time those surveys must be performed, and it was his duty to come to the minister and ask for sufficient money to have them performed. But that does not say that we must push into these territories this year. He had added $160,000 before he took anything off. Having added $160,000, he deducts that amount. All the minister has to do is to say to Dr. Deville "We want to make an equal reduction with the year before", and he should be able to do it, because the expenses of surveys this year are not as much as the expenses last year. He knows that the expenses of equipment and of surveys are not as large this year. Things have gone down. He can get the same amount of work done with less money than last year. There should be no difficulty in making a reduction equal to last year's reduction, and, unless he does that, he makes no substantial reduction. Why can he not come down in the estimate? Even then, the estimate is higher than it ever was before the necessities of the soldiers' settlement came in. Certainly, all the sol-

diers did not go on Dominion land. If they had done so, we would have required one million and a half for the surveys. But there were several applications for Dominion lands requiring substantial expense for surveys, and this was not the only thing. There were several other things in relation to obligations which had been entered into with provinces in regard to boundary surveys.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are still in existence.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think they are completed.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is not the one completed in British Columbia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No, there are still some surveys not completed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is much to do.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): But they are still there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The international boundary surveys are not in this book. Anyway, there is very little to do in the way of boundary surveys and practically nothing in the way of soldiers settlement and there is really no reason why there should not be as much deduction this year as last year.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment is carried.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the hon. gentleman withdrew his amendment altogether.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I made the suggestion to my hon. friend (Garland Bow River) and he said he would withdraw it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the amendment that is carried is the one moved by the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. GARDINER: In regard to the question as to where these oil leases are being located, I was pleased to hear the minister say that some very severe regulations were in force. I hope the minister will take into consideration the possibility of eliminating speculation in oil leases. As the hon. gentleman has been living in Edmonton for some years past, he knows very well the great hardships, that are being suffered because of speculation in oil leases, and I hope he will take that matter into consideration when he is going over this regulation.

Item as amended, agreed to.

Protection of timber in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, the N.W.T. and the Railway belt in B.C., Tree culture in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and inspection and management of forest reserves, $1,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I would like to ask the minister what steps are being taken in connection with this work, and, in doing so, I take this opportunity of bringing to his attention, and to the attention of the House, the serious condition developing in Canada with the rapid depletion of our forests reserves—a condition which I think is really becoming alarming. Of course, a part of what I refer to and, which I have in mind, is not wholly under the jurisdiction of the minister, but in the railway belt of British Columbia the conditions to which I refer obtain as well—that is through waste in methods of lumbering, through forest fires and through the depredations of insects of one kind and another. This deforestation or denuding of our lands and forests is, I think, one of the greatest problems facing this Dominion to-day. It is the same thing in the maritime provinces, and the northern and other parts of Quebec, northern Ontario, and it is becoming serious, even in the province of British Columbia, which has been looked upon as having very large areas of primitive timber. I would like to ask the minister if there is in his mind, or in the purview of the Government, for the immediate future, the consideration of reforestation and of more care of existing forests. I hesitate to make these observations, because under these conditions, perhaps one ought to be prepared to substantiate his remarks with data, but I have not the data under my hand at the moment. Perhaps this is a suitable opportunity for the minister to tell the committee just what steps are being taken. I think it might be beneficial.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume what the hon. gentleman has in mind is reforestation as well as the care of the existing forests. It does not appear that the Forestry Department have entered upon a very large programme of reforestation, but there is a report here of what they have done to date. It reads:

Reforestation by planting is not being undertaken on a large scale, as in most places natural reproduction is fairly satisfactory, and in any

case it is not advisable to undertake large planting operations until the fire preventive system is thoroughly organized and equipped.

Experimental planting has been done on the following reserves:

	Acres
Spruce woods	129¼
Riding mountain	6½
Duck mountain	2
Turtle mountain	1
Manito	4
Elbow	18
Dunburn	17
Beaver Mills	1
Pines	16
Nisbet	4
Cypress hills	1¼
Cooking lake	5
	205

Seeding has been done on the Spruce woods, Riding mountain and Cooking lake reserves.

Most of the stock for planting is grown at the forest nursery station at Indian Head, Saskatchewan.

Mr. STEVENS: That is all in the prairie provinces.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, practically all of it. There is not any doubt that steps should be taken in a more adequate way to preserve our forests. I have some knowledge of this in my own province, from the devastation by fire in our spruce timbered areas. One can realize what a terrific amount of damage fire can do in a very short period. I know considerable criticism has been offered with respect to fire ranging, and last year the fire patrol at High river—that is the aerial patrol—located 57 fires. I have not the report with me, but I think the report I have at the office states that in a short season they were able to locate fifty-seven fires. I am somewhat anxious that that should be continued, because I think millions of dollars are lost annually by forest fires, and some more adequate steps should be taken to protect our forest areas. I do not believe it is necessary, in many parts of Canada, to replant, because I think the natural growth, if fire prevention is undertaken, will take care of reforestation. But we have allowed our timber areas to be reduced almost to the danger point, and it will be wise on the part of the Government to take whatever steps seem to be necessary for the prevention of fire, and the reforestation of many areas in Canada that are unfitted for any other purpose. I expect to make a personal investigation as well as to get all the information I can on this matter, and, perhaps, on another occasion I may ask for an increased grant.

The aerial patrol is very expensive, and yet, after all, perhaps, it is not so expensive as it appears to be at first sight, inasmuch as it covers so much more territory than can be done by a man on horseback or on foot, and can locate fires at a time when it is much easier to control and extinguish them than when they have gathered considerable headway and done considerable damage.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am glad to hear the minister say a good word about the air patrol. I had the honour, last year and the year before, of presenting to this House the estimates in respect of the Canadian Air Service, and I endeavoured, in my humble way, to emphasize the great usefulness of the air service as regards forest patrol. I regret, at that time, my views did not meet with ready approval from the Opposition benches, and I am glad, indeed, to hear the minister say tonight that, in his judgment, the air service, as a means of fire control, is a particularly good service and that although expensive at first glance, upon examination, it need not be so expensive on account of the great extent of territory which the air patrol covers. I believe, that last year, prior to Christmas, over fifty incipent fires were discovered by that part of the air service located at High River. The air service has a great opportunity to discover fires; and when fire is discovered in its incipient stages, it can be very easily dealt with; whereas, if a day elapses or even a few hours elapse before it is discovered, it may become an uncontrollable force and tremendous destruction of property may ensue. I sincerely hope that the Government, in view of the statement of the minister, will see to it that the air service of this country is continued upon a proper basis, in order that it may be utilized for the purposes for which it has been utilized during the past two or three years, in the protection of the forests of this country. I know it was argued, last session and the session before, that the Dominion government should not take part in this work; that it was essentially a provincial work, and that the provinces, if they wanted to protect their timber, should protect it at their own expense. There are, however, in this Dominion, forests of which the timber belongs to this Government. Surely it is the duty of this country to protect that timber, and the most efficient way of discovering fire is by means of the air service. I am afraid the estimates for the air

service for the present year do not contemplate very much work of this kind. So far as I can gather, those estimates are rather directed towards military service in connection with the air service of Canada. Essentially, it is a military force, and probably, under present day conditions, no military force can exist or should be allowed to exist without a suitable air force. But there is the other side to the question; there is the civil aviation side and that is the side which should appeal to the House, perhaps more than the military side. Something should be in the Estimates to preserve that force for the purpose of looking after our forests, for the discovering of fire and for preserving a large amount of this country's wealth which, at any time, may be devoured by flame.

Mr. CALDWELL: Might I suggest to the minister a method of fire detection that has been used in the maritime provinces for the last two or three years? It is possible it may not apply so readily to the prairie provinces. The New Brunswick government has sought out the highest mountains in that province; it has erected on them towers or shelters for the look-out men who are stationed there, and these shelters are connected by field telephones with headquarters or with the local telephone line, so that the men can get connection with headquarters. In this way they are able to detect fire at a great distance because, from the high peaks, one is able to get a survey of a large stretch of territory. This method of fire detection is very inexpensive; whereas the air service for fire protection, while it is very efficient, is very expensive. Our provincial government uses the aerial method as well, but in a very limited degree, on account of the fact that look-outs, as they are called, have been established pretty generally throughout the province on those high mountains. I just call this to the attention of the minister, because I feel, in this way, a small expenditure gives great results.

Mr. MANION: Does the minister happen to have under his hand at the moment the percentage of timber and of pulpwood in the Dominion which is under the control of the Dominion government and the percentage which is under the control of the provincial governments.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not the figures with me, but I think I can get them.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. MANION: The reason I asked the question is that I should like to ask another question bearing upon this matter. I suppose the minister has been receiving copies of circulars which have been distributed by various people who are deeply interested in the forests of this country. In some of the circulars sent out by men who, one would conclude, are very well posted on the question, serious statements are made as to the condition of the forests of this country. As the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said, if the statement in regard to the rapid depletion of our forests can be sustained, the condition is certainly a serious one for this country. In view of those statements, is the minister's department looking into this question and taking into consideration the idea of dealing with those statements, and, if they are correct, of bringing about legislation to carry out the suggestions put forward in those circulars?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Is it intended to discontinue the aerial patrol service in southern Alberta, or to do away with the High River station?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That does not come under the control of the Department of the Interior, but I can say frankly that the department will be glad to avail itself of the services of that patrol. No doubt that matter will come up for discussion when the estimates for that particular service are being considered.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understood that this matter was under the Department of the Interior, and I also understood that the minister had secured some permanent buildings in High River for this service.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It was never under the control of the Interior Department but under the Air Board, up to last year at least.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And Dr. Deville, of the department, was on the Air Board.

Mr. MANION: Has the minister any information on the question I asked a moment ago?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Fifteen per cent of the total area is under the control of the federal government, and that area is found in British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. MANION: What information has the minister on the other question regarding the circulars, and the seriousness of the situation referred to?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The officials of the department are aware of the circulars having been issued, and all efforts of the department are directed towards the preservation of the forests. Everything that is done has that end in view.

Mr. MANION: Do the officials regard these circulars as exaggerating, or rather representing, the condition that actually exists?

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the minister answers, I may say that I know the writer of one of these circulars, and he is willing to back his theory with his own money. I refer to Mr. Frank J. Barnjum.

Mr. MANION: That is the man I refer to.

Mr. CALDWELL: He has offered cash prizes to individuals in the maritime provinces, and also in Quebec and Manitoba, for the best area of reforested land.

Mr. MANION: Does my hon. friend know of the serious statements that have been made in regard to the conditions that exist?

Mr. CALDWELL: I will come to that. This man has also offered prizes to individuals for any area of young spruce and fir trees, but especially spruce, planted to the satisfaction of the forestry officers. He is putting up his personal funds to carry on this work, so that he is quite earnest about it. With regard to the destruction of forests by the spruce bud moth, I am only too sorry to say that I know what has been said to be absolutely true. It is estimated that 60 per cent of the spruce in New Brunswick has been killed in the last three or four or five years by this moth. I am glad to know that the evil is diminishing, and like other pests it may suffer a natural extinction. Otherwise, I feel that any action the Government or private individuals may take in the way of reforestation will be of no avail unless something is done to combat the ravages of this insect. I do not know whether the federal department has taken any action in this matter in the nature of research work. I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell), one evening when his estimates were before the House, what was being done, and he replied that they were using the aerial service to locate the killed areas so that they might direct the lumbermen just where to cut, in order to save the timber before it was too far gone. If the timber is cut within one or two years of its being affected it is still good, but after three or four years it is utterly useless, either as lumber or pulp. I thought at the time, although I did not express the opinion, that it is rather futile merely to give locations to the lumbermen. Having lumbered somewhat myself, I know that every lumberman has his own cruisers on the various grounds to determine where to cut, and where and to what extent there has been any damage. I would rather see a department of the federal government devote its money and energy to finding, if possible, a remedy for this evil, because some means ought to be found of combating the ravages of these insects. I do not know whether the minister's department has any data on the subject, but he can readily realize what a serious menace these insects are. Any large area of forest infected by flies, for instance, which migrate from one locality to another, is soon in danger of destruction. These flies attack the very tops of the trees, which have the appearance of having been singed by fire, and after a while the injury gradually works down until the trees are entirely destroyed. Perhaps the minister may have some information as to what research work, if any, has been done to ascertain the extent of the activities of those provinces that own their timber. I understood from the Minister of Agriculture that his department was carrying on some such work. Work of this kind, I think, should be undertaken by one department of the Government. The Department of Agriculture does something, while the Interior Department carries on independent activities, and thus there is likely to be overlapping. This is a serious question and the minister might say what the policy of the Government is.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The work is carried out in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, whose entomologists make a study of insect pests. In British Columbia, where the bark beetle seems to be ravaging the forests, work is being done in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, the provincial authorities, and the Forestry branch, towards the extermination of all insects. I agree with the hon. member that overlapping should be avoided as far as possible, and that one department should un-

dertake the responsibility of prosecuting this particular work. It is quite obvious that these insects are destructive to forest life. I have no personal information on the subject, and I did not know that the forests in my own province were being attacked by insects.

Mr. MANION: What information is there in regard to the authenticity of the statements to which I have already drawn attention?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no definite information, but the officials of the department think that probably the statements are not overdrawn.

Mr. COOTE: I might return to the subject of the aerial patrol at High river. This is an important matter, which, I understand, comes under the Department of the Interior. It is possible that the service is furnished by the Air Board. I am not very familiar with the details, but I want to impress on the Minister of the Interior, and perhaps more forcibly upon the committee, the importance of the work at that particular station. They patrol the forest reserve, in, I think, the Clearwater, the Bow river and the Crow's Nest districts. The Crow's Nest and Bow river areas are particularly in need of this patrol, for irrigation projects in southern Alberta are already under way which will take practically all the available waters from the rivers in that territory, and the head waters of those rivers are all located in the forest reserves. Now, if those forest areas are allowed to be burnt over, it is questionable whether the rivers will then supply sufficient water at the proper season of the year for irrigation purposes, and the Government has already invested considerable money in surveys for these irrigation projects. For that reason I would impress upon the committee the necessity of continuing the aerial forest patrol at High River station. Last year the service located fifty-one fires, which were all extinguished without doing any considerable damage, with the exception of one fire which started in British Columbia and had gained headway before it was visible to the patrol. In case this is not under the minister's department, and not included in the estimates under discussion, I would specially plead with him that he use his influence with the Air Board to see that the service at this particular station is not discontinued, because it serves a dual purpose in the preservation of the timber and of the water supply for the irrigation system in southern Alberta.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Forestry branch value very much the work done by the air service in the location of forest fires, and there can be no doubt about the advantage and utility of employing the Air Force for this particular work, although perhaps it was not primarily organized for that purpose. It becomes increasingly apparent that drastic measures will have to be adopted to prevent destruction by fire alone, without taking into consideration destruction by insect pests. I think it will be generally admitted that fire is the most destructive agency we have to contend with in the preservation of our timber resources, and every effort should be made to check forest fires.

Mr. WARNER: I visited the department that is handling our forest fire patrol by air service, and I was assured that there was no intention of discontinuing the patrol at High river. I was informed, however, that the estimates for this service having been reduced, they would have to curtail the patrol more or less. I was glad to observe that those in charge fully understand the necessity of this service not only to protect the value of the timber but by keeping the live timber on the eastern slopes to preserve the rainfall and snow, as the conservation of this moisture materially affects all the country lying to the east of the foothills, as well as being of vital importance to the successful operation of the irrigation projects referred to by my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Steedsman). Any one who has studied that district understands very well the benefits accruing from the retention of the air service. The service has been a little expensive, but the departmental officials admit that the expense will be lowered very much in future compared with the amount of work that can be done.

Mr. COOTE: The minister has told us that tree cultivation is carried on to a small extent in several of the forest reserves. Yesterday and to-day we were told in discussing the agricultural estimates that to make agriculture permanent in some of the older settlements of the prairie provinces it was necessary to go into mixed farming. That is quite true, but there is something here that is of as great importance to agriculture in those areas as mixed farming, and that is the cultivation of trees. Has the minister

taken into consideration the advisability of demonstrating, not in the forest reserves, but out on the open prairie, what can be done in tree planting, and so encouraging the farmers to plant trees, because I am quite sure that in that direction lies the salvation of those areas to a great extent? It might be worth while for the department to start a plantation, to be extended from time to time, that would act as a shelter belt, and where the settlers might go for the purpose of securing young trees for use on their farms.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That work has been carried on in all the years that I have been in the Northwest. Trees are supplied to farmers for planting on prairie farms in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The species distributed are mainly Manitoba maple, elm, ash, cottonwood, Russian poplar, and willow. Some spruce, tamarack and pine are also distributed for which a small fee is charged. The reports of the inspectors show that these plantations have a high average of success. There are two nurseries for the purpose. One was established at Indian Head in 1903 and one at Sutherland in 1912. The increased demand for trees made necessary the increase of accommodation for furnishing the supply. The new nursery is now supplying trees for distribution and this supply is largely increasing as the nursery develops. The number of trees distributed in 1921 was 4,083,975 to 3,603 applicants. The average number of trees sent to each applicant was 1,092.

Mr. COOTE: I am quite aware that this work has been carried on, but the minister has possibly not quite grasped what I was driving at in regard to those plantations out on the bald prairies. What I suggest, and what in my humble opinion would be of very great value to the settlers there, would be a demonstration on those drought-stricken areas of what can actually be done. These settlers are in such condition financially that it is almost impossible for them to experiment in tree planting, and if any area could be set aside there for demonstration of what could be
10 p.m. accomplished in the way of tree growing, the results should be of great benefit to the settlers. It was brought out in the course of the discussion that these settlers might ultimately have to move out to other parts of the province.

Item agreed to.

For surveys and investigations of water and power resources, and for administration of water-powers, etc., $367,000.

Mr. HODGINS: In view of the possible taking over by the provinces of their natural resources, could this item not be reduced?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Agreements have been entered into between the Water Powers branch and the various provincial governments for surveys of this character. All provinces, therefore, irrespective of whether or not the natural resources go back to them, are receiving service of this character.

Item agreed to.

Reclamation of Dominion lands by drainag· (including revote of $69,000), $217,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Would the minister explain this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is a matter in which I have been interested for some time and which I discussed with the department when I was provincial premier. Arrangements were made with the federal department by the western provinces with respect to reclamation, and on assuming office I found that one project under way had not been completed; the vote this year is for its completion. It is not the intention of the department to carry on any further surveys in this connection; it is believed that the work can be done more advantageously by the provinces themselves. Where Dominion lands are affected we are prepared to enter into agreements to turn those lands over to the provinces or to individuals whom the provinces may suggest as proper persons to be entrusted with drainage projects.

Item agreed to.

Canadian National parks, $966,500.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a substantial increase in this item. Would the minister be kind enough to explain it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The apparent increase of $166,500 is not an increase when the three Governor General's warrants, granted in August, October, and November last, totalling $166,500, are taken into account. The increase of $166,500 over the original vote last year, is due mainly to:

Banff Windermere road..	$81,000
Fencing additional area in Elk Island Park to provide sufficient pasture for the increasing number of buffalo..	16,000
Edith Cavell road, Jasper park.. ..	10,000

Town planning work transferred from Conservation Commission August 1st, last	10,160
New park area-Vidal's Point on shore of lake Katepwa near Indian Head	2,670

The balance is made up of small amounts required for maintenance of roads, streets, public buildings, recreational facilities, etc., which are exceptionally high because during the war, the parks appropriations were reduced to $300,000 for two years, and $349,670 for two years, which were not sufficient to provide adequately for the general maintenance work in the parks. The total number of visitors to all the parks last year was approximately 160,000, about 60,000 of whom were foreigners. Allowing an average expenditure of $300 for each foreign visitor, this represents over $18,000,000 brought into the country, in return for which we sent practically nothing out. Capitalizing this revenue on the basis of a 5 per cent dividend, it means that the national parks are worth to-day $360,000,000 to the people of Canada, and their value is increasing yearly. This does not take into account what they are worth as playgrounds to Canadians themselves. The country's return was about twenty times our expenditure, and it must be remembered a good deal of this was spent on new road construction forming an investment on capital account that will bring in its own revenue in the near future. Anyone who has visited the Banff park will realize its immense value from the point of view of the tourists who visit it as well as of the residents of the country who go there. The Windermere road, which we hope to complete this year, will make a connecting link that will bring the tourists from the international boundary north of Calgary, through the Banff park, on to the lakes in British Columbia, and, returning, either by way of the coast or back through the Crow's Nest pass. This is a portion of the work that we have been asked to complete, notwithstanding the fact we may find ourselves short of money; for it will bring to Canada a great number of people who otherwise might not come here. With respect to the Jasper park, and to the other parks that are on the National system of railways, I think they should be developed in order that we can encourage traffic upon our own railways and get a return for these investments. I believe I am safe in asserting that if these playgrounds along our National railways are developed even to the extent that the Banff park is developed to-day, it will mean a very considerable addition to the earnings of these railways. I am strongly in favour of developing those playgrounds.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understood the minister to say that the increase of $166,500 represented the three Governor General's warrants which were issued last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why are they in the estimates of this year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They are in the estimates; I was simply pointing out that the estimate of last year, plus the Governor General's warrants, equalled the estimate of this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I thought the minister meant. He is asking for the same amount as was necessary last year.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were the warrants exactly this amount? I do not think so.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The officials inform me the warrants were: $100,000, $50,000 and $16,500. I may say that I know something of the necessity for the last warrant—namely, the unemployment situation was taken into consideration in connection with the construction of the Banff-Windermere road and on that account construction was continued after the appropriation was exhausted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was one of the major factors in determining the Government to press on with that work? I listened with pleasure indeed to the minister's defence of the expenditure in connection with these parks. I can remember well when that same duty devolved on me, when I was not treated with quite the same consideration across the floor, when I was told that this expenditure was merely catering to the rich and was really not for the good of the country at all; and in my humble way I had to defend it and say that our parks were an asset for the whole country in that they brought money into Canada. I can remember as well having to adduce figures in an endeavour to show that we really obtained as much profit per acre from the rocks and mountains of our parks as from the wheat fields of Alberta. That, perhaps, would not amount to very much now because I have been taught to believe by hon. gentlemen to my left that there is no profit per acre on the wheat fields. Anyway if the one source of revenue fails let

the other continue. I am grateful that the minister is now able to present to a much more sympathetic audience the case that I presented before.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It depends on the minister.

Item agreed to.

Grant to Alpine Club of Canada, $1,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really think the minister should not have the heart to ask for this $1,000 for the Alpine Club in the absence of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, have a heart!

Mr. MEIGHEN: I recall the battle that he waged in this House year after year—waged against heavy odds and with considerable support around him—to save the suffering people of this country from this awful imposition of a thousand dollars—a thousand dollars that he saw passing from the treasury into the pockets of the rich and the powerful to enable them to enjoy the scenery of the Alps of Canada assisted by the hard earned savings of the people of this country. The hon. member is absent to-night but I know it could not have been by intention, because even this session I find that the memory of the filching from the treasury that had been done by this Alpine Club has not passed from him. I can recall well that he reminded me of it only about two weeks ago; but here when there is opportunity to save the nation from this imposition he is absent from his duty. I will not, I am sure, appeal to the minister in vain when I ask him just to let this item stand in order that the House may be treated once more to the lugubrious eloquence of the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I also have a recollection of being attacked on a similar vote in the legislature of the province from which I come, and knowing the sympathetic mind and heart of the right hon. gentleman I am sure he will agree to allow this item to pass realizing what we have both suffered in the past in this connection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are none of the other critics going to speak at all?—because the hon. member for Brome was not alone.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, he was alone.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, my recollection is much more intimate than that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I am sure that the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot) was one of his coadjutors and I see him now in his seat.

Mr. LANCTOT: I am here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And silent.

Item agreed to.

Seed Grain Advances—Amount required to meet uncollected portions of advances of seed grain made in the Western provinces by the chartered banks to holders of unpatented Dominion lands under the guarantee of the Dominion Government, also including commission payable to banks for collections, fees to secretary treasurers of municipalities and officers of the provincial departments of agriculture, clerical assistance, travelling expenses, etc., $200,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume the method that was installed about three years ago is being continued by the minister—the method of guaranteeing the banks up to a narrow margin of interest, giving them an incentive to collect this money themselves? Also, how much of the vote of $500,000 last year was actually spent? I know it was absolutely impossible to judge how much we should need?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Two hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. MEIGHEN: About the amount being asked this year. I think the minister will, if he has looked into the matter, be able to report to the committee that this method has saved the country very large sums of money and has proved efficient, effective, and economical, meeting the situation in every way.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I thoroughly agree with what the right hon. gentleman has said. So far as I have been able to learn it is the most economical method of dealing with the situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That, I presume, will be read by the critics of long ago who are absent or inert to-night.

Item agreed to.

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of Labour Gazette and allowance to correspondents, $50,000.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not see that there is much use in our sitting in the chamber unless we can hear what is going on.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister might give us a statement as to the progress made

under this item, in the Nova Scotia coal situation.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): This particular vote has nothing to do with the Nova Scotia coal situation.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not think the minister is treating the House with courtesy when he makes that statement. I am not seeking to pester him with things that do not come under the item, but as I read this item it is:

Conciliation and Labour Act, including publication, printing, binding and distribution of Labour Gazette and allowance to correspondents, $50,000.

Surely, under the duties of the department and the administration of the Conciliation and Labour Act, I would be justified in asking a very ordinary question, and I think the House has been very tolerant with my hon. friend in refraining long ago from inquiring as to what progress has been made in the settlement of the strike. If the minister refuses to answer, then we are to rely upon press reports, and when he refuses to answer my very simple question, I think I am justified in making a few speculations. It would appear from items in the press that very satisfactory progress has not been made. I think the minister should take this opportunity to tell the House just what progress he has made. Certainly I am amazed at his bald, blank, and scarcely courteous refusal to give the information.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very sorry, indeed, Mr. Chairman, if my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) understood me as being discourteous in suggesting to him that the next item that we will have to discuss is the one which has to do with the expense connected with handling the mining difficulties in Nova Scotia. There was no intention of being discourteous. I now understand that the hon. gentleman would like some information as to the status of the situation in Nova Scotia, which we discussed in this House some weeks ago, and, of course, I will be very glad to give such information as I have at hand in regard to that matter. As hon. gentlemen have seen from press reports, an effort was made to reconvene the Gillen Board. As a matter of fact, the Gillen Board was reconvened, and, shortly after reconvening in Halifax, two members of the board, in substance and in effect, wired their resignation to me, indicating that they had no authority, as a reconvened board, to deal with the question that had been indicated in this House they should properly and effectively deal with. The resignation of the two members of the board, namely the chairman and the representative of the employees, was promptly accepted by the minister, and later I received from the former representative of the company on that board a letter which, in substance, indicated that he was heartily in accord with the belief of his colleagues that the reconvened board could not, under any intent of the law, deal again with the situation that they had undertaken to deal with in January last. The result was that we undertook, of course, in carrying out the evident desire of this House, to at once institute a new board of investigation under 63A of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, as amended in 1918, and that board is now in course of formation. A week ago last Wednesday the miners' representative appointed a member to that board to represent the employees. The companies have not yet appointed their representative. They asked for some delay, sufficient to compensate or make allowance for the holiday, which was given them. That time expires to-night, when, if an appointment has not been made by the companies, it will be the duty of the minister to appoint a representative for the companies. Then it will be necessary for another five days to elapse, in which we hope that the two members appointed will agree on the choice of a chairman. If they fail to do so, it will again devolve upon the minister to choose a chairman for the board, so that we hope to have a newly established board functioning in regard to the mining dispute of Nova Scotia within the next ten days.

Mr. STEVENS: What is the condition of the dispute now?

Mr. MURDOCK: The condition, as I understand it, is that coal mining is going on under fairly satisfactory conditions. The strike-on-the-job, in so far as it was ever effective, has been, as I understand, distinctly and entirely abandoned, full work is being given ungrudgingly, and the actual coal mining situation is better than it was when we discussed the matter in the House on the 30th March last. Of course, I judge that is because the men believe that, as soon as possible, there will be another board functioning and investigating entirely the situation on their behalf.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was very strongly under the impression that the Government

was only wasting time in this dispute in endeavouring to reconvene the old board. However, I had not studied the act particularly, and I assumed the Prime Minister, who had charge of the matter, and who, I had understood framed the act, knew its terms, and that when he accepted the suggestion of the leader of the Progressive party that the old board be reconvened, he was accepting something that was practical and that would lead somewhere. But on subsequent inquiry I find the impression I was under was absolutely and plainly correct, and that there could be no possible misinterpretation of the matter at all. I must say that, under the circumstances, and a very clear reading of the statute, I do not know why the Government ever set to work to attempt to reconvene the old board, to go back into the old dispute, because, manifestly, the old board had no power in the world to go back in to that dispute. The old board had completed its functions when it made its report, and it could only be reconvened for the purpose of interpreting that report under section 22A of the act. It could not be reconvened and reassume any of the powers at all that it formerly exercised. All it could do would be to go down and give the support of either side without any powers at all. Consequently, when the old board was presumably reconvened, time was being wasted, and when the members resigned they were resigning offices they did not hold. They had nothing to resign. The offices they had held terminated sometime before, with the handing in of their report. So that there was nothing but time wasted in connection with the reconvening of the old board.

Of course, the minister under the provisions of section 63A, which he has just referred to, and properly referred to, could properly appoint a new board. He could, by going through the regular process, or rather he could not, but the parties to the dispute, could, if they so chose, have taken the former members. But they were the men to make the choice; under the act, the Government could not make the choice at all. If the Government was operating under the act, the Government had to leave it to the parties to name their representatives. All the rest of the procedure was just so much, I will not say intentional, but just so much waste time, and I could not help thinking that the minister himself has been of that impression all along. With, however, that time gone, simply through inappreciation of the law owing to hasty action on the part of members of the Government, we are now apparently at the stage where the law is being complied with, where, under section 63-A, the minister is taking steps to have a new board established. That is all right. I do not know whether that is the best method or not; the minister ought to be in a position to know that a great deal better than I. There may be some advantage in having a royal commission under the Inquiries Act, and I am quite prepared to accept his judgment that this is the best step to take. I am glad to see something done to bring about better conditions and to have the Labour Department function as it is intended to function in disputes of this kind. Let me, however, express the hope that, when the board is appointed, it goes to the ground and learns all the facts; that the minister sees, to the best of his ability, that it goes there, and also that, hereafter, when we have declarations of labour policy from the Minister of Labour, we shall be able to understand that they are declarations of government policy. I presume, however, that all are concurring with the minister this time in the appointment of a new board under section 63-A, and that this is not a step which he is taking, only to be repudiated by his colleagues later on.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am, indeed, gratified to hear this evening the statement from my right hon. friend. I was personally convinced, on the third day of April, when he rose from his seat in this House and undertook to insist that, unconditionally, the Gillen Board be reconvened, he knew full well or believed that it would be inconsistent with the provision and intent of the act, under all the circumstances, to reconvene that board, and that the board, when it was convened, would have no effect or authority in law. I felt, at that time, that my right hon. friend—and I am not criticising in this—was endeavouring to assist in delaying the game for the purpose, possibly, of casting some reflection upon the Minister of Labour or the Labour Department or, possibly, upon some of the present colleagues or associates of the Minister of Labour in the present Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before the minister proceeds further in reference to my statement, will he read my words where I insisted that the Gillen Board be reconvened? I certainly intended to insist that what was

done be done unconditionally as regards Mr. McLachlan; but I did not insist or suggest that the Gillen Board be reconvened. What page is it?

Mr. MURDOCK: Page 621, April 3. The language is:

> Mr. Meighen: Anyway, I understand that the reconvening of the board is wholly irrespective of the repudiation of Mr. McLachlan's stand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MURDOCK: Again, on the same page:

> Mr. Meighen: Unconditionally?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear. Certainly. I understood the reconvening of the board to be unconditional, and unconditional, not depending at all on McLachlan's stand. I never made even the suggestion that the board be reconvened—much less insisted that it be reconvened; but when hon. gentlemen said that the board was going to be reconvened, I asked if the reconvening was to be unconditional and stated my understanding that it was to be unconditional. Will the hon. gentleman cease now to misrepresent me? Will he read the preceding paragraph?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have not the slightest desire or intention of misrepresenting my right hon. friend; but if I might be permitted to suggest, it is purely and simply, as a result of the position taken and insisted upon by my right hon. friend, that the delay of the past two or three weeks has occurred in dealing with the mining situation in Nova Scotia. No other statement or reason is responsible for the delay that has occurred, during the past two or three weeks,in placing a board on the job, properly functioning under the law, to do the thing that this House of Commons, according to its declaration on the evening of March 30, last, wanted done. I know how capable the right hon. gentleman is when he undertakes to convince this house that he is not responsible or to disprove anything which I might say to the contrary. I know full well how easily and readily he will evade the responsibility and undertake to place it upon some of my colleagues or upon myself. Again, I repeat, as Minister of Labour, that the Right hon. Arthur Meighen is primarily responsible

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MURDOCK: The right hon. leader of the Opposition is primarily responsible for the delay of the last two or three weeks, which delay I can assure him I am trying to make up for as fast as possible under the law. As he has said and given me credit for, I felt at the time, after the discussion and after full consideration of the law, that the law did not contemplate the reconvening of the board for the purpose of going as fully into all the circumstances as this House appeared to indicate it wanted those circumstances investigated. We could have reconvened the board in order to express its opinion on some phase of its previous award, but I did not think we could have reconvened it for the purpose of an entirely renewed investigation. The situation is as I have stated. We are endeavouring to make up now, as best we can, for lost time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I cannot say whether astonishment or amusement is uppermost in my mind listening to the speech of the minister. I am responsible, he says, for three weeks' delay; and if I got his remarks correctly, although I am finding increasing difficulty in following him, as he is getting further from the realm of reason every time he speaks, the cause of that delay is that I insisted on the Gillen Board being reconvened. I may be entitled to all the compliments he pays me as to fidelity to reason and, consequently, some success in convincing people; but I shall not need to over-exercise any of those powers to-night. Hon. members were present in this Chamber all through these discussions, and, if any hon. member has any recollection of my even suggesting the reconvening of the Gillen Board, I should like him now to stand in his place and say so. He will search Hansard in vain for any suggestion, either in the first discussion or the second. On the first discussion, as every hon. member knows, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in perfectly good faith, having heard the debate, having heard the impossible position taken up by the minister, with which position nobody, not even his colleagues, could agree, suggested that the Gillen Board be reconvened; that it be asked to go back and complete on the ground the work that it had commenced. That was followed by the remarks of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who stated his confidence in the personnel of that board, and recited certain questions that he had put to the parties that had come down to ask for a royal commission. Those parties had themselves stated that they believed that the members of that

board had endeavoured to do what was right, and the Minister of Finance repeated, at that time, that he had made a suggestion that the Gillen Board was the proper one. That was followed by a proclamation of the minister to the press—because he keeps very close to the press, whatever faults he may have—to the effect that they could not move until McLachlan came down and receded from his position. Consequently the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) having taken the one stand, accepting the suggestion of the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar), in which I had no part at all, and as respects which I did not even make a statement, and the Minister of Labour having made a statement to the press of the country wholly contradictory of his colleague's view, I asked in the House, the next day, what was to be done. I called attention to both statements and inquired whether the board was to be reconvened, or whether the policy of the Minister of Labour, as stated in the press, was to be carried out. I was promptly and distinctly informed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) that the Gillen Board was to be reconvened, and that steps had already been taken—I think I am giving the words of the hon. member, or, at least, their effect—to get in communication with the members of the board; whereupon, having in mind the proclamation of the minister that nothing would be done until there was a repudiation of the stand taken by Mr. McLachlan and his men. I asked whether this reconvening was to be unconditional and irrespective of the conduct of Mr. McLachlan.

Mr. MURDOCK: Does my hon. friend think that the Minister of Labour acted in disregard of the rights of all the people of Canada when he took the position that no consideration should be given to a man or men who promulgated and sought to carry out any such thing as they were talking about, such as "loafing on the job?" Does he think that the Minister of Labour improperly took that position? My hon. friend appears to justify the conduct, the attitude, and the claims of McLachlan on April 3rd, and I want to know whether or not I misunderstand him in this respect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me assure the minister that he will not misunderstand me tonight; but I will assure him, first of all, that he will not switch me from the point, until I am through, no matter how he struggles to do so. I will finish that first.

Mr. MURDOCK: And you will give me an answer to that question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have given the answer already, but I have no objection to repeating it. The point is this: having pointed out this conflict of statements with the Government, I asked the Prime Minister whether the board was to be reconvened as intimated by the Minister of Finance two or three days before, and the Prime Minister gave a clear and unequivocal answer. To make sure that there was to be nothing conditional about it, I inquired whether this reconvening was to be conditional or unconditional, and was told that it was to be unconditional. Now, what is to be thought of a minister of the Crown, in the face of these facts, coming to Parliament to-night and asserting that I am the father of the reconvening of the board, and that, because I inquired whether it was to be done unconditionally, therefore, all the delay connected with the reconvening is attributable to me? Is that the only sense of reason the minister has? Is that the best he can do?

Mr. MURDOCK: A mere knowledge of the facts is all I have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's knowledge of the facts may be all right, but in his expression of them he is all wrong.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am willing to let the people of Canada judge who is to blame for the delay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are now before the members of this House. Now what the minister asks to-night is another question altogether, a question debated in this House some weeks ago on the motion of the member for Calgary (Mr. Irvine). My judgment on that is exactly as expressed then. I did not feel that the conduct of McLachlan was such that it could in any way be made an excuse for the Department of Labour to cease functioning. That is the opinion I expressed then and to which I adhere now; and that seemed to be the opinion of the Government, however different it may have been from the opinion of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. MANION: The publication, the printing, binding and distribution of the Labour Gazette comes under this item. I have heard the opinion expressed in the past by labour men that the table which is given in the Labour Gazette on the cost of living is absolutely unreliable. The minister has no doubt seen this table many times. Does he think it is a reliable guide as to the cost of living?

Mr. MURDOCK: When did my hon. friend hear this opinion?

Mr. MANION: I heard it during the regime of the late government. It came to my hearing in the past; I have not heard it since my hon. friend has been Minister of Labour. Like myself, he has been only a short time in office.

Mr. MURDOCK: So far as I have had an opportunity to look into the matter, I believe that the figures contained in the Labour Gazette in regard to either the increase or the decrease in the cost of living are as nearly accurate as they can be made under all the circumstances. The Dominion statistician gets the figures in regard to the cost of all the commodities that go to make up the cost of living, and these figures are compiled as carefully as possible and put into shape for the Labour Gazette. As I say, they are as nearly accurate as they can possibly be made, although I have not the slightest doubt that any gentleman who cared to do so could prove that at some particular town or in some locality the figures were slightly different, one way or the other, from those given in the Gazette. Generally speaking, however, they are reliable.

Mr. MANION: I merely wanted the information. I was desirous to know whether, in the minister's opinion, the figures given in the Gazette were reasonably accurate.

Item agreed to.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, $35,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the minister any information regarding the rather serious dispute in District 18, the Crow's Nest?

Mr. MURDOCK: Under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, the board has been functioning in District 18 for some days now, although, for some reason which I am not quite aware of, it has been for two or three days off the job. The board reconvenes again on the 25th at Canmore, having been already at Drumheller, where it spent three or four days investigating.

Mr. STEVENS: And the men are on strike in the meantime?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes; they left the company's employ on the 1st of April when the contract expired, and the board was convened on that date to deal with the situation. It is now proceeding as quickly as possible in a thorough investigation. It has yet to go to Lethbridge, Crow's Nest, Michel and Fernie to investigate several other mining situations.

Item agreed to.

Labour Administration, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, $45,000.

Mr. MANION: We have one of these employment offices at the head of the lakes, and I should like to know how that office is run by the province and the Dominion combined.

Mr. MURDOCK: The province mans the office, the Dominion pays not more than half the expense. I am told that sometimes it is a little less than half, but never more than half in any particular case.

Mr. MANION: Is the management of the office entirely in the hands of the province?

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes, sir.

Mr. SIMPSON: How often does the manager of the office report to the central bureau in Ottawa as to the number of unemployed?

Mr. MURDOCK: Daily reports are sent to the federal Department of Labour of all vacancies, but those officers report directly to the Ontario government and are under its direct control.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this system working out satisfactorily according to the minister's judgment; and is the effort on the part of these public employment bureaus in a measure meeting expectations?

Mr. MURDOCK: The employment officers scattered throughout the Dominion are helping to some extent in relieving the unemployment situation when there are opportunities for them to secure vacancies for unemployed men to go to. I have not sufficient knowledge of the administration of these offices in every province to give all the information which my hon. friend would probably like in order to show whether any improvement could be effected in their management, if that is what he desires.

Mr. STEVENS: What I had in mind is this. I know one officer in particular in my own city whom I have always held in very high esteem. I may say that he has never been a supporter of mine politically, so I am speaking quite impartially. On the other hand, I have heard criticisms that the offices are not functioning effectively, and I think it would be desirable while the Estimates are before us that some official opinion should be expressed. If

the department receives no definite and adequate reports, I would suggest that steps be taken to keep in touch with these employment bureaus inasmuch as we are paying a portion of the cost of maintenance.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am sure my hon. friend will appreciate that it would be rather a delicate task for the federal Department of Labour to suggest how the various provinces should run their employment offices. We do, it is true, undertake to maintain reasonable supervision over the manner in which they are being conducted, but I am told that we have got to be very careful how we treat any plan that is regarded as satisfactory by the provincial authorities.

Mr. STEVENS: The whole question narrows itself down to this, if the minister will permit me. We are voting $45,000—not a very large sum for the whole of Canada, I will admit—but the object, if I remember correctly, was to lessen the expense and avoid any duplication that might otherwise occur between the operations of the provincial and Dominion Labour Departments. My point is that if the department is not satisfied that effective work is being done, certainly the grant should not be continued and the association should be terminated. I am under the impression that these employment offices are working satisfactorily, but there have been disturbing criticisms, and if the minister from the reports at hand cannot give us a satisfactory answer as to this, then I think the department ought to exercise a more intimate supervision.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am told that we have had no complaints such as suggested by my hon. friend. I am sure he realizes that this $45,000 is not all of the money that is expended by the Dominion in connection with employment offices; this is only for their administration. The amount asked is $45,000, a reduction of $30,000 from the appropriation of 1921-22. The appropriation is intended to cover the expense incurred in the administration of the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act. Briefly, the statute empowers the minister to aid and encourage the organization and co-ordination of employment offices, to promote uniformity of methods among them, and to establish clearing houses for the interchange of information between employment offices concerning the transfer of labour and other matters. For the purposes of such organization and co-ordination provision is made for distribution among the various provinces annually of a sum of $150,000. The present vote, however, relates only to expense incurred in administration, and represents disbursements on account of printing, stationery and other supplies, travelling and temporary help. There are at this time—March, 1922—seventy-six provincial offices and three clearing houses—Halifax, Ottawa and Winnipeg—all of which are outfitted from the department with respect to stationery and supplies. The disbursements include considerable charges for railroad travelling and printing. The appropriation for 1922-23, though considerably reduced from that of last year, is intended to meet the charges incurred in issuing periodical bulletins, and so forth.

Mr. STEVENS: What was spent last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: From April 1, 1921 to March 31, 1922, $49,832.58. This might possibly be added to because of some items chargeable to the past fiscal year.

Mr. MANION: I notice that in addition to item 268, for administration, Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, $45,000, item 269 provides $100,000 for these employment offices. In view of these two items, and the minister's statement that we pay half the cost of running these offices, I do not agree that any diffidence need necessarily be shown in approaching these employment offices with suggestions. I do not know whether diffidence is one of the qualities possessed by the minister. I would like to know how many men have been given employment through these offices during recent months, say since the first of January?

Mr. MURDOCK: I have the totals for the fiscal year; I do not know that I have them for the period since the first of January. During the fiscal year 1921-22 the approximate number of vacancies notified to the officers of the employment service was 429,600, of which 327,900 were for men and 101,700 for women. Applicants for employment during the year numbered approximately 541,400, of which 439,900 were received from men and 101,500 from women. The total number of placements effected was approximately 357,700; of these about 270,600 were regular placements—236,600 of men, and 34,000 of women—and 87,100 placements were casual; that is, the employment was not expected to continue more than one week. The average daily

transactions of employment service were approximately:

Vacancies	1,390
Applications	1,750
Regular placements	880
Casual placements	280
Total placements	1,160

Mr. MANION: These figures really show that practically a thousand people have been placed in temporary and more or less permanent employment; that would be, roughly, something over 350,000 a year.

Mr. MURDOCK: Yes. My hon. friend might like to have the record of the previous fiscal year, 1920-21 by provinces. It is as follows:

	Regular Placements			Casual Placements.
	Men	Women	Total	
Prince Edward Island	95	2	97	0
Nova Scotia	1,637	166	1,803	109
New Brunswick	4,841	334	5,175	222
Quebec	14,438	1,442	15,880	366
Ontario	100,062	9,057	109,119	17,856
Manitoba	52,445	6,681	59,126	27,079
Saskatchewan	40,886	4,012	44,898	6,962
Alberta	47,508	7,273	54,781	14,605
British Columbia	44,810	4,602	49,412	12,546
	306,722	33,569	340,291	79,745

Mr. MANION: These figures agree pretty much with the figures for the past year; they are a little less, but practically the same. That would seem to me to be very gratifying. Now, besides item 268, $45,000, and item 269, $100,000, there is an amount authorized by statute of $150,000—all for employment offices. Why should this amount of approximately $300,000 be divided into three votes?

Mr. MURDOCK: Item 268 is for the administration of the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act. The amount 11 p.m. given in item 269, $100,000, the same as last year, is intended for distribution among the provinces. Under the terms of the act, the amount provided for the year is $150,000. The industrial situation likely to prevail throughout the fiscal year 1922-23 is anything but clear at the present time, and it is thought desirable to supplement the statutory appropriation by the amount indicated, thus enabling the department to meet contingencies which may confront the employment services. I have the following memorandum:

> The provinces have, during the past two or three years been led to expect that the federal grant would be practically equal to their expenditures and this would be possible only by increasing the statutory appropriation as proposed. Its omission would bring from the provinces the protest that they had been induced to undertake certain annual expenditures on a basis of partnership and the federal Government had then withdrawn. A detailed statement of expenditure for the twelve months ending March 31st, is given for the various provinces.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Murdock.]

International Labour Conference, $15,000.

Mr. MANION: I would ask the minister one question about this item. I understand there is an International Labour Conference, having some connection with the Genoa Conference, being held in Rome. Has Canada any representatives at that Conference?

Mr. MURDOCK: My understanding is that it is only a general International Trades Union Conference that is being held at Rome.

Mr. STEVENS: What is this item for?

Mr. MURDOCK: The expenditure under this head arises out of section 13 of the Peace Treaty. It is probable that the 1922-23 conference will be held in Europe.

Item agreed to.

Joint Industrial Councils, $15,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will the minister explain what the work of the Joint Industrial Councils consists in and what councils report at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK: We have only three or four of these Joint Industrial Councils at the present time, I am told. They are in Montreal, Hamilton and Toronto. The results secured are not what the Labour Department looked and hoped for in the formation of these councils. I might add for the information of my hon. friend that the expenditure in connection with this item for the last fiscal year was $13,722.36. The appropriation is intended to meet

charges arising out of work done for the promotion of a system of joint industrial councils as between employers and workmen. The system is largely identical with that known in Great Britain as the Whitley Councils and is thought likely to be helpful in meeting the difficult situation arising out of the industrial unrest. The appropriation is intended to meet charges for printing and stationery, travelling expenses, and temporary assistance.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I ask the minister if any effort has been made to institute a system of joint councils among the employees of the Civil Service? If the Government itself is the employer and the principle is a good one, is the effort being made here as in England to have Whitley Councils established among the Civil Service employees?

Mr. MURDOCK: In reply to my hon. friend's question I would say—

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I do not like to interrupt but I wish to put a question which perhaps may be of assistance. I am at a loss to know what the nature and purpose of a Joint Industrial Council is.

Mr. MURDOCK: An industrial council can be briefly described as a council which would presume to bring the employers and employees connected with a certain industry, or a certain going concern, around the table for mutual discussion with the hope that they would be able to talk their differences over and arrive at an understanding that would prevent any interruption to operations. The Whitley Council is established and maintained to a large extent in England and the industrial councils here are expected to follow very much along the same lines. For further information I would refer my hon. friend to page 71 of the report of the Department of Labour for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1921 where that point is extensively dealt with.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: May I have an answer now to my question as to whether steps are being taken to institute industrial councils in the Civil Service?

Mr. MURDOCK: I started to answer my hon. friend's question by stating yes, that steps are being taken as far as possible to establish industrial councils wherever it appears feasible.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will that kind of policy be pursued as regards the employees in the Civil Service?

Mr. MURDOCK: Did my hon. friend mention the Civil Service?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I said the Civil Service.

Mr. MURDOCK: I beg my hon. friend's pardon, I did not catch his precise question. That matter is under consideration. Representations have been made in that regard and they will be given consideration.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Will the same policy be carried out in regard to the Canadian National Railways, the Government or the Board of Management in that case being the employer?

Mr. MURDOCK: Six of the largest railroad organizations have what could be very properly described, I think, as an Industrial Council in the Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment No. 1 which deals with all disputes arising in connection with those six organizations, or all controversies with the railways, and the entire Canadian National Railways are a party to that council. I think there is work to be done in bringing the other classes of railroad labour, possibly on the Canadian National Railways, under some similar plan for the mutual benefit of employer and employee.

Item agreed to.

Unemployment Relief, $100,000.

Mr. STEVENS: This is a very important item and I know that there are a number of hon. members in this particular corner who are anxious to discuss it at some considerable length. I hope, however, that the minister at the next meeting of the committee will not seek to place upon me, as he did in the case of the leader of the Opposition, full responsibility for all unemployment because I made this reference. It is pretty late now and I know the committee would not care at this hour to enter into a lengthy discussion of this vitally important item.

Mr. MURDOCK: It will be quite agreeable to me to discuss the matter later.

Item allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.12 p.m.

Monday, April 24, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Mr. DONALD M. KENNEDY (West Edmonton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 54 to amend the Criminel Code. He said: This is a bill to repeal section 20 of Chapter 25, the statutes of 1921. This section of the Criminal Code was passed in June of last year, in the face of an insistent demand from a part of the West for an investigation into alleged frauds in connection with the transfer and location of half-breed scrip. Many frauds complained of are supposed to have been committed as far back as fifteen years ago, and the amendment, section 20, Chapter 25 of 1921, provides that prosecution cannot be taken after three years from the commission of the offence.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

NATURALIZATION ACT, 1914 AMENDMENT

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 55, an Act to revise and amend the Naturalization Act, 1914. He said: This is a bill to amend the Naturalization Act of 1914. By this act, a residence of five years, in the previous eight years, in His Majesty's Dominion was required, with one year, the last year, in Canada. When the war broke out an amendment was enacted which provided that the time spent overseas in the crown forces by those who enlisted would count as residence in Canada, but there was no provision for men who enlisted in the armies of the allied countries. The result is that if a Belgian, a Frenchman or an Italian who was a resident in Canada before the war, and who had spent four years in Canada, enlisted in the allied army, his time while he was overseas did not count, and when he came back to Canada, say in 1919, he had to reside in Canada five years more in order to obtain naturalization papers. I submit that this was an oversight causing a grave injustice, and the purpose of my bill is to remedy that injustice. I will explain the bill fully on second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

[Mr. Murdock.]

CAPTAIN CARTY

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. What were the war services of Captain Carty, the commissioner's representative on the Appeal Board of the chief architect's branch, Department of Public Works?
2. What salary did he receive when appointed?
3. Was he instructed or directed regarding those who were to lose or to win their appeals?
4. If so, by whom?
5. Before hearing the appeals did he have interviews with officials of the branch regarding the decision to be rendered?
6. If so, what are the names of said officials?
7. Is he still on the staff of the commission?
8. If not, where is he employed?
9. What salary did he receive during the last year?
10. Did he obtain his present position by competitive examinations?
11. If not, why?
12. What salary is he presently receiving?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Captain Edward Godfrey Carty, Canadian Militia. Appointed prov. lieutenant, 23rd Battery, 8th Brigade, Canadian Militia, 18th December, 1915. Attended Royal School of Artillery, Kingston, 10th January, 1915, to March, 1915. Qualified for lieutenant, artillery. Appointed adjutant and paymaster, Signal Training Depot, C.E.F. (Ottawa), 13th March, 1916. Transferred to 2nd Depot Battalion, Eastern Ontario Regiment (Ottawa), as paymaster, with effect from 29th December, 1917. Struck off the strength of the Canadian Expeditionary Force on general demobilization, 10th September, 1919. This officer had no overseas war service.
2. $1,800 per annum, plus bonus.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. No, so far as the Civil Service Commission is aware.
6. No information.
7. No.
8. Department of Railways and Canals.
9. $2,400.
10. No, the regulations did not require examination for those only temporarily employed.
11. Answered by No. 10.
12. Answered by No. 9.

GOVERNMENT SHOPS, SOREL

Mr. BOUCHER:

1. How many persons from the county of Yamaska were given employment at the Government shops at Sorel shortly before and just after the by-election of May, 1921?
2. What are the names, and the respective occupations and salaries of the said persons?
3. Who recommended these persons?
4. Did the superintendent of said shops give employment to many after having said there were no vacancies?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. 30 persons. 2.

LIST OF MEN FROM THE COUNTY OF YAMASKA EMPLOYED IN SHIPYARD, IN 1921.

No.	Name.	Duty	Wages per hour	Date of entry, year, 1921
292	St. Germain, Alcide	Carpenter	·45	26 May
260	Lafleur, Adel	"	·45	23 "
253	Crevier, Oliva	"	·45	21 "
255	Busiere, Antoine	"	·45	23 "
256	Bibeau, Albert	"	·45	23 "
257	Lafreniere, Rob	"	·45	23 "
258	Peltier, Rob	"	·45	23 "
259	Peltier, Lucien	"	·45	23 "
254	Hamel, Georges	"	·45	20 "
287	Desmarais, Patrick	Caulker	·45	18 "
288	Desmarais, Armand	"	·45	18 "
289	Descheneaux, Sigefroid	"	·45	18 "
290	Descheneaux, Robt	"	·45	18 "
262	Mondou, Willie	Joiner	·45	18 "
618	St. Germain, Robert	Yard Laborer	·35	18 "
629	St. Germain, Aime	"	·35	18 "
243	Descoteaux, Nap	Carpenter	·45	18 "
245	Bussiere, Oswald	"	·45	18 "
251	Desrochers, Oscar	"	·45	18 "
252	Duperron, Israel	"	·45	18 "
217	Larose, Barthelemy	"	·45	16 "
221	Cote, Jos	"	·45	16 "
222	Rene, Alexandre	"	·45	16 "
229	Descheneaux, Alf., fils Ludger	"	·45	16 "
233	Dardin, Willie	"	·45	16 "
201	Crevier, Odilon	"	·45	16 "
203	Crevier, Hormidas	"	·45	16 "
235	Beaulac, Emile	"	·45	16 "
236	Gauthier, Alphonse	"	·45	16 "
235	Desfosses, Etienne	"	·45	16 September

3. Mr. Oscar Lafrenière.

4. No.

INCOME TAX

Mr. CLARK:

1. What was the total amount of income taxes collected in the years 1919, 1920 and 1921 in the Dominion of Canada?

2. What was the total amount paid by (a) manufacturers, (b) wholesalers, (c) farmers, (d) retailers, and (e) professional men?

3. What was the amount paid by each of the above classed according to provinces during the same period?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Fiscal Year 1919, $9,343,419.03; fiscal year 1920, $20,264,419.43; fiscal year 1921, $46,381,806.64.

2. Statistical classification of taxpayers for fiscal years 1919, 1920 and 1921:

1919

(a) Farmers	$ 350,759 53
(b) Professionals	596,100 87
(c) Mechanics	41,337 46
(d) Business	6,077,282 43
(e) Corporations	1,376,829 47
(f) All others	901,109 27
Total	$9,343,419 03

Manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers are included under the items (d) and (e).

In addition, businesses, including corporations, paid $32,970,061.81 under the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.

1920

(a) Farmers	$ 525,836 74
(b) Professionals	1,093,401 07
(c) Employees	4,786,520 73
(d) Merchants	4,450,375 34
(e) Manufacturers	2,551,503 49
(f) All others	6,856,782 06
Total	$20,264,419 43

Wholesalers and retailers are included under Item (d).

In addition, businesses, including corporations, paid $44,145,184.48 under the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.

1921

(a) Farmers	$ 611,736 64
(b) Professionals	2,642,585 66
(c) Employees	11,301,805 58
(d) Merchants	7,689,521 23
(e) Manufacturers	8,217,730 09
(f) All others	11,823,563 05
(g) Not classified	4,094,864 39
Total	$46,381,806 64

Wholesalers and retailers are included under Item (d).

In addition, businesses, including corporations, paid $40,841,401.25 under the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916.

3.

STATISTICAL CLASSIFICATION OF TAXPAYERS AND AMOUNT PAID BY EACH CLASS ACCORDING TO PROVINCES DURING THE FISCAL YEARS 1919, 1920 AND 1921.

1919

Province	Farmers (a)	Professionals (b)	Mechanics (c)	Business (d)	Corporations (e)	All Others (f)	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia	647 60	19,536 72	1,891 61	137,885 63	49,484 16	39,647 52	249,093 24
New Brunswick	204 30	10,988 07	277 24	111,986 79	38,291 82	31,280 69	193,028 91
Quebec	2,169 40	147,720 84	11,541 77	1,594,464 12	434,997 14	353,003 55	2,543,896 82
Ontario	28,079 88	277,600 27	17,564 89	3,311,324 45	550,412 67	274,957 44	4,459,939 60
Manitoba	71,358 97	62,733 68	4,881 86	483,781 35	80,804 15	37,050 76	740,610 77
Saskatchewan	62,938 94	14,004 01	123 84	77,119 93	12,331 08	5,319 01	171,836 81
Alberta	179,389 28	30,987 17	720 35	130,733 64	83,950 04	32,180 11	457,960 59
British Columbia	5,961 16	31,318 50	4,099 53	227,690 05	126,558 41	124,989 87	520,617 52
Yukon	10 00	1,211 61	236,37	2,296 47	.....	2,680 32	6,434 77
Totals	350,759 53	596,100 87	41,337 46	6,077,282 43	1,376,829 47	901,109 27	9,343,419 03

Manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers are included under items (*d*) and (*e*).

1920

Province	Farmers (a)	Professional (b)	Employees (c)	Mercha nts (d)	Manufacturers (e)	All Others (f)	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia and Prince Edward	1,776 12	27,398 87	78,093 78	151,073 81	61,870 00	186,780 48	506,993 06
New Brunswick	2,597 00	16,091 83	46,465 24	104,853 13	62,510 00	100,853 78	333,370 98
Quebec	6,822 38	253,515 11	1,635,528 88	980,412 20	289,377 49	4,080,590 15	7,246,246 21
Ontario	73,777 40	545,856 46	2,255,569 64	1,879,637 71	1,822,428 00	1,605,467 72	8,182,736 93
Manitoba	61,827 20	91,862 16	378,385 80	753,366 66	140,045 00	445,901 04	1,871,387 86
Saskatchewan	199,537 51	43,111 87	23,219 35	113,404 25	5,425 00	93,546 40	478,244 38
Alberta	157,757 11	56,852 82	87,751 10	217,177 81	16,990 00	99,719 88	636,248 72
British Columbia	21,721 47	56,270 60	275,499 32	247,419 71	152,462 00	242,060 82	995,433 92
Yukon	20 55	2,441 35	6,007 62	3,030 06	396 00	1,861 79	13,757 37
Total	525,836 74	1,093,401 07	4,786,520 73	4,450,375 34	2,551,503 49	6,856,782 06	20,264,419 43

Wholesalers and retailers are included under item (*d*).

1921

Province	Farmers (a)	Profes-sional (b)	Employees (c)	Merchants (d)	Manufac-turers (e)	All others (f)	Unclas-sified (g)	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Nova Scotia and P. E. Island	7,883 69	61,483 77	238,047 69	308,546 55	159,366 36	310,874 59	108,142 46	1,194,345 11
New Brunswick	1,197 26	27,455 18	169,662 30	174,049 68	101,465 47	129,104 81	98,528 83	701,463 53
Quebec	18,285 82	717,692 20	3,280,761 25	2,457,538 97	3,105,536 11	4,535,829 67	1,542,330 05	15,657,974 07
*Ontario	40,973 58	1,282,478 98	5,538,637 66	2,916,519 75	4,246,143 27	4,409,496 99	1,579,546 63	20,013,796 86
†Manitoba	145,906 20	182,927 18	1,020,149 22	852,883 38	248,495 26	1,024,222 60	488,151 04	3,962,734 88
Saskatchewan	165,032 06	114,968 64	158,537 72	253,409 74	15,882 01	390,409 41	95,297 05	1,193,536 63
Alberta	127,722 24	120,355 51	339,532 80	292,065 38	110,051 51	369,915 53	39,355 35	1,398,998 32
British Columbia	104,707 32	131,536 88	544,639 44	433,533 48	230,519 55	649,261 56	143,512 98	2,237,711 21
Yukon	28 47	3,687 32	11,837 50	974 30	270 55	4,447 89	.....	21,246 03
Total	611,736 64	2,642,585 66	11,301,805 58	7,689,521 23	8,217,730 09	11,823,563 05	4,094,864 39	46,381,806 64

Manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers are included under item (d)
*Includes receipts from that part of the province of Quebec lying west of Argenteuil.
†For 1919 and 1920 includes receipts from that part of the province of Ontario lying west of the District of Algoma.

MARCONI WIRELESS

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Was the unexpired contract with the Marconi Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada, Limited, cancelled and a new contract entered into?

2. If so, what are the terms and conditions of the old and new contracts?

3. Was this contract entered into prior to a change of Government?

4. If so, what steps, if any, does the present Government propose to take to rescind it?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The old contract has not been cancelled, but a supplementary contract has been entered into.

2. The principal amendments to the old contract are as follows:

That for a period of five years, April 1, 1921, to April 1, 1926, the subsidy in respect of each of the stations remaining open be increased from an average of $2,081 per station per annum to $5,500 per station per annum.

That all Government messages which under old contract were free of charge be handled at half the rates charged on commercial messages.

3. Amendments to contract authorized by Order in Council P.C. 1573 of the 31st August, 1921 and supplementary contract signed 15th December, 1921.

4. The rescinding of the supplementary contract has not been given consideration.

GOOD ROADS

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. What part of Dundas street, in the county of Halton, has been completed by the provincial government of Ontario under the Federal Good Roads scheme?

2. What amount of money has been paid to the provincial government by the Dominion Government on account of this road?

3. What is the cost of the road to date and the cost per mile?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Dundas street, in the county of Halton, is under construction, but no part of it has been completed under the Federal Highways Act.

2. $1,874.94.

3. Approximate expenditure on whole road from Toronto to Clappisons' Corners up to 31st December, 1921, is $580,000 or $18,972 per mile. The detailed audit to give expenditure in Halton county is not yet completed.

PRINCE OF WALES' ROYAL CANADIAN REGIMENT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the Government received an appeal from the 1st Battalion, Prince of Wales' Leinster Regiment (Royal Canadians) to the following effect?

"We beg Canada to help us to be retained in the British army as the Prince of Wales' Royal Canadian Regiment, and so to represent the Dominion just as the Irish Guards represent the Irish Free State, with his Royal Highness as our Colonel-in-Chief, as he is at present".

2. If so, what action, if any, has been taken?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Yes, through the High Commissioner for Canada and also through the Colonial Office.

2. The appeal was submitted to the Army Council who stated that—

"It is with very deep regret that they have felt compelled to recommend the disbandment of this Corps. Such action is rendered necessary by the Articles of Agreement for a Treaty between Great Britain and Ireland, which contemplate the establishment of a military defence force by the Irish Free State.

. . .In view of the present need for economy, involving a general reduction of the Army it would be impossible to substitute reformation in another form for disbandment."

POST OFFICES—MONTREAL

Mr. RINFRET:

1. How many Post Offices are there in the city limits of Montreal?

2. Where are they located?

3. How many letters and parcels were received and forwarded from each of the said post offices during the year 1921?

Hon Mr. MURPHY:

1. 89.

2.—

Office	Location
Post Offices Within City Limits.	
Montreal (Head Office)	St. James St.
Hochelaga	1606 St. Catherine St. E.
St. Henri	12 Place St. Henri
Postal Stations Within City Limits.	
Postal Station A	571 St. James
Postal Station B	324 St. Catherine W.
Postal Station C	802 St. Catherine E.
Postal Station D	317 Centre
Postal Station E	1832 St. Lawrence
Postal Station F	Cor. Notre Dame and Richmond
Postal Station H	St. Catherine, Cor. Bishop
Postal Station M	116 Letourneux
Postal Station N	120 St. Catherine E.
Postal Station R	1918 St. Denis
Postal Station S	222 Blvd. Monk
Delorimier	1128 Mont Royal E.
Notre Dame de Grace.	5382 Sherbrooke W.
Sub Offices Within City Limits.	
Ahuntsic	6441 Lajeunesse
Beaudoin	2097 Notre Dame W.
Bordeaux	2202 Blvd. Gouin
Cartierville	123 Blvd. Gouin
Cote de Neiges O.	1869 Cote des Neiges
Cote St. Louis	1315 St. Denis
Cote Visitation	2132 Blvd. Rosemont

Office	Location
Sub Offices Within City Limits—*Con.*	
Leduc	1089 St. Catherine E.
Longue Pointe	3973 Notre Dame E.
N. Dame des Victoires	742 Montsable
Ontario Centre	441 Ontario E.
Ontario East	778 Ontario E.
Park Ave. Extension	259 Beaumont
St. Catherine St. W.	854 St. Catherine W.
St. Denis St.	282 St. Catherine E.
St. Jean Baptiste	1324 St. Lawrence
St. Jean de la Croix	2850 St. Lawrence
St. Lawrence Centre	508 St. Lawrence
St. Lawrence Square	544 St. Denis
Ste. Cunegonde	94 Vinet
St. Paul	1694 Church
Sault au Recollet	898 Blvd. Gouin E.
Tetraultville	4341 Honfleur
Villeneuve	710 Mont Royal
Villeray	3814 Lajeunesse
Youville	1030 Ontario East
Sub No. 15	271 St. Lawrence
Sub. No. 16	401 St. Denis
Sub No. 17	1911 Masson
Sub No. 18	1911 Masson
Sub No. 19	320 Notre Dame W.
Sub No. 20	2096 Ontario E.
Sub No. 21	2497 Ontario E.
Sub No. 22	892 Lacombe
Sub No. 23	1505 St. Lawrence
Sub No. 26	658 St. Antoine
Sub No. 27	713 Wellington
Sub. No. 31	486 Roy St. E.
Sub No. 33	449 Rachel E.
Sub. No. 35	3049 St. Catherine E.
Sub No. 37	321B Rachel St.
Sub No. 38	1420 Ontario E.
Sub No. 39	230 St. Catherine W.
Sub No. 42	2698 Notre Dame W.
Sub No. 43	481 Gilford
Sub No. 44	2231 Papineau
Sub No. 46	345 St. Antoine
Sub No. 47	244 Laurier W.
Sub No. 48	76 Rose de Lima
Sub No. 49	513 Delorimier
Sub No. 51	117 Bernard
Sub No. 56	301 Colbrooke
Sub No. 58	311 Defleurimont
Sub No. 66	119 St. Denis
Sub No. 68	1345 St. Catherine E.
Sub No. 69	2275 Jeanne d'Arc
Sub No. 72	433 Amherst
Sub No. 73	447 Beaubien
Sub No. 77	437 Mont Royal E.
Sub No. 85	781 Charlevoix
Sub No. 86	1158 Decastelneau
Sub No. 93	1185 St. Denis
Sub No. 94	1387 Rachel E.
Sub No. 95	447 St. Catherine E.
Sub No. 98	988 St. Lawrence Blvd.
Sub No. 101	39 Hector, Lge. Pte.
Sub No. 103	1159 Papineau
Sub No. 104	2217 St. James
Sub No. 105	597 Lasalle Ave.
Sub No. 106	Park Ave. & St. Viateur
Sub No. 108	2501 St. Denis Str.
Sub No. 109	342 Forsythe Str.
Sub No. 112	1445 St. Denis Str.

3.—No record.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the International Conference on the Opium and Narcotic Drug question been held? If so, where, when and on what date?

2. Has the Government on file any copy of the proceedings and findings of such conference?

[Mr. Murphy.]

3. Did the conference discuss the subject of restriction and control of the production of opium?

Have any steps been taken by the British Government, or French Government or the Government of India towards controlling the production and export of opium?

5. Will the Canadian Government make representations to the British, French and Indian Governments regarding control of production and export of opium?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. Four International Opium Conferences have been held. The first was held at Shanghai, China, January-February, 1909; the second, at The Hague from 1st December, 1911, to 23rd January, 1912; the third, from 1st July to 9th July, 1913; the fourth, from 15th June to 25th June, 1914.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

5. As the countries concerned equally with Canada are parties to the International Opium Convention of the 23rd January, 1912 (ratified 10th October, 1919), by which they undertake to restrict and control the manufacture of and trade in opium and similar harmful drugs, and to bring about the suppression of their abuse, no such representations would appear to be necessary.

AERIAL FOREST PATROL—ALBERTA

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. What sum of money has been expended by the government upon the air station and aerial forest patrol, southern Alberta, situated at High River, Alberta?

2. Did the government purchase or build any permanent buildings which would be of no use for other purposes than those of an aerial station?

3. If so, what was the cost of said building?

4. Does the Government contemplate doing away with this air station?

5. Does the Government intend to discontinue the aerial forest patrol in southern Alberta?

6. If so, for what reasons?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 1920-21, $21,947.85; 1921-22, $147,621.26.

2. The buildings at the air station were designed for that particular use. They could be used, if necessary, for other purposes, however.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4 and 5. Pending the reorganization of the air services following the formation of the Department of National Defence, it is difficult to make definite decisions as to the maintenance of any particular air station. The forest patrol in southern Alberta can be continued during the coming summer in any case.

6. Answered by 4 and 5.

BRITISH EMPIRE STEEL CORPORATION

Mr. MARTELL:

1. Was the British Empire Steel Corporation assessed for, and did it pay any Business Profits Taxes during the last calendar year?

2. If so, what was the amount of said taxes, and, when and in what manner were they paid?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. No, as the first accounting period of the corporation ended on 31st December, 1921.

2. Answered by No. 1.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—EMPLOYEES

Mr. FONTAINE:

How many employees (a) men (b) women and (c) returned soldiers, are there in the Post Office Department, either permanent or temporary, receiving a salary of $600 per year?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

Permanent, (a) 1, (b) 3, (c) Nil; Temporary, (a) 8, (b) 25, (c) 27.

ELECTION DEPOSITS

*Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Have all members of the House of Commons been refunded the deposit made by each of them to returning officers in accordance with the provisions of the Electoral law?

2. If not, how many, and what are the names of the members still expecting the refund of said deposit?

3. What are the reasons for delay in returning said deposits?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. No. All deposits received by the Auditor General under Section 40, sub-section 9 of the Dominion Elections Act have been returned to the candidates, as provided by section 72, sub-section 5 of the Dominion Elections Act.

2. One member and one candidate are still expecting refunds of deposits made by them, these being Mr. George Parent, M.P., and Pierre Bertrand, defeated candidate, electoral district of Quebec West.

3. The delay is caused by the returning officer failing to forward the deposits to the Auditor General of Canada as provided by section 40, sub-section 9 of the Dominion Elections Act.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. VIEN:

1. Was an inventory taken of all war material furnished to the British Government by Canada, when the late war was declared?

2. What was the nature of such shipments, and on what date were they shipped?

3. Was this war material paid for in kind or was it paid for in money?

4. What were the dates of these payments and of what nature were they?

Mr. VIEN:

1. Has the Canadian Government received from the Imperial Government, shipments of munitions of war, arms or equipment, during the years 1921 and 1922?

2. If so, on what dates, and what were the nature and values of these shipments?

3. Under what agreement have these shipments been made?

4. Were they written agreements? If so, what is the name of the official who signed them for Canada and what are the dates of said agreements?

5. Does the Government expect other shipments of the same nature?

6. If so, of what nature and value?

7. Were arms, accoutrements and munitions received by the Canadian Government from the British Government, in the autumn of 1921?

8. If so, what was their value?

9. Were the said arms, accoutrements and munitions out of service or in bad condition, and will the Canadian Government be obliged to spend large amounts on repairs?

10. Will a great quantity of this munition be unfit for use after 1924, and thus have to be destroyed?

11. Where was this material disposed of?

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. What are the names, positions and salary of the employees of the Chief Architect's branch, Public Works Department, who worked on the three classifications which were posted in the branch?

2. Which of the three classifications was approved by the deputy minister and recommended to the commission.

3. On what date, month and year were reports or cards for classification from Chief Architect's branch received by the commission?

4. After such reports or cards for classification were received by the commission, were there any other special ones issued?

5. If so, on what date, month and year were they issued?

6. By whom were they requested?

7. What are the names, positions and salary of the persons to whom they were issued?

8. Were all the employees informed? If not, why?

9. What were the duties of those who received these cards?

10. For what position and salary were each of them requested to fill in these cards?

11. To what positions and salaries were they classified?

12. What was the position and salary of each when the first and second classifications were posted?

13. What is the amount of back pay each received?

14. What was their position and salary, also the year they were appointed in the service?

DRAWBACKS

Mr. JOHN EVANS (Saskatoon) moved:

For a return showing a list of the raw materials, with the quantity and value thereof, on which a refund of the duty under the Drawback Act was paid, together with a list of the firms to whom such money was returned. Also a list of the finished articles manufactured from such material and the countries to which they were exported.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: For what period?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: Before this motion is adopted, it would be well for the hon. gentleman to state from what time he wants this return made.

Mr. EVANS: For the last year that the report was made—1921.

Mr. CALDWELL: The period between 1920 and 1921 would be very brief unless it includes one year or the other.

Mr. EVANS: It is for the year ending March 31, 1922.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

CORRESPONDENCE WITH BRITISH GOVERNMENT

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition, moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the British and Canadian Governments, leading up to and concerning the conference of Prime Ministers in 1921.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): As my right hon. friend will be aware, most of this correspondence is marked "secret and confidential". I presume it will be the wish of my right hon. friend that I should ask the permission of the British Government, to bring down such correspondence as is marked "secret and confidential" and obtain that permission in advance before placing the correspondence on the Table of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that some correspondence is so marked, and personally I do not ask that any be secret or confidential. I leave the Government, however, to decide what, in the interest of the country, should be preserved as secret and confidential.

Mr. SPEAKER: Motion agreed to, subject to this limitation.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. STEVENS:

For a Return showing a list of the names of persons from Poland, Roumania or Russia, who were allowed to enter Canada under bond to go farming, and who have been found, on investigation, to have violated terms of the said bond.

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, applications, petitions and other documents exchanged between the Government and individuals or companies, referring to conditions imposed on various railway companies intending to use the Quebec Bridge for the purpose of reaching the city of Quebec.

[Mr. Evans.]

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of contracts, correspondence, agreements and other documents, during the period from the year 1911 to date, between the Government directly, or through any commission, and the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway, referring to the construction and the use of the Union Station at Palais, city of Quebec.

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents regarding the appointment of one or more appraisers for Paris and London, made by the Civil Sevice Commission.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a return showing a list of the names of the names of the persons who were employed as newspaper censors during the war, the name and location of the newspapers which were censured, the date of censorships and a copy of the articles censored. Also a copy of the regulations of the said censorship.

Mr. MEIGHEN:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between the Canadian and the British Governments, respecting an Address passed by the Canadian Parliament on the subject of extra territoriality rights of the Dominion.

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, orders, instructions and other documents, exchanged between the Minister of Labour or any member of his department and Alfred J. Andrews, in connection with the strike in Winnipeg in the year 1919.

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, orders, instructions and other documents, exchanged between the Solicitor General or any member of his department, and Alfred J. Andrews, relative to the strike in Winnipeg during the year 1919.

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, orders, instructions and other documents, exchanged between the Minister of the Interior or any member of his department and Alfred J. Andrews, relative to the strike in Winnipeg during the year 1919.

Mr. McMURRAY:

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, orders, instructions and other documents, exchanged between the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Labour, the Solicitor General, the Minister of the Interior, or any person connected with these departments, and General Kitchen, relative to the strike in Winnipeg during the year 1919.

ALFRED J. ANDREWS—APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg) moved:

For a copy of the Order in Council appointing Alfred J. Andrews a Deputy Minister of Justice, during the year 1919. Also a copy of all letters, telegrams, instructions, orders and

other documents exchanged between the Minister of Justice or any official of the department of Justice, and the said Alfred J. Andrews, pertaining to the strike in Winnipeg, Manitoba, during the year 1919.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I really cannot understand how the Government can permit this motion to carry in its present form. It asks for a copy of the Order in Council appointing Alfred J. Andrews a Deputy Minister of Justice during the year 1919. As hon. members well know, it was not within the power of the Government to appoint another deputy minister while we had one, and for that reason, if not for many others, Alfred J. Andrews was never appointed Deputy Minister of Justice. This motion asserts as a fact something which is manifestly and palpably untrue.

Mr. BUREAU: The motion merely asks for a certain Order in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it asserts as a fact something which is untrue, and it is against the rules of the House that such an assertion shall pass.

Mr. BUREAU: There is no assertion of fact in the motion; it merely asks for a particular Order in Council.

Motion agreed to.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment with which the Municipalities and Provinces find themselves unable to cope, it is desirable that the federal Government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation.

He said: This resolution deals with a question that is of vital importance to Canada at the present time. It was a matter of regret to a great many of us that in the Speech from the Throne there was no suggestion that the Government would deal effectively with the great question of unemployment. The paragraph in the Speech relating to that matter read:

Whilst of the opinion that unemployment relief is fundamentally a municipal and provincial responsibility, my Government has felt that as conditions have arisen in a measure out of the late war, they would be justified in continuing for the period of the winter months the expedient of supplementing by grants from the federal treasury the relief contributions of provinces and municipalities for the purpose of alleviating actual distress.

I take it that the solution of the problem of unemployment should go a great deal further than the giving of unemployment relief, and that the problem is already of such vast importance that it cannot be dealt with satisfactorily by either provincial or municipal bodies. I have a resolution passed at the joint conference of trades unions, returned men's organizations, and representatives of other public bodies, held on February 6, 1922, at Vancouver, which embodies fairly well the position taken by a large number of unemployed people and labour organizations throughout the entire Canadian West. This resolution is as follows:

Whereas the unemployed situation is of a national character, and is one that cannot be handled satisfactorily by municipal bodies; and whereas, the extremely low scale of relief now being given is tending to lower the standard of living of the entire wage working population; be it resolved, that we call upon the federal Government to assume the management of the unemployment situation on a national scale, and that the basis of relief be work at trade union rates or full maintenance on the scale laid down in the Labour Gazette.

In my own province of Manitoba there was held, in September, 1921, a conference on the question of unemployment. This conference was called at the invitation of the government of the province, and I have before me a series of resolutions which were drawn up at that time. It will be borne in mind that these resolutions represent the municipal and provincial aspects of the case. Among clauses dealing with the causes of unemployment I would read the following:

Fluctuations in industry are caused by market changes brought on by world conditions and social habits.

Lack of relations between system of education and the labour market, in order that the youth will be trained in occupations in which workers are in demand.

Allowing men and families to immigrate into Canada, who are not equipped, either physically or financially, to take up farm work, and who are not desirous of taking up this work, but who wish to take up other industrial activities wherein there is no demand.

The lack of organization of productive industry with a view to continuous employment.

Having laid down some of the causes of unemployment, the report proceeds with suggested measures for relief:

Undoubtedly, the unemployment problem is a national one, and must be studied from a national point of view.

I agree absolutely with the finding of the provincial conference on unemployment, that this matter cannot be dealt with satisfactorily except from a national standpoint.

I think this position is well taken, when we consider the action of the Peace Conference at Versailles. In the draft convention and recommendations adopted by the International Labour Conference at its first meeting in Washington during November, 1919, there occurs the following recommendation with regard to the unemployed:

As to No. 3, the minister observes that the experience of other countries has demonstrated that a system of unemployment insurance, in order to be effective and successful, must be made ancillary or complementary to a system of labour exchanges, the whole being adapted to the principal function of finding work for unemployed insured workmen. In this view, unemployed insurance has a pronounced federal aspect, and on the whole the minister thinks the establishment of a system of unemployment insurance is competent to the Dominion in the exercise of its residuary legislative powers with regard to the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Here, then, we have it admitted on the highest authority that there is a place for federal action with regard to this great question.

Now, further, may I suggest that the government has already committed itself on this question. I have a document here with this heading:

Liberals and labour. The Liberal party's record of achievement on behalf of labour, issued by the National Liberal Committee, 115 Sparks street, Ottawa. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, M.P., Liberal leader, etc.

In this document we find the following statement:

And further resolved: (2) That insofar as may be practicable, having regard to Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal government in conjunction with the governments of the several provinces; and that on matters pertaining to industrial and social legislation, an effort should be made to overcome any question of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the provinces by effective co-operation between the several governments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would seem clear from this resolution that not only is it acknowledged that the federal government has responsibilities in this matter, but also that the party in power is committed to take action along these lines.

Very little need be said here with regard to the serious situation which exists to-day. The Minister of Labour admitted in a speech, made several months ago, that there were something like 200,000 unemployed men in Canada. I presume that that would mean in the vicinity of 1,000,000 people—men, women and children

—directly affected by unemployment. That is a very, very large proportion indeed of a population of eight or nine million. I know perfectly well that in the West we have had the most serious unemployment for the last two or three years, particularly in the cities of Vancouver and Winnipeg, and to a smaller extent in nearly all the other cities, including Edmonton, Calgary and Saskatoon. And we have unemployment in the central part; I have resolutions from Toronto, Hamilton and other cities here in the East. During the recess I was down in Nova Scotia, and not only are large numbers of miners unemployed or underemployed, but there are in Sydney something like two thousand unemployed steel workers, who have absolutely no prospect of securing work in the near future and do not know where to turn to get a livelihood. It seems to me that we cannot let this session go by without taking some action to relieve the distress in which so many of our people now find themselves.

There are a few points which I should like to mention very briefly as to the position which it is necessary for us to take. There was a time in the history of Canada when, if a man were unemployed, it was his own fault. There were free lands, easily accessible, and good markets, and if a man could not succeed in one place he could go to another; and if he could not make good in one particular kind of work he could try his hand at another. That time has passed and with the system of large-scale industry that we have to-day a few large corporations control the greater part of the work that is available. I take that example of the steel workers at Sydney; there are several thousand of them in connection with the one great corporation there. If for any reason that corporation closes down its plant, the men are helpless. There was a time when steel working was confined to small local foundries and blacksmith shops, and in those days a man could open a little shop of his own. So far as Nova Scotia is concerned, the farms cannot absorb very many of the surplus unemployed, and they tell me there that fishing is about the only means of livelihood left, and that under present conditions it takes a considerable amount of equipment to carry on fishing successfully. A great many of the men out of work in Winnipeg are employed in railway shops and kindred work. There again I would point out that if for any reason at all the railway is not able to

carry on its work to the full extent, thousands of mechanics find themselves in a helpless position, for it is simply impossible for them to start up any new kind of work; they are on the street. The same thing is true in our larger mining and logging activities on the coast. I submit that to-day with large-scale industry as it is, the individual unemployed workman is not to blame. Notwithstanding that, we treat him still almost as if he were a criminal. We take it for granted almost that he is shiftless or lazy, or he would not be in such a helpless position. In any case we allow a certain maladjustment in industry to bear very heavily indeed on the unfortunate individual and his still more unfortunate family. Now, that state of affairs ought to be absolutely changed.

Another point that needs to be emphasized is that hitherto the municipalities, helped out by the provincial and Dominion governments, have been expending large sums simply for unemployment relief, and at the end of the year there is nothing to show for the expenditure. Surely, it would seem as if in Canada we had sufficient development work to do that for every hour's work there ought to be some return. This practice of putting men simply at work tests, to break stone when great crushing machines are by their side, is absolute folly. The whole trouble seems to be that we have not at the present time the necessary credit to go on with the new works we feel ought to be undertaken, and which if proceeded with would start the industrial machinery moving again. Now, there is not the slightest doubt that in this respect we are being held up, more or less, by certain interested bodies. A few weeks ago in Vancouver I was talking to an alderman who is chairman of the unemployment committee as well as of the finance committee of the council. He pointed out that much as the city would like to give some constructive work to the unemployed in Vancouver, they could not do so because they could not obtain credit from the bank—in this case, the Bank of Montreal. Upon turning to the annual statement issued by the Bank of Montreal, I find that the general manager of that institution takes the position that unemployment is a very necessary evil; that only through unemployment can we drive down the wages to the point they should be,—or, to use the words of the report, that unemployment is a "natural corrective." Mr. Speaker, I think of some of the scenes which I have witnessed in the homes of labouring men during the last few weeks: men out of work; their wives almost desperate; their children, in some instances, kept home from school through lack of shoes or clothing; in some cases not only physical privation, but absolute discouragement with regard to life itself. A large number of people are in that position; yet we are told by one of the leading financial institutions of Canada that unemployment is a "natural corrective". I submit that it is for the Government to defend the people of Canada against an institution of this character.

Why should we ask that the whole burden of unemployment be borne by the provinces or by the municipalities? According to our constitution, this Parliament has to deal with such great matters as immigration, fiscal policy, and so on. I submit that questions of immigration have a great deal to do with the question of unemployment. Thousands and tens of thousands of immigrants came to my own city of Winnipeg last year direct from Great Britain. Ostensibly they were to go on the land, and I believe in the first instance they did so; but the immigration officials told me at the time that there was nothing whatever to prevent these people from drifting into the city when the work of the summer was over. A number of them did drift back into the city, with the result that the municipality is loaded up with the care of them. Their presence in this country, however, is directly due to the action of this Government under its immigration policy. The same is true with regard to a good many of our large fiscal policies: we decide here what those policies shall be, but we shoulder off upon the provinces and municipalities, themselves already overloaded with debt, the responsibility of caring for the unemployed. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot do otherwise in this body than assume responsibility.

It may be said by members of the Government that it is impossible to establish a full-fledged system of unemployment insurance at this particular time. Perhaps that is a reasonable position to take, yet I would say this: until such a system can be established the least we can do is to adopt the principle underlying unemployment insurance, namely, that industry should bear the burdens entailed by industry. If we have brought more people to this country than we need, or if we have placed more people in a particular industry than we need, then the least we can do is to see that that bur-

den is spread out over the community, not borne by the few unfortunate individuals upon whom it now presses so heavily.

Now, without going further into this matter, I would urge that the problem is such a serious one that we should not allow many more weeks to pass before taking definite action. You may say that the spring is opening up, and that with the spring there comes agricultural work and more activity in various lines. That may be true, but we are going to have another winter, and there is no prospect that the next winter will be any better than the one which has just passed. If we are to have effective action, therefore, it must be taken at this session of Parliament. I hope hon. members will realize that while we in this House deal very largely merely with statistics and general principles, there are loyal Canadian men and women in every one of our cities to-day who are in almost desperate straits. I take it that our administrative bodies exist in order to provide for the primary needs of the people. I have said to labour audiences, and I venture to repeat it in this House, that any administrative body, in a country capable of producing as Canada can produce, which fails to provide for the primary needs of its people, even to the extent of food and clothing and shelter, ceases to command the loyalty of those people. On all sides the people in this country are calling upon us for relief, and we face a serious situation if we do not lend an ear at this time and do our utmost to solve what is not only a national but a world problem.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Before the hon. member finally takes his seat, I would like to ask whether he has any concrete suggestion to make to the House as to means whereby the federal government could deal with the problem?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: My concrete suggestion would be that at this session the Government should go into the matter and establish a system of unemployment insurance. Not that such a system would provide work, but it would give immediate and definite relief to those who are out of work, and in the effort to provide for their immediate needs we would find ourselves driven to do something along constructive lines. Most decidedly there are a number of things that could be done. Almost all our unemployment conferences have suggested lines of work which could be pursued. For example, there is a shortage of houses all over Canada; in all our cities rentals are very high, and there is no reason why a great many more houses should not be built. On the western coast there are large areas of land which still have to be cleared; why should men be going around the cities idle when they might be engaged in the clearing of those lands? As I have said, large numbers of people lack the prime necessities of life, even of clothes; we have factories and mills standing idle which are capable of producing these things, and if these various industrial organizations cannot carry on, I do not see why the Government should not do so, and under those circumstances, put these idle men at work and see that the needs of the people are provided for. Down in Cape Breton some of the coal miners are recognizing that principle; they say that if these great corporations, some of whom have leases from the provincial government, can not see their way to make dividends and carry on, then the Government itself should step in and operate the industry in the interests of the people. There is not much doubt that there is work to do. I would venture to repeat to the Prime Minister what I said, I think, in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, that there were three factors, and three factors only, necessary in order to enable us to produce all that we require for the material welfare of the people of Canada, and those are, the natural resources of the country, the equipment and labour. I submit that we have all these three at the present time in Canada. We have natural resources in abundance. At all our Canadian Clubs we have been told of the vast extent of our natural resources. We have the equipment: factories are idle, mills and railways are not working to capacity; we have an abundance of equipment already in this country. One trouble, it seems to me, is that we have been so long adding equipment that the only possible thing we can conceive of now is to add still more equipment. We already have equipment enough; and we have labour idle. What seems to be lacking is a certain courage, and imagination that would enable us to bring these three factors into effective working connection. I cannot see why we should allow things to drift from bad to worse until some of the labour people are driven to desperation. Surely we have the brains and ability here in this House to devise some method for giving the unemployed work. If not the poor individual workman is himself surely helpless.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Let me say at the outset that I am in entire sympathy with my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) in his desire to find some means of helping to solve the problem of unemployment where it exists. I agree with him, too, in believing that the problem of unemployment has a national significance, as well as a provincial and a municipal significance; but I think it is all important that this Parliament should very carefully consider whether the obligation of looking after men who are unemployed should become a federal obligation, rather than it should be understood to be primarily a matter for individuals in the first instance, between municipalities and the people living within their bounds, in the second instance, next, between the provinces and the citizens of the respective provinces, and only finally a matter of concern in the federal arena.

If it were admitted for one moment that it was not primarily a municipal obligation to look after the individuals who are unemployed within their bounds where would we ultimately land in the solution of this question? Should the resolution pass in the form in which I understand my hon. friend to wish it to pass, namely, as meaning that the obligation is upon the federal government to look after the unemployed, every municipality that had unemployed would immediately send its communications to Ottawa and say: The Ottawa Government, in view of the resolution that has passed this House, is obligated to look after the unemployed in this area.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Might I call attention to the fact that the resolution merely suggests that it is desirable that the federal government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation? That might involve taking the matter up with other agencies as well.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What I want to make perfectly clear is this: I do not think the Government can admit that it is primarily a federal obligation to look after the unemployed. I think that there is a national significance to the problem of unemployed, but the problem primarily is one which concerns municipalities, and secondarily, the provinces affected. It only becomes a federal problem when both the municipalities and the provinces have found it impossible to cope with a situation that is completely beyond their control. That condition has arisen, to a certain extent, as a consequence of conditions growing out of the war, and the federal government has recognized its obligation there by promising to co-operate with the municipalities and with the provinces in the relief of their unemployed. There is a standing offer at the present time to the

4 p.m.

municipalities and the provinces —a policy that was adopted by the late government, and one which has been followed by the present administration —to help them meet cases of distress where they are unable to look after their own unemployed. I am told by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) that from two or three, possibly four of the provinces of this Dominion, no request has come to the federal government for assistance. Does my hon. friend think, that the provinces which have made no request for assistance in helping to solve the unemployment problem within their boundaries would be agreeable to being taxed to assist other provinces in the matter of their unemployment as a national obligation? I am afraid that if we began to work out the question on a basis of that kind, we would find it impossible in any way to carry out such a policy. I believe with my hon. friend, as I said at the outset, that the matter is one in which there is a national interest, as well as provincial and municipal interest, but that it can only be met by co-operation between the provinces and the federal government.

The hon. member has suggested that the step that should be taken at once is for this Parliament to pass an enactment in the nature of unemployment insurance. I question very much whether, if we attempted to pass such legislation at the present time, we would find that it comes wholly within the jurisdiction of this federal Parliament. The provinces may have the right to pass such a law; we may have the right to pass such a law; but one thing is certain, that between the two of us we ought to be able to find a way to pass such an enactment if it is in the public interest. It is in that spirit that the Liberal party adopted as one of the planks in its platform the resolution which my hon. friend has quoted, and which I shall quote now, and which, let me say, expresses the policy of the Government on this question:

> That in so far as may be practicable, having regard for Canada's financial position, an adequate system of insurance against unemployment, sickness, dependence in old age, and other disability, which would include old age pensions, widows' pensions, and maternity benefits, should be instituted by the federal Government in conjunction with the Governments of

the several Provinces; and that on matters pertaining to Industrial and Social legislation an effort should be made to overcome any question of jurisdiction between the Dominion and the Provinces by effective co-operation between the several Governments.

That policy is one which recognizes the obligations of the federal government to co-operate with the provincial governments in working out a system of insurance against unemployment. That is an entirely different attitude, however, from the federal Government's admitting that the obligation is upon it to solve this question independently altogether of the municipalities and the provinces.

I would say to my hon. friend and to the House that the Minister of Labour and myself have already been in communication with representatives of some of the provincial governments with a view to having a conference on this very subject during the course of the present year, and I think before the year is out that conference will take place; but I would like to make it perfectly plain that so far as the Government is concerned, we regard all these matters of unemployment and the like as questions primarily of concern to municipalities and to provinces, but in so far as the national interest may also be concerned we are prepared to co-operate with the municipalities and the provinces in seeking a solution.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I shall take up the time of the House only for a few moments in any remarks I have to make on this question. There is no doubt that this is a very important question from the standpoint of any country in the world. I believe that any man who looks at this question in a fair light must decide that no class of men should be permitted to be without work and to go hungry.

We have, unfortunately, in most countries of the world been in the habit of taking better care of our animals—that is the lower animals—than, perhaps, of human animals, and I believe that, from that standpoint, the question my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has brought up is one of importance. There is no doubt every hon. member of the House desires to see some solution, if at all possible, of the unemployment situation, which exists not only in Canada, but unfortunately is world-wide at the present time. My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg mentioned unemployment insurance. He has been more of a student of affairs of this kind than I have, and I presume he knows much better than I do that that type of insurance has been tried out in various parts of the world, and I think probably he knows the conclusion that I draw from my reading, namely that it has not been altogether a success. It has been tried out in a number of different countries, in various cities in Germany, in a number of cities in France, in some cities in Italy, and various other cities, and I believe in some countries almost as a whole. But there has been a great deal of abuse of this system of insurance in the different countries of the world. It has not been found an unmixed good. However, I personally wish to express my entire sympathy, as the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) did, with the problem, but before any system of unemployment insurance could be adopted, I think it would be desirable to go into the question much more thoroughly than this House has ever done since I have been a member of it.

My hon. friend, the Prime Minister, pointed out that the Government of to-day is carrying on the programme as outlined by the government which went out of office in December, 1921. It is rather gratifying to us on this side of the House to have our hon. friends on the other side back up our programme which they did not support before the election. I have noticed that this pledge of the Liberal platform which he read must go into the discard, with a number of other pledges which were in the Liberal platform before the election, and I am pleased to hear the leader of the Government to-day commend what was condemned so vociferously before the election by a number of the members of the present Government. It is certainly gratifying to us on this side of the House, and it should certainly prove to the people of this country that a cure in office is a good deal more difficult than condemnation out of office.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): I want to first state, Mr. Speaker, that I am altogether sympathetic with what I believe to be the views of my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg, in so far as we can, in an appropriate way, co-operate in dealing with this very important question of unemployment. But I fear that my hon. friend is undertaking to place an undue burden upon this federal government when he proposes to hold this Government alone responsible for dealing with the question of unemployment. My hon. friend referred

to certain communications on this question received by him from Vancouver. I have received some fourteen or more communications as the result of a meeting held in Vancouver on 6th February last, indicating that it was the view of an unemployed conference there that the federal government should assume charge over the conditions of unemployment, to the extent of obtaining full wages, at trades union rates, for all persons in Vancouver who were not at that time employed. I must firmly take the position that I do not see how this federal government could assume any such obligation as that, because it would be adopting a plan that might not be in the best interests of the unemployed in Canada, and would certainly place a burden upon this Dominion which would indeed be hard to carry. My hon. friend referred to unemployment being common in the Dominion, which is, I think, substantially correct; but, as indicated by the Prime Minister, we are placed in the peculiar position of having at least several of the provinces through their proper representatives, indicate to us, in a very courteous way, that they are quite competent to deal with the unemployment situation in their particular provinces. As a matter of fact, in connection with the unemployment we find orders which have been in effect since this Government took office as to the handling of this question. We have found four provinces that have not believed it was necessary or essential that they should take advantage of the offers made by the federal government in those two employment orders that have been issued.

Mr. CARROLL: Can the hon. minister tell me which provinces those were?

Mr. MURDOCK: Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec have generally indicated that they were amply sufficient unto themselves to deal with this question; and we, of course, are glad to understand that that is the position. My hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) referred to the statement that there were 200,000 unemployed in Canada. I am glad to tell my hon. friend that the latest advices are that that particular situation is being considerably relieved recently, and that the conditions in which he is particularly interested, in Vancouver and on the Pacific Coast, are not, or should not be, the normal condition on that coast. I am told by a gentleman in close touch with the situation that many of the unemployed in Vancouver and places adjacent are men who were unemployed or could not find employment in the prairie province, and, on account of the climatic condition, merely went out to Vancouver and joined the all-too-large army of unemployed there. The result is—and this may be interesting to my hon. friend—that during the past fiscal year this Government has paid, as its share for unemployment in Vancouver, $102,-432.36, which indicates that the various municipalities and the provincial governments have borne an equal share of the expenses in dealing with the unemployment situation at Vancouver and adjacent cities. I desire to assure my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg and this House that I am entirely in sympathy with the undertaking to devise some means of dealing with this situation. But I hold that if, as has been said in years gone by, charity begins at home, it can be just as truthfully and forcefully stated that assistance and co-operation begins at home; and I believe that the assistance and co-operation which we need in dealing with this unemployment question, should commence in the municipalities and provinces. My hon. friend might be interested in knowing too that the present Orders in Council, under which this Government undertakes to assist in the relief of unemployment, expire on the 30th day of this month, we have, so far as I know, no requests at this time from municipalities or provinces for an extension of the provisions of those measures. It seems to me that, if there was a marked necessity at this particular time for an extension of those provisions, we would have heard something about the matter from the authorities in the various municipalities and provinces. Therefore, I would again suggest that this matter should, and I hope will, be dealt with in the way that I have indicated. I shall be glad to permit my hon. friend to have access to all the files of the Labour Department in order that he may ascertain if, with the records before him, he can devise some means whereby we can or should do something more in connection with this matter than has been done since this Government took office.

Mr. SIMPSON: Is the department over which the minister presides carrying on an investigation with reference to unemployment insurance? In his opinion, would that be an effective method of dealing with the unemployment situation?

Mr. MURDOCK: The Department of Labour has given some consideration to

that question, for I find, on referring to the report of my predecessor, that he deals with a portion of the Speech from the Throne of February, 1921, and I assume that that portion of the Speech from the Throne meant exactly what it says, and that the Labour Department did undertake to investigate the matter to which my hon. friend refers. The report reads:

> The following sentences from the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of Parliament in February indicate the attitude of the Dominion Government on the subject:
>
> "Unemployment, the world-wide result of the conditions to which I have referred, though less widespread in Canada than elsewhere, has received most anxious consideration. Of the charges for the relief of general unemployment, measures have been taken to bear a substantial share, and special measures have been taken to assist disabled and partially disabled ex-service men. These will be submitted to you for approval.
>
> "An investigation is being conducted by the Department of Labour into systems of unemployment insurance and old age pensions."

That is the quoted portion of the Speech from the Throne, and, therefore, I am sure my hon. friend will realize that the Labour Department, in fulfilment of its promises thus made to the people of Canada dealt with and undertook to investigate the question of unemployment insurance and old age pensions. The subject matter which is the result of those investigations is, I feel quite sure on file in the Department of Labour, although I might say that I have not yet had an opportunity of analyzing it and of ascertaining just what it may be.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to participate in any way in the discussion of this resolution, and I would not have said anything, were it not for the fact that the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), who moved the resolution, made some mention of conditions in the city of Winnipeg. Conditions in that city are far from good, and the hon. member is well within the mark when he says that 2,000 steel workers in Sydney, who are anxious and willing to work, are out of employment at the present time and, I believe, are well nigh on the verge of starvation. Did I hear an hon. member say "strikers"? They are not even able to "strike on the job," because they have no job to strike on. Nova Scotia is a province which has not applied to this Government under the various Orders in Council which have been passed for the purpose of aid being rendered by this Government to municipalities. That does not mean that there is not to-day dire want in Nova Scotia. As I have stated, there are in the city of Sydney 2,000 people who are only too anxious to work if they can get employment. They are not looking for charity, and they have not gone to the provincial government to ask for aid, because if they did that and received aid under present regulations in that province, they would become paupers and would cease to be citizens of this country. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why they have not gone to the Nova Scotia government to ask for aid under present legislation in that province.

I want to be quite frank. I have brought this matter to the attention of certain members of this Government, and I am going to interview members of the Government again, because last week I received communications from several clergymen in Sydney, wise men who brought this matter to my attention in a way in which it was not brought before, and I am bound to say that it is a most serious condition,—in a city of 27,000 people or thereabouts, to have 2,000 bread-winners walking the streets in idleness because there is no occupation for them. When I brought this matter to the attention of certain members of the Government, they did not say: "We will not act;" but I am bringing it to their attention to-day publicly, and I am going to interview them again. When I do so, I shall be reinforced by every private member from Nova Scotia, and I am going to draw to their attention the fact that there is a way out of this difficulty as regards the 2,000 steel workers in the city of Sydney. That is, the problem can be solved in that city without adding one dollar to the public debt of this country, because a way can be devised whereby the steel mills in the city of Sydney may be put into operation by this Government, if they see fit to have them put into operation, and for every dollar which will be spent by this Government in putting those mills into operation, this Government will receive a return in the shape of the product of those mills. If this Government are not able to use this product now, they will be able to use it in a very short time. I would not have spoken about this matter; but I felt, the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg having made reference to the situation in the city of Sydney, that my people down there, if I may say so, would think I was derelict in the duty in which

I feel I owe them—and which, I believe, the Government of this country owes them —if I did not speak on their behalf. My hon. friend said that there was a possibility of the steel workers of Sydney going on the farms or fishing. In the first place, that is not their occupation, and, as in any other occupation, success——requires years of service.

That is the first difficulty. The second difficulty is the fact that these 2,000 steel workers in the city of Sydney have not the means to procure the necessary equipment for fishing. It is true that it does not cost very much—between $200 and $400 being required. But this is altogether beyond these people. And in Nova Scotia these workmen could not go in for farming, even if they were adapted to this calling which they certainly are not. We are not a great farming community, and there are no farms that could be available for these men. Furthermore, there is an insurmountable obstacle in the lack of capital. In spite of all the circumstances that have conspired against them, however, these 2,000 men of whom my hon. friend has spoken have not gone to the government of Nova Scotia to seek one dollar of public charity, and I commend that indomitable, manly spirit on their part. At the same time they are, to my knowledge, in dire need to-day, many of their families facing actual starvation.

There is a way out of this unfortunate situation, and I trust that before the Government decide whether or not they will anticipate an order of steel rails for the city of Sydney they will take my word for it when I tell them that there is the direst necessity at this moment for some effective action. The problem is not only local; it is one of national concern. There is not a province in the entire Dominion, if my information is correct, where it is not necessary at the present time for some steps to be taken, either by the local authorities or by the Dominion government to provide relief; and I am one of those who believe that the federal government might be called upon to render more assistance to the people of the country than has been given, either by past governments or, so far, by this Government. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) has stated that $102,000 has been spent in the last two or three months in the city of Vancouver. I can tell him that in order to provide adequate relief in the present situation in Sydney, not $100,000 or $200,000, but $500,000 is necessary. What is $10,000 or $50,000 when distributed among 2,000 families? It is nothing. It may tide them over for a week or so, but whatever assistance it may give is fleeting. So that the time may come, if the present condition of affairs develops as in the last two months, when the federal government will have to make greater efforts than have been made in the past to alleviate the sufferings of the people. I know for a fact that the municipalities in Nova Scotia, which are not in any very different position from those of other parts of the country, are to-day financially embarrassed. At any rate, those with which I am familiar have overdrawn their accounts at the banks and have not the wherewithal to furnish relief to those who are in need. And, what is more, I doubt very much whether the provincial government, if it were called upon, would be in a position to lend any assistance. The federal government may possibly say, "Well, we are in the same position ourselves; we have not the funds." Well, Sir, let there be more co-operation. Take the municipality of the county of Cape Breton, for example. The county council of Cape Breton meets once a year, in the month of January, and if any parts of the municipality were in need of relief it would take a considerable length of time to convene the council and adopt measures co-operative with the province, or with this Government, for that matter. The Order in Council which was passed some months ago offering relief to soldiers embraced only certain classes of men, those who were getting pensions and those who were receiving vocational training, and it therefore did not meet the requirements of the municipalities, and the various districts generally, in the province from which I come.

Now, sir, I wish to inform this House that the people of the province of Nova Scotia are neither thriftless nor lazy, but are desirous, nay more, anxious, to work. They are not a class who would evade the responsibility which they owe their families, their friends, or the public at large. The labouring classes in that province, I say, are anxious and eager to get employment that they may earn a livelihood, because they have not looked for charity and are not doing so now. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, many of them would starve rather than go looking for charity. I hope, therefore, that the Government will believe me when I repeat that there is the most urgent necessity for some effective action in the city of Sydney and its vicinity. In regard to the

miners, there is the question of wages; and I do not think my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) will say that at the present time there is any large amount of unemployment in the coal industry in Nova Scotia. The question of wages is entirely another matter, and I hope that in a very short time the question will be settled when it comes before the conciliation board, which is now being reconvened. At this particular stage, where promptness of action is imperative, I do not think that an investigation into the matter of insurance against unemployment is going to help the situation. No investigations of any kind will relieve the distress that exists; immediate action is necessary. When, however, the question of insurance against unemployment, the question of old age pensions, and other social questions which have been more or less engaging the public mind for some time, are brought to the forefront, I can assure my hon. friend from Centre Winnipeg that they will find a staunch supporter and an ardent friend in myself.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my hon. friend's motion is capable of two interpretations. I shall be prepared to vote for it on one interpretation, but not on the other. If he means that the federal government must assume an obligation, in the matter of solving the unemployment question, apart altogether from the obligation on the part of the municipalities and provinces, I shall feel obliged to oppose his motion. On the other hand, if he means that it is the duty of the federal government to co-operate with the municipalities and provinces in a solution of the question and in trying to devise effective means towards that end, then I shall be prepared to support it. I should like him to indicate which view he wishes us to take of his motion.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Speaker, I wish briefly—

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that the mover closes the debate. If any other hon. member wishes to speak on the motion he should do so now.

Right Hon ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I think the Government ought to be able, as the motion reads, to determine its meaning and to decide its position with regard thereto. For myself, I do not want to be understood as voting in any atmosphere of doubt when I record my judgment on this resolution. I have no trouble whatever in determining my position.

The resolution implies that in so far as relief is concerned the principle we have followed is inadequate and does not get us far enough, and that some new principle, some new scheme should be sought out and adopted, placing upon the federal authorities the initial and primary burden for relief from distress. So far as that is concerned, whether as leader of the Government, or as leader of the Opposition, or as a private member, I have no doubt as to where I ought to stand—none whatever.

I agree wholly with the principle that when it comes to the handing out of relief to those in want and distress, the obligation is primarily municipal; if it passes the municipality, the next obligation is on the province; and lastly, and only lastly, on the federal authority. I believe that if we depart from the principle of primary municipal responsibility, we land ourselves in a Serbonian bog from which we will not emerge, and this House should not countenance departing from that principle for any reason whatsoever. Consequently I oppose the resolution.

I oppose it because I believe it seeks to put this House on a false basis with regard to unemployment relief. I do not for a moment say that we have no responsibility with regard to unemployment; not at all. The primary duty of the federal parliament is to adopt such measures of high public policy as will bring to a minimum unemployment, and spread to the utter most limits employment amongst our people.

May I compliment the hon. member for Cape Breton South (Mr. Carroll)? I know not what he has in mind in suggesting that there are things which may be done in the way of legislation which will conduce to employment among those out of work. That is something for this House to consider. If he has something practical, something which will really bring about that result, I would be disposed to favorably consider it. As I say, I do not know what he has in mind, but consideration of the subject he mentions is the primary duty of the federal parliament. When it comes to actually relieving those in distress, that is the primary duty of the municipalities and the provinces.

Now, is the Government following the proper course as regards both of these responsibilities?—first, to so dispose public

policy as to make employment general and remunerative, which is the initial and major responsibility?—second, to take care to the extent of its last, not initial, responsibility of such residuum of distress as may remain? As to the first, we will know better when the programme of the Government comes down. The Order Paper as yet is absurdly barren,—the most anaemic indeed that I ever have witnessed. But there are still some weeks ahead and there are those who have some hope left. Consequently the time for the discussion of that phase has not yet come. As to the second, as the Prime Minister has stated, the Government is following the principle laid down by the late administration,—the principle of placing the task of actually taking care of the unemployed upon the local authorities. Follow any other course, and what results? Not relief to the people generally, but only the encouragement of unemployment locally due to the knowledge that locally they would not have to bear the strain.

Now, there is one thing in the statement of the Prime Minister that really I do not understand. I hope that he only made a mistake. He stated there were four provinces which had not asked for assistance in the matter of relieving unemployment, and that those four provinces should not be called upon to give any assistance in the way of general relief. Let us inquire into that declaration. Under the late administration the municipalities were asked to put in the machinery to provide relief, where relief could not be avoided and was called for by all the claims of mercy and decency, and then to call on the provincial authorities to provide one-third of the actual disbursements,—not of the disbursements for the machinery at all; we did not propose that we or the provinces pay any of the expenses of organization—but only one-third of the actual amount that reached the unemployed. If the province and the municipality did so we would pay a third. That placed upon the general federal taxpayer the obligation to pay one-third of the residuum of actual relief.

We went further. We said: In so far as the disabled returned soldier is concerned, he is the special charge of the Government. He has suffered in the war, and it may be that because of his suffering he particularly comes in contact with the distress incident to unemployment because often he is the first to be discharged. Therefore, as respects the disabled returned man, we said we could and did take care of him altogether. That is the extent to which we went, and I think we spent something over one million dollars last year in taking care specially of these disabled returned men. I do not know just what the expenditure was in the general relief, one-third of which we bore.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I interrupt my right hon. friend? I assume that he has in mind that I was referring to the system of relief now being administered when I made the remark that the other provinces would probably take exception to spending further money on unemployment relief. I was not referring to the present method of relief at all. I was speaking of the broad question of the federal government assuming the obligation of giving relief to unemployment generally, and I said that under the circumstances the four provinces, not having requested any relief from the federal government, did the House think that those provinces would be indifferent to the federal government assuming the general obligation of relieving unemployment throughout the Dominion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What the Prime Minister said was: Would it be fair to expect these four provinces, which were not asking for anything themselves, to contribute to the relief of unemployment in the other provinces. He said it would not be fair. Whether he referred to the present method or any method is perfectly immaterial. If it is a false principle to call upon a province which does not ask for relief itself to contribute to unemployment relief in another province that does ask it, then that applies to anything which invokes that principle. In other words, if you use a principle that is false, you are doing wrong. Let me repeat. If it is wrong to call upon a province that itself takes care of its own obligations to assist a province that does not, then that is a good principle and you should not invade it. You invade it by the system now in vogue. Consequently I say it is either not a good principle or we should depart from the system now in vogue.

I think it is not a good principle I think that you can fairly ask the whole Dominion to assist on certain conditions in the relief of unemployment. But you must not go too far, you must go only a short distance in that regard; and the reason we came to that opinion was this: The conditions which resulted from the war were such that un-

employment was to some extent—in what measure it was impossible exactly to say—the direct result of the war itself. Therefore, because of the returned soldier obligation we felt in justice bound to assume and spread over the whole of Canada some share of the unemployment burden. That reason seemed to me good. If I did not believe it I would have to oppose the Government's policy, and I could not justify the policy that the late government adopted.

Now, the present Government, while following precisely the principle that we applied, not departing in any way whatever from it, did alter the proportions; but instead of altering them along the line of the principle suggested by the leader of the Government to-day, it altered them exactly the opposite way. It said to the municipality: Your responsibility is primary, but the share you pay will be the least of all. We will pay half, you will pay only one-sixth, and the province one-third; that makes the whole, whereas before the municipality paid a third, the province a third and the Dominion a third. Consequently over the whole of Canada he spreads now half—more than ever—making the very provinces that asked for nothing contribute more than they ever contributed before to the relief of provinces that asked for federal help. In a word, his policy is a direct antitheses to his expression of sentiment. However, it is not the first time that that incident has occurred.

Now, the Prime Minister, in regard to the unemployment insurance question, reads from the Liberal platform. You will be delighted, Mr. Speaker, and we all are, to hear at last a reference to the Liberal platform from the lips of the Prime Minister. I am sure all are in accord with me when I say that this is the first time that platform has been brought into the realm of this House since he reached his present exalted post; this is the first time he has read from its provisions. But, may I ask, Mr. Speaker, what is this resolution that he says his Government actually binds itself to fulfil? It is a pretty safe resolution. He says that if it is in the public interest—these are words that my hon. friend placed in it as he read—and if the public finances will permit, and when they permit, and if it is within our powers, then we ought to find some way of co-operating with the provinces in order to introduce unemployment insurance. If one can improve on that for a resolution that by a circuitous excursion finally ends by saying nothing, that at least he has exceeded my powers of circumlocution. The Prime Minister having seized on this lone declaration of the Liberal platform and declared his fidelity to it, I conclude that the plan of the Government is this: only to give heed to the programme of the Liberal convention when the resolution in question is surrounded at all four points of the compass with a wide-open "if" and when there is nothing but swinging doors in between.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, just for a moment I would like to bring to the attention of the House the condition of affairs in our own province of Ontario, where a certain dispute has arisen between the Hydro-Electric Commission and the provincial government. Bonds have been issued and the money is in the bank for the construction of certain radial lines and other public improvements which, if proceeded with, would go a long way toward relieving unemployment in Ontario. I can only say it is the wish of a large number of the people of Ontario that that dispute should be settled, or this misunderstanding cleared up. The purchase of the Toronto street railway, though it is still the subject of arbitration, has resulted in the payment out of large sums for the reconstruction of the system, and that has given much relief to the unemployed. The same thing could be done in connection with these radials. In most respects the different parties have agreed, but for some reason the legislation governing the matter is subject to some changes. If that matter could be settled several millions of dollars now available in Toronto could immediately be devoted to the purpose for which the money was appropriated, thus giving employment in connection with the works for which the bonds were issued.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting to note that all hon. members who have spoken on this question agree as to its importance and its urgency. I want to make a few practical suggestions, seeing that hon. members on the Government side have not made any, and that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has not made any. It has been stated that the member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has not made any. So perhaps I may be pardoned if I attempt at least to make one or two. If the suggestions I make are not of any value, we simply ask that the

Government take this matter into consideration and themselves make suggestions that will be of value.

There is no idea on our part to charge the present employment situation to this Government. We understand that they have no more to do with it than we have. We are simply urging that it is a question of national importance, and that, therefore, it is a question that cannot be passed by as merely something for the municipalities or for the provinces. Those who have been connected with labour for some years know that the municipalities take precisely the same attitude that this Government has taken. They say: "This is not a matter for us; we have no authority." And the provincial governments say the very same thing. But when we come to this House we find the federal government saying that the municipalities or the provinces are responsible. I think it is reasonable to suggest that the Government should in the first place find out who is responsible. It would be well for labour, it would be well for the members of this House and of other legislative bodies, to know who has authority in these matters. The question seems at present to be undecided, for both the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) and the leader of the Opposition—for once in the same camp—have stated very definitely that this is a matter for the municipalities and must not be taken out of their hands. I am not suggesting that it should be taken out of their hands, but I want to know whether it is actually in their hands now. It seems to me that matters of unemployment or anything else pertaining to labour are pretty much of a football that is kicked around from one authority to the other. It is necessary that we should know where the authority lies.

Now, the unemployment situation is not a new thing, nor is it going to be settled permanently with the coming of summer; it is a problem that has arisen out of the economic system that prevails. I do not think, nor do I believe that the other representative of labour thinks, that the question can be ultimately settled in this House. But we do think that something of a practical nature can be put forward. The Prime Minister challenged the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg to offer a practical suggestion. That is only fair, but I would like to remind the Prime Minister that he already has had a very practical suggestion from the organized labour movement of Canada: I refer to the case as presented to his Government by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada. The Trades and Labour Congress have put forward a solution which seems to them to be good; it is the only one, or the best one, they have been able to think of. As I say, it has been placed in the hands of the Government. I do not know what the Government are going to do with it, but I want to put upon Hansard what the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada request of the Government with regard to unemployment:

> We recommend the enactment of unemployment insurance embodying the following principles:—
>
> (a) Creation of a federal fund, from which payments may be made to unemployed, and under employed persons.
>
> (b) This fund to be raised by assessment on the pay rolls of undertakings whose workers are covered by such insurance and added to by Dominion and, if possible, provincial public funds.
>
> (c) Payments to be made to workers during actual unemployment or when employed for fixed periods for less than 75 per cent of their regular working hours.
>
> (d) No employer to be allowed to discharge numbers of his workers without due notice to the Employment Service of Canada, so as to give them an opportunity to provide for their redistribution.
>
> (e) The Government to have power to investigate as to the real need of discharge of workers, and consequent limitation of production.
>
> (f) No employers to be allowed to discharge workers for lack of work, until the hours of such industry have been reduced to at least half of the normal working hours.
>
> (g) Workers in this way underemployed to have their wages supplemented from the federal fund up to not less than 75 per cent of their normal earnings.
>
> (h) This Act to apply to workers under public bodies as well as to private employers.
>
> (i) Use of the advisory councils of the employment services should be made for the carrying out of the act, and power given them to deal with matters relating to the co-ordinating of public works, and perhaps their partial financing from the fund, in order to avoid unemployment. These suggestions are by no means complete but would provide a starting point for this much needed legislation.

That is the starting point which the organized labour movement of Canada has suggested to this Government, and I repeat, if that is not considered to be a feasible proposition, let the Government provide a more feasible one. Inasmuch as they have admitted that this is a question of grave importance which they are willing to see settled, have they a better solution than the one suggested, and if so, what is it? I think the Labour representatives in this House will be only too glad to sup-

port the Government if they have a solution that they consider better than the one I have just mentioned.

I want to offer another suggestion. If unemployment insurance is not considered to be practicable at the present time, and if the Government has no other substitute proposal, I want to read just a clause from the proposal put forward by the Trades and Labour Council of Calgary. This is merely a palliative, as they call it, but it might be worthy of consideration. I simply offer it to the Government at its face value:

> That the Dominion, provincial governments and municipalities prepare estimates for all public works that can be possibly carried out during the winter months, and that tenders for same be prepared and submitted early in the fall to eliminate any unnecessary waiting to start the work when needed.
>
> That the Dominion Government take under consideration the further construction of the national highways with a view that same be eventually completed from coast to coast.

These are the two principal palliatives. I do not know whether the Government will adopt them, but at all events I have submitted them for consideration.

In conclusion, the Government has already committed itself on this question. It has already paid out doles to the unemployed in Canada. It has accepted partial responsibility, at least, in conjunction with provincial and municipal governments for aiding the unemployed. That is an assumption at least of partial responsibility. Furthermore, the Government, I understand, has assumed responsibilities for losses which may have been incurred by large corporations who were engaged in producing munitions and other war material. If I am not mistaken, the British Empire Steel Corporation in Nova Scotia actually received subsidies—perhaps that is not the exact term—because when the war ceased they were left with a great plant on their hands and seemingly could not make anticipated profits. The Government, I understand, reimbursed them to the extent of their probable losses. Surely, if the Government can undertake to reimburse a company for probable losses, it ought to assume some responsibility for the men who are thrown out of work by
5 p.m. that company. That is not asking too much; in my opinion, it is a reasonable proposition. I believe that the Government is just as sincere in trying to solve the unemployment problem as I am, and I have no hesitation in saying so. I believe that the leader of the Opposition

[Mr. Irvine.]

(Mr. Meighen) is also sincere. But it seems that while we all think it is a great and serious problem which we would all wish to see partially or completely solved, nobody seems to know what to do about it. Does that mean that we must drop the matter there, bury it and leave it; that we will not continue to make a study of this question? Would it not be possible for the Government to have a Standing Committee appointed to study this question and continue to make proposals? Because I can assure the House that unemployment is going to be with us much longer than this summer. Next winter is likely to be as bad if not worse than the last, and now is the time to take precautionary measures and do everything possible to prevent unemployment being as prevalent throughout Canada as it was last winter. If the suggestions put forward by the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada are not practicable, and if the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) and myself have not contributed anything of value, let not the effort stop there; let us find somebody who can give us something of value.

I have another suggestion, and it is that this Government take steps towards calling a national conference at which municipal and provincial governments and the Dominion Government will be represented, for the purpose of taking into consideration the proposals of the Peace Conference and seeing what action shall be taken regarding them.

There is one other thing I would urge, and it is that the Government immediately start to put into effect the resolution that was read by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) to-day.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): First, one or two remarks on the suggestions that have been put forward in this discussion by hon. members who have spoken.

It was suggested by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock), I think, that a certain number of the unemployed in Vancouver were there because they were unwilling to go out on the prairies. A great many of them last spring did go out on the prairies, but were sent back because there was no work for them to do. There were advertisements, I believe, placed in some of the papers on the prairies protesting against any more men being brought over the mountains from the West. Then, as is very well known, owing to the seasonal character of agriculture, after the thresh-

ing is over on the prairies large numbers of men have no further work to do on the farms; that is, there are more men needed on the farms just at threshing time than during the winter months, and those unemployed drift back into the cities, and, of course, a considerable number of them drift back over the mountains to Vancouver. But this situation is no fault of the men who are found out of work during the winter time. It arises as I said before because of certain mal-adjustments in our industrial system itself.

Again, we are told that charity ought to begin at home, and that the municipalities ought to take action in this matter. A very large number of municipalities, at least in the West, have taken action in this matter, and it is only after they have found themselves unable to cope with the situation that they have referred the matter to the provincial governments. In turn, it is only after the provincial governments have found that the question was altogether too big for them, that the federal government has been appealed to. In the resolution of the conference called by the Manitoba Government, which I read it was distinctly urged that the problem was on such a large scale that it could not be solved short of being treated as a national problem.

One hon. gentleman from the East suggested that I had thought that possibly the steel workers might go fishing. He did not catch my point at all. I stated that some people had suggested: Why not go into other classes of work?—why should they not go fishing? And my position was precisely that which the hon. member took, that it would be impossible for them to go fishing or engage in any other occupation which required considerable equipment.

I have no great hope that the problem of unemployment will be solved simply by introducing a policy of unemployment insurance. I frankly admit that unemployment insurance has not been a full success in places where it has been tried. But it has accomplished something. We are faced with a world condition today. Some believe that our economic problems can be solved only by the most radical and far-reaching changes in our whole economic system. I am one of those. But I may be mistaken. If the present system of organization is capable of carrying on, give it a chance. If it is capable of providing for the wants of the people, give it every opportunity, but, in the meantime, do not let us permit the men and women, and especially the little children to suffer. If the existing system can take care of the people, that may show that some of us are wrong when, as we try to analyse the situation, we conclude that other and more radical changes are necessary. Some of us have been fairly closely associated with what is known as radical labour throughout western Canada and I should like this House to know there is a very strong impression among quite large groups of labour that it is next to impossible to accomplish anything through the action of Parliamment. They have almost given up hope. Some of us have stated that we ought to use parliamentary power to the full extent. Others reply that such a course would be useless. Really I do not know but that they are right. If we come here asking for so simple a thing as that this Government should undertake measures to provide for the men that are confessedly on the verge of starvation, and who have had to be fed by the municipalities during the winter months, and if this Government refuses to take action to provide, even for primary needs of that kind, I am sure it gives force to the contention it is hopeless to secure any reforms of far-reaching character through our parliamentary machinery. The Prime Minister speaks of being willing to co-operate with the provinces and municipalities. "Co-operate" is a good word, but I would like to have a little bit more definiteness in regard to it. There has been up to the present co-operation in the giving of relief. The Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) says the way is still open for co-operation in the giving of more relief. My resolution looks to some action more far-reaching than the simple giving of doles. It looks at least in the direction of a permanent solution of this problem, or, if not a permanent solution, then more adequate care for the people who at present are being crushed under our present system. The Prime Minister says he would be quite favourable to the resolution if it were understood that it does not mean that the federal government assumes exclusive jurisdiction in this matter, and that it does not mean that it would take responsibility from the provinces or municipalities. I have no desire, whatever, to remove responsibility from the provinces or municipalities. I have, as a matter of fact, very little interest in these purely jurisdictional affairs. I want to secure definite construction action. If the Premier can assure us that the Government

will go forward in the near future and give us some definite action that is all that any of us require at this particular time. My resolution reads:

That in the opinion of this House, in view of the widespread unemployment with which the municipalities and provinces find themselves unable to cope—

That is, I think substantiated by the resolutions which have come forward to the Government, copies of which resolutions have been furnished to all of us.

—it is desirable that the federal Government should devise some means of dealing effectively with the situation.

That is intended to place upon the Government the responsibility of finding the best means of meeting the situation. In this resolution we are not even urging unemployment insurance. That is thrown out merely as a constructive suggestion. We are urging upon the Government definite action, so that the people who are now suffering shall not have to go through another winter such as that through which they have just passed.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERS AND DIRECTORSHIPS

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. McMaster, seconded by Mr. Lanctôt:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable in the public interest that all ministers of the Crown, on their appointment as such should resign all directorships held by them in banks, trust companies, insurance companies, transportation companies or large public utility corporations; and that should Ministers of the Crown retain their directorships in companies other than those hereinabove mentioned, such companies should have no business dealings with the Government of the Dominion of Canada, or with any department thereof or with any railway or ship owned or controlled by said Government; it being understood that such prohibition should not affect the use by such company of the public services afforded by the said Government, or any department, or by any such railway or ship.

MINISTERS AND DIRECTORSHIPS

Mr. LANCTOT (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that I am not the seconder of this motion.

Mr. McMASTER (Translation): That is the case, Mr. Speaker, the seconder is the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould).

The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) will second my resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: The fault is all mine. The member sitting next to the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster) is

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

the member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctôt), and I gave his name as seconder. The hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) is the seconder of the motion.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): I ask the attention of hon. members of this House to what this motion proposes to do, and what it proposes not to do. It does not propose that members of the Government who are directors in companies carrying on what I might call private businesses should resign their directorships. If a member is carrying on the business, let us say, of a wholesale grocer in corporate form, I do not propose that he should, on becoming a member of the Cabinet, resign his directorship in such company. I propose that his company should be put exactly in the same position as if it were owned by him in non-corporate form, and that the company should not have the privilege of doing any business with the Government. What I claim for this resolution is that it proposes to prevent a possible conflict of fiduciary interests and that it is framed for the purpose of asking the opinion of this House as to the undesirability of members of the Government being at the same time directors in great public corporations, such as the banks, trust companies, transportation companies and great public utility corporations. I trust that I shall be able to place before the House such arguments as will lead it to the belief that what I am endeavouring to do now is in the public interest. I may say, what I said in introducing this matter last year, that I desire to discuss it on the plane of principle and not on that of personality; that I attack, not an individual, but a practice.

This is not the first time that I have brought such matters before the House. Last session, I introduced a bill providing that within fifteen days of accepting office, all ministers of the Crown who were directors in companies—and at that time I made no differentiation between large companies and small companies—should resign their directorships. I have changed that attitude; this session I have not gone so far as I did last year. I have not gone so far, largely because arguments were advanced last year which showed me that it was unwise to go so far as I went on that occasion. What were the arguments used against my bill last year? There was, first of all, the argument that it was unwise, improper. I will deal with that criticism

in a moment. There were other criticisms; there was the criticism that the bill went too far in that it tried to crystallize into legislation what should be rather left to the feelings of ministers themselves. There was also the argument that it went too far; that it was unfair to ask a man who was say, carrying on a business individual to himself, in corporate form, to resign a directorship in such business. I have met those two last criticisms. I am not asking for legislation on this occasion; I am not asking that men who are carrying on their private business or their partnership business in corporate form should, on assuming office, have to resign their directorships in such companies. But I am returning to the charge in respect of the holding of directorships in banks, trust companies and transportation companies, and the first point that I wish to make is that everything which has happened in this country in respect of the holding, by ministers of the Crown, of directorships in banks, trust companies and such other organizations since the introduction of my bill of last year, has ratified, confirmed and approved everything that I said in that connection on that occasion.

I do not wish to delay the House unduly with this matter, for it seems to me that what I have to say is of primordial, primary soundness. I think I shall have the general agreement of hon. gentlemen who sit on both the front benches of this House, when I say that, in this country, the life of a minister is one of unremitting toil. Our practice in this country imposes upon ministers vast amounts of routine business, and it is only with difficulty that a minister is able to obtain the time required to study policies. I say that we have the very best of authority that no man can serve two masters. There is nothing that one can do better in connection with such a matter as this than to give an example. There is no stronger argument, I humbly submit, as to the soundness of the position which I am assuming on this occasion, then what happened in connection with the Merchants Bank of Canada. On the 31st of November last, the Merchants Bank of Canada possessed, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, some hundreds of branches. It claimed to have a capital stock of about $10,500,000 and a reserve of about $9,000,000. For some months prior to the 7th day of December, it had been paying to its shareholders, by way of bonus or dividends, a profit at the rate of about 13 per cent. On the latter date the people of Canada were astounded to learn that the bank was in a very bad way. It was reported that the reserve had been practically wiped out. It was found that great losses had occurred through advances to a stock-broking firm and also to a manufacturing concern of which a representative of the bank had been in charge, or in charge, to a certain extent, of the finances for many months. That was the situation which confronted the Canadian people on that occasion.

The ex-Minister of Marine and Fisheries was a director of the Merchants Bank of Canada. The Merchants Bank of Canada, as the House knows, was sold out to the Bank of Montreal. I make no complaint of the sale; it may have been the very best thing that could have happened, in view of the situation in which that bank found itself on the 7th of December, 1921. But the minister in question was also a director of the Royal Trust Company, which is considered to be and which is, I think, in fact the side-door of the Bank of Montreal, and it is a matter, difficult for any outsider to the transaction, to state whether, in this transaction, the minister in question represented the interests of the Merchants Bank of Canada, which was the vendor, or the interests of the Bank of Montreal, which was the vendee, or the general interests of the Canadian people. I am charging no wrongdoing against any one; but I say that it is an unwholesome position for a man to find himself in, that people cannot tell which side of the bargain he is supposed to be looking after. To my proposed legislation of last year, the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries was an outspoken opponent. Although, when I address the House, I seldom weary it by reading extracts, may I be allowed to read a little of the debate which took place last year in connection with this matter? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the last administration said:

> I have no hesitation in stating that I am a director of banks and trust companies. I ask how could it be otherwise? A man who enters business early in life, achieves a success, and becomes associated not only with a large industrial concern—of which he may happen to be the president, vice-president or managing director—but with other commercial undertakings in the city or town in which he resides, and who amasses wealth, will find himself invited to become a director of other large corporations, banks or trust companies. If a man is not successful in business, and if he is not possessed of good judgment he will not find himself on any of these various directorates.

Now, suppose a business man is called to serve his country? It is a well-known fact that business men have no desire to become members of Parliament, great as the honour is, or to become members of a government, although they appreciate to the full what that honour means. Judging from the political history of Canada and other countries it is a rare thing to find a business man, who has succeeded in commerce or in finance, either a member of the popular chamber or a member of any particular Cabinet. But, Sir, if the State does call that man, there is only one thing for him to do. He must place the duties of his public office, the duty of serving his country, before his business interests, and henceforward devote all his time and all his attention to the administration of those public affairs to which he has been called. If I may be permitted to make a personal reference for a moment my position as a member of the Government and a member of the House is no different from the position which would be taken by any other business man. I had, of course, to drop all my business connections as far as giving them any personal attention was concerned; I have not been able to attend to the duties of the various boards to which I belong. But, Mr. Speaker, is it fair for the hon. member (Mr. McMaster) to expect a business man identified with large interests in this country to at once resign from those boards upon his entering the Government?

In closing the debate, I made this reply to the Hon. Mr. Ballantyne:

Now, I come to the argument made by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Ballantyne). I may say—and I would call all members of this House to witness who heard me the other day—that in introducing this measure I studiously refrained from imputing any wrong-doing to any minister, and I refrained absolutely from making a personal attack upon any one. But the Minister of Marine has endeavoured to attract the lightning upon himself; his doing so has been no fault of mine. The minister has been frank, if he has been anything. He said: I am a director in many large industrial companies, in banks and in trust companies. He seems to think that his holding of these positions is perfectly compatible with his being a minister of the Crown,—and he now nods his head in token of assent. But, Mr. Speaker, he goes on to say this: The energy and the skill required in the administration of a large department of the Government is such that I have not been able to give any attention to my company matters; —and he nods his head again. Well, in all kindness I ask him, is it fair to the shareholders of the Royal Trust Company that he should remain a director of that company, that he should give his name to the institution and the prestige that his name carries with it, while he gives no attention at all to the affairs of the Company? Is it fair, is it right, for a man to hold himself out as a guardian of the interests of the shareholders and of the depositors, if there are any, of the Royal Trust Company, and yet give no attention to the affairs of the Company? My hon. friend is a director, if I mistake not—and he will correct me if I make any mistake—of the Merchants Bank of Canada. Is it fair or right that the working men of this country should be invited to place their hard-earned savings in the care of the Merchants Bank of Canada, relying upon my hon. friend being a director of that institution, when as a matter of fact he tells us that he can give no attention to the matter? I do not think it is right, and I think that on further consideration, my hon. friend will come to the same conclusion.

[Mr. McMaster.]

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Canada who have seen what happened in connection with this bank have come to the conclusion which the member for Brome formed last session in respect of this matter. I need not stress this point. But for a minister of the Crown to hold positions in which he is a trustee for other people's money, when the work entailed in his office as minister precludes him from giving any attention to the affairs of the institution which is taking care of that money, is, I respectfully say, unfair to the minister himself, unfair to the cabinet of which he is a member, unfair to the party to which he belongs, and unfair to the people of the country of which he is supposed to be one of the governors in charge of affairs. A man comes to occupy a great position in connection with business matters if he allows his name to be used as a director. He gives notice to the world that, so far as concerns the policy of the institution in question, he takes his share of responsibility; and although he does not pretend to look after the details himself, he will see that they are properly looked after.

Now let us pass to another phase of the question. The world has been struggling for years past for political equality, for social equality, and now for economic equality. In this struggle men see, with a considerable amount of uneasiness, the fact that in this country, as in others, the money power is becoming centralized in fewer and fewer hands. That is a matter on which we might have a long and interesting discussion. Interlocking directorates tie together a large number of the great financial and industrial institutions of the country. I am not going to discuss that question to-day, but the point I shall make before the House, and perhaps in some degree before the country, is that interlocking directorates should not get past the door that guards the entrance to the executive council of the nation. A friend of mine who is conversant with business matters has prepared a graph for me in which he has put, in most striking form, the connection existing between the great financial, industrial and transportation interests of this country. On one side of the page I hold in my hand there appear the names of fifteen leading men of this country who are directors in large institutions. On the other side of the page, there are the names of sixteen great financial, in-

dustrial and transportation concerns. Fifteen of them are Canadian institutions, and one an American corporation which has been playing no inconsiderable part in financial affairs in Canada during the last few months or years. The amount of assets credited to these corporations totals $4,295,000,000, or considerably more than the whole national debt of Canada. The names of these great institutions are:

The Montreal City and District Savings Bank,
The Sun Life Assurance Company,
The Cockshutt Plow Company,
The Dominion Bank,
The Dominion Textile Company,
The Canadian Bank of Commerce,
The Canadian Pacific Railway Company,
The Bank of Montreal,
The National City Bond Company,—

which is apparently a subsidiary of the National City Bank, New York.

The Royal Trust Company—

—which I have characterized, I think with perfect correctness as being a side-door to the Bank of Montreal.

The Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company,
The Shawinigan Water & Power Company,
The Laurentide Company,
The Royal Bank,
The Montreal Trust Company—

which is really a side-door to the Royal Bank.

—and The Montreal Cottons Limited.

Now, of these sixteen great companies there are fifteen men in Canada who are directors of one, or two, or three, or four, or five, or six. As I desire to discuss this matter on a plane not of personality but of principle, I will refer to these directors as No. 1, No. 2, etc.

Director No. 1 is a director in the Cockshutt Plow Company, the Dominion Bank, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the National City Bond Company.

Director No. 2 is a director in the Canadian Bank of Commerce and in the National City Bond Company.

Director No. 3 is a director in the Dominion Bank and in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Director No. 4 is a director in the Cockshutt Plow Company and the Bank of Montreal.

Director No. 5 is a director in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Trust Company.

Director No. 6 is a director in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Bank of Montreal and the Royal Trust Company.

Director No. 7 is a director in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Bank of Montreal, the National City Bond Company and the Royal Trust Company.

Director No. 8 is a director in the Montreal City and District Savings Bank, the Bank of Montreal, the National City Bond Company, the Royal Trust Company, the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company, the Shawinigan Water and Power Company and the Laurentide Paper Company.

Director No. 9 is a director in the Dominion Textile Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company; in the Shawinigan Water and Power Company; in the Royal Bank; in the Montreal Trust Company and in the Montreal Cottons Limited.

Director No. 10 is a director in the Dominion Textile Company, the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Trust Company and in the Montreal Cottons Limited.

Director No. 11 is a director in the Dominion Textile Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Bank of Montreal, the Royal Trust Company, the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company and the Laurentide Paper Company.

Director No. 12 is a director in the Montreal City and District Savings Bank; in the Sun Life Assurance Company; in the Montreal Trust Company and in the Montreal Cottons Limited.

Director No. 13 is a director in the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company; in the Shawinigan Water and Power Company; in the Laurentide Paper Company and in the Montreal Trust Company.

Director No. 15 is a director in the National City Bond Company, the Royal Bank and the Montreal Trust Company.

To make the proof of the interlocking still more complete, I will take five of the chief of these great corporations and will show how closely allied the boards of these are to each other.

Thus, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has on its board of directors Nos. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11.

The Bank of Montreal has on its directorate, directors Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

There are five directors of the Bank of Montreal who are also directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and of the executive committee of the Canadian Pacific Railway consisting of five directors three are also directors of the Bank of Montreal.

The National City Bond Company has on its directorate, directors Nos. 1, 2, 7, 8 and 15.

The Royal Trust Company has on its directorate directors Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11.

The Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company has on its directorate, directors Nos. 8, 9, 11 and 13.

Now, as the Scotch say, what is the difference? Well, this is what I object to. We have great questions to discuss. We have followed I think a false economic system known as protection. The leader of the party situated angularly opposite will not agree with this part of my discourse.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the hon. gentleman confine his selection of leaders to myself?

Mr. McMASTER: There are others. I was looking at the right hon. gentleman when I spoke, as he often looks at me while he speaks, so I thought it just as well to bring him before the House as an example. It is suggested to me that I call my right hon. friend leader No. 2. Well, leader No. 2 will not agree with me when I say that the Canadian people have since 1878 followed a false economic system,—the policy of protection. That has caused to be built up in this country great corporations which have oftentimes an interest contrary to that of the mass of the people; and therefore I say it is highly undesirable that these special interests should have special representation in a Cabinet. That is one of the reasons why I believe it is unwise to have cabinet ministers who are directors in any company; there is the possibility of public prejudice. I need not stress that point. As I stated before, I am imputing wrong-doing to no one; but I do not think that is sufficient. We should have such a carrying on of our public life that there will not be room for suspicion. Let me take an extreme case for the purpose of making my argument. Suppose we find that in a Cabinet—and I do not care from what party that Cabinet was drawn —every member was a director in a cotton company, and we saw the duties on cottons raised, would we not have ground for suspicion? Of course we would. That is all I wish to say upon that point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will my hon. friend permit a question? Following that argument, why has he not included cotton companies in his resolution?

Mr. McMASTER: I suppose that is a fair question. I wished, if possible, to keep companies within a certain class, and that class covered great companies which were of a semi-public nature. I can easily imagine that an argument could be made out that no director whose company was the supposed beneficiary of the protective system should have a seat in the Cabinet; but to do that I would have to shut out the directors of perhaps half of the industrial life of this country, and I thought that would be going too far. In connection with any reform it is always easy to put forward the stereotyped criticism, that it goes too far, or does not go far enough. If I have the co-operation and enthusiastic support of Leader No. 2 to this resolution I will be satisfied so far as this afternoon is concerned.

Now, the next point I wish to make is that the position I am assuming now, as I assumed last year, is in conformity with present legislation on the subject—the House of Commons and Senate Act, R.S.C., 1906, chapter 10. section 14 provides:

> No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons or shall sit or vote in the said House.

And section 21 provides:

> No member of the Senate or of the House of Commons shall receive or agree to receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, for services rendered, or to be rendered, either by himself or another, in relation to any bill, proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest or other matter before the Senate or the House of Commons, or before a committee of either House, or in order to influence or to attempt to influence any member of either House.

I do not think the passing of such a law was any reflection upon the judiciary, any more than the introduction of his resolution is intended to be or is, if properly considered, any reflection upon the members of this or any past government. Section 33 of the Judges Act reads:

> No judge of the Supreme Court of Canada or of the Exchequer Court of Canada or of any superior or county court in Canada, shall, either directly or indirectly, as director or manager of any corporation, company or firm, or in any other manner whatever, for himself or others, engage in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties; but every such judge shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties.

Then my resolution is in line with the provisions of the law respecting the Board of Railway Commissioners. This statute is known as the Board of Railway Com-

missioners Act, 9-10, George V, and section 14, subsection I, reads as follows:

14. (1) No commissioner or officer of the board shall, directly or indirectly,—

(a) hold, purchase, take or become interested in any stock, share, bond, debenture or other security, of any company subject to this Act; or

(b) have any interest in any device, appliance, machine, patented process or article or any part thereof, which may be required or used as a part of the equipment of railways or of any rolling stock to be used thereon, or of any work or undertaking subject to this Act.

16. The commissioners shall devote the whole of their time to the performance of their duties under this Act, and shall not accept or hold any office or employment inconsistent with this section.

Of course, if they cannot be shareholders in companies making these devices, they cannot be directors in such companies; therefore my resolution is in line with that legislation concerning the Board of Railway Commissioners. The Cabinet is a court of appeal to which the findings of the Railway Commission may be taken; therefore my resolution merely asks that the personnel of that court of appeal should be subject to the same limitation as the court of first instance, the Railway Commissioners of Canada.

Then, the next point, which to me is a very important one, is that the resolution follows the best practice in Canada. I have been told, and I believe it to be a fact, that when Sir Robert Borden became Prime Minister of Canada he resigned all his directorships. I am told on the authority of the Leader of the official Opposition that the former Minister of Finance, Sir Thomas White, gave up all his directorships when he became Finance Minister of Canada. And the attitude of the members of the party sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, is in line with my resolution. I wish it were possible for the Speaker of this House to descend upon the Floor this afternoon and give me the valuable help of his eloquent voice as he did when I introduced my bill on a former occasion. On that occasion the present Speaker said:

Some years ago this Parliament amended the Judicature Act to provide that judges who had been appointed directors and were drawing directors' fees in joint stock companies or in any other company must resign. I may be told at once that no judge was ever accused of being partial in his decisions because he was a director of a company. That may be the case, but there is a great principle involved in this matter, and it is that the public must have absolute confidence in the integrity and probity of those who administer the law. It was for that purpose—that the public might respect the more the Bench of Canada—that this Parliament decided that judges should not be directors of any company. The legislation evoked considerable discussion at the time, and some of the judges protested against what they called this hardship being imposed upon them; yet public opinion ratified the action of Parliament. Every litigant approved of it because, as we say in common parlance, Caesar's wife must be above suspicion.

At the end of his interesting remarks, he said:

But I say that it is in the interests of the ministers of the Crown, and of good government and of the good reputation of Parliament, that public opinion should be satisfied that there are no conflicting interests between ministers as such and any directors of private concerns. Why, it is obvious that any day of the month a minister of the Crown who has charge of a large spending department—let us take, for example, the Public Works Department, the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Department of the Interior—might be put in a very awkward position as between his fiduciary interests as member of a board and his public duties on the other hand. It may happen any day, and therefore I think, without having gone very deeply into the matter, that my hon. friend is living up to British custom, to precedent, and tradition in advocating this legislation.

I do not believe I need go further in pointing out that when this matter came before the House last year, in the consideration of my bill, the party to which I have the honour to belong was very strongly in favour of the measure—not unanimously; there were some who did not like to go as far as I have gone. For instance, the member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) felt that my motion went too far. I have largely met his objections; therefore I can recall to his attention and to the attention of others who were in the House when I made my speech last year, these words of his:

If my hon. friend were to introduce legislation that would prevent incorporated companies that had on their directorate a Minister of the Crown from doing business with the Government, I submit that he would be upon sound ground, but I fear the measure now before the House will be misunderstood, will do no good, and will not attain the object which my hon. friend desires. I am sure he had nothing personal in his mind when he introduced this measure. I am not going to offer him advice, because he is better posted upon these questions than I am, but it does seem to me that if he wishes to create such conditions as will prevent incorporated companies from abusing their privileges he might very well introduce such a measure as will put an incorporated company, with a director in the ministry, upon the same basis as a private man doing business.

That is precisely what my resolution tries to do.

Now, let us turn from Canada to Great Britain. I am not one of those who wish to see this country a pale reflection of any other country, even one so great as Great

Britain. I wish to see in Canada the development of a national spirit; I want Canada to have national characteristics of her own, taking the best from all the different ethnic stocks from which we come, and leaving aside those less desirable. But I do say that to Great Britain we may very safely look for guidance in matters of this sort. It is not the universal practice in Great Britain for ministers to resign their directorships when assuming office, but it is the best practice. When we discussed this matter on a former occasion, the then member for Red Deer, Dr. Michael Clark, said that Sir Edward Grey, when he joined the Campbell-Bannerman administration in Great Britain, resigned his directorship—in fact, I think it was the presidency of a great British railway, carrying with it a remuneration of some £5,000 a year. The whole matter came before the British House of Commons some twenty years ago in an interesting discussion. A private bill had been promoted in connection with a railway, and the votes of two gentlemen, Mr. McCartney and Colonel Lockwood, were challenged. They had voted in favour of the private bill, and their votes were separately challenged by Mr. Swift MacNeil,, who said that the votes should be disallowed because they might have been influenced by the interest these members had in the companies concerned. Mr. Dillon, whose remarks are reported in British Hansard, fourth series, volume 93, page 216, spoke as follows—the precedent of Lord Rathmore had been alluded to:

> He was a very honourable man, but his case formed a very bad precedent, for his was a most striking case of a minister of the Crown uniting with that position the directorships of innumerable companies. According to the Directory of Directors, that gentleman was a director of no less than ten companies.

Mr. Lloyd George, whose name is not unfamiliar in this House, said:

> He did not think that any man ought to put himself in a position where his private interests conflicted with his public duty. He would put it higher: He did not think a man ought to put himself in a position where his duty as trustee for a corporation conflicted with his duty as trustee for his constituents.

There were two resolutions to disallow separately the two votes of these gentlemen, and there voted in favour of the motion for disallowance the present Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lloyd George, his predecessor, Mr. Asquith; Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, John Morley, Reginald McKenna, and our own Edward Blake.

[Mr. McMaster.]

In the United States it is also, I will not say the universal, but the best practice. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when Mr. Harding formed his administration, Mr. Andrew Mellon, who had been a director of a large railway company, enjoying a large salary in that position, resigned his directorship on becoming Secretary of the Treasury.

I quote an extract from Le Journal of Paris of the 9th of February, 1922. M. Loucher, one of the ministers, had been accused, and no doubt wrongfully accused, of having profited in his private business through his official position, and in the Chamber of Deputies he made this statement:

> I wish to destroy, once and for all, a number of legends . . . It has been stated that I have been profiting by my presence in the Ministry to do business. That is false. As soon as I assumed office at the end of December, 1916, I quitted in definitive fashion all business affairs in which I was engaged directly or indirectly. And I assure you that it was not without a pang that I have thus abandoned the fruit of twenty-five years' work . . . And in this connection I should proclaim here that it is greatly to be regretted that it is not permitted in France for a public man to remain in business without running the risk of seeing himself suspected. However that may be, knowing that fact I have abandoned business since I was called upon to form part of the Government. . . And it is thus that to-day, with a clear conscience, I can reply to my accusers.

The editorial writer of this paper also makes the statement that M. de Lasteyrie, as soon as he was named Minister of Finance, resigned from all the financial companies or boards of directors of which he formed a part.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McMASTER (resuming): I endeavoured this afternoon to present this resolution in a manner which, I trust, respected the sensibilities of all who did not agree with me, for it is not my intention to wound or offend. I tried to point out the undesirability of ministers of the Crown being at the same time directors of great financial corporations. I showed that there was an inevitability of conflict of fiduciary interests. I showed the possibility of public prejudice. I showed that the attitude which I assumed was in line, not only with my attitude of last session, but also in line with the present legislation as

respects senators and members of this House, as respects judges, and also as respects members of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I also showed that it was in line with the best practice in this country, in Great Britain, in the United States and in France. It is also, Mr. Speaker, I submit, in line with the attitude and practice of the banks themselves. If hon. gentlemen examine the boards of directors of four or five of the great leading banks of this country, they will find that, as far as commercial banks are concerned, practically no man is a director in more than one of these banks. I remember noticing with what alacrity a friend of mine, who had been a director in the Bank of Commerce, when elected to the Bank of Montreal, retired from the Bank of Commerce. Apparently, the banks will not submit to any possibility of divided allegiance in respect to their directors. There is another argument which I might cite, derived from the history of our country. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, with your knowledge of Canadian history, of which no one has a greater mastery, that after Confederation it was possible, for some time, for members of this House to be, at the same time, members of the local legislature of Quebec. There was what is called the "double mandats," or the double agency.

Mr. GAUVREAU: It is quite changed now.

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, because the Liberal party insisted that it should not be so. The Liberal party took the position that there should not be any division of fiduciary interest or responsibility in a man who represented the province and at the same time represented the Dominion, who was forced to make up his mind whether he would serve his country in the provincial or in the federal field.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the hon. gentleman aware that a member of the local legislature was appointed to the Senate by the Government which preceded this one?

Mr. McMASTER: That is true, I understand, but it does not affect the validity of my argument. The law at one time was that a man could be a member of the legislative assembly of Quebec and also a member of this House. The law was changed by reason of the application of the principle for which I am struggling to-day. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say something more. John Morley, in his Reminiscences, tells us that in writing to Lord Minto, when Governor General of India, he stated that whether they liked it or not, the master both of himself and of the Viceroy in India was the British House of Commons. Then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the master of this House is the public opinion of this country—

> There is on earth a yet Diviner thing,
> Veiled though it be, than Parliament or King.

And that thing is what we know as public opinion. Public opinion, no doubt, is divided upon this question, as it is upon other questions, but I submit, with great confidence, that the informed and disinterested public opinion of this country points the way in the direction of the acceptance by this House of the resolution which I have submitted this afternoon. Public opinion is sometimes wrong. It is then the duty of public men to combat it. We have seen a William Lloyd Garrison mobbed in the streets of Boston, because he withstood the public opinion of his time. We have seen a John Bright losing the seat which he had represented in the House of Commons in Great Britain because he opposed the Crimean War. We have seen a Lloyd George escape from the town hall in Birmingham in disguise because he opposed another war. But where public opinion points the way to better and purer laws, I submit it is the part of wisdom, the part of prudence, aye, the part of patriotism, for individuals and political parties to place themselves in conformity thereto.

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): In rising, I wish, first of all, to refer to what I deem a compliment paid me by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in asking me to second his resolution. Perhaps, looking at it from a personal point of view, I take the credit to myself, simply because I believe the hon. member has learned, in the short time in which I have been in this House, that I, at least, am consistent with respect to the policy I advocate and believe in. The policies I have endeavoured, though in a feeble manner, to further, since I have been here, represent my beliefs. As I look back one year and recollect that this resolution, or a resolution very similar in its nature, was before this House, I know that by my vote I approved of it on that occasion. Likewise I know that the people at home, who are watching and paying attention to the votes as they are recorded in this House,

strongly approved of the attitude I took on that occasion when I recorded my vote in favour of the resolution, as presented and argued for by the hon. member for Brome. That is one reason, perhaps, why an individual shall be consistent. I have always taken the attitude that in public political life, as in private life, the individual who will hew consistently to the line, all the time, will get further perhaps, and be thought quite as much of, as the individual who tries to play politics. There might be another feature in that proposition, namely that the individual taking the course which I have indicated is likewise playing politics. However, I believe, Sir, that the people of Canada approved the resolution as presented by the hon. gentleman last year and will approve it again this year. I wish merely to place myself upon record on the question, because the hon. gentleman has presented the argument, and I am sure that no more time should be taken in this House in arguing this question. Perhaps time should be taken in endeavouring to rebut the proposition, because I am sure the hon. gentleman has so completed his argument that it would be quite impossible to assault his citadel and depose him from the position he has taken.

There are one or two thoughts, however, in connection with the question that I might add. It is my belief that people in the rural districts throughout Canada have in the past ten or fifteen years paid more attention to political and economic questions, than have the city dwellers, and are more advanced in thought and initiative. I speak this in pride perhaps, because I have the honour of representing a district distinctly rural. I have sat in the municipal councils in that district many times, and I have heard equally as good expressions of opinion in public questions in those meetings as I have heard in the House of Commons, a statement is not intended to be derogatory to any hon. members here. Nevertheless, these people are of necessity paying attention to questions which are economic and political, and in that they do not have to take any inferior position to any other class of people in this whole Dominion of Canada.

The hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster) introduced a question this afternoon relative to the Merchants Bank. It had to do with the whole principle of the resolution. Like the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), I have no desire to have any thought which I may utter interpreted as being against any individual.

[Mr. Gould.]

I live in the West, and I may say that all but one of the fifteen industries or institutions which the hon. member mentioned this afternoon is in the East. To prove that I have no desire in my heart to say anything personal against any one, I wish to state that, in my search for information, I have made no endeavour to secure information concerning any individual who may be a director in any of the institutions of Canada. Consequently, I cannot speak with authority in that connection because I have not the knowledge; but as regards the general principle of the resolution as outlined and debated by the hon. member for Brome, I agree with him in all the arguments that he has presented.

I have a citation which I wish to make in regard to this question so far as it relates to the Merchants Bank. It seems to me that the business of a minister in a government is very much like any other business; and when one sees that individuals occupying positions as bank directors influence the banks and banking institutions of Canada to lend money to their interests or institutions, one finds it possible to conceive the idea that the same individuals, if, by chance, they should occupy positions on the treasury benches, will do the same thing in those positions. I am not making a charge against any one; I am making this statement because of the present unrest in the minds of the people of Canada. The minds of our people are quite harassed at times on account of the fact that they are, perhaps, unable to place their fingers upon the spot to which a liniment or other remedy should be applied. Therefore, if those who sit in high places can do something which will contribute towards putting an end to the unrest which is prevalent throughout this country at the present time, they should do it in the interest of peace in Canada, and one course of action would, I think, be to approve this resolution. The article that I have in my hand and that I wish to place upon Hansard, shows the sums of money that have been lent by the banking institutions of Canada to their own businesses or to their directors in their own businesses. I mention this only because of the fifteen institutions which the hon. gentleman cited. One of them is existent in the West; and when we in the West sometimes feel the pinch or need of money, and when we find that these business institutions in the East, with their directorates all in the East, refrain from lending money to our legitimate interests

in the West, although they can hand out large sums of money to the large corporations in the East, we are inevitably led to the conclusion that we have been prejudiced against, and we think the principle is wrong whereby they can persuade the banks to lend money to their own directorates while other businesses in Canada go without funds. This is a statement showing the loans made by the Canadian banks to their directorates:

Name of Bank	Loans to Directorates
Bank of Montreal	$1,112,870
Bank of Nova Scotia	1,044,269
Bank of Toronto	350,766
Molson's Bank	189,884
Banque Nationale	162,392
Merchants Bank	459,035
Banque Provinciale	Nil

That speaks volumes for our hon. members from Quebec. The Banque Provinciale does not show that it has lent any money whatever to its directorate.

Union Bank	$1,066,668
Bank of Commerce	1,378,913
Royal Bank	631,821
Dominion Bank	540,564
Bank of Hamilton	528,792
Standard Bank	83,892
Banque d'Hochelaga	273,575
Imperial Bank	120,620
Home Bank	295,712
Sterling Bank	267,207
Weyburn Security Bank	51,078

That is a western institution and the only one.

Mr. VIEN: In what way is the advance of money to directors by banking institutions connected with the motion before the House?

Mr. GOULD: I was arguing that if, in the ordinary business world, an individual, who may be a director of a bank, can influence that banking institution to do business with the organizations with which he is a member, we can likewise conceive of the same individual, as a member of any government, exercising a similar influence. Possibly the hon. member was not in his seat; but I argued a few minutes ago from that premise that, as unrest is prevalent throughout Canada at the present time because of that fact, the unrest might be mitigated or lessened if the principle contained in the resolution is adopted. That is the only point that I wish to make by the citation of these figures. The hon. member for Brome this afternoon gave citations concerning conditions in England and France, and he also cited ex-Ministers of Finance of the Dominion. I wish to point out that those hon. gentlemen, to whom reference was made in those citations, recognized the underlying principle of this resolution. They recognized the possibility, at least, of an evil in the body politic or in the business world by the retention of their positions on directorates while they occupied seats on the treasury benches, and, consequently, they voluntarily resigned their directorships. I might state that some years ago I had the honour for some years of holding a position on one of the rural councils in the West, and that was a principle that was enunciated in that council at that time. I also believe the provincial law, in many provinces in this Dominion, demands that a man, upon taking office as a member of any municipal board, shall retire or resign from directorships that he may hold in any companies. I do not think one would have to delve very far into this matter to be able to justify one in coming to these conclusions; but, without making specific references, I may state that the people know what they are talking about, and when they make resolutions of this nature, they are perfectly warranted and justified in the attitude they have taken.

The necessity for the retention of positions as directors cannot be argued from a financial point of view because, I recollect, as other hon. members will also recollect, that two years ago a resolution was introduced by Sir Robert Borden increasing the salary of the Ministers of the Crown. One of the reasons given in support of that resolution was the fact that as ministers of the Crown gave, or were supposed to give, all their time and attention to the public business, it was therefore only right that they should receive a remuneration commensurate with the services they rendered the country. In the face of that contention, the measure was adopted practically without debate, no dissenting voices being raised against it. Every hon. member seemed to recognize, at that time, that the labourer was worthy of his hire, and a minister of the Crown worthy of the compensation it was proposed to give him, and consequently the resolution was carried.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to dwell on this point, but I might make a slight reference to the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot), who, this afternoon, declined, in favour of myself, the honour of seconding the resolution now under consideration. Adverting for a moment to the resolution introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Robert

Borden on the occasion to which I have referred, I might say that, immediately succeeding it, another resolution was introduced to increase the indemnities of private members. That resolution came in for a little discussion in the House, and I do recollect that the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville—

Mr. GAUVREAU: Order. What has that to do with the motion before the House? Leave the question of indemnities out of it.

Mr. GOULD: I was about to say this, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Laprairie and Napierville has taken a slightly different attitude this year from the position by which he stood last year. At least, that is my interpretation of the hon. member's attitude, and I can only utter, in the words of the old adage: Consistency.—

Mr. SPEAKER: In justice to the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville, I said this afternoon that the fault was entirely mine in naming him as seconder of the motion. I presumed that he was seconding the motion of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) because he sat next that hon. member; but the moment he dissented I immediately mentioned the name of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould). The fault, I repeat, was mine.

Mr. GOULD: I was not seeking to attach any blame to anyone in the matter, Mr. Speaker; and certainly I am not blaming the member for Laprairie and Napierville. Indeed, I took it as a compliment that the opportunity of seconding the resolution should have come to me by the circumstance that my hon. friend declined the honour himself. However, the refusal of the hon. member to second the motion did bring to my mind the fact that last year he supported a similar resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How did you vote on this resolution last year?

Mr. GAUVREAU: What about you too?

Mr. GOULD: Did my hon. friend address the question to me? I voted in favour of the resolution last year, and I am consistent this year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I cannot find the hon. member's name in the division list.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

[Mr. Gould.]

Mr. GOULD: The hon. member is evidently very much concerned about what I did. However, I have a distinct recollection of the matter, as no doubt the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) also has; and knowing my attitude towards this question he had no hesitancy, I take it, in accepting me as seconder of the resolution. I shall not discuss the question further. if arguments are to be adduced they should be in rebuttal; and I am sure that hon. gentlemen who may endeavour to refute the conclusions of the hon. member for Brome, as disclosed in his speech this afternoon, will do naught but strengthen that hon. member's position.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): I desire to address a few remarks to the House upon the principle of the motion, which, in my judgment, is of sufficient importance to invite a fairly general discussion, and, I think, is certainly of sufficient importance to call for a fixed and definite decision before the matter is finally concluded. In the first place, I think it is due to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) to say that he has placed his case before the House, this afternoon and evening, in a manner entirely creditable to himself. I think his argument to-day has been much more convincing than that which he presented to the House just about twelve months ago, when he introduced a bill embodying to a large extent the same principle which is embodied in his motion on the present occasion. I congratulate my hon. friend that he has made an argument to the House on a high plane entirely free from any element of personalities, but rather has discussed the question solely on its merits. I might also pay him tribute for his courage in the matter. He certainly has the courage of his convictions. It must have been noticeable to the hon. member for Brome, as he spoke this afternoon, that his own political friends in this Chamber were not in the same enthusiastic or receptive mood on this occasion as they displayed in this House twelve months ago when the same subject was under discussion. The ominous silence which prevailed upon the Government benches this afternoon and evening spoke very eloquently of some radical change which has taken place in the views of Government members in the intervening twelve months. Certain it is that last year when the hon. member proposed a measure far more radical and drastic, far more sweeping and compre-

hensive than is embodied in the motion he has made to-day, he received a very decided and enthusiastic support from those members of his own political party who now sit on the Treasury benches and who to-day remained absolutely silent during his able speech. I did not happen to be in the House last year when this question was discussed, and I did not have the privilege of voting upon it. And just here let me say that I do not believe my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) had that privilege either. If he did vote on the question, all I can say is that the records of the House are strangely in error, because, on looking over the division list, I fail to find the name of my hon. friend from Assiniboia among those who voted either for or against the motion at that time. But the hon. members who now support the Government were certainly in favour of my hon. friend's sweeping proposal of last year. What was that proposal? I have before me a copy of the bill which the hon. member then proposed. That bill, in brief, was this:

No person accepting or holding the office of first minister—

Then follows an enumeration of other ministers in the Cabinet—

—shall hold the office of, or act as, director of any incorporated company.

Provided, however, that the provisions of this section shall not apply to holding office of or acting as a director of any company incorporated for purely religious, charitable, philanthropic, or educational purposes.

With that trifling exception which I have just read, no man could be a director of any company and hold office in the Government of Canada as a minister thereof. Such was the proposal which was acclaimed and enthusiastically supported just a short twelve month ago by hon. members who now occupy the Treasury benches. Some of them who are before me to-night made glowing speeches on that occasion, stating in eloquent terms their reasons for supporting the drastic and sweeping proposal then put forward by the hon. member for Brome. But the hon. member who went further than any one else in that respect was my hon. friend who now occupies the high position of Prime Minister. It is true that he did not on that occasion deliver what one might call a speech upon the bill, but he interjected a few remarks that showed very very clearly what his position was in regard to it. He was prepared to go even further than the bill went; he was prepared to out-Herod Herod—or perhaps I should say out-McMaster McMaster, if the rules of the House will permit of such an expression. If, Mr. Speaker, you will turn to page 589 of Hansard you will see exactly what was said by my hon. friend the Prime Minister, then the leader of the Opposition. Let me give this quotation in the language of Hansard:

Mr. Meighen: (During Mr. McMaster's Speech): Does the hon. member not think that if his bill is to be accepted it should, under our present practice, apply as well to the leader of the Opposition?

Mr. Mackenzie King: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMaster: I would have not the slightest objection to its applying to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Meighen: And to the leaders of both Oppositions?

Mr. Mackenzie King: Certainly.

Mr. McMaster: I know my own leader and can speak for him; I am sure he would not have the slightest objection to having it apply to him. As regards the leader of the Opposition sitting angularly opposite, I cannot speak for him.

Mr. Doherty: But does the principle apply?

Mr. McMaster: There is, of course, the consideration, as the member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) remarks, that there is no salary attached to the position of the leader of the other Opposition.

Mr. Meighen: That is not the point.

Mr. McMaster: That is not the great point, I admit. If that is the only thing standing in the way of the Government's acceptance of my bill, I would be willing to go one step further and have it apply to the leader of the Opposition as well.

Mr. Meighen: It would be of no use to have the one without the other.

Mr. Mackenzie King: Perhaps I should say right at the moment that I should feel it distinctly in the public interest to have the provision apply to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend now says, "hear, hear." I assume from that "hear, hear" that he has not changed his views during the intervening twelve months, and that he still applauds the same principle to-night. So I suppose we are going to find him in hearty accord and sympathy with the motion which my hon. friend from Brome has moved on this occasion.

But my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, has acted very strangely in the interval. In the meantime we had a general election, and my hon. friend was called upon to form a new government. In the few months that intervened he cannot have forgotten that debate which took place in March last year. That debate and his vote on that bill must have been present to his mind when His Excellency called upon him to form an administration. If these were his principles and his convictions then—and as he

"hear hears" them to-night when I refer to them, I assume they are still—then why did he so utterly disregard them when he undertook to form his administration? I turn to the division list on that bill, and I find no less than six ministers of the Crown sitting to-day on the Treasury benches, all of whom voted for that measure, that sweeping proposal introduced by my hon. friend from Brome in March, 1921; I find there my hon. friend, the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Beland), voting for that measure; I find my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), among the names of those who voted for the bill; I find the name of my hon. friend, the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp), among those who voted for the measure; I find the name of my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, among the supporters of the measure; also my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), and my hon. friend, the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie). All of them, solidly, upon that occasion, with great acclaim and enthusiasm declared to the House and the country their support of that radical and sweeping enactment which proposed that no man who was a director of any incorporated company could sit in the Cabinet. A few months afterwards a new government was formed, and I believe I am within the mark when I say that several members of that government are at this moment directors of incorporated companies. And not only that—that relates to the bill of last year—but they would likewise come within the narrower language of the motion this year, namely,

> —that all ministers of the Crown, on their appointment as such, should resign all directorships held by them in banks, trust companies, insurance companies, transportation companies or large public utility corporations;

It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that in one short year after a solemn pronouncement of that character—because a vote in this House, I take it, is about the most solemn pronouncement a man can make—my hon. friend, the leader of the Government should, at the very first opportunity, seek to violate and repudiate the principle which he then solemnly affirmed.

Now, for myself, I am not inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Brome in the proposal which he has so eloquently placed before the House this afternoon. I believe he is making a mistake in his motion, that he is assuming too much in connection with our public life, and he has not in my opinion made out any case at all for action such as that contemplated in his motion. I cast my view back over the last fifty or sixty years of our political history since the day when Canada became a Confederation, and I fail to recall a single instance where injury has resulted to the public service, to the government of the country, by reason of the fact that a minister of the Crown was likewise a director of an incorporated company. There may be an instance of the kind, but I have failed to recall it, and certain it is that my hon. friend from Brome did not cite such an instance, unless in the case of the Merchants Bank, which I will refer to in a moment. Coming from 1867 down to the present day, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall a single instance where public injury has resulted from the fact that a minister of the Crown was also a director of an incorporated company. If after fifty or sixty years' experience we find there has been no lapse, no wrong, no public injury, then am I not within the mark when I say that my hon. friend from Brome is seeking to provide a remedy where there is no ailment?

What is the disease in the body politic which my hon. friend from Brome is seeking to cure? He has not explained to the House what the particular ailment or disease or wrong is; he has cited no instance at all. Therefore I submit he is dealing too much in the realm of possibilities rather than of probabilities. I do not believe wrong or injury has ensued, and I do not believe that wrong or injury will ensue to the public service or to the people of this country by reason of our continuing under the present law, which it seems to me affords every reasonable safeguard. The present law on the subject is in the House of Commons Act, which was quoted this afternoon by my hon. friend from Brome. That law has been in existence practically since Confederation. It applies not only to ministers, but to every hon. member of the House, and that law has up to the present, I submit, been sufficient. My hon. friend has failed to show that there is any rule on the subject, either in this Dominion or in Great Britain. There is some practice to be found in the Imperial Parliamentary reports, I admit, but the practice appears to be as much one way as it is the other. Purely from curiosity I have looked a little into the history of our Canadian Parliament in this respect, and I find that in every administration whether Conservative or Liberal, prominent members of the ministry have been closely identified with

great business undertakings in Canada. But I have found no lapse on that account. I take for example the government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier; when I first came into this House over twenty years ago, Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself, then Prime Minister, was director of one of the great life insurance companies of this country, the Mutual Life of Canada. No one would suggest that this circumstance proved detrimental to the public service or to the people of Canada; quite the reverse, I can assure you. That particular company came to this Parliament for legislation during that period, but nobody ever suggested that the fact that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a director of it had anything to do with the matter. I take the case of the late Mr. Sutherland, whom I knew very well. I turn to the Parliamentary Companion in regard to Mr. Sutherland, because I know that while members do not write the notices in that book, they have the opportunity of revising them, and, as a rule, statements found there are fairly accurate. I find that the late Mr. Sutherland, who was Minister of Public Works in the cabinet of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was "a director of several trading and commercial companies." I turn to the name of the late Mr. Prefontaine, Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that cabinet, and I find identically the same language: that he likewise was "a director of several trading and commercial companies." I turn to the name of Sir Richard Cartwright, and I find the following language in regard to him: "He is president, director or trustee of several commercial and financial corporations." We all remember Mr. Charles Hyman, at one time Minister of Public Works in that same administration, a man connected with a number of commercial companies and likewise a director of the Bank of Toronto. And so with the preceding Conservative administration: I take the name of Sir John Carling, connected with half a dozen joint stock companies and with one bank. I take the name of the late Sir Frank Smith, vice-president of the Dominion Bank and president of transportation companies in Canada. You will find that the same thing applies practically to every government that has held office since confederation. But the point that I want to urge upon the House is that so far as we know, so far as experience goes, so far as history goes, no harm has resulted from the practice, no wrong has been done by it. There has been no weakness in the system; no public injury has resulted from the system. Now, I believe in many cases it would be a very great hardship to ask a man, as the price of his admission into the government of this country—a man who is wanted in that capacity—that he forego his right to sit on a board of directors in any of the companies enumerated in this motion, and in which his whole fortune may be wrapped up. It may be his whole investment; his life's work may be represented in the capital stock of that company of which he is a director. His presence may be urgently required in the government of Canada, and it would be a hardship—to my mind it would be an absurdity—to ask him to come in and assist in the government of the country and at the same time to say to him: If you do, you must jeopardize your private fortune and resign your directorship. That, simply, is the proposal of the present resolution.

I said at the outset that I believed my hon. friend from Brome had distinctly failed to make out a case for changing the law. If he were able to make out such a case, then I might revise my opinion, but up to the present, I am satisfied, he has failed to make out a case. He seeks to produce a remedy for a disease which is non-existent in the history of the government of Canada and has been from confederation up to the present time. However, I am satisfied that what the House and the country most desire to know at the moment is what view the Prime Minister of Canada takes on this question. I know there is great expectation in the galleries; I know there is great expectation in the country—one has only to read the daily press and to see the names there mentioned and the views there expressed to realize that—and there is a general subdued excitement and curiosity to know just what the Prime Minister intends to do in regard to this matter. I can tell the hon. member for Brome that if this resolution were to pass it might have one very unfortunate application in regard to this Government and this country. True, it would not be in the nature of an enactment upon our statute book, but it would be a resolution of the House of Commons, tantamount to a plain direction of this body which any government is bound to obey. If the resolution passed this House, the Government would be expected to obey it, and we might be placed in the position of being called upon to sacrifice an hon. member of the Government whom we on this side of the House look upon, and whom a great many of the people in this country look upon, as about the only real guarantee

of stability which the Government contains. I refer of course to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). If the passage of this motion as it stands to-day were to put the Minister of Justice to an election in the matter; if it were to call upon him to decide whether he should resign his position in the Government or his position as director of the various banks or companies of which he now is director, and if he should decide to resign his position in the Government, I will be candid enough to say that I believe it would be nothing short of a calamity in the country at the present critical juncture of our national affairs. It would be a most unfortunate thing for the country, to say the least, but for the Government itself it would be a positive catastrophe. It is no wonder that there is considerable expectation in the House and in the country as to just what the leader of the Government intends to do in regard to this motion, and perhaps the easiest way to find that out is for me to conclude my remarks and allow him to inform us.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must thank my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) who has just taken his seat for the compliment he has paid me in saying that the views which I have to express with regard to this motion are of more than exceptional interest to himself and to other members of the House, and possibly also to the country generally. I shall endeavour to leave no doubt in the mind of my hon. friend or of any person in this country as to where I stand with regard to the resolution now before the House.

Let me say first of all that I conceive the purpose of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in introducing his motion, to be that of helping to bring about in the mind of the public generally, a greater sense of security in the administration of public affairs, irrespective of the government that may be carrying on the business of the country. So far as his motion is calculated to have that effect—to give to the public a sense of greater security in the administration of the day—I am certainly in hearty accord with my hon friend. But so far as his motion is calculated, to create in the minds of the people a distrust in or suspicion of the Government, when there is no just cause or good reason for such distrust or suspicion, I am entirely opposed to the motion.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

My hon. friend has said, and I think very wisely, that in a matter of great importance such as this we may well be guided by British practice and British procedure. He has stated that we need not slavisly follow all that is done by the Mother of Parliaments on the other side of the water. Nevertheless, he has wisely affirmed that the British Parliament affords to parliamentary assemblies possibly the safest guide of any institution in the world as to what is best in maintaining the highest and noblest traditions. Having this in mind, with such assistance as I have been able to get from recognized constitutional authorities, from books, and from students of this question, I have gone to some pains to endeavour to see what attitude the British Parliament has taken on this all important question. I shall seek to compress into a very few paragraphs the essence of the situation as it has been of recent years.

May I say first of all, that when this question has come up for discussion in the British Parliament it has generally been viewed from a much broader point of view than the restricted one of the present motion, which is limited to the question of directors relinquishing their directorships upon entering the Government. The question has generally been discussed from the broad point of view of the right of members to vote where they are believed to have a personal interest in the subject matter which is before the House. That question has been debated over and over again in the British Parliament. It has been the subject of special parliamentary inquiries. My hon. friend this afternoon quoted some illustrious names in support of a contention which he was making. I hold in my hand a report of the Select Committee of the British Parliament on this personal interest matter, together with the proceedings of the committee, etc. The report was made in the year 1896, and I find in the membership of the committee such illustrious names as Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lloyd George, and several others. This committee, having examined carefully the rules of the House to discover whether it was advisable to extend them in any way for the purpose of affording greater security in the public mind as to votes cast in the House of Commons, came to the conclusion that the rules as they stood at the time were to all intents and purposes sufficient.

May I say that judging from the records of the British House of Commons, it would appear that while at all times it has been admitted that members of the House have a right to question the right of any other member to vote on a particular matter in which he is supposed to have a personal interest, yet whenever that vote has been taken, with the exception of possibly one or two cases out of a very large number, the House of Commons of Great Britain has invariably decided that the matter should be regarded as one of honour and conscience on the part of the member who is casting his vote, and has refused to deny him the right of voting.

I contend Sir, that that is the right point of view from which to view this question, but coming to the more restricted view, that namely of the duty of members of a government to relinquish their directorships, I find that there have been, broadly speaking, four different attitudes. The first I might describe as an attitude of indifference towards this subject; no question whatever being raised on the subject. I take it that this attitude is not entirely a matter of chance or of accident. I think there are good and sufficient reasons why the British House of Commons has for the most part assumed it. A good and sufficient reason, to my mind, is that every minister of the Crown has in the first instance been elected to Parliament by the people of his constituency. His associations, financial and commercial, are known to his electors, and if they are of a character to arouse suspicion or distrust, then they may become a matter of discussion on the public platform, and, indeed, are certain to be if they are likely to be in any serious way a matter of grave concern.

I would point out further, that
9 p.m. a member of Parliament once he becomes a minister of the Crown, is obliged to resign his seat and to return to his constituency for re-election. He has to go through the process of twice appealing to the electors. The electors know when they are choosing him in the first place whether he is a director of financial concerns or not; when he goes back for re-election as a cabinet minister they also know whether he is a director or not. If his associations are likely to prove detrimental to the discharge of his public duties, that is the time when protest should be made. That is the time when public opinion, which is the last resort in all these matters, should make itself felt.

Let me mention next an attitude at the opposite extreme. I have spoken of the attitude of indifference. There is also the attitude of statutory prohibition, very much the attitude of my hon. friend who has moved this resolution, because I take it that a resolution of the House of Commons to all intents and purposes is expected to have the effect of legislation. My hon. friend referred this afternoon to an hon. member of the British Parliament, Mr. Swift MacNeil, who introduced into the House of Commons in England a measure very much along the line of his own resolution. Not only did Mr. Swift MacNeil introduce such a measure on one occasion, but he introduced it, I think, at least a dozen times, and on every occasion the House of Commons of Great Britain refused to pass that resolution. That is the attitude which the English Parliament has taken towards the extreme of statutory prohibition with respect to ministers of the Crown holding directorates.

The third attitude is the one which has been taken by Mr. Balfour, Lord Salisbury, and other Conservative leaders when this matter came up for discussion. They have contended that these questions should be regarded as matters of conscience and honour, that it should be left to every public man to be guided in his actions as a cabinet minister and as a member of Parliament by the dictates of his conscience and as his own sense of honour would seem to render proper. In the long run we will gain more in virility in our public life by leaving some matters to conscience and honour rather than by seeking to enforce prohibitions that may be too severe and too drastic, and in the end only have the effect of bestowing harsh moral judgments upon some of our fellowmen.

The fourth attitude is the one which I might describe as the Gladstone-Campbell-Bannerman-Asquith attitude, which has been to adopt, not as a written rule, not as a matter of legislation, but as a matter of unwritten policy, subject always to exceptions where exceptions seem to be justifiable, the attitude that ministers of the Crown should not retain directorships. That has been the attitude which has been taken by most of the English Liberal statesmen. That attitude is one on which I shall say a few more words a little later on. It is not, as I have mentioned, the enforcement by resolution of the House of Commons, but rather leaving it to the Prime Minister to exercise his judgment in the formation of his Cabinet as to what

may be most in the public interest and what is best for the nation under the existing circumstances.

So much, then, for the attitude which the British House of Commons has taken. I think if we are to follow British practice in any particular, we would be justified also in following British procedure in the manner of putting that practice into play. If we are to make prevail in this country an opinion such as is suggested in the motion of my hon. friend, I think it is much better that it should be left to a prime minister, in consultation with his colleagues, to take the course which the public interest seems to dictate as wisest and best, all circumstances being considered, rather than to tie the hands of a prime minister and to fetter his government by restrictions which do not take account of circumstances which in the public interest should be taken account of.

My hon. friend this afternoon gave several reasons in support of his motion, and with them I should like to deal. First of all, let me say, I can conceive of cases where it would be very much against the interests of the public for certain individuals to hold cabinet positions and at the same time retain directorships in certain companies. My hon. friend has cited an example this afternoon that I think might well be put forward as a case in point. There are times when certain measures are under consideration, as was cited to-day, where ministers might well feel it the part of propriety, to resign their directorships or else resign from the ministry. But I think these cases have to be treated on their merits, and I submit that nothing has arisen in connection with the present administration which gives any ground to any one for believing that such circumstance exists in this country at this time.

My hon. friend has spoken about a possible conflict of fiduciary interests. He has pointed out that ministers of the Crown have to give most of their time to the business of government, and, I think, last year he said that he believed, where there was a conflict between an hon. member's time as devoted to public affairs and given to private affairs, private, not public, affairs were likely to suffer. That may be a good reason why companies might find it in their interests, perhaps, to prohibit their directors from taking positions in governments, but I do not think it is an equally strong reason why the country should be denied the service of men who have risen high in financial and commercial confidence, if the companies with which they are associated are prepared to allow these gentlemen to give their services to the country in dealing with great national, financial and commercial affairs.

Similarly, my hon. friend spoke about the danger of interlocking directorates. There may be an evil in interlocking directorates, but I contend that the way to meet and cure that evil is not to pass an enactment which will prevent a director of any public company coming into a government without resigning his directorship. Let us deal with the evil of interlocking directorates, as such.

My hon. friend said that he was only following existing legislation. I should like for a moment to invite the attention of the House to the existing legislation, because I can well believe that there are members in this House to-day who may think that there is not adequate legislation to protect the public interests where an hon. member who has to do with affairs of government is connected also with a business which may have direct or indirect dealings with the Government in a manner which will be furthering special interests rather than public interests. I contend that if we read carefully the legislation that at present exists in the Act respecting the Senate and the House of Commons referring more particularly to the independence of members of Parliament we will find that the interests of the public, as respects members of Parliament who are directors and members of a government, is pretty well taken care of in that legislation as my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has already said. Let me read section 14 of the act, and ask hon. gentlemen to recollect that, inasmuch as it applies to every member of Parliament, it applies equally to every minister of the Crown, since every minister of the Crown is already a member of Parliament. The section reads:

> No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

Can legislation be more emphatic than that? If we live up to that legislation, what

likelihood is there of any director of a company, through his position in the cabinet, doing anything unfair or unjust which could be prevented by legislation such as my hon. friend has suggested. Then take the next section, No. 15—

If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or is concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work which, by this Act, renders a person incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or knowingly sells any goods, wares or merchandise to, or performs any service for the Government of Canada, or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid, whether such contract, agreement or sale is expressed or implied, and whether the transaction is single or continuous, the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated, and his election shall be thenceforth null and void.

But let me direct attention specially to section 21, which, I think, is even more important—

No member of the Senate or of the House of Commons shall receive or agree to receive any compensation, directly or indirectly, for services rendered, or to be rendered, to any person, either by himself or another, in relation to any bill, proceeding, contract, claims, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter before the Senate or the House of Commons, or before a Committee of either House, or in order to influence or to attempt to influence any member of either House.

Subsection 2 reads:—

Every member of the Senate offending against this section shall be liable to a fine of not less than one thousand dollars and not more than four thousand dollars, and every member of the House of Commons offending against this section shall be liable to a fine of not less than five hundred dollars and not more than two thousand dollars, and shall for five years after conviction of such offence be disqualified from being a member of the House of Commons, and from holding any office in the public service of Canada.

Subsection 3 reads:

Any person who gives, offers or promises to any such member any compensation for such services as aforesaid, rendered or to be rendered, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to one year's imprisonment and to a fine of not less than five hundred dollars and not more than two thousand dollars.

May I not ask members of this House, is it possible to conceive of any hon. gentleman, being a director and using his position in a government in a manner to further the interests of a company with which he is concerned, who would not become liable to lose his seat in the House of Commons under this legislation? And would not the companies with which he was concerned, if they sought to influence him through payment of director's fees or in any other manner, be violating the law of this country as it stands at the present time?

May I say a further word in regard to one or two other references of my hon. friend? He spoke of the judges of the country and said that the law requires that the judges must give their whole time to the work in which they are engaged and, in the discharge of their judicial duties; must not accept directorships. May I remind my hon. friend that judges are appointed for life; they are given a life tenure of office. They hold their positions at good salaries, with the expectation that their time will be given for the remainder of their days to the discharge of judicial duties. No such undertaking can be given with respect to members of a government. I only need to look opposite to see half a dozen gentlemen who entered the cabinet of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) shortly before the last general election. They were in office for about three months, and, that is all they will ever see of office in the course of their lives. How unfair it would have been to these gentlemen to say "You shall not enter the Government without giving up your directorships in any companies you belong to," and then for them to find, at the end of the few weeks they had served their country in the capacity of cabinet ministers, that they had not only ceased to be cabinet ministers, but had severed any connection they had ever had with any company. The comparison of my hon. friend in regard to judges is not a true parallel by a very long degree.

My hon. friend spoke of the members of the Railway Commission. There again, we have a definite position that is fixed in tenure for a period of years. But if my hon. friend will look at the references to the Railway Commissioners, he will find that they are not precluded from being directors of all public companies. They are precluded from being directors of railway companies, or any companies with which railways are likely to have business dealings—a very proper and right thing in every way. But this is not any such sweeping, wholesale, self-denying ordinance as my hon. friend seeks to impose upon individuals who may enter a government as cabinet ministers.

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) spoke of the Secretary of the Treasury in the United States and said that he noticed, following the best practice in the United States, that Mr. Secre-

tary Mellon had resigned directorships that he held in companies. I do not know whether my hon. friend is aware of the fact or not; but I am informed that in the United States there is a special law applicable to the Secretary of the Treasury alone, not to any other minister, and that under that law the Secretary of the Treasury has resigned such positions as he has held on boards of directors. I am inclined to think the example of our country in that respect is even better than that of the United States. The Minister of Finance is necessarily brought into very close relation with many industrial concerns. My hon. friend said that the ex-Minister of Finance, Sir Thomas White, resigned his directorships when he became Minister of Finance. That was taking a view of his obligations as Minister of Finance voluntarily, not in view of any statute, and that is a much finer attitude for any hon. gentleman to take than to be obliged to do something by compulsion. The House well knows that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in the present Administration holds no directorships in any companies having anything to do with the business of this country. But I venture to say that there is not in this country a man who would have any less confidence in the minister if he held directorships in twenty companies. Public confidence is a matter of belief in the integrity and honesty of a man and not of the position that he may hold. You may have a man without any position who is thoroughly dishonourable; you may have another man holding a dozen positions who, for the very reason that he has a greater responsibility, feels that his integrity must be so much the more circumspectly guarded.

There is this aspect also which is worthy of consideration. The motion of my hon. friend does not go so far as to say that shareholders, if they enter a government as cabinet ministers, must give up their shares in companies. I will leave it to the judgment of the House, from the point of view of public interest as to which is the better—to have a gentleman in a cabinet who is a shareholder in a company, but who is also a director and known to the world as a director, or to have a gentleman in a cabinet having large shareholdings in one of these public companies of which the public knows nothing because of his not being a director? I contend that the mere fact that a gentleman is known to be a director of a particular corporation places upon him a special obligation to be particularly careful when any matter affecting the business of the corporation with which he is associated comes up for consideration in the Cabinet. Men of a high sense of honour will take good care, to see that when matters concerning companies with which they are concerned come up for consideration in Cabinet or Parliament, when there is the slightest possibility of their integrity or honesty being challenged, to vacate or withdraw while the discussion is going on and the matter is being settled.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) quoted from Hansard of last year as to my position in the discussion which took place at that time. With respect to what I said in the debate of last year, I have not a single word to withdraw. I wish to reiterate at the present moment every word that I said on that occasion. At that time I was leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those words seem to belong to the position of leader of the Opposition, because they are exactly the ones I used last year at the particular time:

> Mr. Meighen: Does the hon. member not think that if his bill is to be accepted, it should, under our present practise, apply as well to the leader of the Opposition?
> Mr. Mackenzie King: Hear, hear.

Just what my right hon. friend has said, sitting in exactly the same spot. Further:

> Mr. Meighen: And members leaders of both oppositions.
> Mr. Mackenzie King: Certainly.

I made one other reference in the debate, and it was this:

> Perhaps I should say right at the moment that I should feel it distinctly in the public interest to have the provision apply to the leader of the Opposition.

I stated that, when I was leader of the Opposition. I thought it would be in the public interest that a leader of a political party should not have any associations with corporations by way of directorships and I take that position now. I think my right hon. friend opposite to me takes the same position; I think both he and I hold similar views on these matters. I think each of us has refrained from accepting directorships in any companies. Why? Not because we thought it was wrong that we should accept or that other men should accept directorships, or because we

thought men should not accept positions as ministers of the Crown while holding directorships, but because as leaders of parties, officially so recognized by the law of the country, we regarded our position as perhaps the more secure in the minds of our following as well as of the country, in taking that particular attitude. I wish to repeat that I think it is in the public interest that leaders of great political parties should in every way possible seek to give their entire time and thought to their public duties, and to put their position as far as possible beyond any possibility of question by their own following or by the public generally.

The hon. member for South Wellington went one step further. He said: Why did I forget all about the position that I took in the debate when I came to form the new administration? I did not forget the position that I had taken at that time. I remembered it very distinctly and I remembered also the vote which was registered in this House at that time and which was to the effect that that bill should not carry. The House of Commons, when this subject was up for debate before, decided against the principle that it was not advisable that hon. members holding positions as directors should be admitted as ministers of the Crown. I repeat, I can conceive of cases where it would not be in the public interest for certain gentlemen holding directorships to be simultaneously ministers of the Crown. I believe a situation of that character will make itself apparent, and become quickly apparent, to any one accustomed to dealing with public affairs. But I can also see where the passing of a resolution such as is proposed by my hon. friend to-night, might deprive the country of the services of some of the ablest business men in Canada and this at a time when special knowledge of financial and commercial conditions is most needed in the management of public affairs. I am free to admit that I was confronted with that very problem when called upon to form the present administration. The member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has spoken of the hon. the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin). May I tell the House exactly what took place between the Minister of Justice and myself when I asked that hon. gentleman if he would become a member of the cabinet? When I approached him with the invitation to join the cabinet he said, in reply, that he had been a long time in public life, and had left it with the intention of retiring for good; that he had had no thought of going back into Parliament and resuming the burdens which cabinet responsibility places upon one who has rendered many years of public service; that, having regard to the vicissitudes of public life, its uncertainties and its obligations, he would hesitate to enter the Government if it meant severing his financial and commercial associations. I told him I thought the country appreciated the distinguished service which he had rendered not only to his own province, in the position of Prime Minister, for fifteen years, but to the whole Dominion of Canada as well; that he was everywhere recognized as outstanding in the country's affairs. I said that the people of Canada wanted and needed his services, and that I would not think of pressing an individual opinion in matters of this kind as against the judgment of himself or any of my colleagues in the present administration. Had I, regardless of their distinction and public service, sought to impose upon hon gentlemen coming into the cabinet restrictions of various kinds, I might have succeeded in effecting a mediocre administration; I certainly would not have had the privilege of being surrounded to-day by the gentlemen of distinction and eminence who sit in the cabinet. There are times and places for everything. I have spoken of the Gladstone, the Campbell-Bannerman, and, if you will, the Asquith tradition. May I remind my hon. friend that it was 1868 when Mr. Gladstone first became Prime Minister of England. He was then 59 years of age, and had had a long parliamentary experience. It was not until 1892, a quarter of a century afterwards, when he was past 80 years of age, that Mr. Gladstone sought to impose any self-denying ordinances upon his colleagues. If my hon. friend will give me time, and the occasion demands it, I shall be glad to follow the Gladstonian tradition. I think it would come with much better grace from an older to younger men, than from a young man to men who have long served the country with distinction, and with great honour and credit to themselves and to their nation, to lay down rules in the nature of self-denying ordinances which after all might serve only to indicate a lack of confidence in their fidelity and integrity. As between myself and my colleagues, and between the Government and the country, the relationship I wish to have maintained is that of "Trust me all in all, or not at all." That is the attitude I hold towards

every member of the Government, and it is the attitude I believe which every member of the Government holds towards myself. While we began with confidence in each other's integrity and ability, I may say that at this moment that confidence has ripened into implicit trust. Inasmuch as the support of my hon. friend's motion would seem to make it necessary for me to reflect upon the honour and the integrity of any hon. gentlemen associated with me in the cabinet, I must decline absolutely to vote for it.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): If the experience of the last two months had not rendered me utterly impervious to all sentiments of amazement, it would require at least the space of a few half hours to recover sufficiently from the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) in order to address this House. I thought that the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) was rendering a service when, in speaking on the motion, he invited, even prodded, the leader of the Government to make a statement on behalf of the administration, and to seek to harmonize opposition to this resolution with his vote of a year ago. Well, my hon. friend in so doing may have contributed a service to the country, but he contributed none to the Government and in all respect I suggest that the reputation of the Prime Minister would have been infinitely better if he had declined to yield to the invitation of the member for Wellington and had maintained a discreet if not a dignified silence.

What is the resolution that we are asked now to vote upon? The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) moves that legislation should be enacted providing that no member of a government of Canada shall be a director of any of four classes of companies: first, banks, second, trust companies, third, insurance companies, and fourth, transportation companies to which is added in general words a fifth, large public utility corporations; and that, should a member of a government be a director of any company other than those recited, that company should be debarred from all business with the country. Now, the resolution, admits of discussion from two phases: first, as to its intrinsic merits;—should it be supported or be defeated? Secondly, the resolution is important to the House as bearing upon the public honour of the country, as impersonated in the government in office, I shall commence by discussing the question from the first standpoint.

A year ago the same hon. member, in a speech ranking, perhaps, not equal in fullness of treatment, but ranking equal in fairness and dignity, with that delivered to-day, introduced and urged to second reading, not a resolution merely, but a bill, a statute, providing that no member of the government should under any consideration be a director of any company whatever. That resolution was pressed in this House, supported by several hon. members, and resisted by several, including myself; and, on its coming to a decision, a majority vote against it was recorded. I took the stand then that this was a question that could not be adequately or fairly decided by statutory enactment; that is to say, that it would not be possible for this House to enact legislation which would deal fairly with the situation, which would be practical on the one hand and beneficial on the other. I argued that for the House to enact that a member of a government should not be a director of any company was in effect to debar from the public service many of the business community who could render distinct, indeed conspicuous, service to the state; and, further, that such an enactment would secure no commensurate result. I contended that, to pass the bill which the hon. member moved would, while debarring directors of companies, at the same time admit to the public service as members of the government those who could be influenced by exactly the same considerations, but who might not be directors of companies. On several grounds, by myself and others, it was urged that you could not deal with this evil—if, indeed, it was an evil at all—by statutory enactment, but that, in the words of the then hon. member for Red Deer, Mr. Clark, who delivered a speech that I commend to the consideration of hon. members, it was fundamentally, historically and necessarily a matter for the conscience and honour of the minister himself. That is the stand I took then; that is the stand I take to-day.

I pointed out at that time that if you legislated to debar an hon. member from being a director of a company and also a minister of the crown, you would put it out of the power of a man who had made some money, incorporated a company, and required to exercise some little supervision over the competence that he had gathered for the taking care of his family after his death by being director of his company—

you would, I said, put it absolutely out of the power of that man to be admitted to a share in government, while at the same time the man who did exactly the same thing, who had his company not incorporated but a mere personal concern, could be a member of the government and could as well devote such time as he thought fit to the affairs of his company.

That result in the first place would be unfair. I remember it being urged very strongly by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb)—who, let me say, is the sole conspicuous example of anything approaching consistency on this question among hon. members of the government—that to refuse a director admission to the Government would merely put a premium upon the practice of a director of a company in which he was largely interested appointing a mere dummy, his stenographer for instance, to be a director in his place, who in effect would be nothing but the mouthpiece of her principal and, consequently doing the will of the real director; his interest being concealed behind his dummy while he, the principal, took his place in the government. Many other objections were urged as well. It was instanced that you might have a man a director of a company who had a very minor interest in it, while some other man, not a director, might be interested to a very great extent. The first man is a director because of his acceptability, because of his business probity, because he is known and honoured of men; the other man is not a director, because although he is very rich he does not enjoy the confidence of the other shareholders, he does not enjoy the same reputation in the community. Under the law then suggested by the hon. member for Brome the second man, the unworthy man, could be a member of the government; but the man of honour, the man who stood out and made known to the world his position, was denied admission to the service of the state.

On other grounds the incongruity, the anomaly, the unfairness of the bill was clearly demonstrated to this House, but all to no effect. To no effect upon hon. members now sitting on the Treasury benches it was urged that in Great Britain from time immemorial it had never been the practice to deal with this matter by statutory enactment at all; that the British practice had been to leave the decision in each individual case to the honour, to the conscience, to the sense of public duty of the minister himself, and that to this day there is no enactment in Great Britain along the lines of the bill of the hon. member for Brome introduced last session, or along the lines of his resolution to-night. All in vain it was urged—even urged by myself—that throughout the history of our provinces in not one of them had it ever been seen fit to enact legislation such as that proposed by the hon. member for Brome. There is just as much, yea, there is even more need for this legislation—if need exists at all—in our provincial legislatures than in this House, for our provincial legislatures have to do with those questions of property and civil rights that concern the welfare of companies, corporations, and individuals more directly than has this House. None of our legislatures, I say, has seen fit to follow this example. The idea sounds well, it perhaps makes some appeal to certain people. But it has been considered unsound historically in Great Britain, it has been considered unsound historically in this Dominion, and none of our provinces, whether under Liberal rule, whether under Conservative rule,—yes, though under Progressive rule, has ever seen fit to propose such legislation. These were the arguments urged against the measure. Those arguments appealed to me; many of them I advanced myself. All these arguments I stand by to-night as leader of the Opposition just as I stood by them as leader of the Government.

Now, the resolution before the House is much milder, it is true, than the bill of a year ago. The hon. member for Brome, influenced, he says, by the arguments then advanced, has reduced the scope of his proposal. He says: "I won't object any longer to a member of the Government being a director of an industrial corporation; I won't object any longer to a member of the Government being a director even of a loan company; I won't object any more to a member of the Government being a director of a great manufacturing enterprise, the arguments of last year have put those ideas out of my head and behind me; but I say that after this, if I have my way, no member of the Government shall be a director of a bank, nor of a trust company, nor of a transportation company, nor of an insurance company, nor of a public utility corporation."

Now, that I may be perfectly clear, let me say before commencing my argument on this resolution, that I am equally op-

posed to it as I was to his bill last year. The hon. member's resolution indeed illustrates, as nothing could illustrate better, the inherent unsoundness and fatuousness of the bill of last year, and as well of the method he is adopting now to gain the end he seeks. For what is going to be the result if legislation is introduced confirmatory of this resolution? A director of the British Empire Steel Corporation could still be a member of the government—that would be perfectly all right; a director of the Massey-Harris Company could be a member of the government—that would be all right; a director of the Dominion Textile Company—instead of representing us at an economic conference—could be a member of the government; indeed, we might have, as the hon. member frankly admitted, sixteen presidents of textile companies composing the government if his resolution passed and a bill confirmatory of it was enacted. But if a man is a director of the Street Railway Company of the town of Guelph, he could not be a member of the government; if he is a director of an old corporation, that is all but dead save in name, that once proposed to build a street railway in Portage La Prairie, his interest would be such that the door must be shut against his admission to high place in public life; a director of any little transportation concern, though it be half dead and half alive, anywhere in this Dominion, could not for the life of him get into the government. But a man may be president of British Empire Steel; he may be president of the Dominion Coal Company; he may be president of Dominion Textiles; he may be president of Massey-Harris; he may be president or director of the Cockshutt Company, and he still will be all right and quite fit for admission to the Administration. Now, I know the difficulty the hon. member confronted. He concluded—the argument was such he could not help it—that you could not shut the door to public life and admission to the ministry to those engaged in industrial enterprises. He knew that a man would thereby be debarred from exercising openly, which is always far better than secretly, such supervision of the money as he has managed to make in his life, that he owes to his family, owes to his descendants; and that if you debar public men of that right you cannot expect men of consequence to enter public life. It is just because of this difficulty which the hon. member confronted, and which is reflected in this reduced and wholly illogical resolution that he introduces to-day—it is just for that reason that it has been found impossible in all countries to take care of this evil, if it is evil at all, by statutory enactment. Therefore the argument on this point by the Prime Minister to-night had some appeal to me. I almost congratulated myself that if what I said a year ago passed then like cold water from his breast, if all my arguments had fallen at that time upon barren soil, at least I could see that there had been a fertilizing process in the interval and that what I had sowed in good season was maturing into harvest now.

Let us for a moment, in all seriousness, refer to that phase of the question that has to do with the public honour of our country as embodied and illustrated in the ministry of the day. A year ago a sweeping, all-embracing bill is put before this Parliament for final decision. Arguments are adduced pro and con, just as have been adduced to-night. The government of the day opposes the measure. The government of the day gains a little, but very little, support in its negation from the Opposition of that time, also from the Progressive party of that time. There may have been others, but I recall the leader of the Progressive party, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the hon. member for Red Deer supporting the government in its opposition. But against the course the government took, the leader of the present Government stood and voted, and every indication of opinion that he made was to the effect that he not only favoured the bill but would go further than the bill went and would include within its sweep the leader of the Progressive party and the leader of the Opposition as well. That was the declaration of principle and of faith that the present leader of the Government made to this Dominion, and upon which among other things he appealed to the electorate for support. "Oh," he often declared, "I put the Government on its record," Very well; the Government stood on its record—did he stand on his? Is he standing on it to-night? I am afraid my resources of ridicule would be entirely insufficient if I came to examine the reasons that the leader of the Government advances. He says: "Yes, it is true I supported this bill a year ago." He did all right—he did more; he supported a bill that was sweeping, drastic and complete, going a great deal further than this

resolution goes. He declared that he wanted it to go even further. "Oh, yes," he says, "I voted for it, but I have kept in mind ever since the fact that the House voted it down." "I remember well how I voted, I have never forgotten that," he assures the hon. member for Wellington, "but I am not forgetting that the House voted it down. I declared my principles; I declared my belief; I submitted to this nation where I stood upon the question, but—save the mark—I cannot stand there any longer, because the House voted it down." Well, this will come surely with a thud of despair to those hon. members of this House, if any are left, who expect the present administration under the present Prime Minister to adhere to anything they have declared for in the last five years. Did not the House vote them all down? There have been tariff resolutions proposed on the faith of which hon. gentlemen to my left have on many a platform proclaimed that the Liberal party were practically the same as they, and upon the faith of which hon. gentlemen opposite, with still more emphasis, have declared to the people that there was no need at all for the Progressive party because its principles were identical with their own. Tariff resolution after tariff resolution has been defeated by this House, proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in opposition, proposed by the present Prime Minister himself. Now, what are we to expect? When the Budget comes down and the vote of the hon. Prime Minister is held before his face, and the vote of his colleagues around him are shown all in black and white—when resolutions are called to his memory declaring for reductions on this thing and on that thing, all to cure unemployment and bring relief to a wearied and oppressed people—when all this is done, the Prime Minister will rise and say: "Yes, I remember all these resolutions; I remember that I proposed them; I remember that I voted for them; I remember too, that I believed in them, but all is so different now, because those resolutions were voted down." But more: "Now," he says, "I stand on British precedent." May I ask what precedent he stood on a year ago? He has spent a lot of time on the subject; he has analysed the argument presented by the hon. member for Brome. Back centuries he has gone, and he divides into four categories all of those who have ever discussed this question in the British House. Some who have discussed it, he says, are indifferent to it altogether—do not care anything about it. Others who have discussed it believe it should be left to conscience and to honour. Others, on the contrary, believe that there can be nothing done about it, even though they are not indifferent. And the fourth class, the Gladstone-in-his-prime class and the Campbell-Bannerman class—they believe that the decision should be left to the Prime Minister of the country; and of course my hon. friend, now that he is Prime Minister of the country, is right step in step with the Bannermans and the Gladstones, believing it should all be left to himself. I really admired the skill; rather I admired the plenitude of verbosity with which the hon. Prime Minister contrived to have this question lost in the fogs of the past, to have it buried in the recesses of history. How much better his memory was of what Gladstone said, of what Campbell-Bannerman said or of what Balfour said, than of what he said himself. How much better his memory was of the decisions of the British House and of debates in the House of Lords in the time of Pitt and Walpole than of the debate last March in the Commons of Canada and of his own vote on that occasion.

"Oh," he said, "when I came to form my Government I found out that my individual opinion should not prevail." Why, he had told us before that he had abandoned his opinion in deference to the decision of this House. Which of his two statements is right. I am inclined to think the conclusion is that he has no opinion, and never had any real opinion; inded, I think those words apply to him as respects almost every subject of public policy in this country. "I found," he says, "that if I stood by that resolution I would have only a mediocre government; I could not form an administration of the conspicuous abilities of the hon. members who sit around me now."

I might have had a government of Sinclairs and of Motherwells, if I may abandon the rule for a moment, but I could not have had for example the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau), I could not have had the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), and I could not have had the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie). I could not have had such men as the hon. minister without portfolio from Quebec (Mr. Dandurand), I could not have had the minister without portfolio from Renfrew (Mr. Low), nor could I have had my distinguished friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Kennedy). All these great men, six or seven

or eight, perhaps more, directors of companies and members of his government today he would have had to leave out of his cabinet, and because he had to decide between their superhuman capacities and his principles, without a moment's hesitation he abandoned his principles.

Now I stated a year ago that this is essentially a question to be left to the sense of self-respect and public respect of the member of the government himself. I stated a year ago that the matter had no personal reference to myself nor to the then leader of the Opposition, who is now Prime Minister, that neither of us had any directorships at all; but I stated as well that one could conceive of conditions where the intimacy of relationship between a membership of the governmnt and a directorship would be such that such directorship should not be held. I ask hon. members of the Government opposite simply to reflect whether there are not examples within their own household, rather remarkable examples that could be cured by the application of that sense of public respect and of public duty. I leave it to their own sense of honour and to their own conscience, just as I was prepared to leave it to the same in the case of the colleagues of whom I had the honour to be the head. But while I do so, is there anyone who as a Canadian can think quite the same of the Government of his country, yea, even of his country, when he finds today in that Government are members who are directors of companies and voted a year ago that it was a cardinal principle that no member of his government should be a director of a company. Six or seven or eight of those ministers I say are today directors of companies. The leader of the Government voted that it was in his judgment an evil to be immediately cured by legislation that a member of the Government should be the director of a company, and then immediately takes into his government six or seven or eight men and never asks one of them to surrender a directorship that he holds. Oh, he said, that was my opinion then and something like that was once the opinion of Gladstone, but poor old Gladstone was eighty years of age when he came to the conviction that a director of a company should not be a member of a government. That was, he suggests, the opinion of Gladstone in his senility. Well, the hon. member was not eighty years of age when a year ago he came to the same conclusion. In process of time he is fleeing the other way. Where is he going to be when he is eighty years of age?

The matter has a more serious aspect than would appear from the really absurd character of the course which has been pursued by the Government and by the Prime Minister to-day. What is to be thought of public honour in this country if leaders of political parties are with impunity to be permitted to declare their faith to a nation, receive the votes of a nation and then with scorn, yea, with self-satisfied contempt, aban-
10 p.m. don it immediately the responsibility of office is upon them? I know this is not the first instance. I also am pretty firmly convinced it will not be the last. I intend to hold myself in a position to complain if this wretched example is repeated, I purpose to be in a position to indict the administration. But there are many hon members of this House who will not be on very strong ground in that regard, who have already voted to absolve the ministry from obligations entered into with the people of this country. I am not in that position. And where is public honour to be in Canada if the people of this country when they come to exercise the sacred duty of voting are to have no knowledge at all of what are to be the principles that are to govern the administration when those they vote for are returned to power? I ask, are the people of this country after to-night to have any way in the world of judging as to what this Government may do upon any question whatever? If they are, by what talisman are they to be guided? Is there anybody in this country who can rest upon anything in the whole record of the administration and seize on that as a reason for saying that in his belief the Government will take any certain course upon any subject at all? I affirm that there is not. The Government has contemptuously and cynically turned its back upon every pledge made by its leader. On every one that has yet come before this House for discussion, it has cynically and contemptuously turned away, even when reminded of that pledge by one of its own most faithful supporters. That is the position in which Canada finds herself to-day, and is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding every opportunity given by the people, yea, and given by hon. members of this House, for the Government to establish itself by carrying out the

task it undertook, by carrying out the programme it laid before the people—is it any wonder I ask that inches are coming off daily from the stature of the Government of this country, that it is going down in public estimation? The only explanation of the course they are taking now and have been taking ever since they ascended to office is that if they swerve from the course pursued by the late government to the right or to the left in the ruin they would precipitate the wrong they would inflict, they would bring the inches off their own stature faster than if they defied and entirely ignored their principles and declarations of the past. When hon. gentlemen opposite pursued lightly and without any regard to conviction, without any regard to argument, but merely for the sake of embarrassing the administration, as they thought, and of gaining a temporary advantage dear to the heart of the office seeker or the demagogue when hon. gentlemen opposite pursued lightly the lines of conduct they pursued a year ago, they could not but know that Nemesis surely would come. Doubtless hon. gentlemen opposite instigated the hon. member for Brome to bring in that bill of 1921, at least encouraged him to do so—

Mr. McMASTER: No instigation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Encouragement anyway, came very shortly after he brought in the bill, and he does not deny that there was encouragement before. When they pursued that line of conduct, they must have expected that Nemesis was certain to follow.

Mr. McMASTER: I would like to interrupt my right hon. friend with his permission. There was no encouragement before. I brought in the bill on my own responsibility, as I brought in this resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I venture to say that though there may have been no encouragement and no instigation before the hon. member introduced his bill, he gained very considerable of both from the discussion, and still more from the vote. I would venture to suggest as well that before he brought his resolution in this year he met with very considerable in the way of discouragement and non-instigation, and that it required all his pluck and all his sense of self-respect to declare by the course he was to take that his own honour was just as sacred to him as the honour of the administration. Yes, when hon. gentlemen in this House as leaders of parties abandon the course they pursued as leaders when in opposition they may count that public contempt and ultimately public vengeance will come, but I venture to say that as yet these visitations have only in part arrived. Where is the hon. member going to stand in the respect of this country when it is known throughout the length and breadth of Canada that a year ago he stood four square and definitely for a fixed principle and to-day he stands definitely and defiantly against it. He merely declares that a year ago he was leader of the Op position.

"Oh yes," he says and this was perhaps the best of all. "I believe in leaders of a party not being directors, but I would not apply that restraint at all to members of the administration." Well, I wonder how those words appeal to hon. gentlemen to my left. Their leader is the leader of a party—a very considerable party—in this country. He is a director, not only of one, but, I am informed, of at least six companies. Do they approve of the doctrine that their leader must resign either his directorships or his leadership, while five, six, seven or eight members of the Government retain their portfolios and do not resign their directorship? But such is the specious reasoning by which the leader of the Government supports his stand to-night.

The best thing that from my own standpoint, and I think, from the standpoint of the permanent interests of the country, I can desire is just to leave the leader of the Government where by his conduct he is impelled; to let his action of a year, and his action to-night, his conduct in forming his Government, and the labored explanation he grinds out now in his defence,—let these things speak for themselves, and be an indication to this Dominion of his loyalty to principle and of his sense of public duty and honour.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): I have listened, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of pleasure to the speeches in this debate. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was intent and logical to a degree, but, to my mind, he dwelt in the upper regions of theory and did not get down to earth, where men are practical. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has made a speech convincing and logical, and one, I believe, that will appeal to the common sense of all classes in this coun-

try. The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has remarked that he does not know where the Prime Minister is going to land. Well, he knows where he has landed, after the case of the past and the present was put plainly before the people of this country. We, on this side of the House believe—and I believe the country will substantiate that belief—that where he has landed he is going to remain. My right hon. friend has expressed amazement. Well, he is a wonderful actor, and he can simulate amazement or, as the actors say, register disgust, register anger, or register surprise. No person can do it more ably than himself, but I will suggest that the amazement of April 24 was not in it with the amazement of December 6. I have sympathy with him because I had the same kind of amazement in 1911, and no person can tell me that a man of the disposition of the right hon. leader of the Opposition was not amazed beyond degree on the night of December 6. I am not here to discuss what people said, or how they voted, a year ago. The country has spoken since a year ago, and has said to the leader of the Government: "We want you to form the best government you can find in the Dominion of Canada, according to your judgment; that is your job." Whether he has done that or not the people of Canada will in time declare. At the present moment, I would suggest to the right hon. leader of the Opposition that instead of inches being cut off from the esteem in which the Prime Minister is held, he has been adding to his stature daily through his conduct since the election. I do not know that I will gain anything in enlightenment,either for myself, the House or for the country, by following my right hon. friend. I will submit, however, that for the last twenty minutes of his speech he said nothing about the subject before the House at all. The country is not anxious now to know what happened a year ago, or what happened—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, it was anxious on December 6. The right hon. gentlemen seems to be sitting with his back to the engine, always looking at the scenery after he has passed it, but he will have to face the motive power of the machinery of this country, and look at things that we are approaching, and not at things we have passed. What we are called upon to do in this country, as a Parliament and Government, is what interests the people of Canada at the present time. During the campaign some of us made somewhat heated declarations. I think on this side of the House we are no exception to any of the hon. gentlemen on the other side in that regard. But now that Parliament has assembled, this Government is endeavouring to manage the affairs with the advice of members of this Parliament. The people are reading the papers every day, not so much to know what we say to each other across the floor of the House, but to know what is being done to bring order out of the chaos which this Government found when it came to office.

The question before the House is one simply of practical business. I ask hon. gentlemen, if they were endeavouring to select men to conduct their business, and there were large financial matters of paramount importance to be discussed and dealt with, would they not seek for the men who had experience in those things? Every business man will say that is the correct policy. What is applied to our private business should be applied to our public affairs. The discussion to-day has been woven around the question of whether men who were able enough in a company to become directors of it might not do something wrong in a government. The fact that they have risen to become directors of a company, as my right hon. friend says, is something in their favour, because the men who know them best have entrusted to them their money to manage. That being the case, I take it, sir, that the people of the country do not make any mistake in passing the same kind of judgment. It is all very well for us to discuss a theory, and many theories that are not practicable are absolutely impregnable in discussion. I could name some of them, but will not. This is a question of practical every day business, and we should apply the best business intelligence we have to it.

Take, for instance, the resolution before us. How many hon. gentlemen in this House are shareholders in local rural telephone companies? A great many of them. Let me point out that the attempt to make this apply to directors who are ministers is merely drawing a herring across the trail. What applies to a minister of the Crown, applies to every member of the House and ought to apply, because a private member in this House, if he have interests in any company, is in a better position to do business for that company quietly,

than if he were a member of the Government, and I point out to hon. gentlemen that when an attempt is made to say that one law shall apply to members of the Government, and that another law shall apply to members of the House of Commons who are not members of the Government, they are making a distinction which neither the law nor the independence of Parliament ever contemplated. If this resolution were to become law, then, in its spirit and in its reality, no member of a rural telephone company could become a member of the Government.

Mr. McMASTER: Would the hon. member consider that a rural telephone company fell under the classification of a large public utility corporation?

Mr. GRAHAM: Many of them do, and they are growing larger and of more importance every day. I repeat that, under the literal reading of this resolution, any director of a rural telephone company would be debarred from becoming a member of a government and if he has no right to become a member of a government, he has no right to become a member of this House or of the Senate. Business is not conducted as it was many years ago. At that time individual men conducted businesses; to-day, for the sake of convenience, of better organisation, nearly every business of importance is organised into a company, and in many townships, in every village, every town and every city, we find the men who take interest in public affairs in those small organisations for the sake of helping their own locality and giving courage to those who are endeavouring to make things better in the vicinity in which they live. Does any sane person, who has given this subject thought, mean to tell the country that a man who takes that interest, in his locality, in his municipality, in his province, is to be debarred from taking a larger interest in public life? He has shown, by his interest in those affairs, that he is not only public-minded with a broad view of public affairs but more competent to deal with the affairs of this country on a larger scale, than a man who does not take that interest in things closely around him.

I want to say just one other word, and it is this: If the present law surrounding the independence of Parliament is not sufficient to keep members of the Government right, then you cannot pass a law anywhere or place a law on any statute book that will accomplish that object. If members of the Government or members of the House of Commons or the Senate do not adhere to the law as at present on our statute books, then I say again, with all deference to the hon. member for Brome Mr. McMaster) that he cannot draft a bill which, if enacted, would compel those gentlemen to keep in the line of rectitude. The question is a broad one. You cannot make men honest by statute so easily; and as banks will take without security, the note of a man in whom they have confidence, rather than, with security, that of a man in whom they have no confidence, I would rather a man, who has a reputation for probity, for integrity, in dealing with the public as a member of government, even if he were director in twenty companies, than a man who had a bad reputation and who was a director in no company. To my mind, what the country expects us to do, both as a Parliament and as a government, is to bring our best ability to bear upon the questions now confronting us, and every person will agree that they are momentous. If a man who is director of a bank or some other company will give his time, and he is considered to be the man for the position, then all Canada will say: "Secure the services of that man if you can possibly do so." You will do it in your business, I will do it in mine, and the people of this country will recognise that the Prime Minister has done it in his.

Mr. R. A. HOEY (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is, in my humble judgment, a most important one, one the mere discussion of which will create widespread interest throughout this country, and one, the final outcome of which is awaited even now with considerable anxiety. My justification for rising to take part in this discussion is based upon the conviction that this proposal is, in spirit at least, in complete accord with British practice at its best,—British practice as exemplified and illustrated in the case of many outstanding leaders in Great Britain and, I am happy to state, by many outstanding political leaders in this country.

I should like to apologise to you, Sir, for introducing a personal element. I want to do so, in order to discover, if I can, the disease in the body politic, to which the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has referred, and in order to come down into the realm of practical affairs, to which the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) has referred. During the recent federal campaign, an opportunity was ex-

tended to me to visit many constituencies in western Canada and one or two constituencies, at least, in western Ontario. During those visits I was astonished, shall I say alarmed and depressed, to find a large section of the Canadian people absolutely disinterested in the outcome of the election, not only in their respective constituencies, but in a Dominion sense?

I was naturally anxious to inquire into the cause of this apathy, and I learned that there was, amongst this section of the population, a widespread feeling that governments in Canada, from time to time, had been dominated, if not controlled, by the big interests of this country. I am not saying, at the moment, that they were right in this belief; I am only attempting, in my humble and awkward way, to interpret an attitude of mind. Let me say that I found this feeling most pronounced, not amongst the radical labour element and certainly not amongst the wealthy classes, but amongst what I might be justified in terming the better middle class, business men in a small way, professional men, teachers, many of whom were university graduates and all of whom were keen students of economic thought, the section of the population that, in the older countries, has always been able to determine the outcome of any election by throwing the weight of its influence in with either of the two historic parties. I heard from this class again and again and again of the numbers of Cabinet ministers who, at the same time, were directors of large business companies. I heard them refer to politics as a game in this country, of profit only to those who occupied places in the inner circle. I heard, throughout that campaign, reference made again and again to campaign funds, and that reference to me seemed particularly pertinent when applied to the late government in the early days of the campaign and to the present Government in the closing days of that campaign. But the point that I wish to bring out is this, that that mysterious source from which campaign funds have been obtained in this country and the fact that there are directors of big interests occupying Cabinet positions, are inseparably bound up in the consciousness of a certain class of the Canadian people.

I made the statement then, which I repeat now, that unless something could be done to restore the confidence, and re-establish the faith, of this section in our political institutions, then the outlook in Canada was in no sense promising. We have been witnessing during the past three or four years the collapse of constitutional government in more than one of the older countries. How has this collapse come about? I know whereof I speak when I say that in the case of one country that collapse was preceded by a century of propaganda that sought to convince the people that the government responsible for the administration of public affairs in that land was wholly dominated by the landlords and the wealthy men of Great Britain; and that propaganda, continued systematically, ultimately succeeded in completely undermining the faith of the people of that country in constitutional government. Turn to Russia and study its modern history and you will find that the collapse of constitutional government there was also preceded by a system of propaganda that sought to associate the government of that great country with the wealthy classes. It is my conviction that this impression, so widespread in Canada at the present time, that the governments of this country have been from time to time dominated by big business, has been created largely by propaganda for which all parties have been more or less responsible. That propaganda, in so far as it has substantial basis in fact, and foundation in truth, is commendable, believing as we do in the purifying influence of public opinion and publicity. In so far as propaganda of that kind is based on a desire for party advantage, however, it is pernicious and destructive, is always followed by disastrous consequences, and, in my opinion, is unworthy of the Canadian people.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend says that public opinion, at least in certain sections of the country, has lost confidence in the constitutional government of Canada. Will he tell us what section of the country he visited, and where he found indications of such a lack of confidence?

Mr. HOEY: Perhaps I had better come down to the realm of practical affairs and mention the constituency which I have the honour to represent. There are 20,000 voters on the voters' list in that constituency. I know that a great many voted who were not on the list, but I learn from a table I have here that there were 8,000 of the 20,000 who failed to exercise the right of the franchise on the election day. Let me give my hon. friend some figures from Toronto, that home of tolerance and economic enlightenment. In East Toronto there were 39,435 names on the list, as

against 14,930 votes counted. Does that indicate disease in the body politic? In North Toronto the names on the list numbered 47,622 and the votes counted 20,864. But, more amazing still, in South Toronto there were on the list 31,749 names while those who voted numbered only 7,531. I think I will repeat that.

Mr. VIEN: Perhaps my hon. friend will allow a correction. I was told by an hon. member from Toronto that this small vote given in that city was due not to any lack of confidence in constitutional government on the part of the people of Toronto, but mainly to the fact that the ladies of that city did not vote, notwithstanding that they had been given the franchise.

Mr. HOEY: My hon. friend must have been anticipating my speech.

Mr. VIEN: I am giving the hon. gentleman—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member, I think, is unduly interrupting.

Mr. HOEY: So far as the question of lack of confidence is concerned, I know that this feeling is very pronounced in my own constituency, particularly in the urban districts. Now, I am not one of those who believe that this proposal will prove a panacea for that ill. I do not know that it will. But I do think that it is a step in the right direction; and I believe that, if extended, not by compulsion and certainly not by legislation, which I would not favour, but by mutual agreement and consent among gentlemen, the proposal embodied in this resolution would do much to re-establish the faith of this section of the country in our constitutiounal government. I am aware that such a policy if carried out by mutual agreement, and not, as I have said, by compulsion or legislation, would undoubtedly involve sacrifice. I am willing, as I think we are all willing, to admit that. But was it not a sacrifice on the part of all classes that enabled this country to emerge triumphantly from the great crisis of the war? It was; and I am convinced that it will be sacrifice on the part of all our people, and especially on the part of our leaders, that will enable the country to emerge triumphantly from this post-war period of depression and unrest. And it is because I believe that this proposal is a step in the right direction that it affords me a great deal of pleasure to lend it my support on this occasion.

Mr. JEAN JOSEPH DENIS (Joliette): I listened with a great deal of interest to speech of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), and if I cannot share his views, I must say, in justice to him, that at least he certainly put before the House the best possible case that could be presented under the circumstances. Unfortunately, I am bound to add that, in my opinion, my hon. friend did not make a good case; in fact, I do not think he made any case at all. Before taking up the main argument on this question, I desire to indicate one or two points that should be considered in this motion if it is to pass at all. To begin with, the motion declares that ministers should resign their directorships on their appointment as ministers of the Crown. Well, Mr. Speaker, it would be very imprudent for ministers to resign their directorships on appointment to the Cabinet, especially had that applied to the ministers who were appointed shortly before the last general election. Several of those ministers never were elected to the House, and consequently had they resigned their directorships on appointment they would have resigned for no consideration whatever.

My hon. friend proposes further, that:

> Such companies should have no business dealings with the Government of the Dominion of Canada, or with any department thereof, or with any railway or ship owned or controlled by said government;

It would not be fair to bar a company from doing business with the Government simply because one of its directors happened to be a minister of the Crown, because it is not within the power of a company to prevent its directors from entering the Government. The shareholders of a company generally elect their directors for one year, and it is not competent for those shareholders to displace any director within that period. Therefore I think that part of the resolution should disappear also.

But these are only preliminary considerations, and I prefer to examine the question on its merits. As was pointed out by the hon. Prime Minister, we have at present a statute, that meets the purpose which concerns the hon. member for Brome. That statute is the Senate and House of Commons Act, Section 14 of which provides that:

> No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall

be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

That is supplemented by section 18, which provides that in every contract with the Government there shall be inserted a clause giving effect to the provisions of section 14. This law has been in force for about fifty years, and it has not been pointed out to-night wherein it has ever been insufficient. On the contrary, from all that has been said it appears that the statute has always been considered adequate and sufficient.

I suppose if this resolution should be accepted by the House it would be the duty of the Government to introduce a bill to give effect to it. But I say that this resolution in its present form cannot be accepted by the House, because it is arbitrary, uncertain, obscure, useless, and uncalled for. In a word, it has not been demonstrated that any evil now exists which a statute based on this resolution could remedy.

Now, let us examine some of the arguments put forward in support of the resolution. My hon. friend from Brome says that it is based on English practice. Well, I am sorry to differ, but I must say that that is by no means the case. On the contrary, that practice has been, making allowance for certain exceptions which only confirm the rule, that ministers of the Crown, do not resign their directorships. My hon. friend quoted the instance of the chairman of the board of directors of the Northeastern Railway Company, who on being appointed a member of his Cabinet by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman resigned his railway position. But I submit, Sir, that that is not a parallel case at all, because anyone will readily understand that no man could hold the two positions concurrently. It would be about the same as if the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, when that company was a private corporation, were appointed ministers of the Crown. Therefore that case in my view falls within the exceptions that confirm the rule.

My hon. friend says, further, that it is a general practice for British ministers of the Crown to resign their directorships. Again I have to differ with him, and point out that not only in Great Britain but in Canada and the United States, generally speaking, ministers do not resign their directorships on accepting portfolios. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) quoted many examples of Ministers of the Crown since Confederation who accepted offices without resigning their directorship.

Now, in studying this question I think it is wise to refer to the law in other countries, and with that purpose in view I have examined the laws of Great Britain, the United States, and France, and in none of those three countries have I found any law that by any means resembles the statute which would have to supplement this resolution. I go further and say that in none of our provinces is there any such law in existence. If it is a good principle for the Dominion it is a good principle for the provinces, but, as I have just pointed out, none of the provinces so far has thought fit to embody the principle in legislation. In those three countries and in our provinces the rule has been to refer the question to the integrity, the honour and the sense of propriety of the minister so appointed. Now, sir, if that has been the standard in Canada for the last fifty years; if that is the standard in other countries, has that standard diminished in Canada of late? Is it since the present administration has assumed office that the standard of honour and integrity and sense of propriety has been lowered in Canada? Certainly my hon. friend from Brome will say "No" to that question, as I do myself. In a case like this, where it is more a question of propriety, good taste and honour than of law, I think the wish of the people should be considered. The wish of the people is a criterion, and when they elect as their representative one who belongs to any political party, knowing at the time of his election that he is director of a large corporation, they do so because they want that man to become a member of Parliament, notwithstanding his directorship in that corporation. Therefore I say that if the people want such men as their representatives in Parliament, who is going to say that they are not fit to become members? I apply my argument to members of Parliament because I contend that if my hon. friend's resolution has any foundation at all it must be applied not merely to ministers of the Crown, but to members of Parliament generally. Of course, being applied to members generally it would apply as well to ministers, the minister being only, after all, a member of Parliament. After a member has been elected by his constituents with the knowledge that he is a director of a company or large corporation, the Prime Minister may choose him as a member of his

ministry. The Prime Minister might or might not make an error in his choice, but if he does make an error, if the people do not want this man to become a minister because of his directorship in a large corporation, the people have full opportunity of opposing his selection. After the member has been selected as Cabinet minister he must again go before the people for re-election; he must submit his conduct to them and be elected in his capacity as minister. Under those circumstances, when the people pronounce themselves twice, first by electing a man as a member of Parliament and next by re-electing him following his selection as a member of the Cabinet by the Prime Minister, then I say that Parliament should go no further.

It has been said that the work of a minister of the Crown is arduous and unremitting and that, therefore, he should give all his time to the duties of his office and entirely eliminate all other activities. But directorship in a corporation is only one of the many activities of mankind in which a member may be engaged, and if after becoming a minister a man is precluded from being a director of a corporation, he should also be precluded from looking after his own private business. He should be precluded from giving his time to any occupation whatever other than that pertaining to his office; and that would imply a severance from his friends, from all social functions, from his party affiliations, even from his family, if you want to go that far. Such was never the intention of government or of Parliament; such is not the intention of the people of this country. The people ask that a minister of the Crown shall give his best efforts to the work devolving upon him, but they do not and cannot reasonably ask that he abandon everything; that he should isolate himself, if need be, just because he is a member of the cabinet. It has been very properly pointed out that political life is often of short duration, and if after a man has worked for a lifetime and acquired some wealth he has to put it all aside in order to become a member of the cabinet, there is danger that the most able men in the country will, on that account, refuse to accept any such position.

The hon. member for Brome said, en passant, that no man could serve two masters. That is true, Mr. Speaker; no man can serve two masters if one be the Lord and the other the devil. No man can serve two masters if they are antagonists; if they are working on projects that are opposed one to the other. But in the ordinary course of life a man can serve two and more masters. A man can serve two masters if their interests are different. But any time a minister of the Crown thinks that the interests of the corporation of which he is a director may come into conflict with the interests of the Government; any time he feels that he is placed in a position where he cannot serve the two masters and he must decide between the two, it would be his duty to resign his directorship. Otherwise I do not see that a man who is a member of the ministry and at the same time a director of a corporation serves two masters in the biblical sense of the word.

The hon. member for Brome spoke very eloquently of what he called interlocking directorates. I submit that this resolution has nothing to do with interlocking directorates, if such things exist. What does it matter to this House that a member be a director of several companies if none of which has any connection or dealing with the Government? As long as there is wealth or riches in the country, men of prominence, influential men, men of wealth will be directors of companies, and in that there is no harm whatever?

The argument has been made to-night, and it is a good one, I think, that the fact of a man resigning his office as director of a company does not preclude him from retaining his interests in that company and from being represented by a dummy on its directorate. Suppose, for instance, that the director owns only a few shares in the company, having been elected a director because he was a capable and intelligent man, and that alongside of him there is a shareholder who owns a great many shares, but who is not a director because he is not as able as the other man. Is it not true that the large shareholder will have more interest in that company, although he is not a director, than the first man even though he were a director and a minister of the Crown? Is it not true that the large shareholder who was not a director would be more concerned about the welfare of that company and more susceptible to influence than the director who owned only a few shares? Or take the case of a man who owns a large private industry and becomes a minister of the Crown. There is no reproach against him so far, but if he organizes that industry into a company and keeps a few shares

and becomes a director of that company, he could no longer be a minister of the Crown.

Parliament should always be very careful not to pass what I would call useless legislation. The object of legislation is either to procure a benefit or to cure an evil. I do not see that any benefit will be procured by the passing of the resolution of my hon. friend from Brome, nor do I see that any evil will be cured. If it had been shown that during the last fifty years under the present statute concerning the Senate and the House of Commons, evils had prevailed, or that minister of the Crown had abused his position, either in this or any other country, I would say that there was an evil to be cured, but nothing of the kind has been shown. On the contrary, when we know that ever since Confederation there have been in every government in this country ministers of the Crown who were directors of companies, it is wonderful indeed to think that no evils resulting from that situation can be pointed out to the House to-night. Therefore, I say that the safeguard which the resolution seeks to impose is an artificial, an imaginary safeguard. I believe that there is no necessity for it. What we want in the service of this country are able, experienced, business men, men in whom the community has confidence. Once a man has been elected a member of Parliament and is again re-elected as a minister of the Crown, I say that the confidence of the people of this country has been demonstrated enough so far as that individual is concerned, and for that reason he is fit to be a member of the Cabinet.

I heard one of my friends sitting in the party obliquely opposite make the argument tonight that men of large capital and influence who were directors of a company should not be allowed to become ministers of the Crown. We must be very careful about laying down any such principle as that. If we are going to accept as a principle that the rich man, the able man, the learned man, the man who has been chosen by his associates as president or director of a large corporation because they have confidence in him, is not fit to a be a cabinet minister, I would ask from what kind of material will your cabinet be drawn? There is a country in the world at the present time which has swept aside the rich and the powerful, directors of companies, let us say, and we know which country that is. While I would not by any means compare what my hon. friend said to a Bolshevist utterance or the utterance of a demagogue, it reminded me of a story I saw illustrated by a cartoon not very long ago. Two policemen appeared with a prisoner before a judge in Russia, and were asked by him what was the charge against the prisoner. The policemen answered "A capitalist." The judge asked, "What was he doing? How did you find out this man was a capitalist?" The policemen answered, "We found him in a barber shop having his hair cut."

Mr. McMASTER: That does not apply to the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. DENIS: I am only quoting that in a humourous way. I must say that there is in this country, perhaps in every country in the world at the present time, a certain tendency which may be very honest in many quarters, to set aside the man who has the reputation of being rich and powerful for the sole reason that he is rich and powerful. I think that when it comes to choosing a cabinet, the rich and powerful man should be placed on the same footing as the poor and weak man, that every man should be given the same opportunity providing they are of equal ability and are capable of filling the position.

11 p.m.

In conclusion, I wish to say that the principle at the bottom of this resolution is one which concerns the honour and the integrity of members of Parliament and ministers of the Crown, and I submit that the honour and integrity of a man cannot be remedied or improved by legislation. It is entirely a private matter concerning the honour and integrity of the individual. The people choose their representatives, and those who are chosen members of the cabinet have to go back to the people and accept their verdict.

One aspect of this question which has not been touched upon is that it is purely and simply a question of fact. It is not a question of law, it is a question of fact, and this is the distinction I would make between a question of law and a question of fact. If this question could be determined by a general principle of law applicable to all cases with equality and justice, then I would call it a principle of law. If we have to differentiate and to examine each case in particular, if the principle which is embodied in this resolution were true and right in one case, but might be unjust and unwise in another case, according to the circumstances, then I say it is essen-

tially a question of fact, and I submit that questions of fact cannot be regulated by statute. A question of fact has to be examined each and every time on its particular merits. That is the reason why it might very well happen in one case that a minister of the crown, being a director, could not remain in both offices without violating his oath of office. On the other hand, it might very well happen in many cases, and in most cases, that a minister of the crown could hold a position as director of a company without any incompatibility, without any evil or wrongdoing whatever, and, for that reason, I say that this question is merely one of fact. It cannot be regulated by statute, but can be regulated only by the sense of honour, integrity and justice of the man. For these reasons, I will vote against the resolution.

Hon. J. B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): I rise for the purpose of tendering, if I may, my respectful and heartfelt sympathy to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I think this is an occasion where he needs sympathy, where he deserves it and ought to have it in full measure. I am not in accord with the proposition which he has placed before the House. The party of which I am a member was not in accord with the proposition in its broader form when placed before the House last year. The hon. member for Brome will have no reproach to make to the members of the official Opposition. He cannot agree with them, but he knows that where they stand to-day they stood when he first introduced his resolution. He will, at least, give this portion of the House the credit for both sincerity and courage. Can he do as much for his own side of the House? For years hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have accepted the services of the hon. member for Brome as one of the chief critics, if not the chief financial critic, of the Government of the day. He is a good Liberal and was brought up in the faith. He sat in council, though, as yet, I have not seen any very visible emblems of reward, and, perhaps, my hon. friend does not expect any, but, if I might paraphrase a little, I would have said that before the opening of this Parliament—at all events before the introduction of the resolution—he might have stood against the world. To-day there are none so poor in his own side of the House as to do him reverence. Every member of the Government and every supporter of the Government who has spoken has, in a mild, perhaps charitable, but still possibly firm manner, told the hon. member for Brome that he does not really know what he is talking about, and that his panacea is no panacea at all.

Unfortunately, some hon. gentlemen who took part in the debate this year, and also took part, even though a limited part, in the debate last year, and a larger number of them who concurred in the vote last year, did not express by their vote to the hon. member for Brome the things they say to him this year and the things they are going to show him by their vote tonight. It is rather unfortunate. He has been told that the principle is a good one, that no man can serve two masters, but I think the hon. member for Brome is probably considering it from a little different angle tonight. He is probably asking himself how one man can serve one master who goes in different directions at different times. The trouble is not in the multiplicity of masters, but apparently this chart, about which we hear so much, has come in evidence again—the chart that shows no lighthouse, no compass, nothing but an aimless sea of indirection upon which the political bark is allowed to float in a manner that will best serve the political exigencies of the moment. Let my hon. friend from Brome make up his mind now, a little late perhaps, to endure this sort of suffering for the rest of his political career. He can now really appreciate the company into which he has gotten himself.

We have been told that public opinion is the master of this House. I hope so. I would be very glad to think that, and, naturally, those of us who sit in this angle would like to lead public opinion along the same lines as we think, but how, may I ask hon. members of this House, are we going to do it? Shall we go on the public platform, or stand in this chamber, or discuss on the street, things that we do not intend to put into practice when we come into office? Shall we go from one end of Canada to the other, exhorting the people to support the Conservative party and declaring to those people that if we come into power we are going to do thus and so, and at the same time have the mental reservation that we do not intend to do anything of the kind, and that we intend to shape our course according to the expedience of the moment? That is not simply one of the issues, but that is the dominant issue in Canadian politics to-day, —whether the party shall or shall not be true to its previous record and true to the

pledges which it has given to the people. Shall we in this group follow the example, let me say the temporary successful example, which has been set? We intend to hold a nationwide convention of our party, to reassert and reaffirm those principles which eventually will be triumphant in this country. And when we do so, are we to take as a guide that great convention which was held a few years ago, the party behind that convention having, up to the present time, practically repudiated or refused to put into force every plank, every doctrine, in the platform to which it subscribed? My hon. friends, who sit to my left on this side of the chamber, in fact, I might say, the party which is in morganatic alliance with the Government, a truly morganatic union because it gets none of the honours and yet it is expected to bear its share of the burdens of this entanglement, have supported this morganatic union by voting in this House to absolve, so far as they can, the gentlemen who have gone to the country on one platform and who have come back to this House to put into practice an entirely different platform. They have done so upon the only challenge that has been given in this House since the opening of the session. They will live to see the day when they will rue that morganatic alliance. We do not expect, because we are true to our principles, the gentlemen to our left, who have professed—and they are, I believe, absolutely sincere in their professions—principles largely antagonistic to our own, to look upon our platform with a favourable eye. But it is about time—

Mr. PUTNAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. BAXTER: —and my hon. friend who says "hear, hear" may as well make up his mind whether he is going to say "hear, hear" to every sham and subterfuge which comes from his side of the House, or whether he will, like the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), stand on his feet, follow his convictions, stand by his principles, when his party has gone astray from him. I do not know whether my hon. friend sat in this House last year or not; but if he did, the chances are at least nine out of ten that he joined with the hon. member for Brome in what, although he may not have meant it so, was virtually and really an attack upon the administration of the day. As has been pointed out by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) cabinet minister after cabinet minister in this administration lined up in the vote last year against the former administration, and where are those principles to-night? When those principles are abandoned, how much may the morganatic alliance depend upon the sincerity of this Government in dealing in even such an important matter as the Wheat Board? I want to tell my hon. friends to my left that they are being jockeyed to-day in regard to the Wheat Board. I am not in favour of the Wheat Board.

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

Mr. BAXTER: It is about time.

Mr. PELLETIER: I really believe my hon. friend is out of order. What he is saying is absolutely irrelevant; it has nothing to do with the question before the House, and it seems to me that he ought to confine himself to the question under discussion.

Mr. BAXTER: Mr. Speaker, you have not called upon to me to justify my stand; but, if it is necessary for me to discuss the point, for the information of my hon. friend, I will tell him that, upon such a resolution as is before the House, a very pertinent, proper and immediate thing to discuss is the sincerity of the Government which he is supporting.

Mr. PUTNAM: What has that to do with the Wheat Board?

Mr. BAXTER: A great deal as, in my humble judgment, hon. gentlemen sitting to my left will find out before the session is over.

Mr. PUTNAM: Or the Board of Commerce?

Mr. BAXTER: If my hon. friend wishes to discuss the Board of Commerce, I suggest he should discuss that privately with the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock).

Mr. PUTNAM: The one is as relevant as the other.

Mr. BAXTER: The Board of Commerce is not an issue at the present moment.

Mr. PUTNAM: It is just as much as the Wheat Board.

Mr. BAXTER: If my hon. friend really wants to discuss the question I will give him an opportunity of doing so. I do not mind being interrupted provided the chunk of interruption is a big one, but I do not want our voices to ring together at the same moment.

Mr. PUTNAM: I only say that I am just obtuse enough to think that the Wheat Board is as far away from this debate as is the ill-fated Board of Commerce. I gave that as an illustration.

Mr. BAXTER: I have much pleasure in agreeing with my hon. friend as to his obtuseness. I trust my hon. friend and myself can approach the subject from the same point of view. If my hon. friend wishes to pay himself any more compliments and have me second them. I shall be most happy to do so. If my hon. friend has not yet reached the limit of his vituperative vocabulary as applied to himself, I will give him an opportunity to apply the epithets.

Mr. PUTNAM: I think the House will see that the seconder was nearer home.

Mr. BAXTER: I may say, perhaps, for the benefit of our friends sitting to the left, that, in my opinion—and it is of course, possible that I may be wrong—if the Government of the day really desires to give my hon. friends the Wheat Board that they or some of them profess to want, it would be easy for the Government to do so. I do not want it; I am not an advocate for it; but they can learn, by the translation of yesterday's declarations into to-day's action, how much sincerity to expect from the present Administration. The same sincerity that the hon. member for Brome is experiencing to-night is just the measure of sincerity that my hon. friends sitting to the left may expect. The morganatic alliance will be a splendid institution while it brings the necessary support to a government that cannot live without it. It will be utterly disregarded when it interferes with the interests or desires or prejudices of hon. gentlemen who sit to the right of Mr. Speaker.

I should like, just for a moment, to deal with what the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) said. I think he referred to the fact that the party on this side of the House was a defeated party, and his satisfaction is quite evident, quite natural, quite pleasurable. The hon. gentleman should not be too hard upon defeats. I fancy it was only the fact that he too had been defeated that prevented him from joining in the chorus and vote which supported the hon. member for Brome last year, and he probably would have been as busily engaged as other members of the Government to-night in swallowing his previous utterances if he had been a member of the House last year. Fortunately, he had escaped, and he was able to take what the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) and, in fact, pretty nearly every hon. gentleman who has spoken to-night believe is the wise, sane and healthy course; for I believe myself that the rewards in political life are all too small to induce the captains of industry to enter political life and give their services to the state, and instead of putting up barriers to keep such men out, I believe it is in the interests of the country that such men should be induced by every possible means to come in and help administer a government. I find no fault with the Prime Minister for having induced such captains of industry, such capable businessmen as he has, although the number is not, by any means, as large as it might be for the good of the country.

I can assure my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) that defeats are not permanent. We are in the positon of a party which, when it again meets the country, will present to that country an unbroken record of consistent adherence to what we, at all events, have believed, do believe, and shall believe, is the best policy in the interests of the entire country. When my hon. friends go to that country for endorsement, it will be utterly impossible to tell from their previous performances what their next performance will be, whether they will go back to the platform they discarded or adopt something new. But this will be sure, that whatever they may utter on the public platform, in the discussions of the next campaign, whatever they may print in their handbooks, whatever they may set forth in the newspapers of the country, will, on the word of the Prime Minister, be nothing more than an advertising campaign to get votes, and will not entail, in their eyes, any obligation upon a single man jack of them to carry it out after he gets back to the House. And my hon. friends to my left can take credit to themselves for having voted to endorse that particularly responsible and, I was almost going to say, that particularly honest statesman.

Now, what the people in this country vote for, that they will get. What their representatives in this Parliament vote for, that they will get. And if they vote for sham and insincerity they will have it in full measure; but they will not get it from this group. My hon. friend from Brome

(Mr. McMaster) last year made a declaration, and in tones of most respectful sympathy. I want to commend to him the careful study of his words. Hansard records him as saying: "I know my own leader and can speak for him." Can he tonight? Did his wildest imagination a year ago ever foresee the day when his honoured leader would rise in his place and repudiate him and his resolution, and swallow whole, without an effort at gulping it, the doctrine promulgated last year by my right hon. friend the leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen)? And does the hon. member for Brome think that that is distinctly a good thing in Canadian public life? Is it the sort of thing he wants to subscribe to? It is the sort of policy any man can pursue? Would it not have been at least decent, would it not have been at least fair, to have given the hon. member for Brome some notice of a change of direction, some notice of the back-tracking of the Government, so that he could at least get into line in the procession if he wanted to? That would have been more merciful than to treat an old stalwart supporter to the kicks of absolute repudiation, when he is standing for what he at any rate believes to be an absolute principle and absolute right.

Mr. J. FRED JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I do not intend to attempt a speech at this late hour. One or two of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me would lead one to think that he is very much concerned as to the welfare of this party with which I am associated. I think he made use of the statement that we Progressives were being jockeyed on the Wheat Board proposition. Well, be that as it may, I would inform my hon. friend that when we find ourselves in a bad way we will not look to him or to those associated with him. The hon. member drew attention to himself and to his party in connection with the resolution that is before the House, in words something like these: "We are here to-day, we were here yesterday, and we will continue to be here." Well, Sir, that is the trouble with the hon. gentleman and his whole party. They have been where they are for the last forty years, and consequently we have had no progress when their party was in power.

Now, the reason I rose at all was to make an explanation rather than a speech. It will be observed that the leader of my party (Mr. Crerar) is not in the House, and it is because of his unavoidable absence that I have spoken. I desire to explain why he is not here. He is under the care of his physician, as he has been for the last number of days, and in this age of misunderstanding,—and, I am very sorry to add, sometimes of misrepresentation I thought it well to let the House know that had he been here he would have been where I am and doing what I purpose doing, namely, supporting the resolution of my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster).

Mr. GAUVREAU: Hon. members opposite had a different attitude last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I may say to my hon. friend from Brome, in connection with this matter, that friends may come and friends may go, but he and I, at any rate, will go on forever, and I also will support his resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): The hour is rather late, but I believe that this issue is of sufficient importance to warrant the few minutes I shall devote to its consideration. The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in his resolution, and in his most excellent presentation of the case, has given voice to a sentiment and emphasized a principle which I feel sure will receive very hearty endorsation from the people of the country. I wish to congratulate him on his splendid courage, and on the wisdom and moderation which he exhibited in the presentation of his arguments. "Behold a Liberal indeed, in whom is no guile."

I have been rather surprised, however, in the debate which has followed, that patriotism has not been emphasized very much. I do not think there is any class in Canada that is more apt to wave the flag and to prate about patriotism than parliamentarians in general, and we have not to look very far back to find where hon. gentlemen, who have taken part in this debate, waved the flag until the folds were almost worn out. But here is an opportunity for practical patriotism. This resolution calls upon the man of ability, who has proved that ability in the affairs of business, to give his service to the country, not his half-hearted efforts but his whole-hearted service, as well as his complete time, for which the country pays him and is grateful. And yet, not one single parliamentarian has lifted up his voice or waved the flag on this occasion. Surely this is worthy of patriotic emphasis.

Most of us agree with the central thought of the resolution, that no man can serve two masters, and that we are called upon to vote as to whom we will serve, or as to which master we wish to see our administrative representatives serving. It is very clear—and this is the point which has withstood the test of argument, for no one has challenged it so far as I have heard—that when a cabinet minister holds the position of director in any company he cannot give all his time to the service of the country, while at the same time there may be a clashing of interests. For this reason it is well that he should separate from one or the other, that he should be called upon to give his services in a patriotic sense to the nation, or else give his whole time to the industry which has claimed his attention so far.

I think it was the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) who submitted that no harm has been done by this old method. What an argument indeed! Have we been reduced to a miserable negation? Is that the only argument that the hon. member can put forward in support of his position? He very well knows that it is exceedingly difficult to prove whether any harm has been done in a direct sense; but, nevertheless, I am not so sure that we cannot prove in a general way that harm is being done and will be done. We have just had a bank collapse, and, as I understand it, one of its directors was a member of the late administration. He admitted that he had been giving attention to the Government and not to the institution that collapsed. Now, is it not reasonable to suppose that if he had been attending to the bank's business he would have known the condition it was in and would have warned the public, or perhaps even saved the institution? There is a case at least where harm did come. Is it not harmful where a man is so divided in his interests that he cannot give good service to one or the other?

No one will deny that throughout the country there is prevalent an idea that the financial interests, the railway interests, and the manufacturing interests have in the past had a very great deal too much to do with Canadian governments. As to whether that very settled opinion is well founded or not is another question, but the fact remains that a very large section of our people entertain it. Consequently, if we passed such a resolution as this, and implemented it with legislation, it would to some extent remove the ground for that opinion at least, and tend to establish greater confidence in administrative bodies.

If a corporation represents a man's life, as the hon. member for South Wellington put it, let that man stay with that corporation; there is no particular demand that he should give it up. Then the hon. member tried to give this argument a personal turn and mentioned specifically the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), who, he warned us, was the actual foundation of the present Government and who, if this resolution passed, might resign. I do not know the hon. member's authority for that statement, but personally I do not think that eventuality would be possible. I am willing to admit the greatness of the hon. Minister of Justice. I believe that every hon. member recognizes his ability, and would regret very much anything that would deprive him of the opportunity of serving his country at this time. But it is just because we believe in his greatness that we have no fear in passing this resolution, for surely such a great man as we believe him to be would not, because of a statutory prohibition, as it was termed by the Prime Minister, feel called upon to resign. We believe that the hon. Minister of Justice is too big a man to take such a course; on the contrary, we believe he would be patriotic and continue to serve his country notwithstanding such legislation. No one would imagine for a moment that the hon. minister would fail to rise to the opportunity for patriotic service afforded by this resolution. But let me put it another way: What would the people think of the hon. Minister of Justice if he should resign because this resolution was passed? There is the other side of the question. I do not believe they would think very much of him if he did resign; personally I think he would say: I have been selected to serve my country at a very critical time in her history, and I am going to rise to the patriotic level of this resolution and continue my services for the benefit of the nation.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister went around so many corners in his swift retirement from his previous position that I was not able to keep my eyes upon him, and consequently I cannot follow him in all the turnings he made. The argument which he so ably delivered to-night I am sure could have been delivered a year ago with equally good reason. If the argument put forward to-night is good, it was good a

year ago. I believe this is another evidence of the influence of the party system. Either the Opposition to the late administration were wrong in supporting that resolution, or they are wrong now in refusing to support it. In the one instance the Prime Minister was in opposition; now he is in power. Did the Prime Minister vote for a more drastic bill last year to give assurance to the electorate, as he put it, or did he vote for it to discredit the government then in power? Which was the reason then, and what is the reason now? Personally I regret very much that he feels it to be his duty on this occasion to back away from that position, for I do not think it will be taken as a high example by the young men of this Parliament that our Prime Minister so suddenly has forgotten the argument of his party and his own vote and stultified himself on this occasion. I do not think anyone who reads the argument in Hansard—if anyone ever troubles to do so—will feel that he has justified his action satisfactorily, if he was right last year, and I want to say again that I regret very much that he has seen fit to take this action on the present occasion.

The Prime Minister also referred to the practice in Great Britain. I should like to find out if there has been a single case in the last forty years where a member of the British Government has found it necessary to resign from the directorate of any company. If that is not so, what is the reason? Is it not that the members of the British House of Commons do not expect to be called to office if they hold directorships?

The hon. gentleman also made much of the defeat of Swift MacNeil's resolutions in the British House of Commons. Does he not know that they were voted down by Tory majorities? And is that the standard the Prime Minister of a Liberal Government sets up in the twentieth century? I hope it is not. Perhaps he overlooked that.

Then the leader of the Opposition of course comes along to make political capital out of this; and I think perhaps we were as tired of his argument as we were of the argument of the Prime Minister on this question. There is really no credit coming to the leader of a Tory party for not having moved,—because he cannot move. Everyone knows that that is an impossibility, for if he were moving he would not be a Tory, he would have to be something else. He is this year where he was last year; he will be there next year and all the years that are to come. And when he places himself right straight in the middle of the road of progress, we all know there is no necessity to make a long speech about it.

Next the hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) comes along, and he is very anxious to forget all about last year. No one blames him for that of course; that is quite human; I think I would want to forget it also. He told us that the argument of the hon. member for Brome unforunately came from the upper regions. Are we to understand that the answers to his argument come from the lower regions? I can see no other conclusion—and really, they sounded like it.

Then came the member for St. John and Albert (Mr. Baxter) swimming an uncharted sea without destiny or direction; and he begins by presuming to give the full interpretation of the resolutions that are passed in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman permit me?—he is apparently through with me: does he consider that consistency in public life is a political vice?

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any vice that is more vice-y than consistency that is blind consistency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Blind what?

Mr. IRVINE: Blind consistency. I was dealing with the statement of the hon. member for St. John, and I say he presumes to give the interpretation of the resolutions and bills that pass in this House. He even presumes to tell the Progressives what they voted for. I believe that the Progressives are quite capable of coming to their own conclusions upon resolutions, without any advice whatsoever from the hon. member for St. John. Now, as it happens, I did not agree with that vote that he referred to, but I think perhaps the Progressives were led into a trap. But if trap there was, it was laid by the party of which the hon. member himself is a member. If some of us were trapped by a Tory trick, it is not anything to boast about; we might as well forget it, and it would be well for the hon. member, I think, if he forgot it also. He went on to say that if we voted for a sham we would get it. Well, we know that, too. We have just had an excellent sham and I presume some did vote for it.

The resolution of the hon. member for Brome still stands, impregnable; his argu-

ments have not been touched. Hon. members who have spoken in opposition to it have brought up various arguments from their point of view, but I think that it will be agreed that those who wade through Hansard to-morrow will find the argument of the hon. member for Brome unanswered; it stands tier upon tier just as he built it up. We are called upon, then, to vote on the question whether we shall give the representatives of the Crown an opportunity of devoting all their time on a patriotic basis to the service of this country, or whether we shall hamper them or let them be hampered by other influences and their directorates and their companies. That is the issue, and I believe the people of Canada expect us to vote for this resolution.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I want to state first that I am opposed to the resolution of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and I wish to give this House my reasons for this opposition. This resolution, I believe, implies a departure from constitutional usage, and any legislation which might be adopted following this resolution would result in depriving the Cabinet of the services of a distinguished citizen, whom the people of his province and county entrusted with their confidence and, who is absolutely needed under the present circumstances for the good administration of Canada.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, if this resolution were adopted, that person, who enjoys the confidence of his fellow-countrymen would have no other alternative but to choose between the directorates conferred upon him by important companies and the distinction of being a minister of the Crown. Given such a case, the man who possesses the confidence of every one, would likely choose the directorates; and this is why it would be deplorable for our country to behold men so highly necessary and endowed with such intellectual powers, cast aside; it would be a misfortune indeed, if such men were denied all participation in the administration of public affairs. It would be detrimental to our country, and this is the reason why I shall not support this motion. I am convinced that the resolution of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is uncalled for and in support of my contention, I may say this. In the first place the country needs the services of able and intelligent men for the good administration of the country's business. The world over, able statesmen are scarce and when we do happen to possess such men, they should be called upon to take an active part in public affairs. In most cases, however, they have already been designated by their fellow-countrymen to fill the important directorship of these large financial companies. This entirely shows their remarkable aptitude and skill and it is incumbent on the country to entrust to them the management of public affairs. If this resolution were adopted, Mr. Speaker, we would be deprived of the benefit of having amongst our administrators men of experience and ability.

Secondly, in any constitutional government, there is a sacred duty which imposes itself upon a Prime Minister, the one of personally choosing his colleagues. But by this legislation you prevent the Prime Minister from calling upon those who are on these important directorships and who are highly qualified; you circumscribe his freedom of choice which it is most important should remain unimpaired, and you tell him: when you are selecting your Cabinet, you shall not be allowed to single out men who are directors of large companies; you shall have to ignore them; you shall have to choose men in whom you have not an absolute confidence, men who have not given proof of integrity and long experience.

My last argument is this: the purport of the resolution is to cast odium on the public man of the day. How? Because this man has private or personal duties to fulfil, you believe he is not broad-minded enough, when his country requests his services as minister of the Crown, to so engross the time in a disinterested manner; because this man has a pecuniary interest in a company, you throw open to doubt his love for his country. I repeat it, I believe this resolution is based on a false principle. I had no intention to take part in this discussion, but I changed my mind after listening to all the arguments which were brought out during this debate, especially to those put forward by the opposition and to those brought out by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Baxter). He stated that, not being a member of this House last year, he takes his cue in supporting the resolution, from the attitude then taken by his leader. For my part, I do not believe that we are inconsistent with our past in voting down the resolution of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), and this is why I deemed it my duty to make known to this House the reasons that have induced me to take such a stand.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): My only justification for speaking on this resolution at this late hour is its importance and the dearth of argument that has been submitted in its favour. To me this has been an evening of astonishment, not the least part of which was the statement a few moments ago by the hon. member for Last Mountain (Mr. Johnston) who, turning to this corner of the House, said that if his party ever got into difficulty they would not come to us for help, because we did not change. That statement was made in spite of the fact that only a few members in this corner of the House had spoken on this subject. He followed that up by saying in his next breath that men may come and men may go, but he and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) were going on forever. They never changed. I submit that if the hon. member has no more faith in our party and its desire to help forward anything that we believe to be in the interests of this country than he has in his own consistency, I do not blame him very much.

I believe this is a particularly important question to those of us who are in Parliament for the first time. Speaking for myself, I am not inclined to form a hasty opinion upon a subject of this kind. I looked for instruction, for inspiration, if you like, from those who were friendly to the measure. My only source of information has been the record of the debates of last session, which show that fifty-four members of the House were strongly in favour of this measure and voted for it a year ago. Strangely enough they are nearly all in one group to-night and prominent among them is the Prime Minister himself and many of his Cabinet. I had expected that the right hon. leader of the Government would give us some information in support of this measure which he advocated a year ago and let me point out that there is no argument against this resolution that was not just as applicable twelve months ago. As the right hon. leader of the Government has said he did not speak at any great length on this question a year ago. May I be permitted to quote a few sentences from one who is held in very high esteem not only by the Prime Minister himself and his party but by all parties and members of this House? The Prime Minister himself in his eulogy on appointing this hon. member to the position of First Commoner, spoke of his exceptional ability, his great endowments and his distinguished public service. In view of the well known modesty of the hon. gentleman who holds that high position I shall not refer to him more personally, but I am sure he will pardon me if I quote just a few sentences of his remarks in the debate on this question of last year, and which I am sure the Prime Minister himself applauded and concurred in. On page 592 of volume I of last year's Hansard I find this:

> I say is not the honour of being a minister of the Crown, the honour of being sworn in as a Privy Councillor, a reward by itself? In my humble judgment, no man should hesitate, when accepting that honour, to put aside his private interests . . . I say that it is in the interests of the ministers of the Crown, and of good government and of the good reputation of Parliament that public opinion should be satisfied that there are no conflicting interests between ministers as such and any directors of private concerns. . . . It strikes me, after having heard my hon. friend and the objections that were made by some of the hon. gentlemen on the other side—mild objections I must say—that this is a needed reform and one which is consistent with British traditions.

Surely in view of such a careful and well-worded pronouncement on this important subject, we could not look for anything but support of this resolution upon the part of those who were friendly to the measure last year. Among those to whom I particularly looked for guidance is the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie), the Solicitor General. I particularly looked to him because I had the pleasure of hearing him a few nights ago, when I was very much pleased with his eloquence and ability. Moreover, his apt quotations from Scripture show that he is at least in touch with a very high authority. So much was I impressed with his eloquence that I was not surprised, on looking up last year's debate to find that he used the words "Wash us and we shall be whiter than snow." I presume that in the meantime he has not forgotten the tune. That may not be necessary now; as it would have to be changed anyway to wash us over again, because to my surprise I find that some who advocated this measure a year ago have fallen from grace, not the least being the Prime Minister himself. I had expected that the hon. member for North Cape Breton would use his missionary powers and great ability in endeavouring to convince those of us who are new members, and are in a sense sitting in darkness, not to mention some of the older members who perhaps have exhibited somewhat sceptical tendencies. I seem, however, to be doomed to disappointment because evidently his time and abilities will be taken up in per-

suading the leader on his own side of the House. My hon. friend is very apt in quoting Scripture, so no doubt he remembers the parable of the ninety-nine sheep that were safe in the fold but one was wandering on the mountainside, and it is well-known what anxiety that caused. What, then, can we say on this occasion, when although there are ninety-nine safe in the fold, one is lost in the wilderness, and that is the bell-wether, the leader of the flock. Surely, if missionary work is necessary, it is necessary on that side of the House, and we on this side of the House will probably be denied the privilege of that much-needed persuasive power.

12 m.

I might also have looked for enlightenment to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), who last year supported this measure. We all know his undoubted ability and eloquence although he has not been particularly generous to the House in that respect this session. I had hopes that he had been reserving his powers in order to try and get this resolution carried by a large majority. Perhaps it is not too late yet for the hon. member for North Cape Breton to secure assistance from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in endeavouring to convince those of us who need information and are in a sense still wandering in darkness.

Speaking seriously, there are something like one hundred and thirty new members in this House, who are anxiously looking to those who have been here and understand the needs of the country, and are in a position to give direction and guidance to those of us who are learning. Are we to be told by the fifty-four members who voted in favour of this measure last year, that the facts and arguments they made in support of it then are not now to be taken seriously? Surely any arguments that could be made in support of the measure last year are equally applicable to-day. Surely now, when the sun of democracy is shining and responsible government has again been restored, we may look for stronger and better guidance in the future.

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto): I did not intend to speak upon this debate, but after what has been said on the subject I would like to say a few words. This is private members' day, but I think it should be called Brome day. The speech of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) should be enough to let the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) know that his friends have all forsaken him and fled.

The principle embodied in this resolution is an academic one. I do not know what object the hon. gentleman has in introducing the motion. He cannot accomplish anything by it because if it is carried it will not have any effect and will merely be a scrap of paper. The privilege which has been attacked by the resolution has not been abused by the late government nor by the present Government, and I think the present Government should be given a fair show. There are only one or two members of the Government holding directorships. I think the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) was one of the best provincial premiers the province of Quebec ever had. I am sorry he is not here to-day. Judging from what he has done for the municipalities he has accomplished more than any previous premier ever did. He has erected court houses, registry offices and other public buildings for the municipalities in his province. He has done more for the municipalities of the province of Quebec in this connection than has been done in any province of the Dominion.

If there was ever a time in the history of this country, both in Dominion and provincial affairs when the country wanted business men, it is the present. In my province of Ontario we have a government without a single business man in it. Look at the loans they have made and the financial statement in the budget brought down in the Ontario legislature. They say they have a surplus, but nearly a million of maintenance charges has been put into capital. That is the way they run the province. The privilege dealt with in this resolution has not been abused by the present Government. One or two of the ministers hold some directorships but the passing of this resolution will not mean anything to them. They will not lose any directorships by it.

I may say to my hon. friend from Brome, and my friends, the Progressives, that if they went a little farther up than the mere directorships it would be better for the country and the proposition would commend itself to the judgment of the country. Let them take up the question of the banks and their business methods. Let them deal with the question of the Merchant's Bank which had a president who did not preside, directors who did not direct, managers who did not manage and auditors who did

not audit. If that matter were investigated something might be accomplished for the country in that direction.

This motion would not prevent shareholders in these large concerns from becoming members of Parliament or Cabinet ministers and probably a large shareholder would be far more injurious to the company if he were in the Cabinet than a director could. The motion does not refer to corporation lawyers and legal counsel. Can they too be retained in the Cabinet to the exclusion of those who are directors? This principle has been discussed in England and it has not been adopted there. They leave the matter to the honour of the ministers. I think we have a very honourable body of ministers here. The Prime Minister must be a responsible officer and has very responsible duties to perform. The ministers work in the mornings, afternoons and evenings. I do not know what time they get to attend to their own affairs or the affairs of any company with which they might be connected. I do not think that the privilege I have referred to has been abused. The principle of the motion may be all right in some respects, but there is no demand for it in the country or in the House, and I do not understand why the time of the House should be taken up with it. The Minister of Justice has given up directorships in La Presse, in The Cockshutt Plow Co. of Brantford, a six million dollar concern, and one or two others, I think. I believe we might leave this matter to the ethics and to the honour of the gentlemen of the Cabinet. There is no demand and no necessity for the resolution and I do not see how any good can come of it. I hope the House will not take up any more time and I ask that the vote will be taken.

Mr. JOSEPH T. SHAW (West Calgary): I think, with all due deference to the member for North Toronto, (Mr. Church) who has just preceded me, that this matter is one of vital importance to the people of this country. I am not concerned as to whether or not the attitude of the Prime Minister is due to what I might term conscientious inconsistency, or perhaps due to party exigency, nor yet am I concerned with the problem of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) as to whether he is standing to-day where he stood yesterday, and where he proposes to stand in the future. It seems to me the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has presented to this House a very important and very essential principle, and that, in the discussion which has taken place, and the desire to make party capital out of this situation, we have ignored the question at issue.

The first thing I should like to direct attention to is the fact that the resolution, as compared with last year's resolution, is very much narrower and is confined to what I might call public service corporations, using the term as used by the good people to the south of us. These corporations are the ones which must, of necessity, come frequently to this Parliament, and must very frequently make applications which are passed upon, approved, or disapproved by this Parliament. For instance, the railway companies are under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. The cabinet, the executive of this House, sits in appeal from that Railway Commission from time to time, or may do so. Then take the situation with regard to banks; these institutions are, as one writer has stated, the manufacturers of credit on other peoples' money; they must, at regular intervals, make reports to the Finance Minister, and those reports are subject to inspection by this parliament from time to time. Not only that, but I believe it is the practice every ten years to revise the Bank Act under which they operate. Then again, we have insurance companies, which also are peculiarly under the jurisdiction of Parliament. That, to my mind, is the distinguishing characteristic between the corporations mentioned in the resolution and the private corporations which were included in the resolution of the hon. gentleman from Brome introduced last year. These, as I say, are public service corporations. They are corporations which are performing public functions, and, in that sense, they are perhaps performing a duty of government.

What is the position of a director in one of those companies? He stands, of course, as a trustee for the shareholders. It is his duty to advise on matters of policy, to direct the government and to preserve and to enlarge, if need be, the assets of his company. On the other hand, what is the position of a minister before this House? And I, from my standpoint, see absolutely no distinction between the position of the first minister of the Crown and that of any other Cabinet minister. He is here simply as a trustee, entrusted, perhaps, for a short time or, perhaps, for a longer period with responsibility from his constituents and from this House. He is the trustee of the people and the executive

trustee of this Parliament. Under those circumstances, if a man occupies a dual capacity, as a director in a public service corporation and, at the same time, as one of the executive of this House, with the necessity, as I suggested at the outset, for supervision or inspection of his company at various times and in various ways, is it not possible that, at some time or upon some occasion, his interest as director may conflict with his duty as trustee of this House? That, I take it is in short, the neat point for discussion now, and the question is not one of whether somebody took a position six or twelve months ago inconsistent with the position now assumed. That is a matter of special significance, perhaps, at a time like this when institutions, including even this institution in common with all other governmental institutions, are being questioned and analyzed as never before by the people at large. It is absolutely essential that the independence of Parliament should be preserved; that there should not be even the slightest breath of suspicion regarding the conduct of any minister of the Crown in connection with his relation to any private or public corporation.

It is the plain duty and responsibility of this House to see that no one shall be put into such a position of difficulty by having to act in a dual capacity, and if he is, by circumstances, put into that position, then he should resign the directorship or his position as a minister of the Crown. Not only is this in the interest of Parliament itself; but, to my mind, it is equally in the interest of the corporations affected. These corporations have, perhaps, secured much money on the strength of the particular members mentioned as directors. Men of every class and walk in life are, perhaps, expecting, and reasonably so, that these particular individuals as directors will give all their time, energy, and talent to the care of their corporations. Not only are their interests involved; but the interests, perhaps, of hundreds of other people are likewise involved. Therefore, it occurs to me that, while it is a proper thing for a minister upon his appointment to resign his directorships, I think we should have on the statute books of Canada legislation affirming this resolution, so that no one can be put into that dual position. We should divorce private interest from public duty, by a statutory prohibition of this Parliament. I shall, therefore, have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Brome.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, may I direct attention to just one point, to which, I think, attention has not yet been called, and that is the absolute necessity that there should exist in this country some body that will protect the people from the arbitrary power of these great corporations? Within the past few years, as we all recognize, there has been a shifting of power from the political to the industrial field. In the olden days, when industry was a small affair, the employer had comparatively little power. To-day, when industry is on such a large scale, the employer has power such as those in political power know nothing whatever about. We sometimes have talked of captains of industry, of princes of finance, of money kings. These terms are significant of a real state of affairs, because, in many respects, the men, who are at the head of our big industrial, commercial and financial affairs, have more real authority than those who occupy prominent positions in the political life of the country. It has been stated that whoever controls a man's job—I am speaking as a Labour man—controls his life. That is true; whoever controls a man's job, controls his very livelihood, and if he has no one who can stand between him and arbitrary power, his case is perfectly hopeless. Within the last few years we have witnessed a great concentration of capital in this country, so that to-day the big financial institutions determine whether or not there shall be production; they determine in what branch of industry there shall be production, and upon what terms that production shall be carried on. That being the case, it seems to me that it is absolutely essential that, in some way, there should be an impartial authority absolutely dissociated from those big interests, which can protect the people of Canada from the arbitrary power which those industries have gradually attained.

The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) referred to a chart which had been prepared and which showed the interlocking directorates to which he made reference. He gave no names of directors, giving only the numbers, doing this in order that no personalities might enter into the discussion.

Mr. McMASTER: Was that not a wise thing?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: It may have been a wise thing. I can quite understand the position of the hon. member for Brome.

As, however, the discussion has gone on, reference has been made to the one member of the cabinet who is included in the list given by the hon. member for Brome. Some days ago I was furnished, not by the hon. member for Brome, but by a friend who had evidently been working on the same proposition, with a graph of this character, based, I believe, upon the Canadian Annual Financial Review of June, 1921. It seems to me that a graph of this kind ought to be placed definitely before the people of Canada, and they would then have no doubt as to the absolute necessity of this body making some provision for preventing power being placed in the hands of a few men such as we have here. As the hon. member for Brome was reading the list, I was checking this particular graph with his, and I think it is the same graph as it represents the same figures, the total capital controlled being something like $4,295,000,000. The names of the fifteen men who each have directorship in from two to eight of these big companies or corporations are as follows: 1, Sir Augustus Nanton; 2, Sir John Aird; 3, Sir Edmund Osler; 4, Lt.-Governor Cockshutt; 5, E. W. Beatty; 6, Sir Vincent Meredith; 7, Baron Shaughnessy; 8, Sir Lomer Gouin; 9, Sir Herbert Holt; 10, Sir Charles Gordon; 11, C. R. Hosmer; 12, Hon. R. Dandurand; 13, J. E. Aldred; 14, C. E. Neill; 15, E. L. Pease.

It seems to me there is no particular reason, if these men are occupying the most honoured positions in the country, why their names should not be generally known to the public, in order that their position in society should be recognized. I quite realize the fact that they have attained this position because of considerable business ability and all that kind of thing. It is not a matter of impugning their personal integrity in any sense whatever, but it is a question as to how the public itself can in some way control the great power which has gradually been concentrated in the hands of a comparatively small group of men. The resolution of the member for Brome would look to the separation of the Cabinet, on the one hand, from the power which is exercised by great corporations on the other. That may be a temporary measure; but it is in the right direction. The public generally is not going to be satisfied until, in some way, not only do we insist that Parliament shall not be directly controlled by these great corporations, but that, on the other hand, in some way, right within the corporations themselves, there shall be introduced a very large measure of democracy. Political democracy was the watchword of the last generation, and we are all glad to think that we have attained a certain measure of political democracy. But political democracy is an absolutely hollow thing unless we have industrial democracy as well. This resolution which has been presented to day is simply the first step in controlling these great aggregations of capital which have placed almost unlimited power in the hands of small groups. For that reason I believe I am expressing the opinion of a large group of at least the labour and middle class people in this country when I urge that the resolution be adopted.

Mr. McMASTER: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I will not be long in my closing remarks, but there are just a few things which I think, in justice to myself, and I hope, in the interest of the country, I should say. I will deal with the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King). In his eloquent observations he made the statement that I had wrongly interpreted the practice in Great Britain, and that in 1896 a committee of the House of Commons had sat for the purpose of considering the question whether it would be wise to more stringently draw the rules of the House of that great Parliament along the lines of, although not quite precisely in accordance with, my resolution of to-night. It is quite true that it was decided not to change the rules of that House, but that decision was arrived at by a vote of six to five. The five that voted for the purpose of amending the rules, more in the spirit of the resolution I have before the House to-night, were, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Courtney, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. MacNeill, while those who were opposed to any change were Mr. Bonsor, Sir W. Hart-Dyke, Mr. Halsey, Mr. Grant Lawson, the Solicitor General and Mr. Woodhouse. Now, I respectfully suggest that the five who voted in support of the principle I now advocate are well worth the six on the other side.

The Prime Minister stated that I had no ground for believing that anything untoward had happened in connection with his administration, and I would assure you, Mr. Speaker, I would assure him, I would assure this House, and I would assure this country, that I never suggested for one moment that there was anything untoward in any action of this Government. In bringing this matter before the House, what

have I done? I have simply done what I did last year with the enthusiastic co-operation of the Prime Minister himself. Not only in the debate which has been referred to, as to the advisability of directors in large companies being ministers of the Crown at the same time, but in another debate, was the attitude of the party plainly set forth. There was that debate provoked by me in connection with the railway estimates, in a speech which I made showing the inadvisability of members of the board of directors of the National Railways being also members of the board of directors of any company who might sell things to the railway. It was not precisely the same case, but it was precisely the same principle; for what is the principle? Without imputing wrongdoing to any one, I say that the principle is that a man should not be put in a position where either his personal interest or his fiduciary interest can conflict with any other fiduciary interest. That position was assumed by me on that occasion. I made a speech then late in the evening, and the Prime Minister did me the great compliment of placing largely the same facts before the House in his own budget speech. He did me the further compliment of placing those facts before the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The principles are not the same. The case of members of the board of directors of the railways purchasing for the railways from companies on the boards of which they are also directors, is not parallel to the principle now under consideration. If similar action were attempted by a minister of the Crown he would be disqualified in five minutes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the Bank of Montreal not dealing with the Government now every day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all in that direct way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and to the extent of millions.

Mr. McMASTER: If I might interject myself into the debate, if I remember the circumstances correctly, and I think I do, it was not charged by me or by the Prime Minister that directors of the national railways who were directors in other companies had been selling. The point I made was that they belonged to companies which might sell, and therefore it was improper for them to be also directors in the national railways, who might buy from the companies in which they were concerned. There was a possibility of a conflicting fiduciary interest. Now, let us take the question of banks. I do so frankly, and I would point out to the House that I was careful in my introductory remarks to avoid any personality at all. It is a principle that I am advocating, and I try to keep away from personalities altogether. Let us put the case in a suppositious way. Suppose there were a minister of the Crown who was a director in a bank. Suppose that bank were doing work for the government. Do not even suppose that; suppose the bank were only doing what banks are obliged to do every month, sending in returns to the government. Suppose my right hon. friend were in power; what position would he take in regard to his Minister of Marine and Fisheries, say, when it was found that the bank of which he was a director had to be charged with having sent in false returns to the government. What position would my right hon. friend be in, and what position would his Minister of Marine and Fisheries be in if such a situation existed? I do not need to stress the point, Mr. Speaker. The thing is so patent that it is inadvisable to have ministers of the Crown directors also of banks.

Now, I spoke about interlocking directorates. The Prime Minister said: Well, interlocking directorates should be treated as such. I ask: By whom? By this Parliament, which may contain certain members in the Cabinet who are also members of these companies whose directorates interlock? It seems to me that whatever our opinion may be about the advisability or inadvisability of interlocking directorates, we should see to it that the interlocking does not pass into the Cabinet chamber. That is the position I am putting before the House to-night; I think it is reasonable.

It is true the Prime Minister seems to think that there is plenty of protection in the Senate and House of Commons Act, extracts from which he quoted. Now, if there was not an exception—which he did not read—permitting a company of which a member is a shareholder, dealing with the Government, what he said would, I think, be quite accurate and the necessity for this resolution would to a certain extent disappear. But it seems to me that whether a man is a director or merely a shareholder in the company, the fact that he is such does not prevent the company from dealing

with the Government. I think that is a correct interpretation of the law.

Shareholders need not give up their shares; that is quite true. I am sorry that I seem to find myself in the unfortunate position of not being able to please anyone. Last year my right hon. friend situated angularly opposite said that my resolution went too far, and now my critic seems to think that my motion does not go far enough.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is looking in my direction. I did not say that. I took objection to it on principle as not meeting the case at all.

Mr. McMASTER: I stand corrected then. But last year I remember my right hon. friend saying: Why, you are trying to imply that a minister should not even have the interest that his family gives him. And I recollect saying, with the former Minister of Trade and Commerce, Sir George Foster, in front of me, that it would be impossible to impose celibacy on his government. Shareholders need not give up their shares; that is quite true. I am not going on the assumption that there is something wrong. If there are dishonest men in public life, they will be dishonest no matter what legislation is passed; but what I do say is that we should try to prevent a possible conflict of fiduciary interest. The Prime Minister has said that leaders of political parties should not accept directorships. I agree with him. But I do not agree with him if he sets a higher standard for himself than for members of his government, because my view is that all the members of the Government, especially in view of our constitutional principle of solidarity, stand more or less on the same footing—that the Prime Minister is merely primus inter pares.

My hon. friend stated that my resolution would deprive him of the ability of leading business men. Now, that is exactly contrary to what I wish by my resolution. If first class business men go into the Cabinet, I wish them to be absolutely "off with the old love before they are on with the new" —I wish them to be in a position to devote their whole time and attention to the affairs of the Government. I am of opinion that men of ability, no matter how rich they are, will be glad to do this if they have the proper spirit which we wish to see manifested in our public men.

The Prime Minister implied that in bringing forward this resolution I had given way to a sentiment of juvenile audacity; that I should leave such questions for older and wiser heads.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I was speaking entirely about myself.

Mr. McMASTER: That just shows how one may misunderstand even one's friends. I must no longer detain the House. I have merely one argument to make, and that is in reply to something said by the right hon. leader of the official Opposition. He said: Under this resolution proposed by the member for Brome you might have in the Cabinet men representing the British Empire Steel Corporation and the Dominion Textile Company; that there is nothing to prevent great industrial corporations having their directors in the Cabinet; and the member for Brome says that that is all right. Of course, my right hon. friend sometimes exaggerates. I never said that that is all right. I grant that that abuse is not specifically covered by this resolution. I grant the difficulty of keeping out certain companies and saying that the directors of those companies should not be in the Cabinet. What I have done is to pick out those classes of companies the directors of which have a particular fiduciary relation to their shareholders; thus the banks look after the money of the people, the trust companies look after the estates of the people. The companies I have picked out are large companies, companies which are very powerful and whose operations affect the whole people. It is possible that my resolution does not go far enough, but I say it is a step in the right direction and I trust it will meet with the approval of this House.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. McMaster), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,	Gould,
Binette,	Halbert,
Bird,	Hammell,
Black (Huron),	Hodgins,
Brethen,	Hoey,
Brown,	Humphrey,
Caldwell,	Irvine,
Campbell,	Jelliff,
Carmichael	Johnson (Moosejaw),
Coote,	Johnston (Last Mountain),
Drummond,	Kellner,
Elliott (Dundas),	Kennedy (Edmonton),
Evans,	Kennedy (Glengarry & Stormont),
Fansher,	Kennedy (Port Arthur & Kenora),
Findlay,	King (Huron),
Forke,	
Gardiner,	
Good,	

Knox,
Leader,
Lewis,
Lovie,
Lucas,
Macphail,
McConica,
McDonald,
McMaster,
McTaggart,
Milne,
Pritchard,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Thurston,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—59.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Baxter,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Black (Yukon),
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bureau,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Duncan,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Graham,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hubbs,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Jacobs,
Jones,
Kay,
Kennedy (Essex),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Léger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald,
MacKelvie,
Mackinnon,
MacLaren,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
McBride,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McKillop,
McMurray,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Power,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Simpson,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Stein,
Stevens,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Lanark),
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Vien,
Walsh,
Wilson—142.

PAIRS

The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips is as follows:

Messrs.

Crerar, Blackadder,

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 52, respecting The Canadian Transit Company—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 53, respecting Itabira Corporation Limited, and to change its name to "Itabira Corporation".—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEW CANADIAN LOAN

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Before the House adjourns, may I be permitted to announce a very important financial transaction which has just been closed. The Government have sold $100,000,000 of Canadian bonds to Messrs. J. P. Morgan and Company of New York. The bonds will be placed on the market to-morrow at par, bearing interest at five per cent, for a thirty-year period, callable after twenty years. The Government, of course have to pay commission to the banks, but the bonds will be offered to the public to-morrow in New York.

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask the Prime Minister what will be the business to-morrow, aside from rejoicing over further debt?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will take up estimates of the Department of Railways as they affect civil government. Then we will go on with Militia and Defence, and, if we finish those, with Indian Affairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the Railway Department, only civil government?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.08 a.m., Tuesday.

Tuesday, April 25, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

DEBATES COMMITTEE

Mr. GEO. H. BOIVIN (Shefford) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of Debates, as follows:

TUESDAY, 25th April, 1922.

The Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates beg leave to present the following as their First Report:

Your Committee have had under consideration certain matters relating to the publication in the Official Report of the Debates, of answers to questions which must necessarily take the form of long and elaborate tabulated statements covering matter not read in the House and not always of immediate and general public interest.

Your Committee considers:—

1. That the publication of the said answers greatly increases and complicates the work of the Printing Bureau, augments the chance of error and endangers the prompt issue of the Official Report of the Debates;

2. That the printing of the said answers greatly increases the expense of the publication of the said Official Report;

3. That the rights and interests of the members of this House and of the general public would be thoroughly safeguarded by the passing of such questions as Orders for Returns, leaving to the Joint Committee on Printing the responsibility of deciding which of the said returns are of sufficient public interest to warrant printing and publication;

4. That the said returns are always available to members in the office of the Clerk of Sessional Papers;

Your Committee recommend that in future any question placed upon the Order Paper, the answer to which must take the form of long and elaborate tables or tabulated forms, shall at the request of the Minister laying the answer upon the table of the House, be passed as an order for a return as provided by section 4 of Rule 37 of the Rules of the House of Commons.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

GEO. H. BOIVIN,
Chairman.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 56, to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. ETHIER: The purpose of this bill is to designate the court before which the petition shall be presented. Paragraph 4 of section 4 of the Bankruptcy Act is amended by strikng out the word "locality" and substituting therefore the words "judicial district", in order to avoid costs to creditors. I will make a fuller explanation on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

CURRENCY ACT AMENDMENT

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), it was resolved that the House do go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Schedule to The Currency Act, 1910, as amended by chapter nine of the statutes of 1920, by changing the millesimal fineness of silver coins from 4 to 6, and by providing that this enactment shall apply to silver coins heretofore struck since the first day of January, 1920, and also to amend the said Schedule, as amended by chapter six of the statutes of 1921, by striking out the millesimal fineness of nickel five cent coins.

PENNY BANK ACT

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), it was resolved that the House do go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Penny Bank Act, chapter thirty-one of the Revised Statutes of Canada, by providing that a proportion not exceeding one-half of such moneys as are received on deposit elsewhere than at the place where the chief office of the bank is situated may be deposited by the bank in such chartered banks or other financial institutions as the Minister of Finance may designate as depositaries, and to provide for withdrawals from such depositaries.

CANADA GRAIN ACT

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. THOMAS SALES (Saltcoats): I should like to draw the attention of the Government to this despatch which appears in this morning's Citizen, under date of Winnipeg, April 24:

The Manitoba court of appeal to-day delivered judgment in the stated case of The King versus the Manitoba Grain Company, declaring section 215 of the Canada Grain Act ultra vires of the federal parliament. This section of the act stated that "no person shall engage in the business of selling grain on commission or receive or solicit consignments of grain for sale on commission, in the western inspection division, without first obtaining such annual license from the board.

The appeal arose from a conviction registered in the provincial police court last year, when Magistrate R. M. Noble fined the Manitoba Grain Company $500 for selling grain without a license. The case has aroused considerable interest owing to the fact that the validity of the Canada Grain Act was attacked by counsel for the defendant company. At the time of the conviction Magistrate Noble granted a stated case.

In this connection I should like to ask the Government what action it intends to take in this matter in order that producers of grain may be protected from the many

mushroom grain companies which will inevitably spring up now that sections of the Canada Grain Act are held to be ultra vires.

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): I have looked over the record and I find that two cases were instituted in the Manitoba Court of Appeal in connection with the very same affair. One was laid on 21st October, 1921, and the other on 31st December, 1921. I am informed by my officials that there were two stated cases. As we did not know exactly in what case judgment was rendered, we wired this morning asking for copies of the judgment rendered yesterday, and as soon as we are in possession of that judgment, we shall be in a position to inform the hon. member on the subject.

NEW CANADIAN LOAN

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like, with the permission of the House, to make an announcement which, I am sure will be received with pleasure on all sides of the House. Late last night, or to be more accurate, this morning before the House adjourned, I stated that the Government had sold $100,000,000 of Canadian bonds in New York, and that they would be placed on the market to-day. I have pleasure in announcing that the books were opened in New York this morning; that the loan is a complete success; that it has been over subscribed, and that the books are closed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I notice that in the announcement of the Minister of Finance yesterday, it was stated that certain commissions were to be taken off. What were they?

Mr. FIELDING: The Government received a net price of 97½. The bankers were free to place the loan on the market at any price not exceeding par. They placed it at par and that leaves the bankers and brokers concerned 2½ per cent for their services.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That would be $2,500,000 on the issue?

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend's calculation is correct, that is right.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No doubt my hon. friend knows whether I am right or not; I make it $2,500,000. Now, in view of the very immediate success of this loan, properly mirroring, as it does, the extreme high standing of this country and the large amount of idle money at present locked up in New York, is my hon. friend quite sure that he has not made this loan altogether too generous in favour of the American investor?

Mr. FIELDING: I shall be glad to discuss that question at a later stage, and particularly to place it in comparison with the commissions allowed on some loans placed by my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think there is a novel provision in connection with this issue, under which any unfortunate subscriber who desires to live in Canada in the future is to be taxed, while the subscriber who stays in the United States is not to be taxed. I suppose this has nothing to do with any immigration policy that the Government contemplates.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friends opposite sometimes accuse us of following their example. It is a rather bad thing to do, because their example is not always a good one. In this case, however, the provision in that bond with respect to taxation is copied from an issue made by my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the issue made by us was in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING: I am referring to an issue made in the United States. However, if we are to talk seriously on this question, we cannot tax an American citizen in the United States; but if this bond at any time is held by a citizen in Canada, subject to the laws of Canada, it must pay the tax.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Railways and Canals—salaries, $191,970; contingencies, $29,500.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Essex, Minister of Railways and Canals): There is very little, if any, change as compared with last year. The vote is less and the number of employees fewer than was the case last year; but I may say, in justice to my predecessor, that this reduction was made before I took charge in January last. During the time I have been in office there have been no new appointments. There are two vacancies, one caused by death and the other by resignation. The increases in vote are statutory, and the change in the designation of certain em-

ployees is the result of the reclassification. When I took charge I told the deputy minister that I was anxious that we should have efficiency, first of all, but with that efficiency we should economize as far as possible. I believe that these estimates have been prepared with that end in view. As we proceed I shall be glad to give any explanations that may be required.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): There are four increases in salaries to the higher-paid officials of this department, three increases of $180 each and one of $300. As the minister says, these are statutory increases, but I desire to make an observation with reference to the salaries of the higher-paid officials. In the consideration of civil government estimates for some of the other departments, the opinion was expressed, from both groups on this side of the House, that, having regard to the general tendency towards deflation, the salaries of the higher-paid officials might very well be left on the basis of 1921. In connection with this department, in regard to which I have some little knowledge, I think that if the higher-paid officials had directed their unquestioned talents to private and corporate interests with the same devotion as they have applied themselves to the public service, they would be in receipt of very much larger salaries than are provided in these estimates. I entirely support the vote under consideration.

I have no intention of precipitating any general discussion on the railway situation under this vote, as I understand it to be the custom, under the civil government vote, to confine the discussion exclusively to matters of civil government, the general policy with regard to the railways being discussed on the general estimates. But I want to ask the minister a question which, I think, is pertinent, even at this time. The Toronto Globe has been for so long a time intimately associated with the Liberal party and its policies that, in Ontario at least, an editorial statement by that journal is taken as carrying almost the same force as an expression of government policy when the Liberal party is in power. I wish to refer to the leading editorial in the Globe of yesterday. That editorial, dealing with the question of the National Railways, contains two statements:

> The Globe believes there are big enough men in the ranks of Canada's railway operators to carry the national system to success, and that Mr. Kennedy will discover and make use of their talents. Some of them will doubtless be found in the service of the Canadian National and the Grand Trunk; some may even be drawn from the Canadian Pacific.

Further on it says:

> In the end, perhaps, it may be found that there is room within the National System for the C.P.R. itself on terms that will be equitable alike to its shareholders and to the public.

The question I would ask the minister is, does the editorial in the Globe reflect the policy of the Government? Is the policy of the Government in accord with that editorial; or is that editorial intended as a feeler to test public opinion in reference to this important matter?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Like everyone else in the province of Ontario who reads the Globe, I pay considerable attention to its editorials, and I had the pleasure of reading the editorials in question. My hon. friend, as a former minister of this department, knows that the minister is also receiving suggestions as to what he should do in railway matters. The Globe, I suppose, has, like many other papers, kindly made suggestions. Beyond that I do not know anything about the editorial. I would say that it reflects simply the ideas of the editor. As to its reflecting the policy of the Government, I have no doubt that the Government will lay down its own policy when the right time comes.

Mr. HANSON: The right-of-way agent is Mr. Fraser, I believe. Is he confining his duties to the old National railways, or is he right-of-way agent for the whole system?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): He is the departmental right-of-way agent and does work in the East that may be necessary for the department and for the railways also.

Mr. MacKELVIE: My excuse for asking the minister a question which would more naturally be considered under the main estimates is that it would relieve considerable anxiety on the part of a number of my constituents if I could have some assurance from him that the pronouncement he made when these estimates were last under discussion, that no new rails would be laid this year, is not, like the laws of Medes and Persians, entirely unchangeable. I have in mind, Sir, that road of which I have no doubt you have some knowledge—the branch line running from Kamloops to Kelowna through the Okanagan Valley. That road has been practically completed for two years so far as the grade is concerned, at an ex-

penditure of five million dollars, involving, of course, a very heavy annual charge for interest, while the depreciation on the roadbed at a conservative estimate must amount to 20 per cent per annum. Good and ample justification could be given for the completion of that line this summer in order that it may be ready to handle this season's fruit and vegetable crops. This road would be second to no other branch line as a feeder for the National railways, and the minister will, I am sure, agree that our National railway system stands very much in need of additional business. The latest figures I have available are for 1919, when from three stations in that district, Armstrong, Vernon, and Kelowna, 320 full cars of fruit and vegetables were shipped and 165,000 odd packages of express; in addition there were shipments of live stock, hay and other products. One section of that line passes through the Salmon river district in which lies probably the most valuable gypsum deposits in the world; they are practically one hundred per cent pure.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that this subject hardly comes under "Civil Government."

Mr. MacKELVIE: I was going to crave the indulgence of yourself, Mr. Chairman, and the minister, for the reason I gave at the outset. I am deluged with telegrams and resolutions from the local Boards of Trade asking for an immediate response, and if the minister could give some assurance to allay their anxiety I should be much obliged. He has a reputation, well earned I am sure, of being a thorough business man.. For business reasons alone the outlay necessary to complete this line could be amply justified.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Like my hon. friend, I have had many representations in connection with this particular line. But may I say to him that his district is not alone in making representations for railway accommodation? From all parts of the West I have had similar representations of their transportation needs. The policy of the Government in respect to the laying of new lines this year is simply this: We felt that, the new board coming in, the responsibility for any capital expenditure should properly belong to that board, and that for the time being, until they have had an opportunity of ascertaining whether the expenditure would be warranted, we should not go on with any new work. However, we are impressed with the necessity of doing something in the district my hon. friend has mentioned, and I can promise him that when the new board is appointed every consideration will be given to the matter.

Item agreed to.

Militia and Defence—Allowances, Active Militia, $120,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry? Carried.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I think some of us heard the word "carried" before we got to the page. This is rather too important an item to be carried without any discussion whatever, and we would like a statement from the minister in reference to it.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): I hardly expected it to go through so rapidly as that.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: You are quite right.

Mr. GRAHAM: The militia estimates, I might say, have been pared down to a point as low as is compatible with national safety; in fact, I have been criticized quite severely for some of the reductions. I think it is well that Parliament should discuss this question. Our militia force was not a mushroom or accidental growth, it took a good many years of development before Canada became of sufficient importance and exercised autonomy to such a marked degree that she undertook her own militia defence. The matter was discussed in the Imperial Parliament on several occasions, and it is a well-known fact that not a few of the members of the British House of Commons and some members of the British cabinet opposed Canada being allowed—if I may put it in that form—to have control of her militia, because it was feared that it would tend to encourage the idea of too great independence and would weaken the tie that binds us to the Motherland. That fear, of course, has been dispelled, because the principle enunciated by Lord Grey as far back as 1851 has been fully borne out by our subsequent history, namely, that the greater the responsibility you place on what might be called the subordinate body, the stronger becomes its attachment to the head. So it has been with the Dominion, as year by year she has developed, greater responsibility has been placed upon her to manage her own affairs, and instead of the tie that binds us to the Motherland being weakened, that

tie has been strengthened. The further we go along these lines, the greater freedom we have to manage our own affairs, the more devoted do we become to the Mother Country and the stronger do we grow as one of the great self-governing dominions of the British Empire. Now, if the House will permit me to show what I mean by these few remarks, I will read what Lord Grey, then Colonial Secretary, wrote to the Governor General of Canada in 1851, when this question was being discussed:

> Canada in common with the other British provinces in North America now possesses in the most ample and complete manner in which it is possible that she should enjoy it, the advantage of self-government in all that relates to her internal affairs. It appears to Her Majesty's Government that the advantage ought to carry with it corresponding responsibility and that the time has now come when the people of Canada must be called upon to take upon themselves a larger share than they have hitherto borne of the expenses which have incurred on their account and for their advantage. Of these expenses, by far the heaviest charge which falls upon this country is that incurred for the military protection of the provinces. Looking to the rapid progress which Canada is now making in wealth and population and to the prosperity which she at this moment enjoys, it is the conviction of Her Majesty's Government that it is only due to the people of this country that they should now be relieved from a large proportion of this charge which has hitherto been imposed upon them for the protection of a colony now well able to do much towards protecting itself.

Canada undertook her own protection, but it was not until 1904 that the British troops at Halifax were withdrawn and our troops took their place.

Now, we have undertaken, and rightly so as a self-respecting people, our own defence. The question that confronts us to-day is; how far should we go, and what should be the extent of our expenditure in this direction? The people of the Motherland, yes, Mr. Chairman, and the people of the entire world, have had the knowledge impressed upon them during the last few years that when it comes to defending what we believe is right, the young men, and the old men, of Canada—and the women too—have done their duty and done it nobly. We have not only a tradition to carry on, we have a duty to ourselves to perform, and the militia must be maintained at a point where it will be able to protect us from internal disorder as well as from external aggression. I am of opinion and fondly hope, as we all do, that it will be many, many years before we will be called upon to go through such a deluge of war as we experienced a few years ago. But even though we may never be involved in another war, we have a duty to perform through our militia in maintaining domestic order.

Now, are we to have a militia, and is that militia to be kept at proper strength? The answer can only be in the affirmative if we are a self-respecting nation. We must have a permanent militia force, as well as a volunteer force, for conditions that may arise within our own borders. We owe that as a duty to ourselves. But at the present time our permanent force is not of sufficient strength to preserve internal order. That is an absolute fact. Under our law hon. gentlemen, and the hon. lady (Miss Macphail) too, will understand that when disorder is threatened in any municipality, the procedure is for the mayor or the reeve to notify the Government, and then it becomes the duty of the Department of Militia to provide ample force for the maintenance of order and good government. The Department of Militia must therefore be in a position to act under the statute and provide a certain number of men to meet any emergency in any part of the Dominion. As will be appreciated, this involves the maintenance of a permanent force of considerable proportions. At the present time this force is composed of 3,800 officers and men, and is a very small force indeed to cope with emergencies throughout such a vast country.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why is the principal reduction in these estimates confined to the permanent force?

Mr. GRAHAM: The reduction will not interfere materially with the efficiency of the force, being in large measure among officers and non-commissioned officers, under a rearrangement that the chief of staff proposes to make.

Mr. ARTHURS: Does the hon. minister say that the reduction in the non-commissioned officers will be a move towards efficiency?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to go so far as that. My hon. friend is a military man, and he is confronting me with a technique that I am not familiar with. It would be a reduction of the units in various parts of the Dominion, and a rearrangement under a new plan. As I was pointing out, now that we have assumed the status of a nation we must carry on those departments which are incident to that status. Hon. gentlemen have said to

me: Why spend money on the militia, seeing that it is non-productive? I reply: Why spend money on fire insurance when it is non-productive? Let there be disorder in any part of the Dominion that the Militia Department is unable to cope with, and immediately we would be criticized because we were unprepared to meet the emergency. Could we, Mr. Chairman, let it be known throughout the entire world that Canada is a country where the militia is ineffective, where the mounted police is to be reduced almost to the vanishing point, where the naval service is to be of little account, and where the flying force is not to function? We would become the mecca of a class of people that would not be desirable in the best interests of the country. It is our duty, even though the militia be not productive, to maintain it at sufficient strength to preserve order and good government within the Dominion. The militia is not productive, but it is highly protective, and if it were not for this force Canada would not be in the position she occupies to-day.

I wanted to make these few observations because as a nation we are at the present time looking forward to standing side by side with the other nations of the world. If we are to realize our aspirations, we must accept the responsibilities that go with those aspirations and be prepared to carry on our share of defence work as part of the British Empire, and that share, so far as the militia is concerned, is provided for in the estimates I am now presenting.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the minister mean that he is going to increase the militia expenditure in this country under present conditions, when people want to get back to a peace basis and are desirous that the militia should be cut down practically to an infinitesimal point?

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimates are not being increased; they are being decreased. So far as the amount is concerned; if we compare this year with 1913-1914, when we were on a peace basis, the estimates this year are less; and if you take into account the present purchasing power of the dollar as compared with 1911-1912, I submit the estimates presented to-day are less than they were that year.

Mr. MARTELL: I congratulate the minister on that.

Mr. HOCKEN: What is the reduction in the number of men in the permanent force?

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimate made by the department and the Chief of Staff is that when the reorganization is completed the reduction will be in the vicinity of 400 or 500 all told.

Mr. HOCKEN: But this vote shows an increase of about $100,000 over last year for clothing and necessaries. How does the minister account for that?

Mr. GRAHAM: I might point out to the hon. member that there are two branches of the force, the permanent force and the volunteers. The $100,000 which my hon. friend mentions is for the volunteer force, which is not, strictly speaking, the militia.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is the volunteer force larger this year than last?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is exactly the same, but we have reduced the amount for annual drill by $100,000. There is also this to be taken into consideration. After the war there was a good deal of clothing on hand, but as that is used up more is required. More clothing may be required in certain lines one year than another. For instance, we have stocks on hand now of certain lines, but in other lines our stock is diminishing.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The expenditure for 1919-1920 for cadet service was $390,000, and to-day it is $450,000. What is the explanation of the increase?

The CHAIRMAN: We have not come to that item yet.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not averse to discussing all the items now, but answering first my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), if he will look at the increase he suggested in the item for clothing and necessaries, he will find that it is merely a cross-entry, a simple matter of bookkeeping. It is a decrease in war-like stores, transferred from one account to the other.

Mr. SHAW: I want to congratulate the minister for having made a reduction in the estimates as compared with last year. I think he is entitled to some credit for giving us this evidence of economy on the part of his department. At the same time it is only fair to say that I have an objection to register, and it is that the reduction is not sufficient. Without going into details of these items, which I presume will be taken up separately, I should like for a moment to compare the estimates of this department with the amount of less than $5,000,000 asked for by the Department of Agriculture, which is the fundamental and basic industry of this country. I know very well that you cannot always very

reasonably compare these estimates under the circumstances. But take the estimates of other departments of the Government. I find that the Health Department, for instance, is asking something under $1,000,000; Administration of Justice, slightly over $2,000,000; Immigration and Colonization, slightly over $2,000,000,—and I think no one will under-estimate the value and significance of the work for which that estimate is being asked,—Fisheries, slightly over $1,000,000; Mines, slightly over $500,000; Labour Department, the main estimates for which are something under $1,500,000; Dominion Lands and Parks, almost $5,000,000; Soldiers' Land Settlement, approximately $12,000,000; and finally, may I just mention the estimates for the Department of Trade and Commerce which total slightly over $3,000,000. I think in comparison with these other necessary and fundamental departments of government, the estimate for the Militia Department is out of all proportion. I realize, of course, the necessity for maintaining in this country not only a militia, but a Militia Department, properly staffed and properly officered, and I have nothing to say with regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of our miltia. I think perhaps it is true, as the minister has stated, that the militia generally has served satisfactorily; but I do think in view of the estimates for other departments of government, there should be a very substantial reduction in the militia estimates, especially as we have just come through a long war, and have had a conference at Washington on the limitation of armaments, and particularly in view of the very difficult economic conditions that prevail throughout this country. I do not propose to move any amendment, but I want to urge upon the minister the necessity for doing something far more substantial than he has done in reducing the estimates of his department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I should like to say a word on the question of the total amount which the minister is asking for on this occasion, and the remarks which have fallen from my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), that they show a substantial decrease from the vote of last year.

The vote of last year was $11,954,000, and the total expenditure until 31st March this year, I think I am safe in saying, was under $10,250,000. I have not received the figures yet, but from my knowledge of the department up till the end of December and from estimates I have been able to make since, I think I am within the mark when I say that $10,250,000 will cover every dollar that was spent last year. This year it is proposed to expend $10,788,000. So the reduction is rather more apparent than real, is it not, Mr. Chairman? However, under all the circumstances which we have in Canada to-day, if we are going to maintain a militia force in this country that is to be of any practical use, I do not believe that the minister can cut very much below the figure he has submitted to the House on the present occasion. I am inclined to think that in some instances his figures are too low; in some others perhaps they may be slightly too high. But it is not correct to say that Canada is one of the nations which is engaged in extravagant military expenditure. I went to some pains just a year ago to make a comparison as between Canada and every other country in the world, just to see what we were spending and how our expenditure compared with our neighbours. My hon. friends who are inclined to be critical can go to any country on the face of the globe, civilized or uncivilized, they can inquire in Europe, in Asia, in America North or South, and they will find that comparison shows that Canada is a long way below the lowest of them in all classes of expenditure on armaments—so far below the lowest that one is almost ashamed to make the comparison. These figures were all submitted by experts to a Financial Conference held in Brussels in October, 1921. The figures are accurate, they were submitted as a result of a call by the League of Nations; and in every comparison you make, the expenditure in this country for military purposes is almost nothing as compared with similar expenditure by our nearest neighbour whether it be a British Dominion or whether it be an independent country. The charge that we are extravagant in this respect, is entirely unfounded, if you compare our expenditure with what any other nation in the world is doing. Now, I submit that the minister has cut these estimates to just about as low a figure as he can go. There may be some details, perhaps, that will stand some paring down; but on the whole I doubt very much if he can go any lower without actually injuring the service.

Mr. MARTELL: Are there not many things in connection with the Militia Department that could be dispensed with in view of other public services being starved?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know about any public services that are being starved, but the point I make is this: If it is the wisdom of this House that we should maintain in Canada a reasonable militia force as was done in the past, if it is the judgment of the House that we should have a militia force at all, then you cannot pay much less than the minister proposes to pay for it this year. On the other hand, if in the judgment of the House the force should be wiped out then he could save that money and apply it to something else. You cannot have your cake and eat it,—if you are going to have a force, and if this force is to be an efficient one, it is going to cost you what the minister is asking for.

Mr. MARTELL: What is the wisdom of permitting drill halls to be lit up all through the winter months and having parades there in order that officers may display their gold braid, while people are starving in this country?

Mr. DUFF: I think, Mr. Chairman, with your permission and that of the minister it might be as well to allow us to deal with the whole series of items connected with this subject instead of limiting the discussion to one item alone. I think that has been the usual practice in previous years.

The CHAIRMAN: The items all form separate resolutions, I am sorry to say.

Mr. DUFF: I think that would be the quickest way—to deal with the entire vote. I also would like to congratulate the minister upon reducing the total estimate from something over $11,954,000 to $10,788,000; but I would like to say that I think. in the present condition of affairs in Canada, in future this expenditure can be greatly reduced. Of course the Minister of Militia has only been in charge of this department for some three months and it was impossible for him in that time to consult the excellent staff of officials he has surrounding him in the department, to discuss matters thoroughly with them, and get such a grasp of affairs, that he could, in respect to a number of the militia items, curtail the expenditure. But the people of Canada are expecting the Minister of Militia to do that in the next twelve months, so that when he presents his estimates to Parliament in 1923 he may make it manifest that those estimates have been cut to the fullest extent compatible with the best interests of the country. I agree with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) and with the minister too, that it is necessary to have a militia force in Canada, but it seems to me that that force should be managed as economically as possible. I believe it is possible to have a skeleton organization;

4 p.m. I do not think it is necessary to spend some of the large amounts which are being expended in connection with this department. Undoubtedly it is necessary in different sections of Canada to maintain such units or organizations that if it were necessary, owing to trouble, to call out the volunteers the needed personnel for taking charge of these units would be available; but I do not think it is necessary to spend large sums of money in connection with the militia. The people of Canada irrespective of politics will support what the hon. member for Calgary has said in this regard. I believe too that the people will back up any government or any party that will cut to the lowest possible point not only the militia expenditure but the so-called naval expenditure, which latter is absolutely a waste of public money. I am not criticising the present minister, for he has only been in charge of the Militia Department for three months, but I would like to call his attention to one item. I do not wish to ask the minister to reduce his estimates by resolution of this committee. I have a great deal of faith in the minister and some of his officials; they have the best interest of the country at heart just as much as my hon. friend from Calgary or any other member, and although the item to which I am about to refer appears in the estimates I do not think the minister will spend one dollar of that money during the coming season. The item to which I refer is Annual Drill, $1,400,000. The minister and his officials have already shown their good intentions by cutting this item down from $1,500,000 as it was last year to $1,400,000 this year. The mere fact that this item appears in the estimates does not mean that there is any necessity for its expenditure. The hon. member for South Wellington, who was minister of militia in the National Liberal and Conservative Government, told us a few moments ago —and I presume that in so doing he was endeavouring to present himself with a bouquet—that, although last year when he was minister the militia estimates called for $11,954,000, they only spent $10,250,000 or thereabouts. Now, Sir, I have such confidence in the present Minister of

Militia that although his estimates call for $10,780,000 it will be a matter of great surprise and disappointment to me if when he comes to present the militia estimates next year he does not show that instead of expending any such sum he has only paid out some six or seven million dollars. Reductions such as that in this expenditure are what the people of this country want. There is one sum that need not be expended this year, as I have already said, and that is $1,400,000 for annual drill.

The CHAIRMAN: I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that that item has not yet been reached. We are now considering the item of Allowances, Active Militia—$120,000. Shall the item carry?

Mr. VIEN: The total of the several items is $10,788,000 and I think that on the title given to all these items we could discuss the whole question.

Mr. HANSON: What does this appropriation of $120,000 mean?

Mr. GRAHAM: If the rules of the House would not be violated by his doing so, I should like my hon. friend (Mr. Duff) to conclude his remarks. Suppose we carry the first item, and then he can discuss the first one on the second.

Mr. DUFF: Before we proceed to the next item, I should like to suggest to the committee that, instead of discussing one item alone, we do as we did in previous years, discuss the whole appropriation. If necessary, I would make a motion that the whole appropriation be discussed.

The CHAIRMAN: I am instructed that it is the rule of the committee that these resolutions should be discussed separately. There may be some items in this resolution, but there is, at present before the committee, one resolution, namely, No. 89, Allowances, Active Militia.

Mr. DUFF: When I was interrupted by the Chair, I was endeavouring to say that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), who was Minister of Militia in the late government, in the remarks which he made a few minutes ago, when he was discussing what he termed reasonable expenditure on the service, compared the total expenditure in Canada with expenditures in other countries. It is quite true that the expenditure for militia purposes in Canada is much smaller by head of population than similar expenditure in any other country; but we must agree that conditions in Canada are altogether different from conditions in other countries. For instance, nobody in Canada wants to have conditions as they are in Russia to-day. I have read in the newspapers of two or three men in Canada who have said that we should have conditions as they exist in Russia to-day; but I do not belong to that class, and I believe ninety-nine per cent of the people of this country would be strongly opposed to our having conditions as they are in Russia to-day. Furthermore, I do not believe anybody in Canada with any common-sense wants to have conditions as they are in France or in any other European country. Consequently, it is not necessary that the people of Canada should vote for militia purposes such large expenditures as must be made in other countries. Therefore, I do not think that the argument of the hon. member for South Wellington should have very much weight and effect when he says that we should spend large sums of money for militia purposes, because, forsooth, other countries are spending large amounts.

As I said a moment ago, it seems to me that the estimate for annual drill should not be spent this year at least. If ever the necessity arose, we have in this country 400,000 men who are available at any time for service of this kind, in order to maintain peace and order in Canada. It is a well-known fact that during the late war, the men who were gathered in at a few moments' notice and who were outside of the active militia of this country, made the very best soldiers which Canada or the United States or any other country sent to the war. Men who were taken from ordinary avocations in life in this or any other country, after a little training, made as good soldiers as other men who had spent many years in military service. With the available material in this country, if anything happened, we do not need to have a great standing army. I have no objection to the estimate for the permanent force. I notice the minister and his officials have cut down this amount by $755,000. That is a step in the right direction, and the minister should be congratulated that, at this stage in the affairs of Canada, in our present financial and industrial condition, the estimate for the permanent force has been reduced by $755,000. I notice that the item for the Dominion arsenal at Lindsay shows a reduction of $218,300.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that

all these items will be reached in due course, but the item at present before the committee is No. 89, Allowances, Active Militia.

Mr. DUFF: If you are going, Sir, to confine me to the one item, I will bring my remarks to a close; but it seems to me that we should be allowed to discuss the whole appropriation. If, however, you rule in that way, I must bow to your ruling. I want to say, in conclusion, that the people of Canada are anxious to see this Government reduce expenditure on militia, navy and anything else of this character, to the lowest possible amount, and this department under the present minister will receive the thanks of the country if, instead of spending $10,000,000, the amount is cut down as low as possible.

Mr. MARTELL: I have a few observations to make in regard to this appropriation, and they shall be brief.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friends say "hear, hear." All the "hear, hear's" in the world will not prevent me from giving expression to the views that, as a representative of a constituency in the federal Parliament, I have been sent here to present to this House.

I want, first of all, to congratulate the Minister of Militia and Defence upon the fact that he has, to some extent, decreased the militia estimates. I have every respect for the Minister of Militia and Defence, but I want to assure him that I believe he has taken too much advice from officials in his department who are fonder of gold braid parades than of the interest of the people of this country. It seems to me that, while we require a certain militia in this Dominion, this militia should be reduced to the finest possible point. We have heard in this House debates about unemployment; we know that agriculture in Canada is being starved; and now, even though this country is in dire straits financially, and whilst the minister—and I congratulate him personally and not his officials upon this fact—has decreased the estimates, this vote for militia is being maintained in order that we shall have in Canada people who, fresh from o'er the seas, give native Canadians the feeling that they are being looked upon with an easy sort of tolerance. These people want to have gold braid marches in order that they may parade before the people of this country their connection with Sir So-and-So and Sir Somebody Else. The people of Canada do not care whether you have an ancestor, a family tree, or not, so long as you are able to do an honest man's work with brain and hand; and we, in this Dominion, as a young nation, a nation within the British Empire, a nation that has a right to control its own affairs, want the least possible amount of militarism. I pray the indulgence of the minister while I ask him that he be good enough to do his utmost to see that these estimates are brought down to the lowest possible point.

What do we find as regards militia camps in this Dominion? Some people who go to these camps seem to forget that they are Canadians at all; they seem to assume, during these camps, a sort of autocratic spirit, and the idea is to grind down the young intelligent Canadian, who goes there primarily for instruction that may fit him, if the time ever came, to defend his native land. The minister, if I may be figurative, is on the hilltop listening to the murmurs of the far off sea, but he fails to realize that young men must be fitted to brave the stream of life. He looks upon the distant sea, but he does not note the rushing tide below him. In my opinion the Militia Department of Canada exists to-day for no other purpose than the holding of gold-laced parades. We are asked to spend the sum of $10,788,400 for gold-lace parades and nothing else, while agricultural exhibitions in the country cannot receive any aid from the Department of Agriculture. We are told that a dire financial condition exists in this country which makes it impossible for us to give one or two thousand dollars to these exhibitions, and yet we can spend over $10,000,000 of the people's money on gold-lace shows. We have heard the question of unemployment discussed on this floor. Children are crying for want of food and clothing, and shoes, and workmen find their slim pay envelopes altogether inadequate to supply their families with even the barest necessities. In the face of that, what justification can there possibly be for spending such a huge sum as this on a mere empty show? I shall certainly vote against the item.

Mr. HANSON: The minister might state what is meant by "allowances, active militia." I might say to my hon. friend for Hants (Mr. Martell) that if he is sincere in his declarations he should get up and move that the vote, or some of the items thereof, be cut in two. We could thereby judge of his sincerity.

Mr. MARTELL: If you put that motion I will vote for it.

An hon. MEMBER: What courage!

Mr. GRAHAM: In regard to command pay, drill instruction, etc., there are certain allowances given to the officers for the number of men brought into their companies and trained. Then there is an item of $20,000 for the care of arms. Where there is no caretaker the different officers are allowed a certain amount to defray the expense of looking after the arms. There are allowances for postage throughout the Dominion, and to cover contingencies, etc., and allowances to trumpeters. Each trumpeter who qualifies is given $3 annually. These things make up the amount of this particular item.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I should like some information in regard to the permanent force.

The CHAIRMAN: That is a separate item.

Mr. CAMPBELL: It is impossible to discuss these various items separately. If you cut one estimate it automatically affects the other, and the militia should be considered in conjunction with the permanent force.

Mr. GOOD: I desire to question your ruling, Mr. Chairman, in regard to the separate consideration of these items. How can you discuss the general aspects of the whole question if you are to be unduly restrained in considering the bearing of one particular vote upon another?

The CHAIRMAN: Bourinot at page 425 says:

> As in other committees, each resolution must be proposed and discussed as a distinct question, and when it has been formally carried, no reference can be made again thereto. Neither is it regular to discuss any resolution before it has been formally proposed from the chair. Each vote or resolution is necessarily a question in itself to be proposed, amended and put as any motion or bill in the house.

That is the authority on this question.

Mr. DUFF: That ruling holds good so long as the minister submits his items as separate resolutions. The minister, if he desired to do so, instead of placing before the committee a list of fifteen or sixteen separate resolutions, could embody them in one resolution covering the whole amount, so that they might the more freely be discussed. I would ask him to do that in deference to the wishes of the committee.

[Mr. Hanson.]

The CHAIRMAN: These resolutions, prepared by the treasury board, appear before the Chairman as separate items. I have only one item before me now, No. 89.

Mr. DUFF: Could the minister not change the form in which he has placed the items before the committee, so that we might discuss the whole question from every point of view?

The CHAIRMAN: That could be done by the unanimous consent of the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no real difficulty in the matter. The resolutions, it is true, are all for separate items or classes of expenditure, but in the consideration of each item, its relation to the whole may certainly be discussed, and the size of the whole vote is undoubtedly open to discussion. As I understand the ruling of the Chair, it is simply that the question as to the correctness of any particular item not immediately under consideration shall not be discussed. That is quite right, and I do not think that such a ruling hampers hon. members on either side. The relation of any one class of expenditure to another, embraced in the resolution, can be discussed, and consequently the question can be considered as to whether or not there should be a gross reduction. But the rightness or wrongness of any item not under consideration, the Chair has ruled, cannot be discussed. It does not seem to me that there is any restriction to be complained of.

Mr. DUFF: When I was speaking I thought that the Chairman ruled that I could discuss only one item. I was proceeding to deal with other items and he called me to order. Before we go further I want to know whether we are to be confined to just one item, or whether we can discuss the whole militia vote amounting to over ten million dollars.

Mr. GRAHAM: Like the leader of the Opposition, (Mr. Meighen) I do not see that there is much difficulty in the way. I think we can proceed calmly. Each one of the items is an entity in the whole, and in discussing one you can certainly refer to others. The bearing which this item has on the others is discussable. The Chairman is merely trying to avoid any discussion in detail of all the items under one particular vote, and then going over the same items all over again when we take them up in their order. These resolutions have been submitted to His Excellency and must be discussed in their order; but I see no objection to a general discussion of the status of the militia.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What I have to say, Mr. Chairman, concerns not, perhaps, this particular item so much as the underlying principle of the maintenance of anything like a large force in Canada. Some of us are not in a position to discuss the particular items; it is obvious that one item might be reduced and others left as they are, and that the efficiency of the force might thereby be impaired.

The minister has suggested—and I think we can all agree—that the time has come when Canada is quite capable of administering her own affairs. The question arises, then, as to the principle on which we propose to administer our affairs. It seems to be taken for granted that we must follow the example of European nations and proceed to arm; in fact, the minister says that we must have all the departments necessary for the equipment of a nation. Now, I should like to challenge the implication that in order that we may become a self-sufficient nation it is necessary for us to maintain a military force. At this particular time we are talking about international disarmament; it would seem that the best way to bring about international disarmament is by national disarmament. We in Canada are in a peculiarly good position to accomplish this. We have the Pacific on the west, the Atlantic on the east; we are bordered by a friendly nation to the south; why should we be prepared to resist aggression on any of these fronts? We have made it a boast that throughout the past century we have had no warships upon the Great Lakes, and we have said that that in itself is the greatest safeguard we have against warfare between the United States and ourselves. What is true in regard to warships on the Great Lakes is equally true in regard to armed forces; we need not seek to protect ourselves against aggression from the south. It may be said that we ought to be prepared to protect ourselves against any unnamed enemy who might arise from some unexpected quarter and seek to injure our nation. I take it, however, there is a growing sentiment on the part of a large number of the Canadian people that since we professed to have gone into the great war to end war, now that the war is over we should try to get back to an absolute peace basis. This Parliament succeeds the one which administered affairs during the period the war was in progress. Now is the time when we should decide whether or not an armed force means or makes for peace. I for one —and I think I voice the sentiment of a considerable number—have been led to doubt that very much.

It has been further suggested that perhaps we ought to protect ourselves because of probable internal disturbance, I submit that our position in this country is very different from that of European states; we have no subordinate races that must be kept down or are in danger of rising against the nation as a whole, I do not think we have any classes that are particularly dangerous. A good many of our forefathers came here in order to escape the military burdens of Europe; why should we proceed to set up military forces in this country similar to those which they left in Europe? If we provide for the needs of the people, there is no doubt that we shall have a loyal population. Who are we, anyway? We are all anxious to make a living for ourselves, anxious that our families shall have a decent education and so on; that is the feeling of the Canadian people. Under these circumstances, what group is there that we need fear? Now that the war is past we ought to reconsider this whole matter and decide whether we need maintain military forces in this country. Instead of being an insurance against trouble they are rather, it seems to me, provocative of trouble.

Mr. HUGHES: After listening to the discussion and after giving the matter some little consideration, it seems to me that the first thing to be done is to decide upon a policy. The first question is, if we want a military force, why do we need it? Do we fear invasion or aggression from any other country? Are we preparing for a war, and if so, against whom? If that is out of the question; if aggression or invasion on the part of any other country is not to be thought of, then should we have an armed force to preserve internal peace? I think we should, there is no city in the Dominion that does not require a police force, though we are a peaceable people. Then, if we should have a national force, the question is, of what size should that national force be? Having decided that, we can reasonably proceed to have a national force as large as necessary, but no larger. If we are preparing for or expect another war, if we anticipate foreign trouble of any kind at any time in the future, what size of force do we need? It seems to me that these are the questions that should first be

settled. I do not think we should anticipate any trouble from foreign countries. I do not think we need fear any aggression on the part of our southern neighbours. We fear no trouble from Europe; we need anticipate no trouble from the Eastern countries across the Pacific. Then the question is—I come back to it—what size of force is necessary? That we should have some force there is no doubt, but I think the present force is too large for internal purposes, and the general policy should be adopted of cutting it down to the lowest possible point. If the force is maintained beyond what is necessary, it is a waste of money, and money is very much needed for other and productive purposes. I shall have a few words to say on the next item—I may not, I suppose, speak on it now, Mr. Chairman—but in my judgment the annual drill is a waste of money. I know it was cut out a few years ago, and I do not think we had the annual drill last year. In any case, it was not general; it may have been held in some places.

Mr. GRAHAM: This estimate is lower than the one last year.

Mr. HUGHES: I know it is, and I think it should be lower still. Now, I used to drill some years ago and I know it was just a holiday. While the country was rich and we had money to spend, perhaps there was no great harm in it, but we have not the money to spend now. I know that captains in the militia, in order to make up the full complement of their companies, had to take men much over age, and in the cavalry regiments horses were used that would be no good for war purposes. The men who went to drill looked upon it simply as a holiday. When war actually broke out very few of them were available or of any use. The young men of the country, and middle-aged men too, volunteered in large numbers and made good soldiers, but only a small proportion of the active militia were available or were any good.

Mr. LANCTOT: It is no good at all.

Mr. HUGHES: My hon. friend says that it is no good at all; well, I pretty much agree with that. If there is one item in this appropriation that ought to be cut out it is that which provides for the annual drill—and there may be others.

To summarize what I have said: the first thing to be done is to decide what policy we should pursue, whether we fear, or expect, or anticipate, aggression from any country within the next few years. If we do not anticipate anything of that kind, then we should not provide for it. We have no money to waste; we have no money to spend on frills.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) intimated that we ought to be ashamed of our situation as compared with the situation in some of the European countries. I suggest that we ought rather to be proud of it. In regard to the total figures as indicated in the estimates, I would like to call attention to the fact that a dollar goes a good deal further this year than it did last year, and when allowance is made for that, possibly the comparison between the respective amounts is not as attractive as it might otherwise seem.

I would like to emphasize the sentiments that have already been expressed by several hon. members to the effect that we are spending relatively too much money on the militia. So far as my observation has gone, militia quarters and militia activities are rather in the nature of gold braid and fuss-and-feathers entertainment—a sort of social club—than anything of a strictly protective or military character. I do not say that unkindly or with the idea of reflecting upon any other person who may be connected with the militia. But so far as my observation goes, things tend inevitably that way, and it is not a good way; it does not do the country any good. And occasionally we have exhibitions, that are, to say the least, disgraceful.

In regard to the need for preserving order at home I do think that the member for Kings, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes) is right when he says that we are overstaffed or "over-forced" so far as the militia is concerned. We have had a great deal of talk about unemployment and about unrest, and I think that lurking in some peoples' minds there is a thought that the militia may be necessary in order to put down agitators—people who are stirring up the unrest which has arisen out of bad industrial or social conditions. Now, let me make this suggestion if $5,000,000 that is voted for militia purposes could be transferred to the solution of the problem of unemployment, we would not need so much miltia and we could have a much happier solution of these labour difficulties and this unrest than we can possibly bring about by maintaining or increasing a force capable of suppressing anything of that nature, I feel very strongly that if that is in our minds at

all, we ought to get rid of it; it is not the right way to handle problems of that sort. I do believe, of course, in having sufficient police to maintain law and order. But we must not think that we have to have a large and still larger force for that purpose, because difficulties of that type ought to be handled in an altogether different way. I therefore repeat my suggestion that the diversion of a very large part of this vote along other lines would be very much more satisfactory to this country.

As I said a little while ago, a serious difficulty presents itself to any of us who wish to suggest a reduction in the total vote. If we consider the vote item by item, there are few here who understand the details sufficiently to be able to say that this or that particular vote ought to be cut down by such and such an amount. I feel that the total vote ought to be reduced, but I cannot put my finger on any particular item. I suggest that, if it is in order, we should be able at some time during the discussion to move a reduction in the total vote without having to move a reduction in each particular item. Of course, if we go through each item and pass it, we are not then in a position to move any reduction in the total.

Mr. VIEN: I do not believe there is any difference of opinion among the members of the committee on the question whether we ought to maintain a militia in Canada. I do not think any hon. member would move that the militia should be dispensed with. That being the case, it comes down to a question of proportion, a question of quantity. With what has been said on both sides as to the restrictions which should be made effective with regard to our militia expenditure I am in full sympathy, and I would be much more critical of the items on this page of the estimates were we not to have in the near future a reorganization of the Department of Defence, which will mean that the Minister of Defence will have to look into the reorganization of the militia as well. If it were not for that, I would, with many members on both sides of the House, ask the minister not to expend the money that we are going to vote to him. But I do not think it would be wise under the circumstances, either on this item or on the total vote of $10,000,000, to go into the details of where a cut should be made. It is a good thing, I think, that the opinion of so many members has been expressed and that that opinion has been unanimous with regard to the desirability of curtailing militia expenditure and reducing it to the minimum. But some of the items will, I think, bear investigation and in connection with them some hon. members may wish to draw to the attention of the Government the desirability of not expending the total amount voted. I have been connected with the militia for about twenty years now, and I know something about it. During the last ten or twelve years money has been spent foolishly, lavishly, in many centres, and curtailments are absolutely necessary. For instance, on the staff of each of the various districts the minister has a paymaster, an assistant paymaster and an auditor. Why should there be any necessity for having these three officers in each of the districts? If the paymaster is a responsible officer, no more audit beyond what the Auditor General does and what the General Paymaster does, should be needed. I grant that during the war the volume of business transacted in every district may have justified the appointment of auditors, but the war has been over for three years now, and I think we can dispense with the services of the auditors in the various military districts. That is only one instance. I have asked the minister to give me some information by letter, and I shall have something to say when we come to the item for the general staff. I think that we could dispense with a number of officers who are now employed on the general staff. I pointed out to the minister and the House the other day that we had seventeen generals in Canada to manage the affairs of the militia, whereas ten years ago we could manage the whole business with two or three generals, who were paid between $4,000 and $5,000 each, as compared with between $6,000 and $9,500 which these generals are drawing to-day—and we have seventeen of them. Yet when the minister, carrying out the policy which now receives the approval of the committee, puts some of these men on the superannuation list, he is criticized by the former Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) and his friends, who almost shed tears on the retirement of these great generals. These generals are being superannuated on a very generous basis indeed. To cite only one case, that of General Burstall, whose name was mentioned the other day, I am told that he is being superannuated on $6,000 a year, which is $2,000 more than the salary he drew in 1914.

Mr. LANCTOT: More than Mr. Doherty, the ex-Minister of Justice.

Mr. VIEN: Some of these cases will bear investigation. I would urge upon the department the necessity for further curtailing the list of staff appointments. We have too many generals in Canada; we have too many officers on the permanent staff. I know that it is the intention of the minister, in the reorganization of his department, to bring about this reform, and if we were not on the eve of passing a bill reorganizing the whole defence of Canada I would be much more inquisitive as to the item we are now discussing and much more critical as to the amounts we are asked to vote. We have curtailed the expenditure by $1,000,000, and I am sure that the minister will not expend all of the $10,788,000 which he is asking for. I am in full accord with the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) when he suggests that next year the Minister of Defence, as he will then be called, should be able to come to this House and tell us that instead of expending $10,000,000, he has spent only $8,000,000 or $9,000,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: Five million.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend says $5,000,000. That raises the question how much the militia expenditure should be curtailed. If you have a militia you have to give them some training, or you do away with the militia altogether. I would cut down the annual training—and this will probably be one of my suggestions when the item comes up—to a minimum, for a few years to come. We are in no immediate danger of an uprising within this country or of an attack from outside. I think we could take a holiday for a few years in many lines of military activity. So far as that is concerned I wish to support heartily the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for Lunenburg and some hon. members on the opposite side of the House, urging the minister in the reorganization of his department to curtail expenditure as much as possible and not to expend the amount which he is now asking for.

Mr. CHURCH: The discussion on item 89 has taken a very wide range this afternoon. If a loyal country like Canada is going to amount to anything, I do not see how the minister can have an up-to-date department such as Canada should have, if the necessary money is not voted. I was surprised to hear some of the carping criticism that has been made this afternoon, in view of the fact that the minister has cut down his estimates, and that there are only two items in which there is an increase. There is a small increase for clothing and necessaries, but anybody who has purchased anything in these lines knows the difficulties of buying in the open market to-day. As head of a department of 1,100 police, I know the difficulty we have in this respect in Toronto. The other increase is in the maintenance of military property. There has been a change in the situation in some of the cities and towns. I come from a city where the large military organization is drawn mainly from the working classes. Toronto sent over 60,000 men to the war, nearly all of them under the voluntary system. I do not say that other parts of the country did not do well too; I mention Toronto only as an illustration. Our men have come back to civil pursuits and many of them are now engaged in departmental stores and factories all over the city. It is a workingman's constituency that I represent, and the officers commanding these old units have continually to put their hands in their pockets for the upkeep of the regiment. Take the 12th Battalion, the York Rangers, General Brock's old regiment, with him at Queenston Heights. They to-day have not a house or an armoury, and Toronto has had to provide them with a property. The city has fixed up the old St. Paul's hall, at a great cost to the taxpayers of Toronto. Is this country so hard up that it cannot provide this unit and others with an armoury but must let the officers pass the hat to keep up the regiment? That is only one case; the same thing is true of other regiments. The men of the 12th Battalion are working all day long. They have stored the arms in the old St. Paul's hall. Another battalion has been put in the old town hall, the St. Lawrence hall; another battalion has been put in another old building. These are all old city buildings, and in these are rifles and stores of all kinds, embracing fifteen or twenty different items. And many of the officers who are given the custody of this government property are working men. He is responsible for the care of those arms, and he gets very little for it. Owing to the miserable pittance he receives, he has continually to put his hand in his pocket. We have reached such a state of affairs in Military District No. 2 that the officers have the utmost difficulty in getting returned soldiers to join the regiments. They are not getting any support in this House. I want

to say that it is not the fault of the officers of the militia department, because they are most competent men.

I would not cut a cent off these estimates. Canada either needs a militia or it does not. God forbid that the time will ever come in this country when Canada will be without a militia. Where should we have been in 1812, especially as regards the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, had it not been for the militia. Had the militia at that time been treated in the spirit in which it is being treated to-day, what would have happened? Where should we have been in the days of 1837?—in the days of the Fenian Raid in 1867?—at the time of the South African war?—and during the late great war, had we not had an efficient militia? How can we maintain an efficient militia force if we do not provide for expenditures such as appear in the item under discussion? Why the Government makes the most parsimonious allowance for militia officers and in the city of Toronto they have had to buy their own typewriters and even pass around the hat in order to help equip a battalion to go overseas. That is the way Canada treats its citizen soldiers. But it is not the way citizen soldiers are treated in the United States. I visited Niagara camp last year and there was hardly an officer present who had not to put his hand in his pocket to help his unit and many were compaining. I asked in a number of cases the reason for that and all those of whom I inquired told me the same story. It was necessary to pay so much money out of their own pockets. Even the young farmer or the young working man in the city cannot be got to join a regiment. They say they are not given a sufficiently liberal per diem allowance and they have to meet their own expenses out of their own resources. The miserable pittance allowed by the Government would not even buy cigarettes, and yet the cigarette to-day is looked upon as "a work for the general advantage of Canada,"—that is what we are going to hear some day in the Railway Committee if we go much farther along the present line. I am surprised that so soon after the war Canada shows that she has learned so little from that struggle. I am surprised at the criticisms that we have heard this afternoon concerning every branch of the Militia Department. I say that the Militia Department has done good work, especially in regard to the cadet corps of Canada. I saw the excellence of that work manifested at Niagara camp last year. Thousands of young lads aged thirteen, fourteen, fifteen and sixteen were being drilled in connection with these corps, and they received a splendid physical training. In the province of Ontario a few years ago we heard the cry "Close the bar and save the boy." Well, they have closed the bar but they are now forgetting all about the boy. Were it not for the work of the cadet corps the boys would be ignored entirely. A short time ago a vote of a million dollars or more for developing the live stock industry passed this House. This money was intended to promote the raising of cattle, hogs, sheep and other stock. But what expenditure is being made on behalf of the boys of the country? Very little beyond what is being done through the medium of cadet corps. In my opinion the cadet movement forms a recruiting ground for the militia force of the country, and in times of stress and strain we shall need that force. But what kind of a militia force are we going to have if we cut down the expenditure in the manner that has been proposed. It is a most surprising thing to me, in view of the great lessons of the recent war, that we should have to sit here and hear such carping criticism as we have heard directed against this small vote of $120,000 to cover allowances to the active militia. Such an appropriation as this is most necessary if you are to have properly organized militia camps under an efficient militia system. While economy in proper directions is a necessary and desirable thing, I am sorry that we have gone to an unnecessary distance in that direction in connection with our militia. A militia force is not simply a luxury; it is a patriotic necessity. Anybody who has had anything to do with the policing of any of our large cities knows that the presence of the permanent force is necessary in our large centres of population. Considerable unrest prevailed throughout Canada during the last five years but happily it was not necessary to call upon our militia force to the same extent as was the case in the United States. We have happy relations between capital and labour in Canada, and I want to see that condition prevail in the future as it has in the past. At the same time it is necessary to maintain the permanent force which really forms the backbone of our militia system, because it is the force which provides instructions at our various training schools

5 p.m.

where the officers and non-commissioned officers of the militia get their real training in military matters. In view of all I have said I maintain that the expenditure provided in the item under discussion is necessary and I hope it will not be curtailed to any further extent. I believe that the present Minister of Militia, like those who immediately preceded him in that office, is well disposed towards the militia, but I hope he will not proceed too far in the direction of economy and injure the militia beyond repair. While it is necessary to have economy we do not want to carry that policy to an undesirable extreme so far as the militia is concerned, otherwise the force will be simply as it was in the days of 1812 and 1813. If disaster to the militia is contemplated that result will be obtained by adopting the advice of some of the critics whom we have heard this afternoon.

Mr. GOULD: In rising to speak upon this subject I might ask the same question that has been so often heard among our neighbours to the south, "Who won the war?" My hon. friend who has just spoken seems to claim the credit for the militia of Canada, but I am sure there is no hon. member but will acknowledge that it was the laymen—the men picked from the prairies and from the industries in our towns and cities, the men who desired in their hearts to go out and help the Motherland to defeat the common enemy, and not the trained militia who exerted the greatest influence in winning success. The militia who had been in training for years were a very slight factor in the winning of the war.

Mr. MEWBURN: Will my hon. friend tell who formed the first Canadian contingent of 30,000 men that went overseas? Will he tell me how many Ontario militia were in that force?

Mr. GOULD: That is a mere side issue and does not disprove my argument. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) has claimed the credit for the militia of doing all these wonderful things. I maintain that if you take an equal number of men from our farms and factories who have the right spirit and enthusiasm they are the equals in performance of the organized militia. When I spoke upon these estimates last year I endeavoured to point out that the money we were asked to vote was not for the maintenance of a defence department for Canada. I tried to show that the greater part, or at any rate a large part, of the money we were then asked to vote was being devoted to useless purposes. I also stated that in a good many instances, in my humble opinion, the money went to feed parasites. I expressed the opinion that the condition of agriculture in Canada, and the state of unemployment, was such that we ought not to be asked to maintain a military aristocracy, who were living on the fat of the land while the rest of our people were working too long hours and contributing heavily to the public treasury through taxation. It does seem to me that we should discuss here the general principle as to the desirability of such expenditure. As the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) has said, it is at the commencement of a new parliament that we should come to a distinct understanding as to whether we are going to continue military expenditure upon the scale on which it has been maintained in the past. I desire to ask who is the common enemy who threatens us? Why do we want a defence force in this country? These are questions which should be discussed at this time, and if the will of Parliament is that the voting of such moneys should continue we will submit to that decision. Otherwise, such large appropriations should not be continued to be asked for these purposes. It seems to me that a little Peace Conference should be called in Ottawa at this time to decide upon the policy we should follow in the future. Throughout the world different countries are calling for a stop to military expenditures nevertheless in Canada there are individuals clamouring that it be maintained, and trying to imbue the people with the idea that there is a common enemy to be feared and met. My hon. friend from North Toronto, of course, likes to have large military expenditures in the city from which he comes. But when he speaks for North Toronto and takes this attitude I have a right to speak for Assiniboia, a purely agricultural constituency, and take a contrary stand. I think I am right in saying that the greater part of the revenue which this Government receives from the province of Saskatchewan comes from my own constituency, and what do we get in return for it? In former years the views of the agricultural people of Canada have not been adequately expressed here, but they now have a fair representation in Parliament, something they have not had before within the lifetime of this Dominion. The representatives of agriculture are here

now and they are going to stay, because they have a real mission to perform, and one of the aims of that mission is to see that this unwarranted expenditure is reduced.

Mr. MacLAREN: I notice that a number of those who have spoken have criticised the expense of the militia on the ground that at the present time there is apparently no need of it. I would like to point out that when trouble arises, or when war breaks out, we do not receive notice. We do not get any such notice as that after a certain number of days a certain nation will proceed to war. That is not the way wars break out; as a rule they break out in the most unexpected manner. Who expected in June, 1914, that war would be declared in August following? I venture to say that no one in this Dominion made that prophecy. The militia of Canada is necessary up to a certain point in order that we may be ready for emergencies, because the most important point of all is that we do not receive notice of trouble. We may say that there is not likely to be any trouble to the south or to the north or anywhere else, or to be internal trouble; but these things arise with startling rapidity. It is the duty of every man in this country to protect his home and family, and, therefore, I say that the existence of the militia is necessary up to a certain point for the purpose of being prepared.

Another point to which I wish to refer is the training of men. There is, amongst members of the House, a great misapprehension in reference to trained men. Men were not taken off the farms nor from the towns and put into the front line without previous training. The men, who went to the front at the first and who were able to carry on until they were supplemented by others, were men who had already undertaken and undergone military training in this country. It was no time to put untrained men into the line, and a certain time for training is required. Apparently a number of members who have referred to this matter seem to think that men can be picked out and, in a short time sent to the front; but men required intensive training for about four months before they were put into the front line.

My other and last point is that the whole list of estimates, as submitted by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham), appears to me to be a very reasonable and necessary amount. I have no doubt that, under the new organization, this amount will give us efficiency; but I do not think it is desirable, wise, or safe to attempt to carry on the militia of this country with a smaller amount than that for which the Minister of Militia has asked.

Mr. BAXTER: I do not want to make any lengthy remarks; but there are a few words which might well be said to the committee, because, I am sure, no hon. member has any desire to misrepresent things as they exist. We are, I understand, considering only the first item of this appropriation, and in connection with that, remarks have been made which might lead the committee and the people generally to believe that unwarranted expenditure on gold lace is involved in these items. It is very easy to use the phrase "gold lace"; the words slip easily from every member's lips. They will, no doubt, be bandied about throughout the country, and they will succeed in adding to a prejudice which, unfortunately, exists in certain quarters towards the militia. Would hon. members be greatly surprised if I called their attention to the fact that, in the first item, not one pennyweight of gold lace is involved? Would they also be somewhat astonished if I told them—and if my assurance is not sufficient, it can easily be backed up by many hon. members in this House—that the officers of the militia of Canada pay for their own gold lace out of their own pockets, and they pay the customs duty upon it themselves? Let us deal with plain facts; let us not indulge in slurs and sneers against a large body of gentlemen who are contributing their time, brains and wealth towards keeping up the militia of Canada and who are getting not one dollar of return for so doing. That happens to be the fact; it may not be popular; it is not a good thing on which to make a stump speech; but it happens to be the fact, and, as regards the particular estimate under consideration, I will invite the careful attention of members to some of the items involved in it. One item is "care of arms." Hon. members will realize that, throughout this country, sometimes in armouries, but very often, in the rural districts, in the homes of commanding officers, rifles which have cost this country millions of dollars are placed, and they have to be taken care of by the officer commanding the unit who is responsible for those arms. The allowance for looking after those arms used to be $40.

Mr. IRVINE: Are those rifles that are being cared for Ross rifles, or some others?

Mr. BAXTER: I do not know anything about the Ross rifle. I am not talking about the Ross rifle; I am talking about the rifles that are the property of the Dominion of Canada and that are distributed in many places throughout Canada, the rifles which would be used if any active use should be required of rifles either inside or outside of this country by our militia.

There is equipment as well, as I am reminded, various clothing. There is not only the clothing, but there are the belts and other equipment; there are, in some places, guns, and these have all to be taken care of. In the days that I can speak of, I know the allowance to a rural commanding officer was $40 a year for looking after the rifles and equipment of his company or battery or whatever the unit happened to be. The allowance is a modest one; I do not think it has been increased, but the minister will correct me if I am wrong in so thinking. Where there is an armoury kept up out of the public funds, this allowance is not paid; but where the country saves the expense of a caretaker through some person undertaking to do this work in connection with his unit, he received the modest sum of $40, for this very valuable service. If this service was not performed, the rifles would be destroyed by rust, and millions of dollars of this country's investment would become nothing. That might possibly suit certain people in this country; but I do not think it suits the great majority of this Parliament, or the vast majority of the Canadian people.

The commanding officer is allowed $40 for postage which he has to spend, in rural districts especially, in communicating with members of his unit who live at considerable distances. He has to arrange, prior to annual training, to find out where his men are to see that they are got in, to see to the distribution of clothing to them, and to see that the clothing is returned after the season is over. If that service is not performed, that clothing is lost and millions of dollars are lost to this country. Therefore, hon. gentlemen who wish to reduce this item are really endeavouring to lessen the necessary services for taking care of the property of the country. One hon. member said—and I think he was candid—that he did not know how to attack these estimates in detail because he did not know what they stood for. I would suggest that the hon. member first search the Auditor General's report for the details in order that he may know what the items are, and then he will be in a position to criticise; but he should not rush blindly in and endeavour to strike out an appropriation which may mean the destruction, the loss to this country, of ten-fold, yes, a hundred-fold, of the amount involved in this appropriation.

Another item is "command pay" which is somewhat similar to what I have been explaining. The amount for drill instruction is received only when a man actually gives the time or some instruction in drill or hires someone else to do that work. I do not see how it is possible to maintain the services rendered under this item for one penny less than the amount involved. It is certainly no answer to talk about gold-lace which is worn by officers at their personal expense. If hon. members were keeping in touch with the militia, they would know that, since the war, gold lace has practically disappeared. There is no waste of money for ornament or show; the service is simply practically what a farmer does if he puts a house over his reaper or binder instead of exposing it to the weather, as, unfortunately, happens to be the case in some parts of the country with which I am fairly familiar. It is simply reserving a man's capital. If you want the capital of the country wasted, strike out an item like this and let millions of dollars go to pot.

Mr. IRVINE: My hon. friend (Mr. Baxter) has demonstrated what a great loss to the country it would be if we did not take care of old clothes and rifles at a cost of $120,000. Well, I think it might be advisable to burn these old clothes and destroy these rifles and save that $120,000. We shall have to spend $120,000 next year, and at that rate it would take only a few years to buy new rifles. An expenditure like this is only a waste of money. These estimates can be reduced by about $5,000,000, and I should like to know whether this is the time to bring in a resolution for that purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: If such a thing were done there would be no militia force in the Dominion.

Mr. IRVINE: If it is proposed to reorganize the militia, it might facilitate and hasten that re-organization if the minister knew exactly how much money he had to

spend upon it. If we vote the full $11,000,000, or thereabouts, it is not likely that even he will hurry with the re-organization.

Mr. PUTNAM: What was the approximate cost of the annual drill for the average year preceding the war?

Mr. GRAHAM: If hon. members will allow the item now before the Chair to pass, I could better explain that question on the next vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Item agreed to.

Annual Drill, $1,400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: These estimates are on the pre-war basis. Of course, the entire work of deflation has not, perhaps, yet taken place, but as the cost of everything approaches normal the expenses will be proportionally reduced. The drill in 1913, before there was any war at all, cost $1,800,000. The amount asked for this year, after the war, is really less than the pre-war vote, notwithstanding the fact that the dollar in 1913 was equal to approximately $1.75 now.

Mr. MARTELL: What was the financial condition of Canada prior to the war, and what is it now?

Mr. GRAHAM: Undoubtedly it was better before the war, but in 1913 it was not too promising. At that time we were on the verge of hard times, as was indicated by several banking institutions in the world. That, however, is not the question. Do we need annual drill? That is the question.

Mr. LANCTOT: What were the estimates in 1910, when there was a Liberal party in power with a good government?

Mr. GRAHAM: The last I have are the estimates for 1910-11, but I may point out that, although brought down by the succeeding government, they were the estimates of their predecessors. The expenditure in 1910-11 was $7,067,000. That was practically equal to the estimate of to-day, if indeed it was not more, considering what the dollar could buy then as compared with now. Clothing for the troops now costs 50 per cent, 75 per cent and sometimes 100 per cent more, and so does maintenance. The salaries paid to all officers since the war have been higher because of the increase in cost of living, as recognized by every business man in the country. This year it is proposed to train half, or, at most, 60 per cent, of the number of men trained in 1911. The purpose is merely to keep up what one hon. gentleman referred to as skeleton training, and not full training at all. Full training, as my hon. friends who have been ministers will know, would cost three or four times more. I consulted with General MacBrien, the chief of staff, one of the best men in the Dominion in his position, a man who is careful financially and who made a wonderful record in the war. He is an honour to his calling, and he thinks it is necessary, if we are to have a militia in Canada, that we should keep up some training. If I were asking the committee to sanction a scheme of extensive training I should be open to criticism, but this does not provide for more than 60 per cent, or at most 65 per cent, training. I was criticised by a Toronto paper the other day for reducing the number of days from sixteen to nine. This vote provides for the training of 60 per cent of the force for nine days instead of sixteen, and the only criticism that I have heard so far is that the reduction has gone too far. I would leave it to hon. gentlemen who had sons, relatives and friends in the war. Are your boys, who have come back, looking to be trained? I do not think they are. But if any emergency arose and you needed men, do you think it would be fair for the men who went through hell for four years to be asked to undertake the same task again, without our calling upon the younger men to do some drilling to take their place? I do not expect that there will be war, but if we are to keep up a militia we must have some young men enter the militia every year. It is not fair to those who have gone through three or four years of war that we should stand aside and say we will not train others to take their places but will let them shoulder the burden as they shouldered it before.

Now, in discussing this matter with General MacBrien I took it up from every angle. I asked him what the effect would be on the militia if we had no training. There is a certain overhead expense we must keep up in connection with the officers and organization for the training that is given every year. General MacBrien gave it as his considered opinion that if we do not provide some training for our young men we will do an injustice to the militia that this House will hasten to rectify, perhaps in three or four years, at the expense five times as great as the sum I am asking for to-day. That being the case, I leave the decision to the House. I am strongly

in favour of having some training given each year to our young men. Our men who went overseas, God knows, had fighting enough. But those men have sons and brothers who are anxious to receive training and be ready to enter the permanent militia if required. If we expect to retain a militia force without that training, we may as well be prepared to abandon the service altogether.

Reference has been made to the permanent militia that did go overseas—and that did not go overseas, as one hon. member said. Let me point out that if it had not been for our trained officers you would never have got thirty thousand men across the ocean in the time you did. And many of the boys who were anxious to go were the sons of the men who had been in the permanent militia, the men who were trained in our militia camps—the camps we propose to hold this summer—were the men who were put in charge of our boys and trained them. As a result these boys were fit to go overseas in a few weeks; but without that training they would have had to remain here indefinitely and Canada would not have been able to achieve the proud position which she now occupies.

I am not a military officer, or a military man, but two of my boys trained as officers, and my experience was that an officer has to supplement his militia pay with a good deal of his private funds to keep up his company. The money we vote for training does not go into the pockets of the officers; they have to pay out hundreds of dollars of their own money to keep up their regiments. When it is charged that officers are living in luxury and having a lot of government money to put in their pockets, I know from my own experience that those officers spend a lot of their own money as well as all they get from the Government to keep the militia alive.

Mr. MEWBURN: With regard to this item for annual training, I concur with what the hon. minister has said, particularly with the last part of his statement. The annual pay granted for the training of our militia does not go into the pockets of the officers, as some people seem to think. I am speaking particularly with regard to the training of what is known as a city corps. For years prior to the war I do not think any city corps that trained and drew its annual drill-pay ever put one cent of the money into the pockets of its officers, non-commissioned officers, or men; that money went back to maintain the efficiency of the corps which the government did not grant sufficient funds to keep up. Since the armistice the old militia units have been pretty well shot to pieces.

I take issue with some hon. gentlemen regarding the militia which did not serve overseas in the first instance. The first Canadian contingent mobilized at Valcartier was composed, to the extent of over 98 per cent, of officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the active militia. Now the active militia are endeavouring to get on their feet once more. This annual allowance for training is the only means by which these units can rehabilitate themselves. The foundation of the old city corps was kept together during the war period by those ex-officers and others who were too old to go overseas, hoping that when the war was over the old units would come into being again. That has taken place. The officers, non-commissioned officers and men of those respective units that served overseas have to the extent of pretty nearly 90 per cent gone back to their old units again, and those officers are bringing in the new generation of our young men to educate and train them in the work, but they are not getting one cent of pay for doing so. This annual drill-pay will be contributed back to the Government in the maintenance of those units that have been a credit to the country in the past, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) said, and I think they will continue to be a credit to Canada as long as Canada is a nation.

I think the vote should not be cut down one cent.

Mr. CHURCH: Increase it.

Mr. MEWBURN: In fact, I should like to see it increased. As the minister goes along, he may not require the whole amount. I know last year a small percentage was spent in training simply because the ranks were not filled up rapidly; but large numbers of the units to-day, as I know personally, are up to their old peace establishment of 1913. All the more credit to them. They are not getting any pay out of it. The item of command pay is in the same category. A small allowance was given to officers commanding corps for command pay, but I do not believe that any officer in our militia ever put a cent of that money in his pocket. We have heard talk about gold lace. I would point out that any equipment officers had was paid for out of their own pockets and never a cent was contributed out of the money voted by Parliament.

Mr. LANCTOT: I have listened with a great deal of surprise to what has been said this afternoon respecting the militia of this country. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island comes nearest to my view in his remarks. I am always astonished when I contrast the attitude of a minister putting his estimates through with his attitude when he sat on the other side of the Chair. When we are on the Opposition side we have not the same views regarding expenditure. I remember very well that last year the Prime Minister of to-day found the militia vote too heavy and moved to cut it down by fifty per cent. I was pleased to support him. Now I am surprised to-day that one of his ministers should, in the first session of this new Parliament, ask for practically the same amount of money to be spent for militia purposes as was required last year. As we all know, our national revenue has in the meantime fallen off very materially. But notwithstanding that, it is now proposed to spend the same amount of money on the militia as was spent last year, although we were supposed to have been engaged in a war to end war. Not only so, but quite recently we sent representatives to the Disarmament Conference in Washington. Is it any wonder that the farmers of this country are tired of the schemes of politicians here in Ottawa to spend money for nothing?

The Minister of Militia said a few moments ago that we are spending very much more money to-day because everything is dearer. We are not surprised to learn that the pay of the militia is higher than it was in 1910 and 1911. But we farmers have also to pay more for our men than we did before the war. What do we do to meet this? We simply reduce the number of our employees. I can speak from personal experience in regard to this, because before the war I used to hire four men all the year around for my farm work at a total cost of $1200; but now that I have to pay $500 or $600 to each man I have to get along with two assistants; I cannot afford more. Now, if that is the condition with the farmer, it is equally the condition with this Government. Things have changed since 1919. We have spent, I understand, over two billion dollars, for what purpose? "To win the war" as we say in this House. Our financial condition is bad and will be for a century to come, I suppose; will any hon. member say this afternoon that we are to raise more soldiers to go into another European war? For myself, I say no. The people of my county will not be satisfied with any suggestion made by hon. members of the Opposition in this House that the militia estimates are too low. I do not like that kind of business. I do not like to receive compliments from my opponents or to have them suggest that we are not spending enough money for militia purposes. I rather think that we are spending too much, and that is what I used to say when I sat on the Opposition side. Now that I am sitting on the Government benches I have not changed my view, nor will I do so.

One of my colleagues declared this afternoon that we should not cut out the entire amount of the vote for training the young men because we have experts at the present time in the Militia Department, and we must use those experts. In reply, I may say this: I want to keep the experts, and if they are not busy during the coming spring and summer, why should they not do some training among themselves—the colonels, the majors and the generals of all kinds? And when they are tired of that training I invite them to spend a few weeks on a farm and work during haying time and harvest time. That would be great training for them.

I do not know what force would actually be required to keep peace in our territory. But our people are all good people, and I think a force of eighteen hundred men would be sufficient for the whole country. The rest of the men can be sent to the east or to the west, wherever they are needed on the farms. The farmers will pay them, so that the country will not be obliged to meet that expense, and the result will be a benefit to the country as a whole.

Mr. MORIN: In the beginning of his remarks the hon. member stated that another hon. member shared his views, and he referred to him as the member from Prince Edward Island. I think he meant the member for Hants (Mr. Martell), did he not?

Mr. LANCTOT: No, I referred to the member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), who said that we were spending too much money on the militia and that we should arrange to have a force no larger than necessary to keep peace within the country.

Now, when we did have a great militia force the country could afford to pay for it. In 1912 and 1913, and in the first part of 1914, the government of the day were preparing for war and we had war. Now the war is over; we have no money to spare for anything that is not necessary, and I

therefore intend to move that this item of $1,400,000, in its entirety, be cut out of the estimates for this year. Let us sign an armistice for two or three years under which we shall stop spending money for nothing, and if the time comes when we have need of soldiers, we will find a way, as we did in 1914, to get the men we need.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the minister (Mr. Graham) on this item. As he spoke I recalled what took place in this House last session and the session before, when a similar item was under discussion. I could not help wishing that I had had the present minister's assistance on those occasions when I was trying to explain, in my humble way, why this vote of a million and a half for annual drill should be granted. I took the ground, it so happens, that he has taken to-day. I pointed out that the three or four hundred thousand men who had fought for three or four years in France or Flanders were, perhaps, the most finished soldiers in the world. They certainly required no more training; besides they had done their bit, if any men in this country or any men in the world had ever done their bit, and should not be asked for further services. I tried to show the House that it was advisable to bring on a new crop of trained men, and that for that purpose this money was necessary. But on both occasions hon. members now sitting opposite did not take that view of the situation. In the session before last the leader of the Opposition himself, now Prime Minister, moved to reduce this item by between eleven and twelve hundred thousand dollars, to leave, I think $300,000 odd as the amount for annual drill. And listen to his argument on that occasion. The present Prime Minister stated, page 3675 Hansard of 1920:

> I would point out that we have in this country at the present time an army of experienced men who need no drilling, men who have been through the war and have suffered its hardships. No amount of drilling in the world will make them more efficient than they are to-day, and until we are through with the work of demobilization we can well afford to dispense altogether with annual drills.

In other words, we should ask the very men whom the minister pictured in such glowing terms a moment ago—we should ask these heroes of the war to do the work that younger men should do. We should call upon them to defend the country in order that the present crop of young men that is growing up should be exempted.

[Mr. Lanctot.]

The House, I am glad to say, negatived the motion of my hon. friend the Prime Minister. It was his view then that this item should be reduced by between eleven and twelve hundred thousand dollars, and he so moved. But now he is Prime Minister; he is head of the Government that comes in with the same vote, reduced by $100,000, and there is no explanation from him of the changed situation. Last session in this House the then member for West Kent, Mr. McCoig, now a senator, who always prided himself on being a farmer member, moved that the vote be reduced by $750,000—a pretty substantial reduction. Every member of the Opposition, now sitting on the Government side, who was in the House just eleven months ago, voted for that reduction. They are there to-day, ranged behind the Prime Minister and his friends, supporting practically the same vote they condemned twelve months ago. Into the House at the present moment steps my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). He took the same view a year ago. I have before me his statement on that occasion. He said:

> But, I do humbly submit this is not the time for these things. My hon. friend the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), himself a gallant returned soldier, the other day reminded us of an important fact. We have 400,000 trained soldiers in Canada to-day—the best material for fighting that the world has ever produced. These men can be called upon if any emergency arises.

That is pretty definite. He goes on:

> Why we should anticipate any emergency at this time it is not easy for anybody to conjecture. If there ever was a time when we had need of but little military expenditure it is to-day, and I believe the men who will be most ready to confirm that view will be the returned soldiers themselves.

That is all the difference between promise and performance. They sat in opposition a year ago and condemned the proposed expenditure. They voted loudly for its reduction and they gave the reasons I have just quoted to the House. And so for the last two sessions. What, then, must they think to-day of the Minister of Militia in their own Government who proposes practically the same vote, with just as good reasons, the same reasons as were given to the House last year and the year before, the same solid, substantial reasons, because I maintain the vote should be granted, and granted without hesitation. But what shall we say of the sincerity, of the honesty, of men who on two occasions during the last two sessions have deliberately voted to reduce? Do you wonder

that some of their own followers have been misled? Do you wonder that my hon. friend who last spoke in the committee is a little disappointed? Do you not believe that he had reason for thinking when he came to the House this session that there would be something substantial by way of reduction? I am glad there is not. I am glad they have in the new minister a man who sees the necessities of the situation, and a man strong enough to maintain what is the proper stand in connection with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I wish to point out to my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Guthrie) that there is something very different in the situation as it presents itself to the House this year, and as it presented itself two years ago and last session. May I remind my hon. friend that two years ago when we took exception to this vote, his government had in the estimates a vote running into several millions of dollars, I think, for the purpose of demobilization. We in opposition at that time took the position that until demobilization had been completed, until the Government had got through spending millions of dollars on demobilization, there was no justification for putting in these large amounts for the purposes of annual drill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Have you not got that vote this year?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, we have not. We may have some claims, but not for the purpose of demobilizing the men from overseas.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is just christened under another name.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all. At the time I speak of, the Government were still bringing men under arms from across the sea. There is nothing of that kind in the estimates at this time. There is a great difference. When exception was taken by those of us in opposition at that time to the expenditure on account of annual drill, it was because the Government was asking us at the same time to vote millions of dollars for the purpose of demobilizing men who had been serving actively. We contended that as long as we were paying out money for demobilization purposes, we should not be asked to pay further large sums for annual drill. That is a very different situation from the one that presents itself at the present time, when demobilization has been completed, and we have to decide whether we shall continue to have a militia in this country or abandon it altogether.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot allow my hon. friend to get away with that statement, because it is not correct. He says that at the time we were bringing men home from overseas. I will challenge him to prove that statement. Demobilization at that time was completed, and the hon. gentleman who sits beside me (Mr. Mewburn) retired as Minister of Militia in 1919. Between 300 and 400 men were kept in Great Britain packing up material to be shipped to this country. These men were demobilized in the autumn of 1921. There may have been 200 or 300 men in Europe in the session the year before last, the session of 1920, engaged in packing up, but last session when the vote was made to reduce there was none. We were not bringing men home. The vote called the demobilization vote was not in the estimates for that purpose but it was for the purpose of paying war claims that had not then been adjusted and paid, transportation claims largely, claims with the British Government, and claims of shipping companies. Between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 was in the estimates for that year and last year between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 was there for the same purpose. This year the Government has changed the wording of the vote. Instead of calling it demobilization they have called it "Adjustment of War Claims." It appears on page 71 of the estimates, and amounts to $8,411,800. If my hon. friend says he moved to reduce this vote in 1920 because there was a demobilization vote, I tell him that he has one there in the estimates now under a different name. If the motion to reduce was made last year because we had between $6,000,000 and $7,000,000 for demobilization, I tell him that he has a larger one still in the estimates under a different name.

Why not let us have a candid statement? They were in opposition in those days and they were pandering for what they supposed was popular support; they were pandering in this House, without thinking the matter out as they should have done, for popular support, and they boldly proposed on both occasions to cut this vote down to the vanishing point, where it would have been absolutely worthless as a vote for that purpose, and on each occasion the Government had to muster its followers and vote the motion down. Twelve months have gone and they are now in power and

in a position to carry out their ideas. Do you think they intend to do it? Is it any wonder that my hon. friend down there feels disappointed that he has been fooled in the matter?

Mr. LANCTOT: There is nobody to fool me in this House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not believe anybody in this House can fool him, but he had reason to expect at all events that these deliberate actions of the Opposition only twenty-four months ago would be put in practice at the first session of Parliament. I am glad they were not put in practice. All I want to do now is to show the hollowness of the contention of the Opposition in former years, and particularly in view of what the Government proposes to do at the present moment.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If what my hon. friend says is correct, then he deceived the House in the matter of demobilization, as he did in the matter of the purchase of ammunition. He told this House in regard to ammunition for artillery purposes that there was need for a very large vote running into a hundred thousand dollars or thereabouts, because the ammunition for artillery purposes had to be manufactured in our Canadian arsenals. We found out afterwards that my hon. friend was bringing in from the Old Country ammunition, high explosive shells, amounting it is estimated to $6,000,000, out of a credit which was to this country's account in the Old World. He has still to account to Parliament for that expenditure, and I will expect before this debate is over that he will do so. If what he says is true about demobilization, he deceived us in the same way in that regard, for he distinctly led us to believe that the reason why we had to vote this large sum for demobilization was because men were still overseas and had to be brought back, and our contention was, if that were true there was no necessity for voting money for annual drill in Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I assume that my hon. friend will verify his statement. What I said will be in Hansard and I assume that my hon. friend will produce it. I am going to deal with the ammunition question, but as it is six o'clock it would be hardly worth while starting on it now.

Mr. FIELDING: It might be explosive.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House took recess.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY

Mr. TOLMIE moved that the House go into committee on Bill No. 6 respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment. I beg leave to move, seconded by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman):

> That the House do not now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the said bill but that the said bill be referred back to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines with instructions that they have power to amend the said bill by striking out the word "two" in line eight thereof and inserting the word "one" in lieu thereof, and by striking out the word "five" in line fifteen and inserting the word "three" in lieu thereof.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will the hon. member explain what this means?

Mr. NEILL: I will be very glad to explain. This is Bill No. 6 "An act respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company". The railway in question is a subsidiary of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The bill grants that company authority to build a railway or rather, I should say, renews the authority for them to build this extension of a railway in Vancouver Island from a place called Courtenay to Duncan Bay, a distance of thirty-six miles, in the district that I represent. The bill extends for five years the period in which the company can build this railway which is only to be thirty-six miles long. The bill itself says the company may begin construction in two years and complete the road within five years; but as a matter of fact it really gives them five years to begin and end the construction of the railway because the company do not come, in that regard, under the ordinary provisions of the Railway Act of Canada which requires the expenditure of fifteen per cent of the value of the line within two years upon construction. That provision does not apply to the present bill, it is overridden by a special clause, so that the company really get five years in which to begin to build the railway. Now my amendment will reduce the period in which the company must begin construction to one year, and the period within which it must complete the line to three years. I wish to disavow any spirit of hostility to the Canadian Pacific Railway

Company in any way whatsoever. I believe they are a great and very well managed company and I would be very glad to see them running our National railways. But that has nothing to do with this situation. If the company are as anxious to build this railway as they say they are—and my constituents are equally anxious—then we are all united on the subject. In that case we want to do the Aaron and Joshua act and hold up the hands of this railway Moses who seems somewhat inclined to let the tide of railway construction, the tide of battle, go against him as in the case of Moses of old.

I can give three reasons why this railway should be built at once: In the first place the company have had five years to build it and have not done so. But apart from that, the construction of the railway would provide a great deal of very necessary work. We hear much in this House about unemployment and we hear of hundreds of thousands of dollars spent in alleviating unemployment, very largely in non-productive work the greater portion of which is a loss. Then too, there could be no more opportune time than the present to build this railway bearing in mind the question of labour. Labour is probably as cheap now as it will ever be, unless the cost of living takes a very great change of which there is no immediate prospect. In addition to that, if this enterprise were proceeded with, it would give a very great amount of very much needed work for the people in that vicinity and relieve the labour situation on Vancouver Island and in Vancouver city. As you know there is a great deal of unemployment in Vancouver at the present moment. In the second place access would be given to a great number of people who have been living there hoping, and praying and expecting this railway for something like fifty-five years. Comox Valley is one of the oldest settled districts in British Columbia. It is a very fine, fertile valley, and these people went in there many years ago with "the sure and certain hope," as the Church of England Prayer Book says, of the railway coming along, and they are living in that hope to-day. Not only that, Sir, but it would lay open to settlement large areas of fine agricultural land. These areas would be made easy of access and would be most suitable places for settlement by some of that herd of immigrants we are told it is the policy of the Government—they have a vote of something like $400,000 in the estimates for the purpose—to bring into the country. We are told these immigrants are coming along, and the Government could not get a more splendid or more fertile valley in which to locate them—if they are going to get them—than in the same Comox Valley. As I say this railway would give access to those lands.

I have cited the arguments in favour of having this railway built. Now, as to possible arguments against it. I am handicapped in that regard because I cannot think of any such arguments, and having to speak first in this discussion it is hard for me to anticipate any possible opposition. The only way in which I could anticipate any opposition is to revert back to the statements made to the Railway Committee when this matter was under discussion there. I may say in passing, Sir, that the transactions in the Railway Committee revealed to me, as a new member of the House, a somewhat remarkable condition of affairs. It appears that, according to the rules, and the dictum of a gentleman named Bourinot—who I understand is an authority and has been dead for some time—when a railway bill of this character comes before the Railway Committee there is allowed to appear before that committee and argue the merits of the case the learned counsel of the law employed by the railway in that behalf. That occurred in this case and I have no objection whatever to the appearance of the counsel in question; he did not abuse his opportunities in any way whatever. I merely state that he was allowed to present his case as fully and as often as he thought necessary. But when it came to the member who represents the district through which this railway is to run, on account of his not being a member of the committee he was not allowed to represent the views of that district at all. As a matter of fact I was able to make some observations concerning the bill because it was not known at that time that I was not a member of the Railway Committee. When it was discovered that I was not a member of the committee, owing to my honesty in not voting when a vote was taken, immediate objection was raised to my activities, and had it not been that Providence—ever kind to the under-dog—sent to my assistance an angel disguised—perhaps I should say thinly disguised—in the fleshly form of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell), I would not have been able to get my amendment before the committee at all. At any rate there is the condition of the rules. It may be

argued—I have heard hon. members assert that I have exaggerated the case—that even though an hon. gentleman is not a member of the committee he is allowed to go there and speak his mind provided he does not vote. As to that, let me say that the question was brought up in the Committee on Agriculture a few days ago and it was decided—absolutely decided on the authority of the gentleman I mentioned a moment ago, Bourinot (page 469)—

"That a member of the House who is not a member of the committee has no right whatever to attend such committee for the purpose of addressing it, or putting questions to the witnesses, or interfering in any way with the proceedings."

If that is one of the rules which I and other new members are supposed to receive with reverence, to handle with loving care and to hand on, unimpaired, to our successors, then I would suggest that the sooner we have a bonfire of those rules the better, and let us start out with a fresh set of rules more in accord with those that would be common and customary in an ordinary commercial or industrial undertaking. Let us get a little more down to business and have a little less of these rules. As I have said before, I understand the author is dead, so he will not feel hurt at any criticism, but I think he should have taken some of those rules with him.

I now propose to deal with the arguments advanced before the committee. I think, however, "argument" is an ill-advised word, for argument suggests, does it not, a basis of fact and a superstructure of logic? I could not help thinking, when I heard the statements made in that regard, that both the logic and the facts were somewhat wobbly. I will not call them arguments; I will call them statements made in that connection. The first one was that this was part of a big railway, a main railway I think was the expression used, from Victoria at the south end of the island to the north end of the island; that 140 miles had been built, and there was a general impression given that there was a vigorous and aggressive building movement going on and that, whenever they had a moment to spare, they turned and dug a few more miles of this railway. It is true that the railway runs from Victoria; but it does not run to the north end of the island, and the company has not a charter to do that. It stops at Duncan's Bay. The railway has been built from Victoria to Courtenay, 140 miles having been built recently, we were given to understand. Of this 140 miles, 75 miles were built under the terms of the union of British Columbia with the confederation. That takes us back a good many years, and it was built, not by the Canadian Pacific, but by a gentleman by the name of Dunsmuir who received, for the building of those 75 miles of railway, a large sum, I forget the exact figure, but practically enough to build the road, and he also received a grant of practically one-third of Vancouver island. This grant took in everything, base metals and coal mines as well. One of the members for Vancouver the other night, in speaking of the natural resources of British Columbia, mentioned this land grant to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway, and he said that it was conservatively estimated as being worth $25,000,000. When one considers that there are six or eight very valuable coal mines on the island and a vast quantity of timber and base metals, perhaps he was right; but at any rate, enough money to build the railway and $25,000,000 worth of land were paid to build 75 miles of this railway thirty-eight years ago. Therefore, I do not think it enters very much into the consideration of whether this franchise should be extended to-day or not. Twenty-eight years later, they took another burst of railway construction and they built another sixty-five miles. That was some twelve years ago; and if we are going on the same geometrical progression of railway construction, the cycle when another burst of railway construction to complete this thing will come around will, so far as I can figure it, be the year 1948. I am wrong—1946 was the correct date. About that time I fear—I will not fear, but I trust many of those men, including myself, who have waited so long and faithfully for that railway, will be in a happier country where railways will not be needed and where politicians are excluded also. In that happier clime I would hate to meet my constituents and hear them say to me: "You did not get that railway built."

Another statement that was alleged as a reason why this extension should be granted and against my proposal to shorten the period in which it would be built, was that there was a lack of funds. Lack of funds for the Canadian Pacific to build thirty-six miles of a railway in a comparatively level country! A bait was thrown out to the Progressive members who were present. It was suggested that it would not be fair to the rest of Canada for the

Canadian Pacific to concentrate all their building energies on this 36 miles of railway on Vancouver island. But I think the Progressive members and other members who were present have sufficient acumen to understand that their opportunities of getting railways will not be impaired, even if the Canadian Pacific are compelled to spend their vast resources in building 36 miles of a railway on Vancouver island, the work being spread over three years. I may mention that it is supposed—I would not guarantee this—that the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway is one of the most profitable extensions of the whole Canadian Pacific. I do not believe the Canadian Pacific, that great company with its high standing and reputation, would approve its apologists who say that it would impair its credit or finances if it built that railroad in three years instead of five. About 30 miles from this identical place, I travelled over a logging railroad 40 miles in extent, and as well built and ballasted as the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway is, and that railway was built by that logging company without any subsidy from this House and without any fuss being made about the matter. I saw that road built simply to get out logs, and there are many reasons why it would be more advantageous to build this particular road.

Another statement that was made as a reason why they should be given practically unlimited time was—I will prove later on, that this is only a precursor of more similar bills, for there is no intention of building under this bill—"you might as well give it to them for if you do not, no one else will build the railway." There may be a certain amount of cynical truth in that statement, because, if there was any prospect of opposition, this railway would have been built long ago. We will consider that point later. The one thing that I am certain of is that no other railway company is likely to come here asking for a charter as long as the great Canadian Pacific has a blanket charter to build this line.

There is one of the best water powers in British Columbia along the line of this railway, and I am told that negotiations are going on to-day by a large English syndicate to harness that power. For that purpose they would require to have a capital of between three and four million dollars. Suppose I come here next year on account of the Hydro-Electric Company asking for a charter, what a howl would go up. I would be a destructionist, a financial Bolshevist and everything else: I would be interfering with vested interests, and I would be howled down. But why not give these people an opportunity?

Apart from that, there is another aspect to which I should like to draw the attention of the House. Some years ago, when the railway boom was prevalent and everybody was building railways, the Canadian Northern, now the National railways, got a charter on the Island to build from Victoria up to Courtenay, the place I am now talking about. They spent $3,000,000 and they got the railway graded, but no steel on it, as far as six miles from the west coast at Port Alberni. Since then they have laid steel to Cowichan lake to get out some valuable timber there. That has been done by the government; it shows that they have it in contemplation, and there is no reason to suppose that they will let the $3,000,000 which they have already spent there, lie idle. It may be in time to come they will extend it, and if they do extend it, the line will run from Victoria to Courtenay and from there north. We were told in 1896 that a vast industrial boom took place on account of the accession of the Liberal party to power. It may be—I do not know—that history will reproduce itself and we shall see another industrial boom. If that is the case, it may well be that, in the course of a few years, the Canadian National Railways may find it possible to continue the railway further north. Amongst other industries that I might mention that would be touched by that line is the anticipated radium mine of British Columbia. I am proud of it. I do not believe there is another spot on the North American continent where radium has been found except in the district I have the honour to represent. Now, radium is not found like placer gold nor is it as easily gathered and put into a suitcase; it is found in rocks and involves an expensive process of handling. It is found within ten or twenty miles of the line of this railway; and this is the day, and British Columbia the place, of unexpected development. We never know the moment some big company may take hold of it, and it might well be that if this railway is not built under this charter some other corporation might be found to build it. The most fatal objection that was raised was the one on which the lawyers and politicians are alike agreed: it was the fatal one of precedent. We find, Sir, that precedent haunts the very precincts of this House. It was stated that we had in the

dim past established the precedent that two years to commence and five years to finish was the ordinary rule with regard to railways, and that because we had once laid down that rule, therefore we must forever adhere to it. Now, it would be all very well if this were a big railway, or even if this were the first time that these people were asking for this concession. But this is the second reincarnation of this railway, and it does not necessarily follow that they should have the same time in which to build and finish. They know now what they are up against and have had ample time for preparation; and if an extension is granted now they will come back two years hence, asking another extension. In any case, this custom that is spoken of with such awe and respect has been in force only for a few years; and are we never to learn from experience that if certain legislation or certain regulations do not produce the object aimed at, we should abandon hoary-headed precedent and strike out for ourselves? Are we never to take a chance? Perhaps hon. members of the Government would not be sitting where they now are if the electors, on December 6th last, had not decided to take a chance; and I think that the chance taken by the electorate was quite as great as the chance we should take in getting away from precedent now. It is yet in the womb of time whether the wisdom of the country was justified in her children on that occasion; but, I think, the chance the people took on that occasion was, if anything, much more desperate than the one I am asking the House to take to-night in abandoning precedent for once.

There is something else I want to point out. It has been the custom of this House always to defer to the findings of the Railway Committee. Word will go around that the railway committee has investigated the subject, and we must stand by their decision. At the bottom of members' minds is the idea: "It will save us the trouble of making up our minds for ourselves if we accept the findings of the committee." Well, may I remind the House of the precedent which we established quite recently? Only a few days ago there was introduced into this House a report of the Agricultural Committee in connection with the Wheat Board. That report had been unanimously arrived at in the committee; yet, when it was brought into the House it was torn to pieces, the House unanimously deciding to send it back whence it had come. But this legislation, which I am asking to have returned to the Railway Committee, was carried only by a narrow majority in a comparatively small meeting of the committee. I think, therefore, that we have ample reason for not adhering to the principle that because the Railway Committee passed on the question we must necessarily be prohibited from exercising our own judgment as well.

There is something else about the bill which more than ever convinces me that it is not intended to build under this charter, but to continue for another series of years the present state of things. We are all aware, Mr. Speaker, of the custom in connection with all these bills—and I have another one, No. 5, before me now—to insert a clause specifying the amount of bonds that are allowed to be issued against each mile of railway to be built. That clause was in the original act relating to this railway; but is it in this bill? It is not. They did not think it worth while putting it in. And they have either forgotten, omitted or neglected to put in even the customary clause giving the wretched bill a name. Are they so ashamed of this poor foundling that they have disdained to give it a title in the ordinary way? And when we find the omission of another clause with regard to the spending of 15 per cent in the two years, we are more than ever driven to the conclusion that they regard the whole thing as a stop-gap and have no intention of building under it. If they did intend to build, would they not have put in the clause about the bonds for the money to be provided to build with and would they not have given the poor foundling a name? They will be coming back two years from now and two years thereafter; and will simply regard this as a blanket charter from year to year and from decade to decade. This is unfair and unbusinesslike. It is unfair to the men who are living in that district, the pioneers who are expecting a railway; it is unfair to the men of the past, and unfair to the men of the future; for some hon. members may not realize that immigrants coming from the old country are very often misled by legislation of this character. Real estate men who have farms and lands to sell will show those immigrants this bill and say: "Look at that! There, under the imprimatur of the Government of Canada, is the assurance of a railway." And the poor deluded immigrant, unfamiliar with our system of doing business, will think this railway will be built. I have known

cases where men have gone in and built a home ahead of the railway on the strength of such a promise and the railway was not built for twenty-five years. It is not fair to the people who are already there, nor to those who may come hereafter, and I am not asking for anything unreasonable. I simply want a fair and just compromise. I am not saying that we should compel them to live up to the old charter, in which case they would have to begin operations immediately; I am merely asking that they shall begin operations within one year and complete within three years.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks that have been made with regard to the construction of this railway. I am familiar with the conditions prevailing on Vancouver Island and particularly with the proposed route of the railway in question. The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway is asking for an extension of the line from the present terminus at Courtenay to a point at or near Duncan Bay, a distance of some thirty-six miles. This is not through country that is not fairly well supplied, at some reasonable distance, with water communication; it is located on an island, and there are fair roads through a good part of that country. The case of the railway company was presented to the committee and thoroughly threshed out, and it received the approval of the committee. Conditions have not yet reached normal, and we know that certain expenses are high in connection with railway construction, although prices have a downward tendency; and it is only fair to grant the reasonable request made by this railway—not an unusual request either—for an extension of time in order to complete the road. There is no other railway in that section of Vancouver Island this proposed line could couple up with except the railway now in operation and having its terminus at Courtenay. I do not think there is much danger about settlers being deceived. A settler should know enough to keep his eyes open when coming to Canada, and he should be very diligent in protecting his own interests. Anybody can tell a settler that a railway is to be built in some place or other. It is the settler's business to protect himself by securing proper information. I trust the House will accept the finding of the Railway Committee and grant the extension of time.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbinière): The question involved in this discussion has already been fully threshed out before the Railway Committee. That it was not possible for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or any other company, to build the railway is quite evident by the fact that nothing was done under the charter, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company now comes before Parliament for an extension of time. If no extension is granted, it is pretty certain that no other company will build this railway. Even if the extension is granted, it will be fully six or seven months before the promoters are ready to begin work in the field, because financial arrangements will have to be made and extensive engineering plans prepared. So it is not likely that within the twelve months' extension which my hon. friend (Mr. Neill) proposes the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be able to commence operations. As a matter of fact they are asking for an extension of two years. Neither before the committee nor before this House, has it been proven that any other company intend to undertake this work if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company default. If another company were ready to proceed, provided this charter were not renewed, then there might be some ground for refusing the request of the promoters; but in the absence of any such competitors I think the full extension of two years should be granted. Obviously, an extension of only one year would not be sufficient to enable the Canadian Pacific railway to complete construction and it would only necessitate their coming back and asking for a further extension next session. We are asking therefore that the time be extended for two years.

Mr. NEILL: If the hon. member will permit me? When he says "We are asking for an extension" whom does the "we" refer to?

Mr. VIEN: I mean the members who advocate the granting of the promoters' request. I am not surprised at my hon. friend's question. The remarks of those of his friends who were opposing the bill before the Railway Committee almost led to a row on that very same point. The aspersion that the hon. gentleman is trying to cast upon us is weak indeed. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should not curtail the extension of time which the petitioners have asked for, but should give them such further time as will allow them to commence the work and carry it to completion. If

they do not begin construction within the specified time, then my hon. friend's argument can be advanced should the petitioners come back for a further extension in future.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). I think he has taken a very reasonable view of this proposition. The railway company have slept on their rights, so to speak, for a number of years; and whilst my hon. friend from Lotbiniére (Mr. Vien) says that if another company could show that it intended to build this road it would be a good reason for not extending this charter, I submit, in all deference to his opinion, that having this charter upon the statute books is inferentially a prohibition against other people coming in and undertaking construction. If a company were incorporated for the purpose of building this road, when they put their stock upon the market they would at once be met by the assertion—and it would be an assertion of fact—that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company already held a charter for its construction.

We all know that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a large and powerful corporation, so much so that when a member rises in the House to oppose it, he is to a great extent courting political oblivion. But when principle is involved it matters not to me whether it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any humble body of people associated for the purpose of building a railway, I think they are both entitled to equal consideration. So it is incumbent upon Parliament, I submit, to see that neither directly nor inferentially is an embargo placed upon any project to build a railway. As I have already stated, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or its subsidiary, has had this charter for a number of years, and on divers occasions has come to this House for an extension of time. To-day a further extension is being sought without any legitimate reasons therefor being given.

The motion of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni gives the petitioners an opportunity within the next twelve months to prove their bona fides. If they begin construction within the next eight or nine months, or even within the next eleven months, they will have amply demonstrated to Parliament and to the country that they are serious in regard to this matter, and I am sure they would have no trouble in getting a further extension of their charter to complete the railway.

It is all very well to have railway charters upon our statute books, but I submit that it is in the best interests of the people that no charter be granted to any individual, firm or corporation for the construction of a public utility unless ample evidence be adduced to Parliament that the promoters are financially able to begin construction of the work for which authority is sought. Because, as I have already said, if we enact legislation for the construction of a public utility, it inferentially has the effect of debarring others from building that utility. It is time we called a halt to permitting a corporation or an individual, either the mighty Canadian Pacific or the humblest individual in Canada, to hold charters for the purpose of keeping other people from building railways in a particular section, or of building them when it suits their own convenience, not the convenience of the public at large. I am not a resident of British Columbia—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MARTELL: My hon. friend says "Hear, hear," but I assure him that I am a resident of a greater province—Nova Scotia. I am submitting to-night, however, the same arguments that I would submit were this a charter for a railway in my own province. What is the case of British Columbia to-day, as it has been so ably set forth by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) may be the case of Nova Scotia to-morrow; and Sir, in this age of democracy it is necessary that everything possible be done to retrieve the mistakes that have been made in the past, in order that we may at least retain for the people of the future the rights which are legitimately the rights of the people and not of any corporation.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Neill), which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Bancroft,	Carruthers,
Beaubien,	Coote,
Binette,	d'Anjou,
Bird,	Drummond,
Black (Huron),	Elliott (Dundas),
Brethen,	Euler,
Brown,	Evans,
Cahill,	Fansher,
Caldwell,	Findlay,
Campbell,	Forke,
Carmichael,	Gardiner,
Carroll,	Garland (Bow River),

Gervais,
Good,
Gould,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Hatfield,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Humphrey,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kellner,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Lapierre,
Leader,
Léger,
Lewis,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McKenzie,
McMaster,
McMuray,
McTaggart,
Martel,
Millar,
Milne,
Morrison,
Munro,
Murdock,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Pelletier,
Power,
Pritchard,
Raymond,
Reed,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Humboldt),
Stork,
Thurston,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—91.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Baxter.
Black (Yukon),
Bourassa,
Bowen,
Boys,
Bureau,
Cardin,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chisholm,
Church,
Clark,
Copp,
Déchêne,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Desiauriers,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duff,
Duncan,
Forester,
Fortier,
Garland (Carleton),
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hanson,
Harris,
Hocken,
Hubbs,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Jones,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lavigueur,
Logan,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacKelvie,
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Malcolm,
Manion,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Mercier,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Pacaud,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Senn,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stein,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Leeds),
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Vien,
Walsh,
White—95.

Main motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Militia and Defence—Annual Drill, $1,400,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, shortly before the committee rose at six o'clock, and while we were discussing this item of $1,400,000 for annual drill, I had taken occasion to comment upon the fact that last session a motion had been made in this House by the then hon. member for Kent county to reduce the amount then in the Estimates for annual drill by one-half, and that the present Prime Minister of Canada and those now supporting him on the Government side had solidly voted in support of that reduction. I had likewise commented on the fact that in the year previous, in the session of 1920, my hon. friend the Prime Minister had himself moved in respect to this item, which then stood at the sum of $1,500,000, a motion that it be reduced by the sum of $1,150,000, to leave it the net amount of $350,000, and I made some comment on what I think I can reasonably call the change of front on the part of my hon. friend the Prime Minister in respect to this particular item. He moved the motion himself in this House in the year 1920.

9 p.m.

This afternoon shortly before six o'clock he attempted to make a justification of his change of position. He attempted to justify his change of attitude, because to-day his Government has laid before the House a proposal to expend $1,400,000 for annual drill, by stating that in 1920 conditions were different, that we had then a large number of men practically under arms, undemobilized, and that that fact was present in his mind when he made the motion in 1920. I endeavoured, in reply, to point out to my hon. friend that he was entirely mistaken in that view, that we had very, very few men undemobilized when he made

his motion, that there were overseas only some 200 or 300 men who had not been returned to Canada. Then my hon. friend replied to me in language to which I think I may fairly take exception, or, at all events, I may ask him to justify the statement he made. He used this language:

If what my hon. friend says is correct, he deceived the House in the matter of demobilization as he did in the matter of the purchase of ammunition. If what he says about demobilization be correct, he deceived us in the same way in that regard, for he distinctly led us to believe that the reason why he had to vote this large sum for demobilization was because the men were overseas and had to be brought back and our contention was that if that were true there was no necessity for voting money for annual drill in Canada.

I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I am what you would call over-sensitive in regard to language that is used in reference to myself, but when the statement is made from his place in Parliament by the Prime Minister of this country that I have deceived the House in regard to the matter of demobilization, and that by reason of my deception my hon. friend then leading the Opposition made a motion to reduce the amount for annual drill in 1920, I think I may fairly ask him to justify his statement by telling the House just what I said in justification of the charge he has made against me. I have in the interval taken a look at Hansard, and I find that on the 16th of June, 1920, my hon. friend entered upon a fairly elaborate discussion of the militia estimates. I am going to quote from what he said (Hansard, page 3646):

But the point to which I wish particularly to direct attention is the minister's endeavour to draw a comparison between the expenditure on militia and defence at the present time and amounts that were voted prior to the war. The minister seems to think that at the present time we ought to vote an amount at least equal to amounts that were being voted prior to the war. That is where I take direct issue with him. Before the war it was pretty generally anticipated; it was certainly said in official quarters that a menace was threatening the world, and that it was necessary to meet that menace by increasing our military and naval forces.

That argument was used as the ground for increasing military expenditures, and it was largely in anticipation of the danger of a great international disturbance that this country voted for military and naval purposes the sums of money which were appropriated at that time. But conditions are wholly different to-day. There is no world menace. Where does the minister expect invasion from?

May I ask the same question again to-night of my hon. friend?

The minister says that this expenditure is needed for the defence of Canada—defence against whom?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

I ask my hon. friend the same question to-night.

There is no answer; there is no answer to be made. There is not an hon. gentleman on the other side who will say that a single nation at the present time has any hostile intention or attitude of hostility towards this country, or that there is the slightest danger of Canada being invaded from any quarter. Yet the minister asks us to-day to vote a sum that will bear comparison with expenditures voted on the eve of the terrible situation which occurred in 1914. I might further point out that prior to 1914, that, to be correct, during the period of the Liberal Administration, because the minister referred to that period, we had surpluses, not deficits in our public accounts, and we had a small national debt. To-day we have a colossal public debt; we have obligations that are wholly different, and we are not in the same position to begin to meet them. It is one thing to lay out sums of money on different appropriations when there are plenty of funds in the treasury, but it is quite another matter when the nation is trying to cope with an enormous deficit and to meet obligations such as the country heretofore has never been faced with, and when conditions are such that there is the strongest reason why we should economize in every possible particular, and especially in those particulars in which no satisfactory reason can be shown for large expenditures.

But the most important consideration of all is this. The minister has spoken about the need for training camps, permanent barracks and the like. Prior to 1914, it was necessary to have men trained as soldiers; we had no trained men, or very few, but what is the position to-day? We have in this country to-day an army of trained men, the most efficient soldiers that will be found in any part of the world, so that the situation is wholly different from what it was prior to the war. The need for training to-day is not what it was prior to the war. We have the experience, knowledge, and attainments of thousands of men as our security and safeguard if there be need for such at the present time. That is a reason why, on this particular score, much could be done in the way of reducing expenditures.

I followed my hon. friend on the same date. I tried to give him full particulars, these are the particulars in which he charges I deceived the House. As reported at page 3676 of Hansard for the same day I stated, in reply to my hon. friend:

There are still undemobilized of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, of all ranks, 2,386 men out of a total enlistment of over 390,000. There is no other country which took part in the war that can show that result, or anything like it. Of these men 1,334 are employed in the depots in this country on military work; 632 are patients undergoing treatment in hospitals; 420 are on the medical and nursing staffs, orderlies and attendants in hospitals; making a total of 2,386 undemobilized out of well nigh 600,000. In addition we have in England undemobilized 36 officers, 154 men and 63 members of the air force who have been transferred to the Canadian Expeditionary Force, or 253.

That, surely, Mr. Chairman, was a plain, direct unequivocal statement of the extent

to which demobilization had proceeded on that day in June when my hon. friend made his motion. Now, lest it be said that on the vote for demobilization, which is a separate vote, something was said by me, I have looked that reference up too, and I find that in reply to questions I said on the 30th June, as will be found at page 4552, that we had only between two and three hundred men undemobilized in Great Britain or overseas. I gave particulars that same day of the whole proposed expenditure of the Militia Department in connection with the thirty-eight millions for demobilization. This statement will be found at pages 4550 and 4551 item by item, showing what part of that vote was to be expended in Canada, showing likewise that $9,745,000 of it was to be expended by the Overseas Ministers in Great Britain—every detail, every particular as to money and as to men, and my hon. friend sat in his place and heard my statement. The statement made by my hon. friend in regard to me to-day is the statement which I have read to the House—namely, that my hon. friend based his motion for a reduction in 1920 upon the fact that I had deceived Parliament in connection with the demobilization vote, and that annual camps were not necessary in 1920 because large numbers of men were then coming from overseas to Canada and these were highly trained soldiers. I take exception to the language of the Prime Minister, very grave exception. If he made his statement recklessly, if he made it in a moment of heat, I suppose he can explain it. The Prime Minister has had to turn many pretty sharp corners this session. I have no doubt he had to lie awake at night sometimes to think up new excuses for his many changes of front. I do not mind what excuses he gives to the House for his latest change of heart; I do not know what has caused him to change his opinion in regard to annual drills—it matters not one whit to me. But I ask him if it is quite fair that he should seek to offer as an excuse for his change of opinion a baseless statement that somebody else has deceived the House of Commons? Did my hon. friend not take the same position last year just twelve months ago? Did I deceive him twice on the subject? I do not think I uttered a word in connection with the subject last year; if I did he will produce it to the House now. But I am dealing with the expenditure of 1920, and I have gone over the records and if there is anything else to be stated I trust my hon. friend will give it to the House. Certain it is that so far as I am aware I gave the House in 1920 the fullest, the fairest, and the most exact statement of the situation as it then existed. The true reasons for the motion to reduce annual drill by $1,150,000 in 1920 which actuated my hon. friend were given by him to the House on that occasion when he admitted to the House and which I quoted a few moments ago.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Chairman, when we speak of demobilization my understanding is that it is the reverse process of mobilization. When forces are being mobilized they are being brought out for a particular purpose; when they are being demobilized they are being disbanded for a particular purpose. I maintain that when the minister asked this Parliament to vote millions of dollars for the purpose of demobilization, the people of Canada and the members of this House understood by that term that the money was for the purpose of demobilizing the forces that had been mobilized, and if he was trying to get money for any other purpose he was deceiving the House. That is the position I took and I say it is a right and proper position. Now in regard to what I said this afternoon as to my hon. friend deceiving the House in the matter of shells, let me indicate to him just what I have in mind and—

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we have not come to that item yet; we are dealing with the vote for annual camps.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I know my hon. friend is very anxious to get away from this, but he has brought up the question himself and I think he had better stay and hear the matter discussed. He has referred to the Hansard of 1920. I shall also refer to the Hansard of 1920 when my hon. friend came before the House to secure an appropriation from Parliament for the purpose of purchasing munitions. On page 3,717 of Hansard, June 17, 1920, I find the following:

> Mr. Lemieux: Is it not a fact that the Quebec arsenal was quite sufficient for our needs, except for a certain period during the war when munitions were urgently needed on the other side? In normal times, would not the Quebec arsenal be amply sufficient for the needs of our militia?
>
> Mr. Guthrie: As between the two arsenals I think Lindsay would be the better adapted, but there are military reasons for maintaining both arsenals. I believe the construction of the two arsenals was advised by a high military authority, for reasons which are obvious. I believe that either one has the capacity to turn

out a sufficient output in peace times. Neither of them is being operated to its capacity at the present time.

Mr. Lemieux: How many men are there at the Quebec arsenal?

Mr. Guthrie: At the present time, nearly 500. All our heavy ammunition and quick firing ammunition, as well as a large part of our rifle ammunition, is made at Quebec. Lindsay only manufactures at present small arms ammunition; I do not think it has the equipment for making artillery ammunition.

Mr. Lemieux: I am informed that the munitions turned out by the Quebec arsenal were highly commended by military authorities during the war. Is that a fact?

Mr. Guthrie: I understand that our ammunition has been very highly commended, both that made at Quebec and that made at Lindsay. I doubt if any better ammunition is turned out anywhere.

I submit that, when my hon. friend told this House that all our heavy ammunition and quick-firing ammunition, as well as a large part of our rifle ammunition, were made at Quebec, he led every member of this House to believe that the appropriation, which he was asking Parliament to vote for purposes of ammunition, was necessary because we had to get that heavy ammunition from the arsenal at Quebec. That was in 1920. I now come to the Estimates of 1921, when my hon. friend was asking Parliament to appropriate money to pay for the salaries of inspectors of munitions. What did he say? At page 2782 of Hansard of April 29, 1921, I find this statement:

Mr. Guthrie: The inspector of ammunition at Quebec is Mr. Keightley. We have two arsenals, one at Quebec and one at Lindsay. From these arsenals a large amount of ammunition has been turned out, running into many millions, and in that connection it is necessary to have a competent inspector. No loss can be greater or more consequential than that resulting from defective ammunition. The item is reduced this year by $25,000; we have brought it down to the lowest possible figure. There has been no attempt to disguise these items; they are carried now as they have been for fifteen or twenty years.

A little further down he made this statement:

Mr. Guthrie: This item covers arms and ammunition.

Mr. Power: Is this for small arms or for artillery stores?

Mr. Guthrie: About 200,000 rifles came back to Canada at the end of the war, and of these about 40,000 are at the present moment being overhauled. Many of these arms as returned were found to be more or less defective from wear, rough usage, or loss of some trifling detail affecting the serviceability of the whole arm. After these 40,000 are repaired, they will be put back into stock. The amount of money involved in stores of arms and ammunition is very large; we have the stores on hand now, and they must be kept in shape and continually examined and inspected; otherwise, on account of deterioration, heavy losses are liable to be incurred.

I submit that, when my hon. friend asked Parliament for the appropriation for that purpose, he clearly led the House to believe that all the ammunition that was required was in storage in this country at that time; that there were large quantities of it, and that, for that reason, he had to pay a large amount for salaries to inspectors of munitions, for whom he was asking a particular appropriation at that time. I ask the committee to keep together in mind these two statements—the statement on June 17, 1920:

All our heavy ammunition and quick-firing ammunition, as well as a large part of our rifle ammunition, is made at Quebec.

And the statement of April 29, 1921:

The amount of money involved in stores of arms and ammunition is very large; we have the stores on hand now, and they must be kept in shape and continually examined.

Those statements, in the absence of any other reference to munitions available from any other source, I contend, imply and can only imply that we were getting all our munitions in this country and that, for that reason, Parliament should vote the amounts that were asked for. The committee should note what the Minister of Militia and Defence of that day said, which is in the paragraph preceding the one about munitions:

About 200,000 rifles came back to Canada at the end of the war, and of these about 40,000 are at the present moment being overhauled.

He spoke about arms coming back from the other side. Nothing was said about munitions. He made it perfectly plain, or rather he tried to convey the impression that all our munitions were manufactured in the arsenal at Quebec. Elsewhere in the debate, I think it will be found that he defended the fact of the amount asked for being so large by stating that it was because wages had gone up at the arsenals where these munitions were being produced. It was in the light of that discussion, of those statements, that this House appropriated money for munitions, for high explosives for the artillery. What do we find? I have in my hand a memorandum of gun ammunition entered at the outport of Lévis, Que. I will not go any further back than May of last year. Remember it was in April of last year that my hon. friend's statement was made to the effect that we had all the stores here, and that he got the appropriation for the purpose of munitions. What do I find according to the customs entries:

Date of Entry.	
31st May, 1921; primers, guncotton, howitzer shells, etc.	$ 334,340
16th July, 1921; percussion fuses, tubes, etc.	12,600
28th June, 1921; fuses, shells, quick-firing, shells, breech-loading, 8-inch howitzer	91,320
15th August, 1921; shells, cartridges and fuses	202,863
15th August, 1921; shells, cartridges and fuses	509,405
24th August, 1921; shells and cartridges	488,269
24th November, 1921; fuses, cartridges and shells	731,553
24th November, 1921; fuses, cartridges, shells, detonators, etc.	509,103
Total	$2,879,453

Or between May, 1921, and November, 1921, within this last year, a total importation, according to the records of the Government itself, of high explosive shells and cartridges to a value of $2,879,453. If there is not deception there, I should like to know where deception is to be found. If this country was entitled to that quantity of munitions, why did my hon. friend not tell the House about these matters? Why did he not, when he was asking this House to vote money for high explosive shells, say that we had a right, if we had it, to bring from the Old Country, out of some credit to which we were entitled there, munitions to the extent of $2,879,453? He said not a word about that; nor would the country have known anything of it, if it had not been that, passing the port of Lévis one day, I saw one of these Government merchant marine ships laden with high explosive shells, and made an inquiry of my hon. friend. What did he say when I spoke of the matter?

Despatch from Guelph, Ontario, October 22:

"No munitions," said Hon. Hugh Guthrie, Minister of Militia, at one o'clock this morning, "have been purchased since the war excepting a few spare parts to put in shape such material as we have in Canada."

And in further correspondence I had with the then Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia, which correspondence I shall ask to have brought down so that every hon. member may have the privilege of reading it, they admitted that these high explosive shells were paid for out of a credit to Canada's account in England. What is a credit? It is the same as an appropriation by Parliament. It represents the money of the people of the country; it represents what the people have paid out in the form of taxation one way or another. It is out of that money that this $2,879,453 worth of high explosive shells has been paid. What is to be done with these shells? Of the shells I saw, every box was marked "To be fired or destroyed before June 1925"; otherwise they would be of no value. My information went to show that these shells have been sent all over the country, deposited not in one province but in half a dozen provinces; and I am told, I believe rightly, that the only place in Canada where the militia would think of firing them is the camp at Petawawa where the artillery practise. Whether I am right or wrong in that regard I stand ready to be corrected. But the point is this: we have bought, according to government records, a couple of million dollars' worth of high explosive shells, representing one-fifth of the whole appropriation which is asked for the department for this year. What are we to do with these shells? I am told that they are no good for ordinary practice; and they must be destroyed, according to the indications on the boxes themselves, within a certain period. I shall place on record the statement my hon. friend gave me, and which came from his department, when I wrote him inquiring what had been ordered. This is only a part of the quantity that has been imported. Earlier in the same year, as far back as July 15, 1920, I find that there was an importation of shells and cartridges to the value of $355,865. Not a word was said to this Parliament about any shells or cartridges having been brought from England at that time, but Parliament was asked to vote money in order that this very class of thing might be purchased from the arsenals in Canada which, according to the statement of my hon. friend, made all the heavy artillery munitions. Here are the munitions received from Great Britain, according to the schedule he has given me:

MUNITIONS RECEIVED FROM GREAT BRITAIN

SCHEDULE "B"

Description	No. ordered	Received to date	Still due
Section No. 23			
Cartridges, Q.F. 18 pr. Shrapnel, Mk. 1A plugged.	103,000	103,016	Nil
Cartridges, Q.F. 18 pr. H.E. Shells, plugged	4,000	.....	.....
Cartridges, Q.F. 13 pr. 9 cwt. A.A. Guns:— Shrapnel plugged	2,500	2,500	Nil
Cartridges, Q.F. 13 pr. 9 cwt. H.E. plugged	2,500	2,500	Nil

MUNITIONS RECEIVED FROM GREAT BRITAIN

SCHEDULE "B"—*Concluded*

Description	No. ordered	Received to date	Still due
Section No. 24			
Cartridges, Q.F. 4·5″ How. filled 15 oz. 14 drms. Cordite	33,000	15,895	17,105
Shell, Q.F. 4·5″ How. Mk. XII H.E. plugged	33,000	16,158	16,842
Cartridges, B.L. 60 pr. filled, cordite 9 lbs. 7 oz.	6,000	6,000	Nil
Shell, B.L. 60 pr. Shrapnel, Mk. IV C. plugged	5,400	5,400	Nil
H.E. Mark IX C. plugged	600	600	Nil
Cartridges, Q.F. 4·7″ Mks. I to IV* Guns:— filled 5 lb. 7 ozs. Cordite	6,000	2,483	3,517
Shell, Q.F. 4·7″ Shrapnel, latest Marks	5,400	5,400	Nil
H.E.	600	Nil	600
Cartridges, B.L. 6″ 26 cwt. How. filled Cordite 5 lbs. 12 ozs.	8,000	8,000	Nil
Shell, B.L. 6″ 26 Cwt. How. filled H.E. Mk. XIII plugged	8,000	8,000	Nil
Cartridges, B.L. 8″ How. filled Cordite 17 lbs. 8 oz.	2,000	2,000	Nil
Shell, B.L. filled 8″ How. H.E. Mk. IXA	2,000	2,005	Nil
Section No. 26-B			
Adapters, 2″ Fuze Hole No. 14-A	6,000	Nil	6,000
Bombs, H.E. M.L. 6″ Trench Mortar	6,000	6,000	Nil
Charges, propelling M.L. 6″ Trench Mortar 1 oz. 4 drms. Cordite	6,000	6,000	Nil
Fuzes, No. 110 in lieu of 134.	6,000	3,470	2,530
Primers, Percussion propelling charge M.L. 6″ Trench Mortar	6,000	2,616	3,384
Fuzes:—			
No. 101E Mk. II delay	4,420	4,420	Nil
No. 106E	43,780	11,450	32,330
Section No. 26			
Fuzes, T. & P. No. 88, Mk. 111*	10,800	10,800	Nil
No. 180 for 2,500 shrapnel 13 pr. 9 cwt. A.A	2,500	Nil	2,500
No. 180-44 for 2,500 H.E. pr. 9 cwt. A.A	2,500	Nil	2,500
T. & P. No. 80 Mk. XI	135,000	137,500	Nil
Tubes, percussion, S.A. Cartridge Mk. I	22,000	22,300	Nil

Now, I am informed, from what I believe to be an expert and reliable source that the actual value of these munitions is in the neighbourhood of over $6,000,000, and these are high explosive shells all of which have been brought into this country within the last year or two. They have all been brought into Canada by the Government Merchant Marine, the cost of their transportation being charged to the people of the country. The shells had to be unloaded at Quebec and Levis and distributed over the country at great cost. I believe that at the present time these shells are being gone over by officers of the Militia Department, and that there is still considerable expense involved in connection with their storage and inspection. Now, I leave it to my hon. friend to explain how it is that he never made mention, in any phrase or word to this Parliament, of any right on the part of Canada to shells or munitions of the kind, when asking Parliament to vote moneys for the purchase of munitions; why he told the House, when asking for an appropriation, that we made all our artillery ammunition in this country; and how in accounting for the use of public money at a time like this, he can justify such a waste.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Let me refer to the first matter. My hon. friend has put forward what, in my judgment, is a very, very, lame excuse for the language he used this afternoon. He has not attempted to justify it. I am going to put myself in the judgment of the House in regard to this whole incident. But when a man in the position, and of the ability, and intelligence, of my hon. friend puts forward the lame excuse in this House, that the trouble arose because he always believed demobilization was the opposite of mobilization, and consequently was misled by something I said, such an excuse is ridiculous. He sat within twelve or thirteen feet of me, when I explained to him every particular, every item, told him where every man was both here and overseas. Does he insinuate that he moved to reduce this item because he was misled, because he thought the demobilization was still going on and was completed? It would have been much more fair, much more candid on his part, much more manly, I think also if he had told the House: I did make that motion to reduce this item in 1920 just for the reasons that are stated in Hansard, and I was not misled. But I am going to leave myself entirely in the judgment of the House and let the House decide upon a review of all the facts. However, such is the lame excuse which the Prime Minister puts forward to justify his change of front. He has turned some sharp corners this session,—perhaps this is the sharpest corner he has had to turn. I still think the manly way would have been the best way for him to have explained his difficult position.

Now, in regard to the other matter, I absolutely deny the charge that I in any way misled or deceived the House in regard to ammunition shipments and had my hon. friend, the Prime Minister, not gone to Levis and become alarmed and over excited at what he saw there, we never would have

had this tremendous ado about something which is capable of a very simple and very satisfactory explanation. The explanation has been given to my hon. friend by me in written form, but he has not seen fit to use it to-night. Even after he received that explanation during the late campaign he did not see fit to use it, but he went from platform to platform shouting at the top of his voice as he did in the city of Guelph according to the report in the Toronto Globe: This ammunition matter constitutes one of the gravest political scandals, if not one of the gravest political crimes, that was ever committed in the Dominion of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There are a good many "hear hears" by members who don't understand and I am going to explain the matter briefly to the House. The shell transaction took place before I became Minister of Militia, but I do not seek to shield myself on that account. I have concerned myself enough about it to make inquiries from Sir Edward Kemp, who was at that time Overseas Minister of Militia, and also of my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn) my predecessor in office, in whose time the whole transaction took place. I have also gone to the trouble of ascertaining definitely from the Deputy Minister of the Department—who is present on the floor to-night—and from the chief of the general staff, who was personally concerned with the matter, all the facts I could possibly gather.

When I stated in the newspaper interview quoted by my hon. friend and which I gave over the telephone at one o'clock in the morning, that no ammunition had been purchased since the armistice down to date, I said what was absolutely true, or else the officials in my department had not told me all that was going on. The statement was absolutely true—not a dollar's worth of ammunition had been bought. Ammunition had certainly been manufactured in the government arsenals but none had been purchased since the armistice.

How did this matter arise? When the armistice came, it came suddenly. Canada, like the other allied nations, did not know there was going to be a sudden cessation of hostilities on November 11. We, like the other allied nations, were preparing for a year or two years more of war, and we were accumulating large stocks of warlike material of every kind—guns, ammunition, shells, all kinds of military equipment, clothes, medical stores and the like, and when the armistice came we had tremendous quantities of all kinds of military supplies on hand in France, in Belgium and in Great Britain; we had also a tremendous supply in Canada.

Let me deal first with the supplies overseas. The practical question immediately arose: What are we going to do with all these stores? How shall we dispose of them? In ordinary peace times our militia could not use them in a generation, no, I have been told by the officers of the department that we could not use them in two or three generations. A great deal of that war material will deteriorate by lapse of time just as in the case of these high explosive shells which so alarmed the Prime Minister, and which bore on the containers instructions that they were to be used before a certain fixed date, otherwise they would go bad, and be of no use whatever.

What then were we to do with this large accumulation of warlike stores? There is the technical and proper term, and that is the term I have used from time to time in this House. What was Australia doing? What was New Zealand doing? They could not use their tremendous accumulations, nor could we use ours. We simply pooled them all. We all turned our warlike stores over to the British government, and the British government took records of them and agreed to store them for us until some final disposition could be decided upon. We knew we could make use of some of them in our militia in Canada, and the overseas ministry, presided over at that time by Sir Edward Kemp, and General MacBrien, one of the most capable officers this country has ever turned out, and with some others, acting on behalf of Canada, determined that the best course to take was to withdraw from this tremendous surplus store of our own supplies what we could utilize in militia training in Canada. Thereupon lists were prepared of such part of that military equipment, including guns, munitions and all kinds of warlike stores, which it was considered we could use in this country. After these lists were prepared and submitted to the British War Office, they said in regard to guns: We will hand over to you absolutely new guns to take the place of your guns which have seen service, because we have a tremendous stock of new guns on hand, and we will take yours over at inventory prices. For use of those guns we selected a supply of appropriate ammunition.

If one branch of military science has been developed during the war more than another it was the artillery branch of the service. Guns which we were using in Canada at the beginning of the war became absolutely useless as the war progressed. We had to have new modern guns. New guns require new ammunition—high explosive ammunition—and such ammunition had not previously been manufactured at any of our government arsenals. What was the use of eighteen pounder high explosive guns if you had no high explosive shells? We had the guns, and we drew out of the general pool as part of our share a sufficient quantity of shells for those guns for the use of our militia troops in annual training.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend allow me a question? Do I understand him to say that no high explosive shells, either of the eighteen pounder or higher calibres, were manufactured in Canada?

Mr. GUTHRIE: None were manufactured in our arsenals. We had no machinery for the manufacture of them, so the Superintendent of Arsenals has reported. I understand such shells were made in Canada by some of the munition plants, but I am talking of the government arsenals. We drew out such material as we could reasonably use, and I admit that to the ordinary civilian mind the list appears to be a pretty long one, but if the hon. Prime Minister will consult the Minister of Militia, or the Deputy Minister, or the Chief of Staff, I think he will find that under modern war conditions we had a reserve of just one day's artillery supplies in this country. That is what we have—one single day's supplies. I have received a written memorandum from the Chief of Staff to this effect. It is not a very heavy supply of reserve artillery ammunition under modern war conditions, is it? I do not understand the technique in many of these matters, and therefore I have to be guided by what competent officers tell me, and such is the information I have received, upon very high authority.

Well, we selected what was coming to us, or rather what General MacBrien and his committee of officers in England thought was proper for us to have for militia training. My colleague, the then Minister of Militia (Mr. Mewburn), and the Overseas Minister of Militia, Sir Edward Kemp, both agreed upon the matter, and the question then was: How were we to ship it out to Canada? Immediately after the war we could not get shipping, but as shipping later became available all of this war material, including guns, ammunition, and all kinds of military equipment, was from time to time sent forward to Canada. There was a great lot of it we could never use in Canada. What did we do with the surplus? We were in a bad fix in regard to a lot of our equipment unless some other government would take it over. We could never use it in Canada. Finally the British government agreed to take the whole surplus off our hands. A valuation was made of it, and the War Office allowed us, I think, three million dollars or thereabouts for the balance of our equipment which we did not desire to bring back to Canada. It was all purely a question of salvage. What, I ask, was the best thing to do under all the circumstances. Was it not better to sell the surplus to the War Office and bring back to this country such portion as we could reasonably use? Many of the guns which we decided to bring back had never been seen in Canada before, or, indeed, any guns like them. The ammunition for these guns had never been in Canada before, or anything like them. Bringing the guns, we would need the ammunition. My hon. friend the Prime Minister in some of his speeches assured his audience that some officer in Ottawa had told him that high explosive shells were never used in artillery practice or training. If he had gone to Petewawa or Sarcee or Camp Hughes in 1921 when the troops were there, he would have found them firing 18-pounder high explosive shells. If he had gone to Petewawa last year he would have found the same thing, and if he will go there this year when the artillery is in training he will see our troops firing the identical shells that he saw landed at Quebec last October, brought here for the purpose of training the Canadian militia. What were we to do with our surplus war material if we did not use it in that way? We used what we could—we saved that money to the country, because otherwise we would have had to purchase or manufacture additional war material—and what we could not use in our militia we got the government of Great Britain to take off our hands at a valuation of $3,000,000. In addition, of course, we had on hand this tremendous supply of war material here in Canada, sufficient to carry on the militia of this country for thirty or forty years under peace conditions. We did the very same thing in Canada as we did in England; we

selected out of these unused stores as much as we could reasonably utilize in our militia before it should rot or become worn out through old age, and we stored it in the various depots throughout Canada. But there was a large surplus which we could not use in many years and we handed this surplus over to the War Purchasing Commission, who sold it for the best price obtainable—something like seven or eight millions of dollars.

This is the story of the so-called shell scandal, and that is the whole of it. That is the story of the shipment of shells which so excited my hon. friend the Prime Minister during the late campaign. Is there anything wrong about it? There is a little quibble about a word in Hansard; perhaps I had better explain that circumstance. In recent years we have maintained two arsenals, one at Quebec, which is equipped with machinery to turn out certain kinds of artillery and rifle ammunition; another at Lindsay, Ontario, where rifle ammunition only is manufactured—this is the only kind of ammunition which the machinery there will produce. Certain kinds of artillery ammunition can be made at Quebec. All the artillery ammunition which we manufacture in Canada we do make at Quebec; none of the artillery ammunition made in Canada is made at Lindsay. That is the idea which I intended to convey in the language I used as quoted to-night by the Prime Minister. I was asked how many men were employed at the various arsenals and what were they making, and I said: "All the artillery ammunition is made at Quebec." I should have said: All that we make in Canada is made at Quebec; none is made at Lindsay. But it is upon that mere quibble, upon that single word, my hon. friend the Prime Minister has had the effrontery to get up in this House and rest his whole case.

May I explain again the matter of the demobilization vote. During the war none of our war expenditure was charged to the Militia Department; it would not have been fair to so charge it. While active hostilities were proceeding, all such expenditure was charged to a vote called "war appropriation." All supplies, all stores, all guns, all transport—everything was charged to the war appropriation vote, nothing to the Militia Department. We were at war; it was war money we were spending, and a special report of the expenditure from time to time was laid on the table of the House giving every item in detail. I myself laid either one or two such reports on the Table, and

9 p.m.

they are still available. At the end of the war we adopted a special vote called the demobilization vote. By act of this Parliament we defined what "demobilization" should include. This act is 9-10 George V, chapter 33. It provided that a certain sum should be appropriated not exceeding $250,000,000, towards defraying any expenses incurred by or under the authority of the Governor in Council during the year ending March 31, 1920, for the following purposes:

(a) the defence and security of Canada;
(b) the conduct of naval and military operations in or beyond Canada and the demobilization of the Canadian forces;
(c) the promoting of trade and industry, and transportation facilities therefor;
(d) the carrying out of any measures deemed necessary or advisable by the Governor in Council in consequence of the war; and
(e) payments made or expenditure incurred during the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and nineteen, for the purposes mentioned in The War Appropriation Act, 1918, and in excess of the amount authorized by the said act.

That act passed for the first time in 1919, and, I think, was re-enacted the following year and, the next year again in the Appropriation Act. Yet a man of the intelligence and parliamentary experience of the Prime Minister of this country comes before the House to-night and tries to lead the House to believe that he did not know what the demobilization vote was. Well, there is the statute. Why did he not read it? I have no doubt he heard it discussed in the House at least twenty times during each session; since it was passed. The demobilization vote was a continual subject of discussion. I think my hon. friend himself was here in the session of 1919, when the act was passed. Surely his professed ignorance as to what demobilization included makes the excuse he has tried to offer in regard to my first objection a very lame one indeed.

Now, I have given a full account of the "shell scandal" from the point of view of the Government of that day. All the records in connection with the whole transaction are in the Militia Department. The overseas papers are all in Canada now; the overseas minister relinquished his office some time before the Government was defeated and his records will be found in the department. All the particulars are there, and the Prime Minister, if he wishes to do so, can delve into them to the bottom. The same officers are in the department to-day as were there when I was in office, and full information

can be had from them. If my hon. friend can find anything wrong in the transaction, anything unbusinesslike in the transaction, anything deceitful in the transaction, let him find it, and make it known to the House. I for one am prepared to say that in anything the Militia Department did in that connection it acted wisely and in the interests of the people, and the Government did wisely to conclude the arrangement with the British War Office which I have outlined and brought that ammunition back to Canada and saved the expense of buying it in the future.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not wish to prolong this discussion unduly, because I think this matter will be better threshed out before the Public Accounts Committee. And I hope the committee will look into it; I am sure that the papers to which my hon. friend has referred will bear examination. When my hon. friend uses the word "effrontery," I think he had better have some regard to his own behaviour. After listening to the explanation he has made of the bringing in of these thirteen or fourteen shiploads of high explosive shells, the House will not have very much difficulty in finding a characterization that will be suitable for his action. When he talks about being manly, I think he might have discarded the lame excuse he laboured under at the outset of intimating that this matter came under his predecessor in office, an hon. gentleman who did not happen to be in the Chamber at the time but who sits beside my hon. friend on other occasions. Every word I read to the House to-night was from the lips of my hon. friend. They were not the words of his predecessor; they were his own words. He has not touched the point of deception which I brought up, which was this: If he knew, as he said he did, that Canada was entitled to these shiploads of shells, why did he not tell Parliament that at the last session, when he was asking us to appropriate money for the purposes of munitions?

Why did he not the year before, if he knew this country was entitled to munitions amounting to $6,000,000 or more from the other side,—why did he not tell Parliament then? I tell my hon. friend that the people of this country will not believe that it was a mere matter of accident that he did not tell this House that we were entitled to all this quantity of ammunition from the other side if we were so entitled. That will not go down with the people of Canada, and my hon. friend would be the last person to accept any such statement from anyone else that might happen to make it. Altogether, there were I think thirteen or fourteen Merchant Marine shiploads of these shells brought into this country. My hon. friend says that they were all obligated for during the time that his predecessor was in office. According to his statement he knew that, and yet he told the House absolutely nothing about it, but came before the House and asked to vote a sum of money for artillery ammunition, telling us that all the artillery ammunition was made in this country and that the money was needed on that account. All of the shells that came in have come in since the debate in which my hon. friend made his statement to the House.

Now in regard to these being our stores, it may be perfectly true, as was said, that there was a certain pooling of supplies after the armistice and that Canada was entitled to draw what she needed out of that pool, but there was a financial settlement made later, according to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia himself, which placed to Canada's account a certain credit. That credit represented the money of the people of this country, and if I am not wrongly informed, I think the minister's letter will show that these shells have come out of that credit. He talks about our own stores. If these shells to the extent of $6,000,000 or more in value, had not been brought in Canada would have had to its credit $6,000,000 more on the other side.

10 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How? That was our equipment. How would we have had $6,000,000 for it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Was there not a financial settlement made in 1921?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The financial statement of 1920 included this. This was our material. We took back what we wanted of it, and the rest we sold for about three million to the British government.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All of this represented material which could either have been retained in the possession of Canada as stores, or credited as cash.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who would buy it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the balancing between this country and the—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is a case of sale.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend has told us he brought stores over here

and turned them over to the Purchasing Commission, for sale in this country.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No. That was the supply in Canada that was sold.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It comes pretty much to the same thing. If I understand my hon. friend now, what he did was to turn over to the Purchasing Commission supplies that we had here. The Purchasing Commission sells them, and then he brings out these supplies from the Old Country to take their place.

Mr. GUTHRIE: All we had in Canada that we could not utilize we handed over to the Purchasing Commission, and they sold it for approximately $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. All we had in England that we considered we could utilize in our militia we brought back to Canada and what we could not utilize, we sold to the British government for about $3,000,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I said, I think this is a matter that can be better gone into and threshed out by a committee than at this particular moment. My hon. friends may smile, but I think it is still owing to this House that the ex-Minister of Militia should explain why, if Canada was entitled to these supplies, if she had them in her possession at the time, he told this Parliament nothing about it. He should also explain why he asked of this Parliament, and accepted from this Parliament, appropriations for the purchase of munitions when, according to his present statement, we had these very munitions in our possession.

I wish to say this further, and I think this is a matter that can be decided at the present time irrespective of anything else: The quantity of high explosive shells that he has brought into this country is far in excess of any use that can possibly be made of them by the militia of this country. Apart from the questionable nature of the transaction, these shells have cost us an enormous sum in the matter of transportation and distribution. They are costing this country at the present time a large sum on account of inspection and storage, and I venture to say that they will not be used but will be destroyed before the time for which they are due. Now perhaps my hon. friend will tell the House just why he said nothing whatever about any munitions to which we were entitled when he was asking us to vote money for munitions and when he knew that after his appropriations had passed he was going to bring in ship loads of these munitions.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When the vote for munitions came up, I did inform the House that a certain amount of military stores—that would include munitions—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well would it not? On one occasion I defined what the term military stores included. The vote I asked from the House was fully explained, in the printed estimates last year, a copy of which I hold in my hand, just as it is explained in the estimates this year. You will find in those estimates specifications of every kind of ammunition for which the vote was taken, just as you find it for this year. What we selected in England was largely what we did not have in Canada, and what we did not propose to manufacture here. A very large part of it is what we could not make with our present equipment. I suppose, had I been specifically asked whether the term military stores included ammunition I could have said yes. I certainly mentioned guns, and I think I described some of them. I certainly mentioned other military equipment, but I was not asked specifically in regard to shells. When I presented the estimates and asked for the vote, I gave the exact specifications of what we proposed to make with the money Parliament voted to us, just as it is set forth in the estimates to-day.

Mr. POWER: May I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion which has been going on for nearly an hour has been out of order and could have been held much better under another item, that of Ordnance, Arms, etc.

The item which we are at present discussing is an item of $1,400,000 to be devoted to annual drill and training of the militia. Last year when this item came before the House, the then member for Kent, now a member of another House, moved that the item be reduced by the amount of $750,000. At that time a large number of members now sitting on this side of the House supported the motion of the hon. member for Kent that $750,000 be struck from the vote. In order to be fair to the government of that day, we thought that $750,000 was a lot to ask a Tory government to take from military expenditure, but to-day the Government in power is supported by members who, at any rate during the last campaign when they were

in opposition, announced that they were anti-militarists. In order to give them and the Government an opportunity of showing that the principle which they advocated in opposition will be the same principle which they advocate when in power. I move, seconded by my hon. friend from Laprairie (Mr. Lanctôt), that this item be reduced by $1,100,000. I would move that it be reduced by the sum total of the vote, but perhaps there may be some small outstanding accounts which require to be paid, and I would not wish to deprive any of the citizens of Canada of their just recourse against the Government in case there is any money due. In moving this amendment to the resolution I would suggest that we are opposed to such an expenditure because, in the first place, we have no money for such a purpose. We have been told time and again by the members of the Opposition and by our friends the Progressives that the country is on the verge of bankruptcy. If such is the case we surely have no means that will permit us to indulge in useless expenditure, and expenditure on militia camps, or for military training, at the present time is, to my mind, a useless expenditure. I understand from the minister that we have reduced the period of training from sixteen to nine days. I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that nine days' training is not sufficient for the making of a soldier and cannot be of any use for that purpose. We heard last year from distinguished soldiers —the then member for Skeena, Mr. Peck, the then member for Edmonton Mr. Griesbach, and others, who have held high rank in the army that it took six months steady, continuous and intensive training to make a man fit to be placed on the fighting line. I submit that nine days training—one day of which is spent in going to, and one day in returning from, the camp, while Sunday is devoted to church parades in any God fearing province—means that we really have only six days in which to teach men to form fours. That, I think, is not sufficient and I submit it is not in the best interest of the country that we waste our money in merely giving a holiday to those who can find any useful employment in the country.

I would go further and say that there is no necessity, even though it were useful, for such military training to-day. It was pointed out by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) that in these days we hear nothing but reports of peace conferences on disarmament, and we spent some thousands of dollars in sending a representative to the Disarmament Conference in Washington. The whole world is talking of disarmament, and we have treaties between the most important powers tending to that end. As has been pointed out for years by members on this side, we are in no immediate danger from any enemy. Last year the then Minister of Militia stated that the militia estimates had been cut down to the lowest point consistent with safety. I repeatedly asked him the question—safety from what, safety from whom? From whom are we liable to attack? Who is about to attack us? The minister could not give me a reply at that time; and I do not know that he can give me a reply to-day. I think it is well known and clearly understood that there is no immediate danger of this country being attacked; that we do not need to at once begin to train the youth of Canada, and that further, the training of young people in the usages and the glorification of war will do more to make new wars than any other propaganda. I say, Sir, that if you teach the youth of this country to use arms, that if you constantly hold before them that the supreme and the sovereign means of settling any difficulty is by the arbitrary method of force, you will lead them to the conclusion that there is no means of obtaining truth and justice in this world but by the use of force. So that for the three reasons I have mentioned: First, because we have no money; second, because such training would be useless, and, third, because there is no necessity for it, I very reluctantly—because I think the members of the House who know me realize that I am a very strong party man; I believe in party government, and I believe in Liberal party government above all party governments, I am very reluctantly obliged in order to be consistent with my stand on former occasions and with what I have said throughout the country and particularly in my own constituency during the last election, to ask for this reduction in the estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the amendment moved by Mr. Power that the item of $1,400,000 for annual drill be reduced by $1,100,000. Shall the amendment carry?

Miss MACPHAIL: Mr. Chairman, the duel of bomb-throwing we have witnessed has been very interesting, and when we who are new to this theatre of war see the great vigour with which the bombs are

thrown, and hear the whiz of them in the air as they pass over the green carpet, we feel that there is really going to be something doing some of these times. But we are disappointed to find that the bombs are always duds and that nothing really does happen.

I think there never was a time when the people of Canada were looking for a lead, a real lead, as they are to-day, a real lead in progress not towards war but towards peace. I think the people are heartily sick of war and talks of war, and particularly sick of voting for war expenditures. When it is noted that the total amount to be voted for the Departments of Justice, Health and Labour, and the government of the Yukon Territory, are altogether $26,701.66 less than what is asked for annual drill, it does seem that too much is being demanded for the last named purpose. Of course, it is quite true that someone will be thrown out of pleasant employment if we drastically cut this estimate; but I think the world will go on just the same, certainly Canada will go on just the same, if we do cut it most drastically. I think, too, that the first thing to be considered by us who are the delegates of the people of Canada—we are supposed to be their delegates at least—is: what do the people want? What would the people whom we represent like to see us do on this occasion? I believe they would like to see us make a drastic cut in these expenditures. For that reason I am going to support the amendment that has been suggested by our military friend who has just sat down, and I am glad the gentlemen on the Government side are proving themselves this evening so favourably disposed to reductions of this character.

Mr. HOEY: I would like to ask the minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, if it would not be possible—in view of the reduction in the cost of living, in view of the increased purchasing power of the dollar, and in view of the fact to which my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has already referred, that this decrease is more apparent than real—to reduce this item of $1,400,000 by $400,000. I think we might perhaps agree on a compromise of that kind. I make the suggestion because I have in my possession, as the Minister for Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) is already aware letters from men who have recently developed tubercular trouble but who are not considered eligible to make any claim for remuneration. I am of opinion—and I should like to test the committee in this matter—that this money could be better spent in looking after the fatherless, the widows, and disabled soldiers who were stricken and maimed in the great conflict than spent in this way. In view of what I have stated, I think this item of $1,400,000 could be reduced by $400,000, and I do not think anybody would suffer in the interval. Our paramount duty at the moment is not to provide for the training of men until we have seen to it that men disabled in the great conflict are adequately looked after.

Mr. GOULD: I have noticed with some interest the co-operation which is taking place between the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Guthrie) and the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham). What one says the other appears to corroborate. Incidentally, even when the civil government estimates of the department were before the House, I was quite interested in noting that the ex-Minister of Militia and Defence tendered his services to the present Minister of Militia and Defence, advising that the list was complete; that it had been reduced to the lowest possible point. It seems to me that we in this House should ask the question: Who are the advisers of the minister? As a matter of fact, I have asked questions similar to this on several previous occasions while the civil government estimates have been before the House. There must be, in the Government or in the various departments, individuals who advise the ministers, and it seems to me that the time has arrived, in the annual protest which we make on the floor of this House against gross expenditures of money, when we must issue notice to those individuals who advise the ministers in their departments, that there is, throughout the country, a strict demand for economy, and that the people are going to see that they themselves who furnish this money have representatives or advisers in connection with the spending of that money, who know the position thoroughly. That is, the individuals who are the advisers must take the dual position of understanding the stand of the people who furnish the money as well as of understanding the spending of the money. This is not a newly-found fault or idea with me. It appears to me that the individuals who advise have said unto themselves: "Oh, well, Parliament will provide the money; all we have to do is to find the

means of spending it," and they have not had a proper conception of the attitude of mind of the people who, away back home, are watching the activities of the people here, and who are wondering if those whom they have sent to Parliament are going to vote these huge sums of money simply upon the request of those who are, perhaps, the advisers of the ministers.

I recollect a question which I asked last year of the then Minister of Militia and Defence. My question which had to do with Military District No. 12, which is located in Saskatchewan, was if it was the intention of the minister to discontinue Military District No. 12? My question was prompted by the fact that this district had been established during the war period upon the distinct understanding and promise that it would be discontinued immediately upon the termination of the war. The Minister of Militia and Defence replied to my question by stating that Saskatchewan had proved to be such a good recruiting ground that they had decided to keep the district in operation. It was news to me and to the people back home that the part of this country from which I come, supposedly at that time filled with Bolshevists, should be accounted by the Minister of Militia and Defence as a good recruiting ground. Certainly, that was an inconsistent position, and we are justified in assuming and believing, from the reply of the minister, that he was capable, in that respect, of taking a somewhat dual attitude. That military district is still in existence, and I have some figures which I wish to place on Hansard, not particularly for the benefit of the gentlemen in this chamber, but for the people back home who will tomorrow read Hansard. I have made complaints on the public platform that I thought there was extravagance in this department, and I want to cite a few figures in relation to Military District No. 12. I have stated on the public platform that I believe an undue proportion of the moneys voted was going to officers, and I have in my hand figures to show the proportion. In Military District No. 12, that is in Saskatchewan, we have:

18th Battery, C.F.A., 3 officers, 3 N.C.O's, 19 men.

21st Battery, C.F.A., 4 officers, 7 N.C.O's, 42 men.

44th Battery, C.F.A., 4 officers, 8 N.C.O's, 43 men.

77th Battery, C.F.A., 3 officers, 9 N.C.O's, 85 men.

12th Brigade, C.M.G., Headquarters staff, 4 officers, 1 N.C.O.; No. 1 Company, 2 officers, 7 N.C.O's; No. 2 Company, 6 officers, 5 N.C.O's, 13 men; No. 3 Company, 5 officers, 8 N.C.O's, 60 men.

12th Signal Company, C.S.C., 5 officers, 11 N.C.O's, 57 men.

I might say that the other military districts, in many cases, show the same proportion, and, in my humble opinion there are far too many officers for the number of men shown. I think I stated last year that they average practically one officer to every two men, and we are being asked to provide money for salaries for those officers.

The economic condition of this country does not warrant such expenditure, and the people have given a distinct mandate to us, who represent them on this floor, that they will no longer abide by the decision of those who advise the minister to ask for huge sums of money to be voted to provide for these inordinate expenditures. I have made repeated protests on the floor of this House; soon I hope to see the fruits of my labour and the co-operation of others who have worked with me, in the reduction of the estimates of this department of Government. I am pleased to link my forces with those of the hon. and gallant member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) when he asks for a reduction in these estimates. I am very sure that, under the present economic conditions of this country, under the wish and will of the people, expressed because of the promises made throughout the length and breadth of Canada by us who asked that the confidence of the people be reposed in us, the time has arrived when the people have a right, in this first meeting of a new Parliament, to demand that these expenditures should be reduced. Consequently, I feel obliged to vote for the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. RINFRET: It is rather an unusual spectacle to find the Government in discussion over a certain matter with its own friends, and the situation was made even more interesting this afternoon when it was found that the Government, on this point, was receiving support from members of the official opposition. But that is a situation which is likely to arise when we have a sudden change in government. Hard as the new administration may strive to drive away from the methods of the old regime, yet members on this side may find that they are not driving fast enough, and they may ask for more radical reforms. I quite understand the position in which the minister finds himself. When he took charge of the office he found an established department, an established staff, and fixed

customs. And I will give him credit for the fact that he at once proceeded to use the pruning knife and was able to announce that he would reduce his estimates this year by over a million dollars. The significance of this reduction is fully apparent when it is remembered that he has to meet statutory increases in salaries, ranging as high as half a million dollars. If we recall, however, that not later than twelve months ago we on this side moved to reduce a similar estimate by 50 per cent, the Government must not be surprised if it finds, even on this side of the House, some members asking for a substantial reduction. There is no sort of economy more to the liking of the people than any saving that can be effected in the Department of Militia, unless it be in the Department of Naval Service. I heard this afternoon, in regard to this item, the argument that after all we are not spending more than we did in 1910, because the value of the Canadian dollar has depreciated. Well, we must bear in mind, along with that fact, the different conditions that existed in 1910. Then we were rich and prosperous; we had surpluses and could spend, not only on urgent matters but also on useful works even though they were not of immediate necessity. Such is not the case now. Last year we had to face deficits amounting to some $200,000,000, and although the Government this year has reduced expenses to a large extent, I regret that the revenue of the country is also decreasing; and it is possible after all that the balance sheet this year may be similar to the one we had last year. I say, therefore, that we cannot use that argument, that we are not spending more than we did in 1910, because the value of the Canadian dollar has dropped. What would you think of a business man who would argue that because he spent $15,000 some ten years ago, when his business was prosperous, he must spend $25,000 this year, when he faces bankruptcy, simply because the value of the dollar has gone down?

With regard to the matter of annual drill, I do not think we can consider this an essential part of the regular departmental work. I know that many members of the force are of the opinion that these drills in the country during the summer time are mere camp feasts or holidays, and I think it would be only proper if the holiday this year were enjoyed by the taxpayers. I am not prejudiced; I will not commit myself as regards the future; but I must say that unless a stronger argument is advanced for the maintenance of this particular institution I shall have to vote for a reduction of the vote.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Prior to the last Dominion election a certain newspaper published in this country made the prophecy that the Progressive party might not be the dog that would do the barking at Ottawa for the next three or four years, but would be at least the tail that would wag the dog. It seems to me that the tail is beginning to wag the dog just a little bit away from the old bone of contention back to the real issue before the House in the consideration of these estimates. I desire to ally myself with the motion that has been made across the floor reducing the amount from $1,400,000 to the handsome sum of $300,000. Even $300,000 is a large sum of money for this purpose, when we consider item No. 51, at page 22 of the estimates, which provides for seed, feed and fertilizer control only the sum of $275,000. I was in our western country during the Easter recess and saw some of the conditions as they exist there this spring among the farmers of my own constituency. I found more than one bank closed and the farmers unable to get loans to buy seed. More than one farmer came to me personally and asked if I would finance him to buy seed because he could not be accommodated through the banks. Yet here in our estimates we find only the small sum of $275,000 apportioned by the Parliament of Canada to the business of financing the people for seed for the important industry of agriculture. I submit that agriculture is of far more importance to the Dominion of Canada than the matter of annual drill, which includes pay, subsistence and allowances to officers and men of the active militia during training, as well as transportation and other local expenses. I think that the few thousand men who will profit by this allowance of $300,000, if the amendment carries, are a small body indeed compared with the several hundred thousand men who came from the agricultural lands of this Dominion and showed their worth during the late war.

Mr. CHURCH: If I understand the principle of responsible government, it is the duty of the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, and other members of the Cabinet, to defend this vote of $1,400,000 which they have recommended to Parliament. In 1920 there was voted by the House for annual drill, etc., $12,500,000, only $10,000,000 of which was spent. The reason the other $2,500,000 was not spent

was that only the city units were drilled at their headquarters. It is all very well for my friends on my left to bring in an amendment like this and think it is economy. It is false economy and not in the interests of the people of this country.

Mr. HOEY: Let me correct the hon. member. The motion to reduce the vote was not moved by hon. members to his left.

Mr. CHURCH: I am glad to hear my hon. friend make the correction, but some of the sentiments expressed by hon. gentlemen of his party endorse the sentiment of the amendment. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think we are at the parting of the ways in this country in regard to militia matters. If this motion to reduce the vote were carried we might as well close up the Militia Department altogether, and it would be a sorry day for the people of Canada if that were done, not only for Quebec but for Ontario and other parts of the country as well. As I have said, the reason why the balance of the appropriation of $12,500,000, amounting to $2,500,000, was not spent in 1920 was the fact that after the war it was difficult to organize and put on a peace footing what might be termed the country regiments. The $10,000,000 expended was largely spent in drilling city corps of the large cities like Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Halifax, Winnipeg, Vancouver, etc. It was devoted to what you might call the city units in the various military districts in Canada. With the small amount of money voted last year the minister reopened the military training camps from coast to coast for the country corps. I attended the Niagara camp at the request of the commanding officer, and I cannot speak too highly of the work done there by the units in training, but I was surprised to hear the discontent among the men both of the rural and the city battalions. Some of the officers of a very fine battalion, the 31st of Grey, then under the command of Colonel Carmichael, a member of the Drury Government, and an excellent soldier and officer, told me that the returned men were getting disgusted at the cheap way the camp was run. The militia estimates were cut down, necessitating the units putting their hands in their pockets to keep things going. I heard the same complaint from men from my own city. The company funds were all exhausted during the war. The 13th battalion, formerly under the command of that fine soldier and patriot—my hon. friend from East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), handed over $30,000 of their funds for the recruiting of their war regiments. In a word, the various militia units after the war were bankrupt. I think 206 units attended the camps last June, and the officers who raised those units brought them into camp only 20 to 25 per cent strong because of the insufficient allowances and expenditure by the Militia Department.

I do not say it is the fault of any particular person or party, but, after all is said and done, we must keep up our defensive forces, and if any one doubts the wisdom of this he has only to go back to 1812, when we are told General Brock could not induce the old legislative assembly to grant him sufficient funds to defend the country. What would have happened to Canada if we had had no militia at that time? The legislative assembly then cut down the estimates for annual drills and defence with the result that General Brock got disgusted and is said to have written to the authorities at home requesting to be recalled. A debate similar to the present one took place in 1911, 1912, and 1913, in this House on militia estimates.

I venture to say, that more than 80 per cent of the men from Toronto in the first contingent for overseas were men who belonged to the militia, and had it not been for the military training they had received from militia units the late Sir Sam Hughes would not have been able to send over our first contingent of 30,000 men within a few months after the outbreak of war. The value of preparedness has been demonstrated over and over again; indeed, it has been stated by many eminent military experts that if the British Empire had been as well prepared on land as on sea in 1914 we would have had no war at all.

If we are to have any militia force at all we must have annual training camps, and it is undisputed that those camps today are not what they should be. The money spent on these annual camps is wisely spent, but if you whittle down this vote too much you might as well throw the money into the Ottawa river for all the good its expenditure would accomplish, as it would be inadequate to produce proper results. I do not believe the people either of Quebec or any other province are asking for this reduction. It is false economy and not true economy to reduce this vote, and I hope the Minister of Militia and the other members of the Government will arise and defend the item, as

responsible government in my view requires them to do so.

Objection has been raised that these camps inculcate a military spirit. Well, in the days of stress and strain when the war broke out was it not a good thing that we had plenty of young men imbued with that military spirit? If not, we would have cut a sorry figure in the war and in recruiting and Canada would never have rendered the service she did to the Mother Country and to civilization.

Mr. HALBERT: I am sure every member fully appreciates what was done by the Militia Department during the war, and by our young men who enlisted and went overseas. But to-day we are trying to get away from war conditions, we are trying to re-establish ourselves on a peace footing. As a young member a couple of sessions ago I listened with a good deal of interest to our delegates who had attended the Peace Conference while they told us that the signing of the Peace Treaty was to end war for all time to come. We were encouraged to believe from what they said that the day had come when swords would be beaten into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks. I am sure we will rejoice at the dawn of a new day when disputes between nations will be settled by ballots and conferences instead of bloodshed and slaughter. Now, we have spent as Canadians a great deal of money in connection with peace conferences and conferences on the reduction of armaments, and some are wondering if we cannot reduce very largely the expenditure on the militia for a year or two in order to pay the expenses of peace conferences and peace treaties. If we are going to have peace I do not think it is a good sign to prepare for war. I do not anticipate a war in the near future, and I do not think anyone else in Canada does. If any trouble is apprehended, then our peace conferences and our negotiations for the reduction of armaments are all in vain. I think the time has come when we should devote more attention to preparing for peace and re-establishing peace than preparing for war. Now, we appreciate the militia just as much as many other people who are advocating it so strongly to-night. The member for North Toronto seems to be terribly excited over the thought that if this vote is not granted the militia will go to pieces and Canada will have no protection. Now, we have a great many trained men in Canada to-day, and in view of the present financial condition of the country we were wondering if some saving could not be made. That is the reason why some of the members on both sides are talking about this reduction.

Mr. MEWBURN: When my hon. friend says there are a large number of trained men, I assume he refers to the men who fought at the front.

Mr. HALBERT: Yes.

Mr. MEWBURN: Is it the hon. member's suggestion that in the event of trouble —and God forbid that we should have trouble—we should call on these men who went through four years of hell and ask them to do this duty again instead of its being done by newly trained men?

Mr. HALBERT: We are not looking for war, we are preparing for peace, and we are spending money for that purpose. We have men going over to peace conferences with a view of preparing for peace. I may say that I had perhaps as many friends in khaki as the hon. gentleman had, so I am not speaking from that point of view. I say I respect the militia; we want the militia, but this is a time when retrenchment is necessary. In the minister's opinion, if the military drill for this year were postponed, would it to a great extent decrease the efficiency of our militia, and what would the saving be? The hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who is opposed to militarism, has told us that this training is for a period of six days. Well, I really do not think the absence of six days' training would affect the efficiency of the militia of Canada, which has been trained for so long. I really do not think it would for one year, but I want the minister's opinion on it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The object is not to continue the training of the boys who were overseas, but to use the officers who received that training to train new young men. I would not ask this House to vote one cent for the further training of the boys who have been trained overseas; I want to give them a rest. The suggestion that the annual drill is for a period of six days, or, in the case of the city corps, nine days, does not leave a fair impression. Some of these men might be trained a good deal longer than they get paid for training, the idea being to keep up their efficiency. My Chief of Staff, General MacBrien, who is a level-headed man and has given great service to the country,

does not, as has been suggested, make his living in the Militia Department; he loves the work and has been selected above a great many for the position. Ten days ago I put the question squarely to him: If we cut out military training for one year what effect would it have? He said: "The effect would be disastrous on any attempt to maintain an organization of voluntary militia throughout the Dominion of Canada." That is the reply he gave me. I have no desire to spend the people's money, but hon. gentlemen talking of economy should remember that some economy has been practised. I venture the assertion that there has been more economy in the cutting of these estimates than has been exercised by any business man in the House in connection with his annual expenditure during the past year. The department has been established since the war on a basis of efficiency and strength by men who have served overseas. On going into a department, the minister, of course, has his own difficulties as well as the officers. But I want to remove an impression which has been created: the officers of the Militia Department have given me every assistance. If hon. members knew the men of whom I speak, they would resent some of the things that are said about them. They are men of practical experience in military matters, and very good business men, some of them. Now, the purpose of the motion is to do away with the annual drill, and if it were adopted I would look for a general degeneration, if not an entire wiping out, of the militia spirit on the part of the young men—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: Now, I do not like to hear that applause within four years of the time when we applauded so many of our young men who evinced that spirit. We applauded every suggestion that the young men of Canada don the uniform in order that we who were older might be defended, and we applauded vociferously every man who enlisted. I am not a militarist, any more than any hon. member of this House—not nearly so much, perhaps as some of those who have spoken to-day. But I do feel that as a Canadian I have a duty to perform, not only to Canada but to the British Empire and to the civilized world. I may be asked how it is that we have any militia vote at all when other countries are disarming. But I ask any hon. member to name a country which has not a militia at the present time and is not maintaining one? Other countries are disarming to a certain extent, but not any more in proportion than we in Canada are, not any more than we are doing in these estimates.

It is not a question of who is going to gain or lose a few votes. It is not simply a matter of the expenditure of money. This is a question of a real national policy, a policy that affects every man and woman living in Canada to-day, and that will affect their children as well. Do we propose, as a young nation, to shirk the responsibilities of a nation while asking for all the privileges? We asked for a seat in the Genoa Conference; we asked for a seat at the Disarmament Conference at Washington; we asked for a seat at the meeting of the League of Nations; we asked to be allowed to take part in the formula-

11 p.m. tion of the Versailles treaty; and now when the time comes that we should maintain our position as a young nation, are we going to shirk, and go back one hundred and fifty years and become Crown colonists to be looked after by Great Britain and not by ourselves? We have a status to maintain as a young people with aspirations, and I must sink my individuality as I believe every member of the House ought to do, in what we might think a little present benefit, because we will be judged as a Dominion in a measure by the part we take as a young nation in the galaxy of nations forming the British Empire and among the nations of the entire world.

I might go on, if it were in order, to mention the navy as well, but I shall leave that until I come to it. We are endeavouring to amalgamate the defence forces of Canada into one department with the object of obtaining efficiency and greater economy, but if the House is to take the attitude that it refuses to grant any money to carry on these services, why amalgamate the defence forces at all, if we are not going to have any such forces? I do not feel strongly on this question on any personal ground. It makes no difference to me personally whether a dollar is voted, but if we are going to strike out, or reduce to the point where it is practically striking out the item for annual training, we are saying to the young man of Canada and to the boys in the cadet service; we do not want you to be trained any more. We smother your aspirations for getting together to develop your manhood and your physical self, as well as getting your military training.

We have talked a good deal about this to-day, and as we were all up late last night I think we had better rise and think this matter over. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. HOEY: I notice that the minister did not answer the question I put before. I deprecate the amount of heat that has been brought into this discussion. I think we should discuss these items calmly and dispassionately as Canadians—

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that there is a motion before the Chair that the committee rise and report progress. That motion is not debatable.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Wednesday, April 26, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GRAIN INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Referring to the answer of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to Question No. 30, April 5, 1922, does the Government intend to reconstitute the old Grain Inquiry Commission with change of personnel or a new Grain Inquiry Commission for the same or similar purpose, or for any purpose? If so, when?

2. Is the Government not aware that very specific charges of irregularity were made before the present Grain Inquiry Commission now existing during the period it was supplied with funds to transact its work, such charges gravely affecting the conduct of the grain trade of Western Canada?

3. Does the Government propose that such charges so made before the Grain Inquiry Commission shall be ignored and go entirely without investigation?

4. If the Government does not intend that the present Government Grain Inquiry Commission shall continue its work or provide funds for that purpose, does the Government intend to provide funds to enable it to close up the work that it has already done and compile and forward its report?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. Not unless there is a reasonable demand therefor.

2. The late administration apparently did not require the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission to render a report, though the said commission ceased to function several weeks before the late administration resigned office.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. The late Grain Inquiry Commission expended the sum of $46,398.02. There is an item of $40,000 appearing in the main estimates for the purpose of resuming the inquiry if a reasonable demand therefor is made.

With regard to submitting a report, this is answered by No. 2.

RIVIERE DU LOUP ARSENAL

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. When will the lease for the use of the Rioux store at Riviere du Loup, Fraserville, known as Arsenal number two, expire?

2. What is the total amount paid to Mr. Rioux for the said building?

3. What is the total amount of money spent by the Government in repairs to this property?

4. Are the repairs or additions to said buildings to remain the property of Mr. Rioux or the Department of Militia and Defence?

5. Is the building insured? If so, for what amount, with what company, who was the agent, and what was the premium?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Expires on the 19th May, 1922.

2. To Madame Caroline Pelletier Rioux: 3 years at $75 per month, $2,700; 5 years at $90 per month, $5,400; total, $8,100.

3. $2,286.55.

4. Repairs remain as part of the building.

5. Not by the Government.

LANDS—SUB-AGENCIES

Mr. MacKELVIE:

1. What Dominion Lands Sub-Agencies were closed during the years 1920 and 1921?

2. What was the reason for such closing in each case?

3. What offices so closed have since been re-opened, and what was the reason for re-opening in each case?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to re-open the sub-agency at Golden, British Columbia? If not, why?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1 and 2. Saskatchewan:—Yorkton, insufficient business; Weyburn, insufficient business; Shaunavon, services of sub-agent terminated; Kindersley, insufficient business; Ponteix, resignation of sub-agent; Turtleford, resignation of sub-agent.

Alberta.—Westlock, resignation of sub-agent; Whitford, insufficient business; Wainwright, insufficient business; Ft. Vermilion, resignation of sub-agent; Donnelly, resignation of sub-agent; Alsask, insufficient business; Frog Lake, insufficient business; Hanna, insufficient business; Mosside, insufficient business; Pine Creek, insuffi-

cient business; St. Paul de Metis, insufficient business.

British Columbia.—Golden, insufficient business.

3. Offices Reopened, With Reasons for Reopening.

Alberta.—Donnelly, for convenience of the public; St. Paul de Metis, for accommodation of incoming settlers; Westlock, for convenience of the public; Turtleford, for convenience of the public; Ft. Vermilion, for convenience of the public.

4. Golden sub-agency.—This sub-agency was closed on account of insufficient business. So far as I am aware, it is not the intention at the present time to reopen same, for the reason mentioned.

CANADIANS EMIGRATING 1911-1921

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. Does the Department of Immigration keep any records of emigrants from Canada each year?

2. If so, how many Canadians by birth have left Canada in each of the years between 1911 and 1921?

3. How many naturalized Canadians have left Canada during each of the said years?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. No. Records have not been kept because of the expense thereby entailed.

2 and 3. See answer to No. 1.

WINNIPEG STRIKE

Mr. McMURRAY:

1. Was a Deputy Minister of Justice appointed by the Dominion Government at the time of the Winnipeg strike?

2. If so, what was the name of the appointee and what were his duties?

3. Who were retained as counsel to conduct the trials, and what amount was paid for legal services?

4. Were other moneys paid in connection with legal services rendered during said strike?

5. If so, to whom, and what amount in each case?

6. Did the Dominion Government pay for special police and detective service during the said strike?

7. If so, how many police and detectives were employed and what amount of money was paid for such service?

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Messrs. Andrews, Andrews, Burbidge and Bastedo; J. B. Coyne, K.C.; Travers Sweatman; I. Pitblado; W. W. Richardson; S. Goldstein; E. K. Williams, and Charles Russell & Co. Amount paid, $150,024.20.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Yes.

[Mr. J. A. Stewart.]

7. The McDonald Detective Agency was employed and was paid $12,332.09 for its services.

CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the number of chartered banks in Canada in each of the years 1901, 1911 and 1921?

1. What was the number of chartered banks banks in each of the above years.

3. What was the total reserve fund of these banks in each of the above years?

4. What was the total amount of savings deposits in each of these years?

5. What was the total amount of deposits on current account in each of these years?

6. What was the largest amount of loans in Canada in each of these years?

7. What was the largest amount of loans outside of Canada in each of these years?

8. What was the largest amount of gold held by these banks in each of the above years?

9. What was the total value of bank premises as of 31 December in each of these years?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. Number of banks (as of December 31), 1901, 34; 1911, 29; 1921, 18.

2. Paid-up capital (as of December 31), 1901, $67,591,311; 1911, $107,994,604; 1921, $129,317,086.

3. Rest or reserve fund (as of December 31), 1901, $37,364,708; 1911, $96,868,124; 1921, $128,373,499.

4. Deposits by the public, payable after notice, or on a fixed day in Canada (as of December 31), 1901, $233,431,229; 1911, $591,068,932; 1921, $1,240,807,268.

5. Deposits by the public payable on demand in Canada (as of December 31), 1901, $102,309,034; 1911, $335,020,693; 1921, $540,942,522.

6. Largest amount of loans in Canada, (Oct.), 1901, $331,675,202; (Dec.), 1911, $850,025,413; (April), 1921, $1,486,636,165.

7. Largest amount of loans elsewhere than in Canada, (Nov.), 1901, $79,498,362; (July), 1911, $136,879,144; (Jan.), 1921, $365,233,732.

8. Largest amount held of current gold and subsidiary coin, (May), 1901), $11,983,876; (Nov.), 1911, $39,032,004; (Jan.), 1921, $85,118,010 (not including gold in central gold reserves.)

9. Bank premises (as of December 31), 1901, $6,753,172; 1911, $32,557,940; 1921, $69,480,648.

SARDINES EXPORT

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries received a petition or memorial from residents of Maceo Bay or other ports of the county of Charlotte, praying or asking that a minimum

price of ten dollars per hogshead be placed on sardines sold for export, during the present fishing season?

2. If so, what action, if any, has the Government taken in the matter?

3. If no action has been taken, is it the intention of the department to take any action in this respect?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Petition urging that this minimum price be fixed for all purposes was received.

2 and 3. The department has no power to fix the price.

PROVINCES AND REPRESENTATIVES, 1877

Mr. RINFRET:

1. How many provinces were there in Canada in the year 1877, and what were the names of said provinces?

2. How many federal members represented said provinces or territories in the said year?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Seven: Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island.

2. Ontario, 88; Quebec, 65; Nova Scotia, 21; New Brunswick, 16; Manitoba, 4; British Columbia, 6; Prince Edward Island, 6. Total, 206.

RAILWAY MILEAGE, 1877

Mr. RINFRET:

1. How many miles of railways were there in Canada in the year 1877?

2. How many miles of railway are there in Canada at the present time?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. On June 30, 1877, 5,574.25 miles, including 25.5 miles of wooden rail.

2. On December 31, 1920, 39,38[illegible] miles. Estimated for December 31, 1921, 40,041 miles.

LIGHTHOUSE BOATS—FUEL

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. After trials made by the Marine Department in regard to wood and coal fuel for the use of lighthouse boats of l'Ile Rouge, l'Ile Blanche and Princess Shoal, is it the intention of the Government to return to the old method of supplying the said boats with cordwood instead of coal, if it is found less costly?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Yes.

QUESTION ASKED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What are the names of the trustees, under the Bankruptcy Act, for the district of Montreal?

2. When were they appointed, and what were their respective occupations before appointment?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. BRISTOL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the claims for reparations for damages afflicted upon Canadian ships during the war by the German nation. Also a copy of the Order in Council appointing the Honourable Sir John D. Hazen to inquire into same.

Mr. GRIMMER:

For a copy of all Petitions or Memorials from residents of the county of Charlotte, New Brunswick, made to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, asking that a minimum price per hogshead be placed on all sardines sold for export during the present fishing season, and for a copy of all correspondence and other documents relating thereto.

Mr. HANSON:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, letters, agreements, contracts, claims, memoranda and other documents between the Caroquet and Gulf Shore Railway Company and the Government of Canada, relating to the purchase of the said railway.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATERWAY

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should give early and favourable consideration to the report of the International Joint Commission on the St. Lawrence River Waterway, and request the Government of the United States to join with Canada in making an international agreement for carrying out the work so recommended.

He said: I offer no apologies for introducing this motion, which I had intended moving on Monday. The three parties in the House will agree, I think, that it is of sufficient importance to warrant not only an afternoon's discussion, but consideration on a second day as well. A debate on this very subject has been in progress in the United States Congress and Senate for some six weeks, and to-day the question I am bringing up in this resolution is the most important one that has been before the people of Canada since Confederation and the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. Not only is it of great concern to us in Canada, but it is one of the most important economic questions under consideration on the North American continent at the present time. I would point out that it is not and should not be made a political question at all; it is a business question, a great economic question, a transportation question that concerns every citizen both of the United States and of Canada. It should therefore be approached not from the provincial, the

local, parish, or sectional standpoint, but from the great national standpoint of what is the greatest good for the greatest number. This subject is so vast and intricate that it is almost impossible to do more than touch the fringe of it in the short time at my disposal this afternoon. It has supporters among all parties in Canada, in and out of the House.

We have three transcontinental railway systems, and in that respect we are far ahead of the economic development of the country. In fact, we could for some years probably get along with one or two such systems, and the money spent on the third could have been spent to much better advantage in deepening this waterway to the sea. Had we done this we would have acquired a gilt-edged security, and solved the transportation question, and from the standpoint of power alone the deepening of the St. Lawrence would have more than paid the cost incurred, to say nothing of saving millions of dollars in freight charges, and so effecting economies in transportation which would redound to the economic advantage of the whole country. And we would have provided a feeder for the National lines, and Canadian Pacific railways to the head of the Lakes and would have solved in the main the transportation problems of this country as well as of the United States.

A review of our canal policy does not disclose what might be called any deliberate, well planned or consistent policy. Money has been spent on some canals that should never have been undertaken; whereas if that money had been diverted to the deepening of the St. Lawrence channel and the Welland canal it would have provided a great national asset. The Welland canal deepening has been more or less a political football. This canal is an important link in the St. Lawrence scheme, and it should have been finished long ago. Indeed, if the work had been prosecuted with the same vigour that characterized the construction of the Chippawa-Queenston power canal, we would have that link in operation to-day. As it is, however, we are told that it may be 1927, and more probably 1937, before the canal is deepened. Until the Welland ship canal is completed a 500,000 bushel barge coming down from Port Arthur has to tranship its cargo of wheat at Port Colborne into smaller boats, at a cost of four cents a bushel, and there is the further disadvantage that most of that wheat goes to Buffalo instead of to Montreal.

With the opening of the new Welland ship canal boats will be able to run from Port Arthur direct to Montreal at a rate of about four or five cents a bushel to Port Colborne, and one cent to two cents for the extra run, Port Colborne to Montreal, without transhipment to smaller boats at Port Colborne, as now.

The St. Lawrence river waterway is being strongly supported by all the Western states,—Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming and Idaho. The legislatures of those states have for years been voting money for surveys, and for an educational campaign in connection with this important scheme. In Canada the governments of Ontario and Saskatchewan have come out very strongly in its favour. In addition, a thousand chambers of commerce and boards of trade and patriotic bodies in the two countries have passed resolutions in favour of it. The opposition to the project is centered in New York and in some parts of Quebec and Montreal. It should be observed, however, that those in Canada do not oppose the scheme from the economic or transportation standpoint, but because they favour some rival scheme. I am not going to decry those rival schemes, because I think that before many years are past we may need not only the St. Lawrence but the Georgian Bay waterway as well, in the same way as at one time one railway was sufficient for our transportation needs, and later with the development of the country a second and even a third railway system was constructed.

A notable utterance in favour of this waterway was delivered by President Harding at the agricultural conference at Washington on the 23rd January last, in the course of which he said:

> I have spoken of the advantage which Europe enjoys because of its access to the sea, the cheapest and surest transportation facility. In our own country is presented one of the world's most attractive opportunities for extension of the sea-ways many hundred miles inland.
>
> The heart of the continent, with its vast resources in both agriculture and industry, would be brought into communication with all the ocean routes by the execution of the St. Lawrence waterway project. To enable ocean-going vessels to have access to all the ports of the Great Lakes would have a most stimulating effect upon the industrial life of the continent's interior.
>
> The feasibility of the project is unquestioned, and its cost, compared with some other great engineering works, would be small. Disorganized and prostrate, the nations of Central Europe are even now settling their hands to

the development of a great continental waterway which, connecting the Rhine and Danube, will bring water transportation from the Black to the North Sea, from the Mediterranean to the Baltic.

If nationalistic prejudices and economic difficulties can be overcome by Europe, they certainly should not be formidable obstacles to an achievement less expensive and giving promise of greater advantages to the peoples of North America. Not only would the cost of transportation be greatly reduced, but a vast population would be brought overnight in immediate touch with the markets of the entire world.

There you have the declaration of the President of the United States. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Mackenzie King) will, before this debate is concluded, appoint another day for further discussion, as the subject is of such supreme importance that it is impossible to give it proper consideration in the short time at our disposal this afternoon. This is, perhaps, the most important question that this Parliament will have to settle, and full opportunity should be given for an exhaustive discussion of the merits and demerits—if there are any—of this great scheme, and of the report of the Deep Waterways Commission.

In connection with this subject it is relevant to refer briefly to the history of the St. Lawrence river and a few of its physical characteristics, and the artificial improvements made on the Lakes by Canada since 1809, in order that the importance of this waterway and its development may be properly appreciated.

The St. Lawrence rises in lake Ontario and discharges its waters into the gulf of St. Lawrence, but what one might term its primary source is at the head of the St. Louis river at the extreme end of lake Superior, 1,870 miles from the gulf. The basin of the St. Lawrence is a great transverse valley, 309,500 square miles in area, extending from the gulf of St. Lawrence into the heart of the continent. Much the larger part of the basin lies north of the boundary, as all its great tributaries flow in on that side. It is separated by a low divide from the Hudson bay basin, and from the Mississippi basin by an even lower divide. The river is remarkable for the number of expansions in its course.

Many surveys and charts have been made of this river since 1809, and a great deal of money has been expended on widening and deepening its channel since that time. The history of the St. Lawrence ship channel proper between Quebec and Montreal starts in 1825, when Hon. James Young, of Montreal, an intensely patriotic man, interested the government in the matter, with the result that a great deal of early investigation, survey and educational work for improving the channel was carried out between 1836 and 1841. This work was made the subject of inquiry by a committee of the Lower Canada legislature, 1836 to 1841. Their report was published and the work was begun, continued and carried to completion by the Harbour Commission. The gentlemen composing that commission from time to time have done an immense amount of work in improving the St. Lawrence channel and harbour of Montreal, improvements involving heavy expenditures. But, as one of the harbour commissioners for Toronto, I am free to admit that money spent on any of our great harbours, such as Quebec, Halifax, St. John, Montreal, Toronto, Vancouver, and Victoria, enures to the advantage of the country generally, and should not be considered as purely a local improvement, because these ports are all a factor in the development of deep waterways and of water-borne traffic. When this important work was handed over by the government of Canada to the Montreal Harbour commissioners, the commissioners went ahead and did very good work. They appointed a board of engineers to inquire into the project. The matter was examined from all points of view and a report was brought down recommending the improvement of the channel between Quebec and Montreal. That report of the engineers was adopted by the government and the Montreal Harbour Commission and operations were begun by the commission on the old channel in 1851. By November, 1851, this channel was opened to lake St. Peter to a depth of ten feet six inches. In 1853 a vessel passed through to the foot of lake St. Peter drawfour feet more than the ordinary depth of water. In 1855 the capacity was increased to sixteen and one-half feet, and subsequently in 1857, to eighteen feet. In 1856 the harbour commissioners pointed out to the government the national character of the work which they had been doing, urging that the work had been for the government of Canada and that the money expended had been devoted to national purposes, for the advantage of the whole country. Outstanding success attended the early operations of the Harbour Commission of Montreal, and the channels were further deepened from time to time, until to-day there is a 35-foot channel 450 feet wide. From 1851 to 1888 the harbour com-

missioners had charge of this ship canal, but in 1888 the work was transferred back to the federal Department of Public Works. There it remained until 1904, when it was transferred by the government of the day to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That is a short history of the St. Lawrence ship channel. The cost of the improvements to that channel to date, according to a return laid on the table of the House on March 20, 1921, has been $23,867,000.

No proper study of this question can be pursued without an understanding of the territory on both sides of the international border which is tributary to this work. The fourteen states I named in the early part of my address, situated in the central and western parts of the United States, are all tributary to this work and will benefit by it, from the transportation as well as from the navigation, power and economic standpoint. The part of Canada most directly affected by this project as a national work are the entire province of Ontario and the parts of Manitoba and Saskatchewan south of the National Transcontinental. This territory on both sides of the border is the greatest industrial territory. The districts affected in Canada are noted for the production of grain, live stock and dairy products, and forest resources—not only in Ontario, but in other parts of Canada. Then, there is the value of the wood used for pulp manufacture; the value of mineral products, coal and copper deposits; and of manufactured goods generally. The freight traffic on the railway lines running through the territory tributary to this work amounts to 37,000,000 tons annually. I admit that the tributary territory in the United States is suffering to-day, in a railway sense, more than the tributary territory in Canada is, because in the United States they are away behind the times as shown by the congestion of railway traffic. In Canada we have no lack of mileage; we have three transcontinental railways. In fact, we have what I might call useless duplication and waste. But we have not the development of water-borne traffic, and in that respect our condition differs from that of the United States.

I wish to say a few words with regard to this question from the navigation standpoint as it affects the people of Canada and the people of the United States. Many phases of the question have been studied during the past fifty years from the point of view of navigation; I will enumerate only a few of them. One of the results

of this development will be the increase of production through improvement of the avenues of transportation and the creating of new ones. The history of water-borne traffic the world over makes it plain that when an important canal or waterway is improved, cheaper freight rates follow, with consequent increased production and closer co-operation between producer and consumer.

Another phase of the question bears upon the effect of improved transportation facilities for water-borne traffic upon the rail route. No less an authority than Mr. Hoover, one of the most eminent men in the United States to-day, gives it as his opinion that if adequate water-borne communications are provided they will act as feeders for the steam roads and have the effect of reducing and regulating rates. I believe that this important work would produce in Canada such revenue for our bankrupt railroads that in a few years they would become a gilt-edged investment. As to the effect upon the railroad congestion, we have the evidence of the new premier of Saskatchewan, Hon. Charles A. Dunning, who refers to the fact that in Canada at the present time there is not the acreage cultivated that there is in normal times, and that with the expansion of agriculture, the cultivation of a greater acreage and the production of a normal crop, there would be very serious railway congestion in the western parts of the country; the railways would not be able to take the crop out. We must provide a route for this water-borne traffic via the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence without transhipment, if we are to solve the congestion problem and problem of freight rates for East and West alike.

Another question arising from the navigation standpoint is, how will ocean rates and inland water rates be affected? The effect will be a saving of five or six cents a bushel on wheat carried from the head of the Lakes to the seaboard. I will not quote the facts bearing upon this point which were placed before the International Commission by some of the gentlemen who came from the West.

Then, there is the effect upon package freight taken from the head of the Lakes to the seaboard and from the seaboard to the head of the Lakes without transhipment. Mr. Richardson, of Kingston, a very prominent man in transportation circles, who has an office in Winnipeg, expresses the view that the development of package frieght transportation on the Lakes will revolutionize things for the

small cities and towns. The small freighter can proceed from Montreal up the river, stopping at Brockville, Kingston, Hamilton, Cobourg, passing through the Welland canal and proceeding to Port Colborne, Sarnia and Windsor and thence to the head of the Lakes. Hon. members would be surprised to see the small freighters coming into these lake ports as I have seen them and the boon they are to the public. They put down their package freight without delay; the merchants can have the goods in their retail stores the same day, and they know when they are going to get them. This project will revolutionize the package freight business on the Great Lakes; that is amply demonstrated by the number of package freighters operating on the Great Lakes to-day, notwithstanding the difficulties with which they have to contend.

What will be the relative cost of building and operating lake ships and ocean ships, and what are the characteristics of each? Some large ocean freighters to-day are not constructed for service on the Great Lakes, and vice versa. Many of the old type of boats, commonly known on the lakes as the whaleback, have already gone down the lakes to the Atlantic seaboard ports with freight. We have the evidence of many eminent men who have sailed the lakes for many years, that three-fourths of all the ocean boats in the world to-day do not draw more than twenty-five feet, and these boats could go to the head of the lakes if we adopt this scheme. I shall not take time to read their evidence because there are other speakers. Three-fourths of the ships that go through the Suez and Panama canals could use the lakes with this improvement.

I believe that if this project goes through, it would result in a great expansion of the shipbuilding industry on the Great Lakes, and that would do more to solve unemployment than any other agency that I know of. I believe that we can produce the right type of ships not only for the ocean but for the lakes as well. Salt water boats could then go up the St. Lawrence river one thousand miles, as every navigation man knows. The same is true of the Amazon river, where ocean ships go up 1,000 miles.

What will be the effect if it is practicable to build a composite type of vessel for lake and ocean use. It will stimulate shipbuilding on the lakes and there will be sufficient cargoes both inbound and outbound to keep the ships busy. It will be of the greatest economic value on both sides of the border. The fact that this district is a great consumer, and the home of many of the greatest basic industries on the continent of America, will be enough to provide cargoes to the head of the lakes and to the seaboard.

Those who are opposed to this project talk of ice conditions and fog, but that would be no more an adverse factor than it is on the American seaboard part of the year. Of all the fogs you see, there are none worse than those that envelop the ports of the Atlantic and Belle Isle. So this project stands on an equal basis with the Atlantic seaboard in that respect. The St. Lawrence is all right for five to six months of the year as to climatic conditions.

There are many other features of this scheme that might be touched upon—the competition between lake freighters and ocean vessels, the necessity of cutting channels and deepening inland harbours. With respect to the latter, many inland harbours are to-day ten and fifteen years ahead of their work in anticipation of this project. Cleveland, Detroit, Toledo and Buffalo are deepening their harbours and the United States government are bringing on advance expenditures instead of curtailing expenditure for deeper harbours as we are doing on this side of the border for deeper harbours.

The United States Government are increasing grants for deepening ports and harbours and for providing deeper water in all the channels. They have just brought down a bill in Congress appropriating many millions for lake ports.

Toronto is spending $26,000,000 rebuilding its harbour. The city itself is putting up eighty-three per cent of the cost of all these improvements through its Harbour Board.

It is not a beautification scheme, but a great commercial, economic scheme to provide docks and do something to develop water-borne traffice for the good of the country generally. I shall not refer any further to the navigation aspects of this project, except to say that it will be a very great factor in moving grain to the seaboard, and will obviate the losses that occur in transhipment at Port Colborne and Prescott, for instance, and prevent in the future a railway blockade and reduce heavy freight rates by rail.

Following the consummation of this work I believe Canada will experience an era of the greatest industrial expansion it has ever known. Alternative routes have been

proposed, but I shall not deal with them, as other speakers are to follow. I have always been a believer in the St. Lawrence route. It has long appealed to my fancy and imagination, and the more I study the proposition the more I am convinced that it is one of the greatest projects the people of Canada have ever had before them for good and the welfare of the country.

I want to refer to another aspect of this project, and it is one of the greatest questions before the people of Canada to-day—the question of water-power. The water-power that would be developed incidentally in the building of this canal would more than pay for the cost of the work. It is only within the last two hundred years that scientific discoveries have given to the world the power inherent in fuels, namely, coal, oil, gas and falling water, distributed in the various forms of heat, light, and electricity. It has been estimated that the total water-powers of the world amount to about 100,000,000 horse-power, of which only about 17,000,000 have so far been developed. The Dominion of Canada possesses about twenty per cent of the world's total water-power and also approximately the same percentage of the world's water-power already developed. The people of Ontario and Quebec are especially interested in this power situation. In Ontario we have no coal. We have to depend for our coal supply on the maritime provinces, or the far West and the United States. The United States will run out of coal in one hundred years, as has been shown by the report of the Conservation Commission of that country. The first of these stores of energy to be utilized by man was coal, as we all know. This fuel is very widely distributed and exists in immense quantities in various parts of the world, but there is no denying the fact that the supply is limited and the world is not any too economical in its expenditure of coal. The supplies of oil and gas are also limited, and prices very high.

Our remaining source of energy, then, is water-power. The people of the United States are not unmindful of this, for every state in the Union is to-day doing everything it can to develop its internal water-powers with a view to conserving the coal supply of the whole country. The municipalities in the province of Ontario have also done for themselves a splendid work in this respect, and have saved the people of Ontario millions in their combined water-power scheme. For some years the Niagara river was looked upon as one of the greatest scenic wonders of the world and was famous chiefly for its beautiful Horseshoe falls, its small Maid of the Mist, and its rainbow. But a new day and a new era dawned when science discovered the power inherent in falling water—a discovery that has conferred a boon on every man, woman, and child in Ontario, and has been the cause of the greatest industrial expansion in that district that has ever been known in the history of Canada. I have here plates and photographs of some forty companies which have located in the Niagara district as the result of science doing what it did to develop Niagara water-power. In commercial and domestic lighting, this power development has saved my own city $22,000,000 since 1911. This book contains a list of the manufacturing concerns, cement, chemical, paper, electric and metal companies of all kinds, foundries, motor car companies, and those engaged in manufacturing by-products, that have been established in the Niagara peninsula as the result of cheap light and power. Just look at the great basic industries that have sprung up in that district, and we had not one of them before the development of Niagara water-power. What has happened in the Niagara district yesterday and to-day will occur along the St. Lawrence if this Parliament has the courage and vision which I hope it has to carry out this work.

To sum up some of the arguments in favour of this work, those who support this canal argue that not only can the power be produced cheaply and command a ready sale, but that it will pay the bulk of the cost of the improvement. The canal can be linked up with the super-power scheme on the Atlantic coast serving the territory from the 39th parallel, near Washington, D.C., to the 44th parallel, 22 miles north of Portland, Me., and from there to the river St. Lawrence. The St. Lawrence will also be linked up on the Canadian side with a great Canadian super-power scheme, consisting of the Hydro-Electric system in Ontario, and the Ottawa river and part of Quebec, and can supply also power for the electrification of federal railways from Quebec to Fort William.

Now this work will conserve the coal supply. It is figured that three out of every five tons of coal consumed by a railway locomotive is an economic waste, that the present system of steam locomotion is a wasteful and not an economical system. Evidence to that effect appears in a report which is before this House to-day.

The construction of this great waterway will relieve the railways of the burden of carrying millions of tons of coal and will effect a most decided economy. Markets for the consumption of the power to be developed will be created along the St. Lawrence. Cheap light and power will be available and this waterway will become the scene of the greatest industrial expansion in the history of Canada or of the North American continent. Small towns like Three Rivers, Brockville, Kingston, Coburg and others will grow enormously, and their population will be tremendously increased. Not only that but entirely new communities will spring into existence and this spectacle of prosperity will be witnessed all the way up to the head of the Great Lakes. The unemployment situation will be automatically solved: there will be an abundance of work for all. The St. Lawrence route, just as the Niagara river is to-day, will witness the establishment of basic plants of all kinds including chemical companies, iron and steel foundaries, paper companies, motor companies, by product concerns and production plants of all descriptions; and if the people of Canada will only have the same courage and faith in this scheme as the people of Ontario had in the development of the Niagara district, we shall witness wonderful industrial developments in connection with this great project. Let me read a few words from a statement made by Colonel John Finnie one of the greatest electrical engineers on the continent, a gentleman of international reputation, before the Conservation Commission of the United States regarding this question:

> I believe that the water-power of the St. Lawrence is infinitely more value to commerce than any navigation which will use the streams after they have been improved for navigation. But most fortunately, there is no conflict between the two because any proper development of the St. Lawrence for power will at the same time take care of the navigation features. He held that the value of this power would be sufficient to carry the cost of the entire undertaking with navigation and power; that the rates would be reasonable. There was no question as to the possibility of marketing as all the available power on the St. Lawrence could be readily absorbed by growing industries. Col. Finney described the projected superpower line, a high tension transmission line designated to serve the Atlantic sea Board from Maine to Virginia, which will always be the workshop of America, and with the proposed superpower line in Ontario, Quebec and the Ottawa river, each country would have a superpower zone to distribute its alloted share and these would be a great industrial revival on both sides of the St. Lawrence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the financial side of this question because some objection to the project has been raised by the financial interests of Montreal. The same objection was raised when the power development scheme in the Niagara district was launched in 1905. I remember well, when the late Sir James Whitney and Sir Adam Beck proposed the undertaking of the Hydro Electric system from which 374 municipalities derive power to-day and have made such a gigantic success of, the opponents of the scheme bestowed upon its promoters the title of "amateur anarchists". You all know what a magnificent success that system has proved; yet if the promoters of that scheme had been influenced by the doubts and fears and lack of courage which characterize some people who are opposing this great waterway project to-day we should never have witnessed any such hydro-electrical power movement in the province of Ontario, and that province would never have been able to take care, as it did, of the munition plants which manufactured munitions during the war. At one time during that great struggle Sir Henry Drayton, then Chairman of the Railway Commission but later Finance Minister of Canada and now an honoured member of this House, pointed out that Ontario was supplying at one period nearly one-third of the munitions needed for our men at the front. But for the carrying out of the hydro-electric scheme Ontario would not have had the power which enabled it to render such great war assistance to the Empire. At that time also there happened to be a shortage of coal, and what a terrible condition of affairs it would have been only for the Hydro, as there was even then a lack of power as well. As it was owing to lack of power during the war, many industries in Ontario had to close down and hundreds of men were turned out of work through no fault of their own. If we have the same faith and courage now as the men of 1905 displayed in connection with the Hydro Electric development the present project will be boldly taken up with the result that the revenue from the power developed will be more than sufficient to meet the cost of the work.

Let me mention another interesting feature in connection with power development. The privately-owned power companies in the Niagara district, representing an investment of $32,000,000, are now being taken over by the city of Toronto and the

Hydro-Electric Commission. This will result in the establishment of public ownership throughout the entire Niagara power zone on the Canadian side and will avoid the evils of duplication. Lack of vision is by no means an uncommon thing in our public men. The late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie had some doubts about the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. He argued that it would be better to tear the rails up and store them at Port Arthur rather than to construct a railway to the coast which would be a colossal failure. Let me read a few lines from what he said on one occasion:

> It would be better to pile the rails up at Port Arthur and leave them unused rather than lay two streaks of rust to the Pacific Coast.

Now, any one who had been rash enough in his day to predict that in the year 1920, such a volume as 335,000,000 bushels of grain would be taken out from the West would have been deemed a lunatic away back in 1874 or 1878.

In other countries vision and courage have been displayed in dealing with questions of this kind. Take the deepening of the canal at Frankfort in Germany; take the building of the great ship-canal from Manchester to the sea, the latter a deep waterway 35 miles long and 450 feet wide. Manchester was dead commercially in the year 1880. There were in that city 5,000 vacant houses and 200 factories closed down—actually the place was stagnant. To-day as the result of the building of that canal it is the third largest shipping port in England. Liverpool fought the deepening of that canal as likely to injure Liverpool and then built the docks on the Mersey, but it was the best thing which ever happened for that city. Liverpool will acknowledge that to-day although it fought the project for many years. Some of the financial interests in the city of Montreal look upon the present project in somewhat the same light that Liverpool once did the Manchester ship-canal. Let me say that I am a member of the Port Authorities Association. There should be no sectional jealousy in an enterprise of this kind. Toronto itself feels that what will help to develop the ports of the province of Quebec and the maritime provinces and the Pacific coast will be for the good of Toronto as well. There may be some differences of opinion about the St. Lawrence waterway project, but I plead with the opponents of this measure not to hold up Montreal to-day as opposed to this work. There has been a change in the

sentiment in Montreal from that which prevailed three or four years ago. I have been told by one of the Montreal Harbour Commission that they are not opposed to the construction of this canal and have not passed any resolution in regard to it—they have an open mind with respect to the project. The stand taken to-day by the financial interests in Montreal is that they do not oppose the deepening of the canal, but they say that when the ships from the West come to the port of Montreal the cargoes from the head of the lakes will have to be transhipped to larger vessels in that port for conveyance overseas. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that argument is futile when we bear in mind the attitude of Montreal at the time the ship-canal between that city and Quebec was undertaken. The idea then was to make Montreal the terminus instead of the ancient city of Quebec, and no such objection was raised at that time by Quebec. They never thought that by taking it to the port of Montreal they would be transferring most of the business from Quebec to Montreal. If that were true, the port of Montreal is no more an inland port than Windsor. It is an inland port built up by deep water channels at the expense of the people of Canada, and we say the inland deep water channels should be extended to the head of the lakes in the interests of the people of this country, and in the interests of navigation. Opposition to the project also developed at the Montreal hearing of the commission and again it is the interests of Montreal against the country at large. The arguments advanced at Montreal, however, were of a somewhat different nature than those of New York state, the contention being that while the St. Lawrence should be deepened and made suitable for vessels of large capacity between the great lakes and Montreal, they should not proceed further than that city but transfer "their cargoes to ocean vessels" at Montreal; also that it would not pay ocean ships to make the passage up the lakes.

That may be Montreal's view of the matter, but they will not find many who will agree with them. When it was decided to bring ocean vessels to Montreal and make it the terminus for ocean trade instead of the ancient city of Quebec, Montreal had no objections to offer on the ground that by so doing it might injure the city of Quebec, and they have as little right now to object to ocean ships passing Montreal and proceeding further. At one time the maxi-

mum depth between Quebec and Montreal was only twelve feet, but by continuous dredging we now have a channel thirty-five feet deep and 600 feet wide through lake St. Peter.

I am surprised at the stand taken by the Premier of Quebec, Mr. Taschereau, whom I looked upon as a very capable and progressive public man. I may say that, like his predecessor, he has done a great deal for Quebec in building good roads, in erecting court houses for the municipalities, registry offices, lands titles offices, and other provincial buildings, which in Quebec are built by the province. I commend him for doing that. I believe he has done a great deal in the way of promoting good legislation. I do not agree with him in a great many ways but I appreciate what he has done in that line. He is considering the problem from a local and a provincial standpoint. What he says regarding the erection of a dam and power house on the American side is not confirmed by the report of the Deep Waterways Commission, which takes the opposite stand. This site for the dam and power house will have to be selected later by agreement. In another part of his statement he says, "We want to see the interests of Quebec protected." But the interests of Ontario are not going to be sacrificed, with 700,000 horse-power belonging to Ontario. Why should Ontario sacrifice part of this power because Quebec will not let us have it?

I would like for about five minutes to sum up some of the important advantages of this canal, and to cite some of the evidence I gave before the Deep Waterways Commission. I will read a few paragraphs. The first paragraph I will read says:

> The advantages of the St. Lawrence route.
>
> (1) It is one of the great natural waterways of the world.
>
> (2) The cost of improvement is less than other routes moreover it would be divided between the two nations sharing its benefits.
>
> It is a high speed highway avoiding long passages.

Eighty per cent of the vessels used on the Suez canal are not more than 25 feet draught. If we insist on an all Canadian route we are going to have a rival American route and both of them will not be successful. I believe there will be a distinct advantage in joining hands with the United States in this work. Millions of horse-power are available incidental to the project. This development would represent a saving of coal running into millions of tons annually. Coal miners may go on strike, but the St. Lawrence never goes on strike. This freight development is a by-product incidentally of carrying out this work. Nature has provided this flowing route to the sea for two reasons. For a great waterway to the sea, and for a great power plant for the development of Canadian commerce. The fact that this work is feasible is proven by what happened in 1911 before the Rivers and Harbours Committee at Washington, where they stated that they were willing to deepen the river to a depth of 30 feet for the privilege of obtaining that water-power. Every year 4,000,000 horse-power of electric energy is going to waste in the St. Lawrence; the equivalent of $800,000 worth of coal is being wasted every year, and the finest system of inland waterways is lying idle because deep-draught vessels cannot pass forty-six miles of the St. Lawrence river on their way to the upper lakes.

The St. Lawrence ranks with the Suez and Panama canals in its magnitude and importance. To provide for a continuous deep waterway, 2,300 miles from the head of the lakes to tidewater, 46 miles of the St. Lawrence would have to be made passable. The cost will be $250,000,000 as I stated in my evidence, but I think it will be found by the report that the cost would be $270,000,000.

We have choked railway facilities in Canada with the high freight rates and cost of transportation, equal on an average to 20 per cent of the value of the goods to be transported, with also a shortage of coal. People are demanding that use be made of the waterways, deeper canals and the use of the millions of horse-power unused and available. The only opposition is in New York and Montreal. Montreal is opposed for local reasons as distinguished from national reasons. They are looking for a larger Montreal. They will readily secure one from this canal. Canada and the United States are not as much interested in the local aims and objects of this place and that as in furnishing the necessities to the great bulk of the people as cheaply as possible. Montreal is no more a sea port than Toronto or Fort William. It is an inland port made an ocean port because of deep river channels. We say these should be extended to the head of the lakes. Montreal's other plea is that it is not practical. Some people said the same thing about all the hydro development and the deepening of the Welland, but eminent engineers in the United States and Canada say it is practical. Canada and the United

States are all bottled up because of lack of an outlet to the sea, although both produce vast amounts of all the necessities of life, far more than we can use at home. They have no adequate outlet, with the result that much of our production goes to waste. I may instance the way fruit and vegetables in the Niagara district have gone to waste every fall for lack of transportation.

The great bulk of the developed power will belong to Canada. Some say Canada will want to take it all. Not so, Canada raises wheat and other agricultural products and sells them abroad and will also do the same with part of this power. The Dominion will not monopolize the power of the St. Lawrence. What Canada needs also is with this canal a forward national shipbuilding policy that would have Canadian ships go out on to seven seas and bring trade to Canada up the St. Lawrence to the head of the Great lakes. Nature has carved out a great highway from the lakes to the gulf of St. Lawrence on the east and to the gulf of Mexico on the south, both routes offering a downhill haul. To Canada and to the great nation that built the Panama canal this should prove an easy task. Had Europe such an opportunity, the project would have been completed and progressively improved for a thousand years or more. China did this more than three thousand years ago. Our great inland seas must be connected to the east with salt water. To the south, to the United States, the Mississippi offers her one logical channel. To the east, and I say it with equal confidence, the St. Lawrence offers the one logical channel to Canada and the United States in unison. The natural route, by the St. Lawrence, is already made for us, except for some forty-six odd miles obstructed by rapids. Overcome this obstruction and there is clear sailing all the way to the sea. It is a national duty—a Canadian duty—an international duty to develop water-power wherever possible. Give us this mighty co-labourer with coal in keeping the wheels of industry revolving and you will put the country beyond the power of any man or group of men to cripple and imperil as the country is crippled and imperiled to-day. It is the shortest by some hundreds of miles from any of the lake ports to Liverpool or northern Europe and the Mediterranean, as will be seen by the following.

From Chicago to Christiana by way of New York is 5,767 miles; from Chicago to Christiana by the St. Lawrence is 4,927 miles—a big difference. The St. Lawrence is also much shorter to Liverpool than New York. To the Mediterranean also the way is shorter by the St. Lawrence than by New York. And is shorter also—to Italy, Greece, the Black sea, and India by the Suez. Now distance is not everything, but in this case it means both time and money. Improvements of the St. Lawrence route will not in any way lessen the value of other waterways which are regarded by some as rival routes.

We have engineering and commercial assurance of these three facts:

(1) It can be done; it is practical.

(2) The cost would be less than other routes proposed.

(3) There would be developed water power running into millions of tons of coal per annum and millions of horse power available for trade and commerce and industrial development. I believe that one joint route for Canada and the United States is better than two rival routes. I believe that such a route can be accomplished more cheaply, that it provides a more direct way to the markets of Europe, that it is more practicable, more serviceable, better than any other plan yet offered. I believe that this improved St Lawrence will bring great commercial development to our own country and corresponding benefit to the people of the world with whom we shall trade. The St. Lawrence route has long appealed to my interest. I was hopeful, and at last we have got a report which gives us in concrete form the cost and the possibilities that will grow out of this great international waterway. The water has been running to waste through all the ages.

The United States spent something over $400,000,000 to construct the Panama canal, but as far as serving the business interests of that country and the world are concerned, the benefits are not comparable to those that would come, through the development of the St. Lawrence waterway to the sea, to Canada, the United States and the world. One objector in the United States said that the canal is to be built in conjunction with Canada. The waterway is for some distance the natural boundary between these two countries. Both nations are equally interested in its development. It is big enough to accommodate both countries. These countries live in amity together, and this great improvement would benefit both. Canada has expended $95,000,000 in improvements in the St. Lawrence river and she has voted

$55,000,000 for improvements in the Welland canal. She should have a route to the sea for her vessels, and this project is the least expensive that makes for an ocean waterway. It has within its development to pay for its own expenses, and no one will deny that, because practical engineers have made the demonstration of what is possible. The idea that the people of the two countries own a waterway one thousand miles in length, reaching into the heart of a continent which is the greatest in production and consuming power in the world,a channel of still water, running to the ocean, and do not provide proper access for it, especially when that project promises to be self-sustaining from its power development alone—seems to me to speak such a lack of courage on the part of our people that I cannot believe it is true. Increased facilities of transportation to meet the ever enlarging demands of distribution can only be provided through the improvement and utilization of our waterways and aiding water borne traffic. Navigable waterways are intended primarily for commerce; and the expenditure of public moneys can only be justified when they are to be so used.

Speaking as a Toronto Harbour Commissioner of twenty years practical experience, I believe that eighty per cent of the present ocean-going craft can reach the upper lakes by the present channels when the way is opened through the St. Lawrence and the new Welland. More than ninety-six per cent can reach lake Erie by the same improvement. In seeking a route to the Atlantic, we must have the best highway that can be obtained.

I have heard at the various conventions of the port authorities of the world which I have attended some arguments against this project; they were more fancied than real and sectional rather than national. Let us consider this question from a national standpoint—not the narrow, local parish point of view—and thereby do the greatest good to the greatest number. I have noted some of the objections and give them here, with the answer to each:

(1) It would be an economic failure and waste of public money. Answer: The power incidental will pay for the work.

(2) The cost would be prohibitive. Answer: The deep waterway reports say that it would not.

(3) Fogs and ice make the St. Lawrence route too hazardous. It is all right for six or seven months. Answer: The fogs and ice on the Atlantic play havoc with the steamship service there as well.

(4) Ocean vessels cannot navigate in the restricted channels nor afford the delays of lockage in canals. Answer: This objection is not sound, the report says so.

(5) There will be no return tonnage, and one-way traffic cannot be developed. Answer: The west is a great consumer.

(6) The purpose is to enable Canada to control the export grain trade. Answer: That is not so.

(7) It is designed to destroy the competition of the barge canal. Answer: It would cater to a different form of trade, and would be a feeder to the barge canal.

(8) The power is not needed. Answer: It will soon be badly needed in Canada and especially in the United States.

(9) It would expose the United States to the peril of invasion by Great Britain. Answer: The British fleet has been for six centuries the defender and protector of civilization. It saved civilization and liberty in the days of Philip of Spain, Louis XIV, Napoleon and the Kaiser. Only for the British fleet in the years from 1914 to 1918, we would have had the awful horror of the German war on our own soil, in Montreal, Quebec, Toronto, Boston, New York and Chicago. The British fleet saved America's shores. There is no danger of the invasion of the Great Lakes. The hope of the peace of the world is in amity between England and America.

We talk about disarmament. The case of the Great Lakes is a shining example to the world of what can be done by two nations in this regard. What could be more significant of the spirit that inspired the Disarmament conference than the simple fact that from the river St. Lawrence to the head of the Great Lakes there is not to-day any sign of a single armed vessel or armed fort? It shows that two peoples, with the same ideals and aspirations, can live side by side in friendly relations without any resort to works of defence.

Before I conclude I desire to read three of four paragraphs from the report now before me of the International Joint Commission, appointed by both governments. That commission was given certain instructions and it submitted answers to nine questions asked them. I shall not read the questions; I shall leave that duty to some other hon. member. The questions, as do the answers, speak for themselves. Having considered the question from every economic standpoint, and having heard

numerous witnesses, the commission have now brought in a report strongly in favour of the proposed work, from the navigation, the power, and the financial standpoints. The report states that an analysis submitted before the commission made it clear that the consensus of opinion of the two countries, as revealed in the public hearing, was on the whole distinctly favourable to the improvement of the St. Lawrence. There are two or three sentences I wish to read:

> The opposition to the suggested improvement centred largely in the State of New York, but was also supported by representatives of various public bodies in New England and in some of the Atlantic Coast States south of New York as well as in the City of Montreal.

But the few Canadians who opposed it did so because they favoured a rural route. P. 156. Further on, the report says:

> The Commission is inclined to the view that the St. Lawrence route would afford a material saving in transportation rates over any of the existing routes between points in the territory economically tributary to the St. Lawrence and overseas points.

The report refers to the time factor as follows (P. 161):

> The Commission is of the opinion that losses of time—due to delay in locks and restricted speed in canals and river channels would not prove a serious obstacle to the use of the proposed route—by ocean-going vessels.

At page 166 the report says that there is nothing in the evidence to warrant the belief that ocean-going vessels could not safely navigate the waters of the St. Lawrence river, and further on it states:

> The terms of the reference make it clear, in the opinion of the commission, that the intention of the two Governments was that the proposed improvement of the Upper St. Lawrence should serve primarily the interests of navigation and commerce and only incidentally those of water power.

In answer to the statement made by Mr. Taschereau and others that the matter was being really engineered by the American water-power interests to serve their own ends, the commission has this to say:

> The Commission is confident that there is no justification whatever for these assertions.

As a matter of fact, public attention, as I have pointed out is centered on the question from the point of view of the general improvement afforded in transportation, navigation and powers, and the economic advantage to Canada.

Now, this is the most important question this Parliament will have to deal with, and I would ask hon. members on all sides to approach the consideration of it with an open mind. Do not let us consider only from the sectional point what is good for Montreal, or Toronto, or Quebec, or any other single section; let us consider what is good in the national interests and that of the whole country, in order that we may obtain some relief from the heavy freight charges and solve our transportation problems aright. I submit that action is necessary in this matter for several reasons: to develop our water-power and improve our traffic; to solve the unemployment question; to develop the great interior of this country and particularly the great West which is suffering to such an extent to-day; and generally to make Canada a better place "for our war heroes to live in." As things are many of our unfit soldiers are out of work in many large centres of population to-day, going about seeking charity in the larger centres of population. This canal would do more to solve the unemployment problem than any other agency, and I urge the Prime Minister to take steps in the matter immediately. The question was considered of sufficient importance in the United States to justify six weeks' discussion in the two houses of Parliament there, and the committees. It has been made a football long enough by legislators, and I think it is time for the Parliament of Canada to do something practical. We have had a number of minor questions discussed in this House. On Monday afternoon and evening, for example, we had under discussion an academic question which, though important, was of trivial concern to the people of this country as compared with the question we are now considering. That discussion on Monday was no doubt interesting from an academic point of view, but this subject transcends in importance any of the minor questions that we have been debating. I do urge the Government, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), the Progressives, and all parties to get together and so arrange matters that all those who desire to speak on this question might have ample opportunity to put their views before the House. For, I repeat, this is the greatest question this Parliament will have to settle, and one of the greatest questions since Confederation. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank yourself and the hon. members of this House for the courteous hearing and attention that has been given me. As I said, I could only begin to touch the fringe of this great and intricate problem in the very short time at my disposal. I have,

however, dealt with the most salient points affecting the economic, the transportation, the navigation, the power and light, the unemployment, the shipbuilding, the rates and tolls, and the financial sides of this big question.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): I had not anticipated the honour of taking part at an early stage in this debate, but I feel that if we may congratulate the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) on bringing this very momentous question to the attention of the House, some endeavour should be made at once to place before hon. members the other side of the case. The hon. member in a very able, although not very comprehensive speech, has presented his own side of the question; and, while it is not my intention to try to follow him in every step that he has taken, I shall attempt to sum up in a general way the arguments on the side of the case which my hon,. friend has not put before us. I want to remind the House also of some of the very good reasons which have been advanced why the Government should be very cautious in this matter, should approach the whole question warily, and, in fact, should refrain at the present time from taking the least practical action. If the flow of the St. Lawrence was as abundant and tumultuous as the faculty of speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Church), we might take chances with it, but in my view the St. Lawrence is too precious an asset to this country for us to lightly and without the strongest motives either attempt to alter its navigability, or enter into partnership with another country in regard to it, or place a mortgage on our property rights in it.

It has been pointed out, and very properly, that the deepening of the St. Lawrence river to permit ocean vessels to reach the Great Lakes is no more than an engineering problem. I grant, Mr. Speaker, that, given the money, it is possible for engineers to provide a twenty-five or even a thirty-foot channel from Montreal to the Great Lakes. But that is not the point. There is a financial and also an international side to this question. Can Canada bear her share of the cost of this undertaking? That is one point. Further, will the results expected warrant the expenditure? That is another point. But a more important point than either seems to me to be this: Is it desirable to enter into a partnership of this kind with the United States?

As to the cost, the situation is very obscure. We have not any precise data as to what this great enterprise would cost. It has been reported that a twenty-five-foot waterway can be constructed for $250,000,000. But it has also been pointed out that this estimate does not cover the deepening of the lake harbours, of the channels of the Great Lakes, nor of the connecting rivers. In this connection I need not remind this House that every time an enterprise of this kind is launched in Parliament the estimated cost is always very much lower than the actual cost of construction.

But the point of my argument this afternoon is not directed so much against this scheme as to show that we do not have enough information at the present time to warrant us entering into it. As to the cost, I would point out from the International Joint Commission's report on this St. Lawrence waterway, which was distributed to us at the beginning of the session, that it is rather dubious what the cost will be. From the summary of conclusions on page 178 I quote the following paragraph:

> The whole question of the distribution of cost has given the commission some concern.

May I interject that it should give us even more concern?

> If the area to be benefited were all in one country, the problem of financing the improvement would be a comparatively simple one, but as the matter stands the situation is complicated not merely by the fact that two neighbouring countries are joining in the project, but that these countries are unequal in population, unequal in wealth, unequal in their ability to make effective use of the waterway. That is the situation to-day, but it does not necessarily follow that it will always be the situation.

On the same page this matter of cost is further discussed and I read:

> Objection may be made that the proposed principle of dividing the cost in proportion to the benefits each country derives from the improvement could hardly be put into effect until the works had been completed and in operation for a sufficient period to secure reliable data on the subject.

Again on the same page the commissioners state:

> In other words, each country should be debited with its share of the entire cost of all works necessary for navigation, including the cost of the Welland ship canal, based upon the proportion the cargo tonnage carried to and from its own ports by way of the St. Lawrence bears to the entire tonnage by the same route. The ratio to be charged to each obviously would require to be readjusted periodically.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted sufficiently from the report of the commission to show that there is no precise in-

formation as to what this scheme would cost Canada, and to show that we would be altogether in the hands of our powerful partner to the south as to what proportion of the cost should be assessed to us.

The estimate that this waterway would cost $250,000,000 is certainly much below the actual cost. But even if we accept that as a correct estimate, and assume that we would be responsible for one-half of it, I submit that in the present state of our finances it would be very unwise indeed to add to our obligations to that extent.

As to improving the navigability of the St. Lawrence, there is a lurking suspicion that this is only the ostensible purpose, and that the real purpose of the promoters is to promote water-power.

But, in objecting to this scheme generally, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that I am not offering the profane opinion of a mere city member, but that I am rather summarizing the arguments that have been advanced against it by men whose opinion is authoritative and deserves great respect. The effect of those arguments is that it is not at all evident that there would be any improvement in navigation as a result of carrying out this scheme at all commensurate with the expenditure involved. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that deep sea vessels cannot compete with lake vessels because the latter have three times the cargo capacity for the corresponding draught; also the deep sea vessel has to be built more strongly and costs three times as much per ton as does the lake vessel. Therefore the claim that ocean vessels could come up the river to our inland ports in competition with our lake vessels is indeed one that is very much open to question.

I think we may reasonably come to the conclusion that while many of the experts have pronounced on the feasibility of a deep waterway of this kind, and that it might bring lake vessels to Montreal, yet it would not at all enable the ocean vessels to profitably proceed to the head of the lakes. In other words, the truth about this water navigation from the middle west to the ocean is that it would require two, and possibly three kinds of craft to complete it. First, it would require the lake vessels proper, built light and inexpensively for cargo-carrying purposes exclusively; then barges to traverse the intervening areas between the lakes and the seaports, and, finally, the heavy and costly sea vessels with large crews, staunchly built, requiring expensive insurance, to carry the cargo the rest of the way. But, Mr. Speaker, we have strong suspicion, as I have said, that the navigation side of the project is only an accessory feature; that the water-power project is the essential motive that has inspired the promoters of the scheme. I quote in support of this contention the New York Times. Of course, it will be argued that New York stands very much with Montreal on this matter, but as I have said, I am merely placing before the House the argument on our side. The New York Times says:

> The people of New York, under our constitution, own the lands under water along the St. Lawrence valley. No one has suggested a way to compensate these owners if their land is condemned. And condemnation proceedings, under the federal statutes, may be brought only where the rights condemned are to be used for navigational purposes. Hence the camouflage of benefiting navigation.

As for Canada, it has been submitted that we have in this country water-power possibilities much greater than we employ at the present time, and that if this scheme would give the United States a vast amount of water-power which they need, it would be practically using Canadian resources to supply them with that water-power, while we on this side would only sacrifice our right to those resources without any compensating benefit. But the main argument and the main objection to this project, Mr. Speaker, is that it would involve an international partnership with a very powerful neighbour, a neighbour whom we expect to exact the letter as well as the spirit of all contracts; and it would give rise to innumerable conflicts in the future. We know that we have been at peace with the United States for a long while, but we also know by experience that every time there has been a dispute we have bought peace, sometimes dearly, by sacrificing our part of the bargain. Need I remind the House that on the occasion of the Maine boundary controversy Canada maintained peace only by sacrificing a portion of territory which should be included in the province of Quebec and which now forms a very wealthy and prosperous part of the United States? Need I remind the House that when the question of the Alaskan boundary was discussed, again we had to buy peace by sacrificing what we thought was our property in that part of the country?

The other day the member for Westmount-St. Henri (Mr. Mercier) brought to the attention of the House a despatch to the effect that the United States repre-

sentatives were already discussing this matter with the British Embassy at Washington. I say in all confidence, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe the British Embassy has gone into this matter with the American representatives; but I do not think I am far from the truth when I say that if the British Embassy had been disposed to do so, the American representatives would have been only too glad to settle this matter over our heads. Anyway, if we are to judge by editorials and articles in the American press with regard to this matter, we can well make up our minds that this partnership, as I say, would be very dangerous to our own side of the bargain. I do not wish to quote at length; I realize that, especially on Wednesday, when we have to adjourn at six o'clock, it is only fair that I should give as much time as possible to other members who desire to speak on the subject. But I would like to place on Hansard a couple of quotations on this matter of partnership. The first is from the report of the New York State Commission. It reads thus—I will quote only one paragraph:

> For a hundred years the two nations have been in perfect accord and no thoughtful person would suggest that these cordial relations should ever be severed, but as a matter of prudence and good statesmanship, if a ship canal were ever to be built down the St. Lawrence river, and for nine-tenths of the distance from Lake Ontario to the gulf of St. Lawrence wholly within Canadian territory and under the sovereign control of the Dominion of Canada, if not the British Empire, then there should be a cession of territory the entire length of the St. Lawrence river, five or ten miles back from the river, constituting a zone like the Panama Canal Zone, secured by treaty with the Republic of Panama.

I would like also to quote again from the report of the International Joint Commission, to show you, Mr. Speaker, that this partnership with the United States would involve innumerable causes for possible conflicts. I quote again from the conclusions of the report; and I would like to point out that I should at least be given some credit for taking my arguments from the very report which is supposed to support this scheme. The report says, on page 179:

> In regard to the method of control, the commission is conscious of the fact that the peculiar character of the St. Lawrence, partly international and partly national, creates an unusual situation, and it believes that, in order to combine the fullest possible liberty of action on the part of each country in its own territory, with the efficient co-ordination of the several parts of the completed improvement, all "navigation works" lying wholly within one country and capable of economic and efficient administration as complete and independent units, should be maintained and operated by the country in which they are located—

Nobody can find fault with that, so far.

> —that "navigation works" not lying wholly within one country and not capable of economic and efficient administration as complete and independent units, should be maintained and operated by an international board on which each country would have equal representation; and that this board should also have the right of inspection of those "navigation works."

I admit it is proposed that we should have equal representation on that board, but who will pretend for one moment that even if numerically we have the same representation as the United States on a board of that kind, the representatives of Canada, able as they might be, powerful as they might be in their own country, can ever counter-balance the influence of the representatives of the United States if an important conflict should arise regarding those works which are of a national character?

Further, as part of the recommendations of the commission, found on page 181 of this report, it is said:

> 5. That, assuming the adoption of the plans of the engineering board, or of other plans also involving a readjustment of the international boundary, in order to bring each of the power houses on its own side of the boundary, appropriate steps be taken to transfer from one country or the other, as the case may be, the slight acreage of submerged land involved.

Again I submit, that over this one little paragraph in the recommendations of the commision an important and involved discussion could take place over what they call the slight acreage of our territory, and if we entered into a discussion of that matter, we do not know where it would end. I might also quote paragraphs 7 and 8 of these recommendations to show that in more than one respect there could be discussion between the two countries on matters of territory, on navigation, on the distribution of water power, and in every case we would be in the position of being the much weaker and the much smaller nation discussing these matters with a very powerful neighbour who could practically get from us all that it demanded. I shall say no more for the reason that I gave only a moment ago. I would like to hear from the House on this question. I do not say that the House should condemn altogether this enterprise, but I think it will agree with me that there are grave doubts on the different aspects of this project, as to its cost, as to its value for navigation purposes, and for the international develop-

ment of power, and finally as to the political consequence of such a partnership with the United States of America. The report makes it very clear that the commission itself did not reach a definite conclusion, for at page 180 I find this:

> The commission believes that, before any particular scheme is finally adopted, all the available engineering data, including the report and plans of the engineering board and all comments thereon or alternative plans, should be referred to a special technical board for careful consideration and report.

And paragraph 4, on the next page:

> That there shall be an exhaustive investigation of the extent and character of the damage through flowage involved in the plan of development finally adopted.

These paragraphs show amply that the commission themselves feel that before they arrive at a conclusion, they should get the two countries together once more and make a further investigation, and that even this report, which is supposed to favour the scheme, is not at all definite in its conclusions. These doubts are sufficient, in my mind, to lead the Canadian Government to exercise the strictest caution.

It rests with the promoters of the project to create and instill the strongest conviction, if they ever hope to have it carried out. But for those who do object to it, it is sufficient to point out the dubious, questionable, and altogether obscure character of the whole enterprise. Only the strongest evidence could bear out the project. This does not exist even in this report. I think we have shown, on the contrary, that the project coasts along dangers and threats, both economic and national, at every turn and winding of its course. I therefore would urge the Government and the House not to accept this resolution.

Mr. JOHN MILLAR (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to speak for a few minutes on this matter, to protest against acceding to the request of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) that another day be set apart for the discussion of this resolution.

I am not going to discuss whether the project is feasible or not, but if we spend the time of the House in discussing questions like this, which are not pressing at the present time and, indeed, are not to be thought of, very important and urgent questions will have to be compressed into a very small space at the end of the session or not dealt with at all. There is no doubt in my mind that if this project is carried out, the estimated cost of $250,000,000 will be doubled by the time it is completed.

What is the situation? I do not want to deal at any great length with western conditions. I think those have been stressed sufficiently for the House to realize the seriousness of the situation. I shall just mention one incident in order to give point to what has already been said. Two days before I left my home, the man who rents my farm said to me, "I can go out now and buy oats for less than it costs to thresh mine." Farmers at the present time are in need of help to buy seed. There are very many urgent matters for which we need money, and I think that is sufficient reason for me to arrive at the conclusion at once that the idea of starting on this project of deepening the St. Lawrence river and the Welland canal so that ocean vessels may go up to Fort William, while it may be quite practicable in the future, and I think will be, at the present time is simply out of the question. That being the case, if another day is set apart for its discussion, where will we be?

I came here with a very good impression of Parliament, and since I have been sitting here, that impression has not lessened; I think as much of Parliament today as I did when I arrived. But I have found what I expected, that occasionally a great deal of time is wasted. I have attended large conventions enough to know that it is impossible to prevent that. I have arrived at the conclusion that there are some cities in this country that are rather expensive. Judging from the pages that are put on Hansard by the representatives from Toronto, I fancy that Toronto is rather an expensive city. One argument made in favour of this project was that it was going to build up small cities into larger ones, and, I suppose, make the large ones still larger. I believe that the attitude of this party in the House is sometimes misunderstood. We have been charged with being narrowminded and with not being able to see other interests besides our own. I wish to make it plain just what our attitude is with regard to these matters. When it comes to a question of developing a great industry which, when developed, will cause life to flow through the channels of trade throughout the whole country, you will find us very, very generous. That includes such works as agriculture, fisheries, and the development of our mines and forests. But I submit that when money is poured out freely into the

large cities it works in very narrow channels and in very small circles, and it is a question to my mind whether this country would be any better off in any respect if Toronto, or Montreal, or Hamilton were doubled in size to-morrow. It is just a question if it would not prove a greater burden on the country at large, than a benefit. The cities are overgrown now; in comparison with the country, they are over-developed. Therefore, I think the policy of Canada at the present time and for some few years to come should be to decentralize, to cause people to go from the cities to the country, so that the country may be built up and take a position of greater relative importance as compared with the cities. That is what we need, not a policy to cause our cities to grow larger. Where does the money expended in the large cities go? It goes into the pockets of the retailers, and then into the pockets of the wholesalers and manufacturers—the movement operates in a small circle. If a city grows larger it probably helps the surrounding country within a radius of ten to twenty miles; but I cannot see that it is any great benefit to the country at large to have these urban centres grow larger than they are now. The present debate ought to be closed at six o'clock so that we shall not have to waste another day over the subject, because when the question is brought up once more, as it undoubtedly will be, the whole ground will have to be covered again.

Mr. E. A. LAPIERRE (Nipissing): I wish to concur in the remarks just made by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) in objecting to this Parliament giving its endorsation to any scheme in which we have to enter into partnership with a foreign country. We of northern Ontario have had a waterway scheme under consideration for the last twenty-five years.. Away back in 1899 the late J. W. Poupore, then representing the county of Pontiac, advocated in this House the building of a canal entirely within the bounds of Canada—a canal to be built with Canadian capital, by Canadian labour, and controlled by the Canadian people. Therefore, when my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) says that all Ontario is in favour of a joint ship canal I can—on behalf of the electors of Nipissing, whom I have the honour to represent—say that we are directly opposed to the construction of the St. Lawrence deep waterway. The Georgian Bay ship canal project will meet all the requirements that the St. Lawrence deep waterway will give us, and it would confer upon Canada, western Canada in particular, all the benefits that are claimed for the latter project. The Engineering Board of the International Joint Commission have estimated that the cost of a 25 foot ship canal would be $252,000,000. As detailed plans could not be prepared within the limited time of one year mere outline plans and lump estimates were submitted, and we are safe in concluding that these estimates will fall far short of what the real cost of this enterprise will be. Canada's initial share in the construction of this canal would be $151,000,000; and I ask hon. members who have been clamouring since this session opened for more economy and more retrenchment in expenses if this is an opportune time to add $8,000,000 in interest charges to the annual expenses of this Government. The economic advantage claimed for this scheme as far as Canada is concerned is merely the cheapening of the export of our north west grain by avoiding the cost of elevating at Kingston and Montreal. All other advantages favour American lake ports. Incidentally the advocates of this scheme claim that 1,500,000 horse power of hydro electric energy will be developed along the route and delivered in each district for a great distance at one-fourth the cost of power in New York city. It is the development of this electric power that is expected to finance the enterprise and lay the basis of an issuance of bonds to enable the waterway to be built. It is this aspect of the water-power development that we of northern Ontario hold in great suspicion as a mere subterfuge to grab the water-power of the St. Lawrence river. The proposition, in our opinion, is mere camouflage. The Buffalo News makes the following declaration:

> There is an ulterior motive back of the whole project—a desire of the "power-ring" to get control of all the water powers along the St. Lawrence river.

And by a strange coincidence the report of the International Joint Commission contains a recommendation that 1,464,000 horse power be developed between Kingston and Cornwall concurrently with the building of the deep waterway by erecting a dam at the Long Sault. Knowing as we do the great tendency toward centralization, knowing how the United States have developed during the last twenty-five years and knowing that the great industrial develop-

ment that has been going on in the middle west necessitates some means of relieving the traffic congestion to the sea board, we must realize that when we are invited to go into this project we are asked to subscribe a portion of the large amount that will be necessary to relieve the railway congestion in the United States. In this enterprise the American government would be the dominant party. By virtue of its larger expenditure it would demand a larger share of the control of the enterprise, and this would inevitably give rise to misunderstandings and some recrimination. This would eventually have to be decided by arbitration and, as was said a few minutes ago by the member for St. James, we should hesitate before we enter into any project that may have to be adjudicated upon by an international arbitration tribunal. The consequences flowing from our past experience in this regard should be sufficient for us to look very seriously into this project. That an organized move is being made in order to gain control of the south shore of the St. Lawrence between Sorel and Cornwall has been stated.

In the report of the Joint Commission, between pages 154 and 155, we find a map of the water-power installation on the St. Lawrence, Richelieu and the St. Maurice rivers. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to look at this map, they will observe the international boundary the Richelieu and the south shore of the St. Lawrence rivers, form an irregular triangle of which, it was said in the St. Louis Globe Democrat a few days ago, would be one of the most remarkable industrial centres of the world. I read from the St. Louis Globe the following:

> Under American control and with the power of the St. Lawrence made available, the area might become one of the most remarkable industrial districts in the world. Acquisition of it would give us jurisdiction of the river bank opposite Montreal, as well as for some distance east of there and that city would lose some of its most flourishing suburbs on the southern shore.

In the Montreal Star of April 21, I find an article of about the same tenor, which reads:

> Washington, April 21.—Asserting that the Secretary of State "has been instructed to negotiate a treaty with Canada relating to canalization and water-power development of the St. Lawrence River," Representative Ten Eyck, Democrat, New York, in a letter to House members yesterday asked that they get behind his resolution seeking acquisition by the Government of half the land adjacent to the proposed canal and half the land to be improved by such development.

> Mr. Ten Eyck said he had written chambers of commerce and other organizations requesting them to urge the House Foreign Affairs Committee to set a date for public hearings on his resolution.
>
> "A treaty," he said, "will shift to a certain extent the future of this important project directly to the Senate, which enjoys joint responsibility of the treaty making powers of the country. I feel that before any treaty with Canada or Great Britain relating to the St. Lawrence project is negotiated due consideration should be given to the land adjacent to the power development.
>
> "It is essential that we own half the land so that we may be a fifty per cent beneficiary in the future before we pay 50 per cent of the cost of its development."

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, why we from northern Ontario oppose the deepening of the St. Lawrence. This country has already expended $250,000 in making the necessary surveys for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. That canal would be entirely within Canadian territory. It would assist in developing what we, in northern Ontario, consider the richest area in natural resources on the entire continent. Have the members of this House ever considered that we in northern Ontario possess one of the richest mineral deposits in the world, that the district of Sudbury at the present moment is producing 85 per cent of the world's nickel, that less than 100 miles further north we have one of the largest silver countries in the world, that a few miles further north we have one of the richest gold countries in the world, and that we have in that district one mine which alone in the last eleven years produced $56,000,000 in gold bullion. This industry is in its infancy. The surface has only been scraped, and it is just a question of time when with proper development we will have in that northern country an area of sufficient size to give homes to many thousands prosperous Canadians. We say that the Georgian Bay ship canal is of paramount importance, and that before this Government gives its consent to any such project as is the St. Lawrence deep waterway they should consider the right of the people of northern Ontario to have their claims considered.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): As another representative from northern Ontario, I fear I shall have to differ slightly with my hon. friend (Mr. Lapierre) who has just spoken. I am not at all surprised at his attitude, because I know his district very well. I know that he represents the city of North Bay and naturally that city is particularly interested in the Georgian Bay canal. I have no

quarrel with the hon. gentleman for taking that attitude, because, after all, Canada is unfortunately so immense in area and so scattered in population that anyone who represents a constituency in this House is more or less controlled in his attitude upon any question by the feeling of his constituency upon that question. And I shall frankly admit most of those who have spoken, or who will speak perhaps, upon this question favourably to this project, are those who represent constituencies or sections of the country which will be to a certain extent benefited by it; and those who speak against the scheme will speak from an absolutely opposite standpoint.

One point that struck me as a little curious is that my hon. friends to my left are not quite as assiduous in their attendance in the House to-day on this question as they usually are. To do them justice, I believe they attend the House—and perhaps it is because most of them are new members—as a rule much more assiduously than any of the rest of us; but here is a question which I believe affects them more than it affects any other section of this House, is of more real interest to them than perhaps any other question that will be discussed in this House, or at least of as much importance, and yet a great many of them are not taking as much interest as usual, the reason being, I presume—and I am not saying it in any critical spirit at all—that they have not perhaps looked into the question as fully as they might have. It is a question that is of distinct interest to them, and I think I shall prove it before I am through. The very point I make about the fact that they are not taking quite as much interest in this is the reason I believe this discussion is a good discussion.

This is a question of importance, not only to my hon. friends to my left, but to the whole country. I regret that of my hon. friends among the Government supporters only two have spoken, neither of whom has supported the project, though the first speaker did not oppose it very strenuously, except by quoting from the report of the commission, and I venture to say that some of his quotations did not really offer any criticism upon the project. But last year I remember when this question was up before the House there were a number of hon. gentlemen who are now on the Government side who supported it very strenuously. None of them have spoken to-day. But I hope that if this subject comes up again some of them will put themselves on record as they did last year. In fact, I am sure they will. Among those who supported it were the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), the Solicitor-General (Mr. McKenzie), the member for Quebec County (Mr. Lavigueur), the member for Stanstead (Mr. Baldwin), the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill), and the then member for West Lambton, who is now a senator. There were others, but those I have named I recall from a quick perusal of the names in Hansard of last year. I find that in the main these hon. gentlemen supported the proposal.

Mr. CAHILL: Let me correct the hon. member. I did not support this resolution last year; I supported the Georgian Bay canal scheme.

Mr. MANION: Well, I have not time to look into Hansard now, but I looked over the hon. gentleman's speech a few moments ago and I was quite sure that he supported the project. However, I may be wrong and I accept his correction. But it does not matter in any case. I do not remember the Georgian Bay canal having been discussed last year except in relation to this question, but, as I say, it is immaterial.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh. oh.

Mr. MANION: I did not mean that as an offence to the hon. member. It seems that his own friends wish to make it so.

Mr. McMASTER: Oh, no.

Mr. MANION: I was going to say that there are three questions to-day before the people which I believe are the most important problems that are engaging public attention. One of them is the tariff, upon which there are differences of opinion in various sections of the country. Next is the matter of immigration; and last of all, perhaps as important as the others, if indeed not more important, is the question of transportation, which embraces not only railways but also such questions as the one we are discusing to-day, namely, canals and waterways. I admit that if this project were carried out it would involve the expenditure of a large amount of money, and I am also aware that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has made the statement, at least as reported in the press, that at the moment the Government is not in a position to consider this question. That, of course, does not say that at a future time they may not consider it, but I understood, from my interpretation of the press announcement, that that was the attitude of the Minister

of Finance, speaking on behalf of the Government. But if the question of expense precludes immediate practical action, that is all the more reason why there should be a thorough discussion of the subject now, so that the people of the country might become familiar with it in its every aspect; and if finally the matter should be decided in the negative, then the discussion will have served the purpose of indicating the various grounds of opposition to the scheme, and making clear the inadvisability, if that should be the ultimate conclusion, of building the canal. But I believe that any one who reads the report submitted by the International Joint Commission, and carefully studies it from every standpoint, will be fairly well convinced, if he starts out with an open mind, that the ultimate building of the canal is something which will be accomplished in the future in this country. There has been considerable discussion on the question not only in Canada, but also in the United States, and I have under my hand a copy of the Congressional Record, of a week ago to-day, in which it was presented both pro and con in the United States Senate.

Now, we should bear in mind that Canada is a great undeveloped country. We have in this Dominion a country of an immense area, and only by comparison can we really fully appreciate its vast extent. It is larger in area than the United States and twice the size of Europe, leaving out Russia. And yet, in that part of Europe excluding Russia, there are 300,000,000 people, compared to eight or nine millions in Canada, which has double the area. If this work is finally decided to be undertaken and the canal is built, it will bring about a greater development of our resources, it will attract more people to the country, and, to my mind, will very materially help my hon. friends to my left in reducing the expense of transporting their wheat from the prairie provinces to Liverpool. Furthermore, it will make for cheaper production in the development of power on the St. Lawrence waterways. We should not forget that anything that can develop the country will bring more people to the country, and in that way serve to reduce the national debt. If in twenty years you could double the population of Canada you would cut your per capita debt in two; and Canada is one of the few countries in the world to-day that are in the happy position of being able to open their doors to an extensive increase in population and thus secure a diminution in the national debt. Most of the European countries are not in that fortunate position. The British Isles are to-day as crowded as they wish to be, and Germany, France, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, and in fact any of those countries you care to name, are more or less completely developed. And even the United States is practically fully developed. So that Canada, as I say, is in the position of being able to open its gates to a larger flood of the right kind of immigration and so, by increasing its population, cut down its debt.

The agitation on behalf of this proposal aims at making the Great Lakes, not from a sentimental standpoint, but for business reasons, the Mediterranean of America. Any one studying the commercial history of the world will find that such cities as Venice, Carthage and Alexandria, and such countries as Great Britain, Holland, Spain, the Baltic cities of Germany which formed the Hanseatic League, and various other countries and cities that have come into the limelight or are prominent to-day as trading centres, attained that status by virtue of the fact that they had access to the sea and had cheap transportation facilities that enabled them to carry on easy commercial intercourse with other countries. Water transportation, as all hon. members know, is very much cheaper than rail transportation. Some authorities estimate an advantage of ten to one in favour of the former, but certainly a conservative estimate would be that water transportation is three to five times cheaper than the other.

All Canada is interested in this question, and I believe that the majority of the people, after carefully considering it, will be in favour of the ultimate building of the system of canals proposed. I admit that both in the United States and in Canada there are certain centres of population opposed to the project. In the United States it is being opposed by New York and Boston, because these cities feel that a certain amount of business would be taken by way of the St. Lawrence and that they would lose traffic in consequence. That may be true. And yet I do not know that New York, immense as it is, has any particular reason to fear for its future growth. In the United States there is one other city, Buffalo, which opposes the scheme, because that city is at the head of the Erie canal, which carries probably 65 per cent of the grain of western Canada to New York to be exported to Europe. Naturally, that city fears that it may lose a certain amount

of traffic, and for that reason it offers opposition. And, in Canada, places like North Bay oppose the proposition on the grounds that have been mentioned, while Montreal so far has taken an attitude antagonistic to it. I do not believe that Montreal would suffer if this undertaking were carried through. Directly it might do that city some little harm, but indirectly it would undoubtedly do it a great deal of good, inasmuch as it would help to build up Canada. And anything that builds up the Dominion cannot possibly help benefiting a magnificent city like Montreal. In any case, suppose it did to some extent harm Montreal in Canada, or Buffalo or New York in the United States, that would not be a sufficient reason for abandoning a proposition of this kind. This country cannot be governed on sectional lines; it must be governed from the standpoint of what is good for the country as a whole, even if occasionally some particular section suffers in consequence. The question is of great importance to Ontario and the prairie provinces, because Ontario is directly adjacent to the Great Lakes, and the prairie provinces grow the wheat which goes over the lakes and upon which, it is claimed, a great saving in transportation would be secured if the canal were completed.

To realize the importance of the lake traffic of this country, let us for a moment consider the tonnage that passes through three great canals that are known to all of us—the Panama canal, the Suez canal, and the Soo canal. Taking the 1920 returns, the traffic passing through the Panama canal amounted to nine million tons; that passing through the Suez canal to twelve million tons; and that passing through the American and Canadian Soo canals to seventy-nine million tons. In other words, the traffic passing through the Soo canals betwen Canada and the United States was almost four times the combined traffic passing through those other two world-famous canals. The value of that seventy-nine million tons of traffic was over $1,000,000,000. We do not realize the importance of our waterways until we make some comparisons of that kind, and therefore I have made them for the benefit of hon. members who are doing me the courtesy of listening to my remarks.

I might point out also that our harbours, starting with St. John and Halifax in the east, and going to Victoria and Vancouver in the west, and taking in Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Fort William and Port Arthur, are practically fully developed, and it would not take very much additional expenditure on any one of them to meet the most exacting shipping requirements of to-day. So that that is not an expense of any very great amount in this scheme.

For the special benefit of my hon. friends to the left, I would draw attention to some facts in regard to the production of wheat and other grains in this country. They know that roughly 300,000,000 bushels of wheat are grown in the prairie provinces annually, most of which goes to the head of the lakes, for shipment by boat either to Port Colborne or Buffalo. If shipped to Port Colborne the wheat is usually transferred to smaller boats or to freight cars, and taken down to Montreal, in each case at considerable expense. If it goes to Buffalo—and sixty-five per cent of it in the past has been going there—it is usually transferred to small boats on the Erie canal and taken down to New York for export.

Now, it is claimed by those who are supporting it that by the building of this St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal at least five cents per bushel would be saved in transportation charges on the wheat of western Canada. That means not only on the wheat exported, but it would be saved also on the wheat that is used within Canada, because all hon. members know that the price for the wheat of the world, including Canada, is set in Liverpool, that being the world market. So if you saved five cents per bushel on transportation, naturally that saving should go to the farmers of the West. Julius Barnes, whom all hon. members know by reputation, the former head of the American Wheat Board, has stated that this scheme would save ten cents to the farmers of western Canada and the western states. I could quote his exact words, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House. He has estimated that there is lost annually to the farmers of the western states through the lack of this deep-water communication from the head of the lakes $200,000,000. In other words, he figures out that more than the American cost of the building of this canal is lost every year to American farmers. If you take 300,000,000 bushels of wheat as being roughly the annual production of the prairie provinces a saving of five cents a bushel in the aggregate would amount to $15,000,000 every year to our western farmers. But that saving of five cents a bushel is a conservative estimate. Herbert Hoover, an international figure to-day, agrees with

the statement of Julius Barnes that ten cents a bushel would be saved to the farmers of the western states and of western Canada. Consequently this question is of particular importance to the farmers of the West. That is the statement I started with, and I think the House will agree with me, because transportation rates on wheat are a direct tax upon the farmers who grow it.

But in addition to that saving of wheat, the building of this deep waterway would mean a saving of freight charges on all freight transported from the East to the West to the head of the Great Lakes or the reverse because package freight is increased in cost by the shipping charges, and also coal and various other commodities. I think it was my hon. friend, the Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie), who pointed out in the course of his speech last year that coal from Nova Scotia, by virtue of these canals, might be shipped up even to the head of the lakes. I believe that is a possibility. To-day Ontario and Quebec get most of their coal from Pennsylvania. The building of these canals would facilitate traffic on the Great Lakes to such an extent that there would be a very good opportunity of coal from Nova Scotia being used as far west as Toronto, and even perhaps as far west as Fort William and Winnipeg, Pennsylvania coal being now used in Winnipeg and a short distance beyond.

Let me point out also another important fact. It deals particularly with the remarks of my hon. friend from Nippissing (Mr. Lapierre) who preceded me. It is estimated that one-third of the population living in the States is tributary to the Great Lakes. In other words, it is claimed by the advocates of this scheme that forty million of the population live in those states which, so to speak, are tributary to the Great Lakes. Much of the wheat and other traffic of those states is tributary to the Great Lakes. It is also claimed that seventy per cent of the foodstuffs and raw material produced in the Union are produced in those states. In Canada half of the population may be regarded as feeding the Great lakes, by their traffic, because Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have a little more than four million people among them; and those four provinces containing half the population of Canada, roughly, and I should say giving more than half of our production, are tributary to the Great Lakes.

Mr. VIEN: If I may interrupt my hon. friend? What advantage would accrue to the maritime provinces and to Quebec, which would be called upon to contribute to a large extent to the expenditure involved, by the construction of the canal?

Mr. MANION: I might reply by asking my hon. friend: What advantage to the prairie provinces was the building of the Intercolonial railway, for example?

Mr. VIEN: The answer is quite obvious —the prairie provinces had not much to say when the Intercolonial railway was built.

Mr. MANION: That is quite true, but they have contributed to its deficits just the same, I notice. However, I will try to answer my hon. friend's question. There may not be any direct benefit to the city of Montreal or the province of Quebec except to this extent, that if these proposals I am laying before the House, and which the advocates of this scheme support, are correct, the whole of Canada would be built up, and in that way Montreal and Quebec would profit also. But before my hon. friend came in I had pointed out that we cannot govern this country in sections. We cannot take every proposition that comes before the House and prove that every section of the country is going to be equally benefited by it before we consider its merits.

Mr. VIEN: It must be for the general advantage of Canada.

Mr. MANION: It might be for the general advantage of Canada, perhaps, but not for the particular advantage of Montreal.

Mr. McMASTER: Impossible!

Mr. MANION: I advanced arguments before my hon. friend came in that I do not want to go over again in regard to the effect of this undertaking upon Montreal and Quebec. So far as the maritime provinces are concerned, anything that builds up this country will also enure to the advantage of those provinces: and of Quebec also, and as I was arguing a moment ago coal might be brought by this route as far as the head of the lakes— I do not claim that that would actually happen—and to that extent Nova Scotia would get the benefit.

My hon. friend from Nipissing spoke of the Georgian Bay canal route. There is no doubt that good arguments could be

advanced in favour of that route—that is, sentimental arguments, and from the standpoint of a route which would be entirely within Canadian territory. But from the standpoint of tapping the densely populated sections of the country, the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes canal system is very much superior to the Georgian Bay canal system, because it goes directly down to southern Ontario, and, what is much more important, perhaps, from the traffic standpoint, goes directly down to those states bordering on the Great Lakes, south of Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake St. Clair, and thereabouts. It is true that the Georgian Bay canal would tap these also, but only in a roundabout way.

The statement has been made to me in private conversation that none of the ocean steamers would patronize this route; they would not go up to the Great Lakes to supply traffic necessities in Canada and the United States. In that connection I should like to point out that over three-quarters of all the ocean-going vessels in the world are of less than 25-foot draught. The picture which some people draw of the Olympic or the Mauritania docking at Toronto or Chicago is, of course, purely an imaginary picture, and any one who has regard to the facts will admit that that would not be the result of the operation of this canal system. But small ocean-going boats are much more numerous than large ones. If I may be permitted a personal reminiscence, I would point out that twenty-five years ago, when I was a boy, in my home city of Fort William I saw a Norwegian ship which had come straight across from Norway, passed through our canals, landed at Fort William, unloaded the cargo there and took a cargo back. If twenty-five years ago that could be done with our canals as they were at that time, certainly with the enlarged canals it would be done on a much larger scale. I remember also crossing the ocean on a passenger ship of the Anchor line which was very much smaller than many of the passenger ships on the lakes to-day. Smaller ships, I repeat, are much in a majority on the ocean.

I would point out also that Montreal is four or five hundred miles nearer to Liverpool than is New York. Buffalo and Port Colborne, by the St. Lawrence route, are as close to Liverpool as New York city is. That is something one can hardly believe until he actually examines the map. But due to the fact that Great Britain is much farther north than we are, and due to the shape of the earth, Montreal is 400 or 500 miles nearer Liverpool than New York, and Port Colborne and Buffalo are the same distance as New York from Liverpool. That indicates the advantage which would be derived from shipping wheat or freight of any kind in this direction.

There is another point which has not been mentioned. We have already spent on the development of the Welland canal approximtely $42,000,000 and it is intended to spend in the neighbourhood of $90,000,000. Well, any one who looks at the map and sizes the matter up will realize that the Welland canal, enlarged through that vast expenditure, is of practically no use to this country unless the further development of this ship canal system is proceeded with. Without that further development, boats from the western end of the lakes may proceed only one lake further than they go at present; they could not go on to Montreal. So that if the Welland canal improvement is proceeded with, the only logical and reasonable policy in that connection must be that the proposed canal system is to be one of the ultimate solutions of the transportation problem.

Then, the power question has been referred to. I do not wish to argue this matter on any false premises. The statement has been made here to-day by somebody that the power development of the St. Lawrence canal would pay for the canal. I do not think that would be the case. It is estimated that 4,000,000 horse-power of electric energy could be developed to-day on the St. Lawrence river, but there is nc great demand in Canada to-day for the three-quarters of that which would belong to this country. Canada to-day has only 2,000,000 horse-power of electrical development, though we have a potential development of 18,000,000 horse-power. There would, however, be a demand for some, and the development of part of it as required would help to meet the cost of this project. But I do not believe at the present time it could be said that the development of horse-power on the St. Lawrence would wholly pay for it.

Mr. VIEN: Does not my hon. friend think that the export of electric power to the United States would help build up their industries to the detriment of Canadian industries?

Mr. MANION: Of course, this development of water-power might be carried on and the power exported, but it is for the

Government to say whether or not the power shall be exported or whether or not the falls shall be developed.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend has just said that there is no market for the power to be developed in Canada, so that if any power of value is developed, it would be for export purposes.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend should not put words in my mouth. I did not say there was no market; I said there was not a market for the 3,000,000 horse-power which would be Canada's share of the development. There is some market in Canada for it, and I have no doubt that by the development of some of this horse-power, hives of industry would be established along the St. Lawrence, and part of the cost of the development could thereby be met. But the question which my hon. friend brings up is a matter for the future. It would have to be decided by the Government whether the export of this power should be permitted.

The development of electric power would reduce the use of coal on the railways; certainly the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National lines between Toronto and Montreal would be operated entirely by the power developed from the St. Lawrence Canal system.

Now, anybody who wishes to get the arguments on this question from the Canadian standpoint can get them by referring to the Congressional Record of April 18th last. Senator Calder, representing New York state, opposed the building of these canals, mainly upon the ground that they would be of more benefit to Canada than they would be to the United States. I wish to quote just a few short passages from a very lengthy speech which he made. He said:

> From the wheat growers' standpoint, therefore, the St. Lawrence waterway must be judged upon the basis of its effect upon a bushel of wheat laid down in Liverpool.

Then he quotes Mr. Craig, of Duluth:

> Then, says Mr. Craig: The Canadian Northwest can double its acreage, multiply it fourfold, eightfold even, before its land is utilized to its last acre.

Then the Senator continues:

> That is the vision—a Canadian acreage multiplied eightfold—with which Craig would comfort the American wheat grower.

Further down he says:

> With these figures that I have submitted to you in mind it is very easy indeed to understand why our Canadian brethren should be willing, even anxious, for us to construct a highway to the sea that will bring Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta a few days nearer to Liverpool. And it is easy to understand why Great Britain, the master wheat merchant of the world, should look with favour upon any plan we undertake that will make the resources of her own rich provinces in any way more accessible to her.

And further on:

> There are other reasons why Canada should be interested in the canal. She is a growing country. Her own commerce is increasing by leaps and bounds. She is particularly concerned with the fuel problem, being, as her editors and statesmen are accustomed to remark, now dependent upon the United States for coal. The Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association makes out a very convincing case—for Canada. It says:
>
> During 1919 Canada imported 13,000,000 tons of bituminous coal from the United States at a cost of $130,000,000.
>
> In Alberta and in the Maritime provinces—

This, perhaps, will answer to a certain extent the question put by my hon. friend (Mr. Vien).

> —Canada has a plentiful supply of bituminous coal, but the high rail freight rates prevent its distribution.
>
> Open the St. Lawrence locks to large freighters and Canadian bituminous coal will supply the Canadian market.

Then he gives very excellent reasons why the canal should be constructed by Canada. I will give two more short quotations:

> By this showing, Canada's interest in the proposed waterway outruns that of Uncle Sam's by the ratio of 3 to 1. Then, too, Canada looks to the canal to save it five cents a bushel on its wheat. It is seeking an outlet for its millions upon millions of undeveloped land.

Finally he says:

> I cite these facts for the purpose of calling your attention not only to Canada's interest in the proposed waterway but to its preponderance of interest. Its wheat farmers have a greater stake in the proposed canal than our own.

To anybody interested in this question that is a very interesting speech. There was a reply by Senator Townsend, who favoured the canal in an impromptu speech. He was not prepared because he did not know the matter was coming up, but both speeches are very informative on this question.

Somebody, I think it was my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret), spoke as if this matter was being decided on a theoretical or idealistic basis, without an investigation. We are not speaking on this question without an investigation. As a matter of fact, on January 21, 1920, the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States united in instructing the

International Joint Commission to investigate this whole question. The commission had hearings all over the United States in cities where it was necessary, and in Canada, from Montreal in the east to Calgary in the west, until December 19, 1921, two years less one month, when they put in their report. So they had nearly two years to consider this question. They listened to all sides of it. They heard the engineers and had their reports. They heard the question debated pro and con, and their report in brief is as follows. Despite what my hon. friend from St. James read from the report, this is its substance in a very few words.

First, they think the canal is advisable from shipping, economic, and transportation standpoints.

Second, the cost will be $252,000,000 plus the cost of the Welland canal. Canada has built the Welland canal, but the commission propose that the Welland canal cost be included, and I believe it should be, although this canal is entirely within Canadian borders. The commission recommend that the cost of the Welland canal should be put in and ultimately divided between the two countries. The United States would pay a larger proportion than Canada because it is more populous, has a much richer population, and will make more use of the canal, as the commission recommend that the cost of the St. Lawrence canal and Welland canal should be divided between the two countries in proportion to the benefits received. In other words, the commission propose that the cost should be paid to a much greater extent by the United States than by Canada. For instance, if the total cost was $252,000,000, the United States would pay more than half of it, perhaps $152,000,000, although the commission do not go into that, but the United States, being a much larger country and having much heavier shipping, would naturally pay more than we would.

In closing, there is one sentimental reason which I have not yet touched upon. I do not believe it is a good thing to mix sentiment or patriotism with business, but at the same time it is worth remembering that this country and the United States have lived side by side for over a hundred years without having had any serious differences. We have a border of three thousand miles, with not a gun or a fort on either side. There has been no war between these two countries since 1812. That seems to me a very fine example, to the European world particularly, of what two countries with friendly feelings and decent common sense can do if they wish, settling their differences, not by fighting each other, but by arbitration. I should like to point out, although there is nothing original in this, as it has been said before, that the building of this canal might well be a magnificent monument to the international amity and good understanding between the United States and Canada.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I had not intended to take part in this debate, but I cannot very well refuse to take up the challenge that has been made to the Progressives by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion). He seems to have taken it for granted. either that we are entirely ignorant of the subject, or not interested in it at all. I am glad that the hon. member has made his confession that he, as well as perhaps others in other parts of this House, is sometimes dominated by sectional interests. It would, perhaps, be in order for some of his colleagues to express the same interest in their own moral welfare as they have already done in the moral welfare of the Progressives lest we be unduly carried away by that demon of selfishness.

Like the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Manion), I have a great vision in regard to these Great Lakes. I have sufficient faith in the wisdom of Providence to believe they were put there for a great purpose, and that some time these lakes will be serving to a much greater extent than they are to-day the purpose for which they have been located in the heart of this continent. It is, of course, a question whether these lakes are being used to the fullest possible extent to-day. The statement is made in some quarters that this is the case. On this point I do not presume to pronounce an opinion, but I do know that the statement is made that we can better afford to pay the cost of the elevating charges that are rendered necessary under the present system, besides paying many other expenses, than we could afford to build this canal under present conditions. Whether that is so or not, I do not know. That the project is a great possibility from an engineering standpoint, I do not suppose any person will deny. That it can be made a commercial success is, of course, a question that can well be taken into consideration.

I think it is unfortunate that some of the objections that have been made to this great project have borne too clearly the evidence of sectional interest. It is un-

fortunate that a great scheme of this kind could not be considered on its merits, first, as an engineering project, and next as a commercial possibility. So far as any political question is involved, I for one would have no hesitation in putting aside any objections that might be raised from the standpoint of the relations between Canada and the United States. I am glad the hon. member for Fort William has also put himself on record on that point. I am not so sure that some of the friends with whom he is associated will feel on that point as he does himself, remembering as some of us from the West do, the attitude they took in regard to the great question of reciprocity with the United States. I am rather inclined to the opinion that the hon. gentleman will not find himself in very congenial company if that question should come up again.

Mr. MANION: I supported reciprocity.

Mr. BROWN: I know he did, and I am very sorry that he is in the company in which he finds himself to-day.

Mr. MANION: I find it very good company.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Of course, of course.

Mr. BROWN: Some of us who represent farmers' organizations in the West had the privilege of attending a conference called in Winnipeg by the Great Waterways' Association a few years ago, and we listened with a great deal of interest to this project as it was placed before us by that association. Two stipulations were laid down in regard to the matter: One was that we should not accept it as an alternative to the Hudson Bay railway, and if there is any seeming indifference on the part of this section of the House towards this project I think it will be explained in large measure by the fact that we still pin our faith to the Hudson Bay railway as affording us an outlet for our products. It will be interesting when that matter is again under consideration by this House to find just how far a sectional interest will dominate in the discussion of this great project.

There was another difficulty that we saw in our way and it was this: We could not see that it was advisable to spend large sums of the money of the Canadian people in the development of canals and great waterways unless we could see very clearly that these waterways would accrue to the benefit of the people, and also, as shippers of grain, to ourselves. That is, we do not propose to spend large sums of money in the development of canals and harbours and then let all the benefits be absorbed by such interests as the combine of lake shippers that exist to-day.

Now, as to being indifferent to this matter, it is only fair to say that there is no indifference among those who occupy this corner of the Chamber. We recognize, as all of us recognize, that the transportation problem is the big problem of the day. There are no people more interested in the question of transportation than the farmers of the West, and I was glad to get such a very candid admission from the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River —one we shall remember on all occasions— that the price is set at Liverpool and that we take that price less the cost of transportation. We shall remember that statement and we shall have occasion to remember on more occasions than the present.

I have some vision in regard to this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that at some time this project will be realized and become an actual factor in the development of our commercial and national life. At the present time, however, it is simply not possible for us to consider it. Whether the canal could be constructed for the amount of $252,000,000 that has been mentioned is certainly open to question—we know that estimates have always been exceeded. But even if it could be carried out for that amount we recognize that it is not an immediate possibility, and I for one would like to echo the sentiment that was expressed by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) that since the project is, for the time being, outside the range of practical possibilities, it is very questionable whether this House can afford to take time at this session to discuss it in view of the fact that we have so many other great problems demanding our immediate attention. I hope that this enterprise may become a practical reality some day and, of course, we must remember that if we have no vision we will never accomplish anything. In the meantime I think we can well afford to look upon this as a vision of one of the things we are going to do in the future, and turn our attention to some very practical things that demand our consideration.

Mr. F. S. CAHILL (Pontiac): I had not intended to take part in this debate until the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) referred to me as having supported this resolution,

or a similar one, last year. I did not take the trouble to look the matter up in Hansard but I have a very distinct recollection of speaking in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. MANION: May I just say a word at this stage. The hon. member is quite right. I have looked the matter up since, and I find that he did oppose the resolution, but I was misled by his opening words into thinking that he supported it. For that mistake I tender the hon. gentleman an apology. I wish to say, however, that the other hon. member from whose remarks I quoted did take that stand.

Mr. CAHILL: Perhaps the hon. member has not had time to look up the record with respect to the other gentlemen to whom he has referred.

Mr. MANION: Yes, I have.

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to say that I oppose this plan of a canal being built through Canadian territory on the basis of a joint arrangement with any other country. If we are to build such a canal in Canada I think it would be advisable for this country to carry out the work. I may point out to my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River, as well as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown), the latter of whom maintains that there exists no danger of any complication arising between Canada and the United States over this project, that complications did arise in connection with the Suez canal when Disraeli bought the stock of that canal. Egypt was not then a protectorate of England but she has since become a protectorate due to the former country acquiring the stock of the Suez canal and controlling that route through Egypt. We are likely to have a similar condition of affairs in connection with the present project if we go into partnership with another country for the construction of a canal through our territory. If we wish to develop a canal for the benefit of Canada why not undertake the Georgian Bay canal which is entirely through Canadian territory, and does not involve a joint arrangement between United States and Canada. The hon. member for North Toronto has pointed out that this enterprise would be of great benefit to the cities of Cleveland, Toledo and Detroit. Those cities are not in Canada and I entertain the idea that this Dominion has no money to spend in developing the United States, which is perfectly capable of developing its own territory. Until we have developed Canada it would be wiser for this Parliament to look entirely to Canadian development rather than to help the development of the United States. If we develop the Georgian Bay canal—and I am not advocating that project at the present moment because I do not believe the country could afford the expenditure that would be involved even though that money would be altogether spent in Canadian territory—we shall develop a canal that will give Canada better service because it will develop the adjacent country and promote the growth of Canadian towns. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Lapierre) has a town in his constituency which would be developed; I refer to the town of North Bay. It would be far better to develop such towns as North Bay than to undertake enterprises calculated to develop towns in the United States.

Mr. MANION: I would like in the best spirit, to ask my hon. friend a question. Is he interested in this project because the Georgian Bay canal would be closer to his constituency than the St. Lawrence canal?

Mr. CAHILL: I will be quite candid with my hon. friend and say that the Georgian Bay canal would develop territory in my constituency, and in developing the constituency of Pontiac, of course, we should be developing the greatest part of Canada.

Mr. MANION: No doubt, you are the proof of that.

Mr. CAHILL: Naturally, therefore I would favour such development. If you can see your way, Mr. Speaker, to calling it six o'clock I would like to adjourn the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is moved by Mr. Cahill that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. HOCKEN: I wanted to say something on the question and if the debate is adjourned I shall be debarred from doing so this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not six o'clock yet.

Mr. CAHILL: I want to make a few more remarks on the question and wished you, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock in order that I might procure some documents pertaining to this question when the debate is resumed. I did not know the motion was to be discussed this afternoon.

Mr. MANION: If Mr. Speaker calls it six o'clock the motion goes to the head of

the Order Paper and my hon. friend will get a better chance to speak again than if the debate were formally adjourned. I would like to ask the Prime Minister what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will take up the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs, Mines, and Public Works.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, April 27, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

CONSOLIDATED REVENUE AND AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 57 to amend the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. He said:

The chief purpose of the bill is to facilitate an earlier closing of the public accounts at the end of the fiscal year. Under the law as it stands the fiscal year ends on 31st March, but the practice has been to allow a considerable time for the closing of the accounts. That makes for delay in the completion of public documents and in one way or another affects the whole business of the House. In England the fiscal year ends at the same time, 31st March, but there is no delay as to the closing of the accounts; the accounts are taken as they stand that day. We purpose to adopt the English system, with a proviso that any accounts outstanding can be dealt with in the following year. But the great object is to close the accounts early and thus facilitate all stages of the public business to which they relate. There is another clause, as to bonds which are held by the trustees of estates of persons who have died abroad, and it deals with the method of giving absolute and proper proof of transfer. It is only a technical matter.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

INSURANCE ACT, 1917, AMENDMENT

Hon. Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 58 to amend The Insurance Act, 1917. He said:

This is one of three bills which hon. members will notice on the Order Paper dealing with the Insurance Act, the Loan Companies Act, and the Trust Companies Act. They are all more or less of a technical character, important in their way, but I think the House will approve of the suggestion I make, that in each of these cases we deal with the bill by first and second readings, and then refer it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce where opportunity will be afforded to all persons who so desire to make representations; and the House will not be asked to commit itself to the bills until they have been fully inquired into by that committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

LOAN COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding, Bill No. 59 to amend the Loan Companies Act, 1914, was introduced and read the first time.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Mr. Fielding, Bill No. 60 to amend the Trust Companies Act, 1914, was introduced and read the first time.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

OVERAGES

Mr. MILLAR:

What financial benefit, if any, did this Government derive from overages at Fort William and Port Arthur terminal elevators in the year 1921?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: For the crop year 1920-21 the total value of the overages to be delivered to the Government was $130,524.06. Accounts have been rendered for this amount, but no payments have yet been made.

SS. CANADIAN EXPORTER

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Was any inquiry ever held by the Dominion wreck commissioner at Victoria, British Columbia, into the loss of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine steamship Canadian Exporter?
2. If so, what was the result of said inquiry?
3. Was any appeal entered to the Supreme Court of British Columbia by the captain of the ship?
4. If so, what was the result of said appeal?
5. Did the Department of Justice give any opinion at the request of the Marine Department as to the results of this appeal?
6. If so, what was this opinion?
7. What is the mode of appointing these nautical assessors for such trials?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. An investigation was held by the wreck commissioner for British Columbia at Vancouver, B.C.

2. Master and first mate were found at fault. Certificates suspended for six and four months respectively.

3. Yes.

4. Finding set aside so far as it purported to affect the master.

5. Yes.

6. That the practice prescribed by paragraph 7 of Canadian Shipping Casualties Rules, 1921, does not leave anything necessary to be desired.

7. Selected by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

EXPORT LIQUOR WAREHOUSES

Mr. MILLAR:

1. How many bonded liquor warehouses, operating in the province of Saskatchewan, have been licensed by the Dominion Government?

2. Has the Saskatchewan Government, or any of its members, approached the Dominion Government with a view to having the numbers of said bonded liquor warehouses reduced or increased, or having the powers of said warehouses restricted or altered in any way?

3. Has this Government granted licenses to any export liquor houses now operating in the province of Saskatchewan?

4. If so, how many?

5. If not, are said export liquor houses carrying on trade over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction?

6. Can the Federal Government prevent said export liquor houses carrying on interprovincial trade?

7. Has any provincial government or any one representing any provincial government approached the Federal Government with a view to having operations of said export liquor houses restricted or altered in any way?

8. If so, what provincial governments, and what was the nature of request or requests made?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: With reference to this question, I would ask the hon. gentleman to see the officers of the department. They claim there is no such thing as an export liquor house in any of the provinces. He might see the officers so that they may have an understanding as to what he means by that term.

MOUNTED POLICE—DR. LOVERING

Mr. CLARK:

1. Has Dr. D. A. Taylor, acting surgeon of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police at Lethbridge, been removed from office, or requested to resign?

2. If so, when and why?

3. Has Dr. J. E. Lovering of Lethbridge been appointed acting surgeon?

4. If so, when and why, and was the appointment made by the Civil Service Commission or by the Government?

5. Was the said Dr. J. E. Lovering a Liberal candidate at Lethbridge in the last general election?

6. If so, how many candidates were there in such election, and how many secured more votes than Dr. Lovering?

7. Is the Government aware that Dr. Lovering, consistently and openly, opposed military service of every description from the outbreak until the termination of the late war?

8. Were applications for the position in question called for by advertisement?

9. If so, what was the nature of the advertisement; how many applications for the position were received and how many, if any, of the applications were from returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Dr. Taylor, eye, ear, nose and throat specialist, was retired and a general physician and surgeon appointed.

2. 22nd March, 1922.

3. Yes.

4. From 1st May, 1922. This is not an appointment which comes under the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

5. Yes.

6. No information.

7. No.

8. No.

9. Answered by No. 8 .

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What was the population of Canada in 1877?

2. What was the federal revenue for the fiscal year 1876-77?

3. What was the expenditure for the same period for (a) current account, and (b) capital account?

4. What was the total revenue of Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1922?

5. What was the expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922 for (a) current account, and (b) capital account?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 4,013,000 (estimated by Dominion Bureau of Statistics).

2. $22,927,760.

3. (a) Chargeable to Consolidated Fund, $23,519,301. (b) Capital account, $7,599,709.

4. As shown by the books of the Finance Department at March 31, 1922 (not closed for the year), $371,519,454.

5. As shown by the books of the Finance Department at March 31, 1922 (not closed for the year): (a) Chargeable to Consolidated Fund, $324,758,377; (b) Capital account, $16,742,081.

MAJOR-GENERALS BURSTALL AND GWATKIN

Mr. WARD:

1. On what dates were Major-General Sir Henry Burstall and Major-General Sir Wil

loughby Gwatkin retired from the Active Militia of Canada, or on what dates are they to be retired?

2. What pay and allowanes were they receiving at the dates of their retirement?

3. Are they pensionable on retirement?

4. If so, at what rates?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Burstall, K.C.B., K.C.M.G.

1, 3 and 4. Lieutenant-General Sir Henry Burstall was granted leave of absence, with full pay and allowances, from 20th March, 1922, to the 28th October, 1923, at which date he is to be retired with a pension of $5,993.14 per annum, under a statute providing for such cases to be increased after 16 293/365 years by $126.86 when all unpaid pension dues will have been recovered, such pension to commence from 29th October, 1923.

2. $9.000.

Major-General Sir Willoughby Gwatkin, K.C.M.G., C.B.

1. Major-General Sir Willoughby Gwatkin resigned his appointment under the Air Board, with effect from 1st April, 1922. He was granted one year's leave of absence from that date, with the same remuneration as he is at present receiving.

2. $4,196.80 per annum. This officer is in receipt of an imperial pension.

3. and 4. Not pensionable upon retirement by the Canadian Government.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—REPAIRS TO CARS

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Have contracts for the repairs of cars, all kinds of cars, belonging and used by the Intercolonial Railway, been given to private companies instead of having these repairs done by the different Intercolonial Railway repair shops?

2. If so, to what companies?

3. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to have repairs and improvements to locomotives, cars and other equipment done by the employees of the different workshops of the Canadian National Railways?

4. What amount, if any, has been paid to private companies for repairs to the rolling stock, for the section of the Canadian National Railways from Montreal to Halifax?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Contracts for repairs to a portion of the box cars only, belonging to the Canadian National railways were given to private companies in order to help out the unemployment situation in the different parts of the country.

2. Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Limited, Eastern Car Company, National Steel Car Corporation.

[Mr. Ward.]

3. The company has always, and will continue to make repairs and improvements to locomotives at their own shops. As to cars, these will be done in our own shops as far as is practicable.

4. The amount that has been paid to date to private companies for repairs to rolling stock for the entire Canadian National railways is $389,961.93. The rolling stock belonging to the Canadian National railways is used for the benefit of the system as a whole and it is not possible to allocate charges for repairs to equipment that is being or will be used on any particular section of the line, such as Montreal to Halifax. The amount of above paid to car companies Montreal and east amounted to $371,600.83.

SALES TAX

Sir HENRY DRAYTON:

1. What was the value of goods imported into Canada, on which the Sales Tax was collected, in each month of the past fiscal year, and what was the amount of such tax collected per month?

2. What was the value of goods manufactured in Canada, on which the Sales Tax was collected, in each month of the past fiscal year, and what was the amount of such tax collected per month?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: No record is available of the value of goods imported or manufactured in Canada on which sales tax was collected.

The amount of sales tax collected monthly during the fiscal year ended March 31, 1922, on goods imported and goods manufactured in Canada was as follows:

	Sales Tax on Imports	Sales Tax on goods manufactured in Canada
April, 1921	$ 686,567 34	$2,328,232 39
May	1,062,292 37	2,123,628 34
June	1,362,396 96	3,114,552 71
July	1,364,309 51	4,051,762 31
August	1,492,634 59	4,367,194 10
September	1,415,466 54	4,050,871 93
October	1,485,759 22	4,589,278 65
November	1,598,218 16	4,019,838 64
December	1,242,466 24	4,749,386 31
January, 1922	1,330,333 10	4,280,908 70
February	1,372,919 69	2,935,733 48
March	1,981,132 04	3,208,508 60
Total	$16,394,495 76	$44,819,896 16

L'ORIGNAL WHARF

Mr. BINETTE:

1. What amount of damage was caused by the fire at the wharf at L'Orignal, in the county of Prescott, during the year 1920?

2. What persons helped to fight the said fire, and how much did each receive for his services?

3. What was the cost of the repairs to said wharf?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. $6,500, based on estimated cost of replacement of landing head, portion of approach and freight shed.

2. O. Dubois, $4.90; Jos. Bertrand, $4.90; Ernest Brabant, $4.90; P. Dubois, $4.90; Charles G. Smith, $4.90; C. Dubois, $4.90; E. Landriault, $4.90; P. Brabant, $2.10.

3. Repairs made, due to damage caused by fire, cost $3,969.13.

EXCISE TAX ON ALCOHOL

Mr. HUBBS:

1. Does the Government intend to reduce the excise tax on alcohol to the retail druggists?

2. If so, will the said tax be made the same as that charged the manufacturers at the distillery or bonded warehouse?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Announcement of such taxation changes as the Government will propose will be made in the Budget speech.

RAILWAY RATES

PROPOSED SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways) moved:

That notwithstanding that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee be appointed to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs, it having been disclosed by recent conferences held between the Government and the chief executives of the various railways with respect to the reduction of freight rates that the representatives of the railways deem it inadvisable immediately to reduce rates on basic commodities because of the expiration, on July 6th, 1922, of the suspension of the Crow's Nest Pass agreement;

That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry to the said committee with particular regard to the effect of the rates established by the Crow's Nest Pass agreement upon Canadian National railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally;

And that the said committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, including the minutes and evidence taken before the Committees of this House in previous Sessions, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak to this motion, but merely to say, I do not think the Government has any right to go on with it this afternoon. This is an important motion —relative, at least, to anything else on the Order Paper; and, questioned last night as to what the business to-day was to be, the Prime Minister answered:

We will take up the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs, Mines, and Public Works.

There was no intimation whatever that this motion was to be gone on with. It is unfair to the Opposition—indeed, it is unfair to the House on both sides—that it should be gone on with when it was not mentioned last night.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I agree entirely with my right hon. friend; that it was not mentioned last night was an oversight. Possibly we might have an understanding now that we proceed with it on Tuesday next.

Motion stands.

STATEMENT OF PREMIER NORRIS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to ask some questions of the Government as to a reported statement by Mr. Norris, Premier of Manitoba, with relation to the subject or railway rates and other matters. In the Montreal Gazette, but as well in many other papers, Mr. Norris is reported to have said at a public meeting, after a rather prolonged sojourn in Ottawa, that the Railway Commission had come to a decision on this subject of railway rates, and he virtually announced what the decision was to be. For exactness, I read very briefly his words:

Important pronouncements were made by the Premier in connection with the freight rates and the natural resources questions.

With respect to freight rates, Premier Norris announced that the fight put up by the provincial government for reduced rates had been successful, and that before the 1922 grain crop began to move a reduction would be effected which would mean an annual saving of approximately $8,000,000 to the province.

Later the quotation is as follows:

Mr. Norris, who returned from Ottawa, a few days ago, reviewed in his address to the convention the fight during the past three years to obtain lower freight rates. Arguments presented to the Railway Commissioners by counsel for the province had resulted in breaking down the railways' case for continuance of what he called present excessive rates.

I am not asking whether this is a correct report of what Mr. Norris said; if, however, the Government desire to make a statement on that, it is for them to decide. Knowing that a provincial election is near

at hand, I assume for my part that this report as to what Mr. Norris said is substantially correct. I ask the Government, assuming it is correct: had Mr. Norris any foundation for the statement? Had he authority to announce a decision of the Railway Commission in regard to the most important question which has come before it since its inception? If so, does the Government believe in the practice of the Railway Commission of announcing its judgments through Liberal politicians?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I confess I cannot see much point in my hon. friend's question, unless it be the implication, in the concluding portion of it, of a political significance in the press report which, probably, could not reasonably be attached to it. I am unable to say whether or not the report which appeared in the press of what Mr. Norris said is correct; Mr. Norris will have to speak for himself on that matter. There has been no official communication between the Government and Mr. Norris on the subject of railway rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the question. Is it correct, as Mr. Norris is reported to have said, that the Railway Commission has come to a decision? If so, is the decision as Mr. Norris says it is?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall have to ask the Railway Commission before I can answer my hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly so. Does the Prime Minister wish to have us understand that, in respect to a subject regarding which the Minister of Railways has a motion on the Order Paper, for the appointment of a Select Committee to inquire into the matter of railway rates, a decision has already been, or may have been, made known to the Prime Minister of Manitoba, although wholly unknown to the Prime Minister of Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly not. No anouncement as to the policy of the Government in this matter will be made until the House has had full opportunity of discussing the resolution of the Minister of Railways and of considering the matter in committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am entitled to an answer.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: No provincial campaign can be carried on here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the Prime Minister or the Government aware of any decision whatever by the Railway Commission on this question?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is this an electoral campaign?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There has been no decision whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have another question, as to which there will be no difficulty at all in the Prime Minister answering "yes" or "no." Mr. Norris, having referred to the suspension in 1918, confirmed by statute in 1919, of the Crow's Nest Pass Agreement, and having made reference to section 325 confirming that suspension, is further reported:

> While in Ottawa he and Hon. T. H. Johnston, Attorney General, have been successful, said the Premier, in securing the consent of the King Government to letting this clause lapse, and, consequently, rates would revert automatically to the 1919 level.

Is that correct or is it not?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The consent of the Government has not been obtained to anything appertaining to railway rates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then if Mr. Norris said this it is wholly erroneous.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. FIELDING: Ask Mr. Norris.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair.

Indians—Nova Scotia, $50,140.

Item agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL: I was not here when the item was agreed to and I should like to say a few words on this subject, as it is important.

The CHAIRMAN: The item has been carried.

Mr. CARROLL: Then perhaps I shall have another opportunity to speak on the question.

Mr. CALDWELL: I move that the committee return to the item. It is hardly fair to pass it without giving the members from Nova Scotia an opportunity to discuss it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL: I understand that there was some intention on the part of the Government of removing the Indians from their present reservation at Sydney to a location outside of that city. Those people who have the interests of the Indians at heart are very much opposed to any such removal. I do not say that they are opposed to the removal of the Indians to a proper location, but the Government has bought some land near the city of Sydney where it is quite undesirable that the Indians should be placed. The situation is anything but a proper one for Indians.

Mr. DUFF: Or any other Indians.

Mr. CARROLL: Yes, or anybody else. I understand that this purchase went through some time ago. As to this place, near Sydney, to which it is proposed to remove the Indians, people from Nova Scotia who have not seen it are at any rate familiar with the general reputation it bears. I desire to impress as strongly as possible upon the minister that, notwithstanding the fact that this location near Whitney pier has been purchased, it would be a crying shame to put the Indians there. I have received strong recommendations from Bishop Morrison of Antigonish, and the Catholic clergy at Sydney—and I believe the minister has also had similar representations made to him—opposing the placing of the Indians on the proposed reservation. These recommendations are made by the clergy of the Catholic Church because the Indians belong to that faith, and they point out that it would be eminently undesirable and shameful to take the Indians from their reservation at Sydney and place them in the proposed location, which was purchased from a gentleman now deceased. I do not take the ground that it would not be desirable to remove the Indians at all, if there were any sentiment in the city of Sydney in support of that intention. But the minister will understand that we object to putting the Indians on a reservation which is altogether undesirable. The situation is such that there are some aspects of the matter which I do not wish to discuss in committee, and for the time being I would urge upon the minister the necessity of deferring action until we can have an opportunity of discussing the subject with him in the privacy of his room.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Argenteuil, Superintendent General of Indian Affairs): I am not aware of the objections my hon. friend has indicated. The land was bought from a Mr. J. A. Gillies and the proposal is to move the Indians there. However, I am perfectly willing to discuss the matter further, if, as the hon. member says, there are aspects of the situation which it is undesirable to introduce in Committee of the Whole. I could take it up in private with him.

Item agreed to.

Indians—New Brunswick, $28,784.

Mr. HANSON: There is a band of Indians located in the town of Devon in my constituency. They have been there for a number of years. The reserve is a small one of about five or six acres in the heart of the community, and the Indians were located there, I presume, before the place became a town. There are also in the same constituency two other reserves, one at French Village, so-called, and the other ot Oromocto. The town of Devon is an ambitious and growing community and has lately become incorporated. I happen to know that the town council have petitioned the Indian Department to have the Devon band removed to either of the other two reserves in the immediate vicinity, and the Indians themselves are agreeable. It is considered in the interets of the growth of the town that the band should be removed. It is also considered in the interest of the Indians themselves that they should no longer be located there. If the minister will look into the files of his department I am sure he will find memorials from the council of the town of Devon asking that this proposal be carried out, not against the will of the band themselves but, I believe, with their consent. Nothing has yet been done in the matter and I have been asked by the officials of the town to bring it to the attention of the department so that the proposed change may be facilitated. The band are small in number, there being less than one hundred I am quite sure, and probably not more than fifty. Their location in Devon prevents the development of the centre of the town practically, and I am sure that if the minister obtained a report from the officials of his department on the subject he would agree with the contention which is being made by the town council itself, that it would be very much to the interest of the town if this band were moved out either to the French Village district or to the Oromocto district. I am quite satisfied that the Indians themselves have no objection to the

change—at least that is my impression after having talked the matter over with a number of them. The council have also investigated the matter and they have found that it meets with the consent of the great majority of the band. I hope, therefore, the minister will look into the matter.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before the resolution carries I would like to ask the minister a question with regard to a matter which I brought to the attention of the department last year, in regard to the illegal cutting of lumber on the Tobique Indian reserve, in Carleton county, New Brunswick. I would like to ask whether the damage assessed has ever been collected from the parties who cut the timber, and just what the final outcome of the matter was?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I promise the hon. gentleman I will give careful consideration to the matter suggested by him. The officials of the department are on the way here. I have no knowledge of the question myself, and have no memorandum in regard to it, but when the officials arrive I shall be in a better position to make a statement.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Ontario and Quebec, $183,115.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We should have the information that is usually given on the voting of the estimates as to the amount spent last year with respect to each of these items. I observe that in three of the votes for Indians there is a considerable increase, commencing with this item, and that in the case of the general vote and the vote for Indian education there are two decreases. The minister has contrived to make the decreases tally to a cent with the increases so that the total amount of all the items is the same as last year. Now apparently there is to be more expenditure in administration in Ontario, in the western provinces, and British Columbia by approximately $140,000 than previously, and in order to recoup the treasury the minister is going to take it out of Indian education. I do not know whether the minister believes in education or not. I expect that some of the reduction is owing to the contraction of the "greater production" work—perhaps I am wrong in that. Anyway my point is this: The Indian Department estimates expanded largely because of the increased cost of the supplies that we have to provide the Indians with. As prices increased the estimates expanded accordingly.

[Mr. Hanson.]

I have not the figures before me but last year, I think, we managed to make a little reduction. This year we have no reduction at all. But this is the year of rapid deflation of prices—perhaps I should not have said "rapid" but of constant, and undoubtedly of certain, deflation of prices—and with even an academic intention to retrench I think the minister could have found an opportunity in these estimates to make some reduction. But he comes before Parliament with the same figure as last year, notwithstanding the fact that there is undoubtedly an opportunity to reduce because of decreased cost. There may not be opportunity in relation to the salaries—it may not be possible to reduce them at all—but there are certain production costs where there would be an opportunity, and unquestionably there could be a very substantial saving in respect to material.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Repairs to roads and bridges and drainage are largely responsible for the increase. I am told by the officials that there has been rapid road development both in Ontario and Quebec by the municipalities and provincial governments and in many cases repairs have been needed to roads leading through the Indian reserves otherwise the continuity of the roads would be broken up, and requests have been insistent that the department should carry out its share of these needed improvements. I have no personal knowledge of the matter but that is the information the officials give me with respect to that particular item. Practically the whole increase is made up of expenditure of that character. Where it is not particularly needed for the benefit of the Indians themselves it is required in the interest of the general public who travel across the reserve, and the money is intended to complete road work undertaken by the province and by the municipality, I expect conjointly. The matter of education is one that I want to make some explanation about, because although through desire to keep down the appropriations the cause of Indian education appears to suffer, yet actually such is not the case.

I intended to make plain to the committee that while the estimates were prepared in that way, I find, on careful examination of the situation later, that that sum will be required for educational purposes, and that there will be a general increase, and the committee will have to pass it, because it will come up in the supplementary estimates for Indian Affairs. Had I been more familiar with the estimates

this would have been provided for, but the matter did not come to my attention in time. My hon. friend has raised this point, but I intended to deal with it when we came to it, and inform the committee, so that we may not be accused of unfairness. In my estimation it should have appeared here, and we should have shown the increase in these general estimates. I shall be prepared to give an explanation of the matter. We shall require practically the same sum for educational purposes as last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government's proclaimed policy of retrenchment has been changed into a policy of increased estimates, with explanations.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I scarcely think that that complexion should be placed upon the matter. I have been frank with the committee, and I have stated what I would have done if I had known the situation. I have no desire that the estimates shall be misleading to the committee. That is the last thing in my mind. If it is objectionable to have this increase in the expenditure, we will have to discuss it from that standpoint, and give the explanation as to why these items appear. I have mentioned as to the item of $9,300 in the general expenses, and the memo I have in regard to that is—

Of this increase $3,300 is required to meet increases in salaries which may be granted under the Civil Service Act and the balance, viz. $6,000 is required to replace the steamboat formerly in use by the Indian Agent at Kenora, Ont., on the lake of the Woods for many years, but now no longer serviceable and unfit for further use. As the several reserves in this agency can only be reached by water, it is necessary for the Indian Agent to be provided with a suitable boat. Tenders for the construction of a gasoline launch are being invited and the cost estimated at $5,000. A boat house will also be required at an estimated cost of $1,000.

I do not know anything about that matter, except the fact that the officials are asking for it and the necessity appears to be great.

Mr. ETHIER: While we are dealing with this item I desire to call attention of the minister to the conditions at the Indian Reserve at Oka in the county of Two Mountains. An Indian Agent has been appointed there to attend to the business of the Indians. His name is Mr. Bertrand. He has been there for some time. There are complaints against him because he does not speak the language of the Indians. I do not know whether he can even speak English. That reserve is composed of Iroquois, Algonquins and a few Hurons. The Indians sent a deputation to Ottawa a short time ago, asking for the appointment of an agent whom they might understand and by whom they might be understood. I presented the matter to the department, before the hon. minister took office, and nothing was done. With the permission of the House, I read a letter which I received from the chiefs of the Reserve:

OKA, QUE., April 25, 1922

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—As chiefs of the Oka band of Iroquois Indians, we beg to ask your assistance in bringing the claims of Mr. Joseph Perillard to the office of Indian Agent at Oka, Que., before the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa.

I thought it was proper to bring this matter before the House directly.

His qualification for the said office is unquestionable. He has served in that capacity in the past with satisfaction. His knowledge of the language of the Indians fits him for the office.

I would say that I know personally that Mr. Perillard speaks Iroquois, Huron, Algonquin and French perfectly.

Mr. JACOBS: How can the hon. gentleman say he speaks those languages perfectly?

Mr. ETHIER: I do not know that he speaks them perfectly, but I heard him in court when he acted as translator when some of the Indians from the Iroquois were brought before the court at Ste. Scholastique, district of Terrebonne. He acted as the official translator of the Iroquois language. He has been there ten or fifteen years as Indian Agent. He was there before 1911.

You would do us great service in pressing his claim. Mr. Bertrand is really not fit for the position, because he is utterly ignorant of the Indian language, and because he is not understood by the Indians, owing to his impediment of speech. Moreover, being engaged in business which is his first consideration, he is at a disadvantage to arbitrate difficulties between Indians for fear of antagonizing the goodwill of the people and thereby lose trade. Of course we do not wish to go into details of Mr. Bertrand's unfitness. We think we have pointed out clearly why we think Mr. Perillard's appointment would be for the good of all concerned.

We trust you will do all you can to further the interests of our people.

We remain, yours respectfully,

Chief NOAH CORENTHE,
Chief PETER ANGUS.

Representations in regard to this matter have been made to the department by the band. Their representatives have been in Ottawa. These Indians have an agent

there who is not understood by them. I am informed that in several cases when the Indians had dealings with the department they had to go to Mr. Perillard, to have their claims translated, and to come here on their behalf. It is impossible to negotiate with the Indians satisfactorily with such a man as Mr. Bertrand. I submit to this House and to the minister that, in the interests of the Indians at Oka, the man who is living there, who has been there about fifty years, speaks their language, knows their needs, and knows them personally, should be appointed as agent there. The agent of course should be familiar with their language, and the man at present in the position is not competent to deal with their affairs in that locality; and should be replaced for the best interests of interested parties. The request made by these Indians should, I submit, be looked into very thoroughly and be given careful consideration by the minister and his department.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and North West Territories, $661,092.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is a total increase of $74,282. One item of increase is hospitals, medical attendance and medicine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The net increase is $34,810, which is accounted for as follows: Grant to the Dynevor Hospital, increased from $1 to $1.25 per patient per day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister mean to say that as the cost of living goes down, the grant for medical attendance and medicine goes up?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not exactly; the question is not one of the cost of living; it is a question of medical attention given to the Indians. I cannot say as to the future, but I understand that there has been a persistent request from those hospitals for increased grants for medical attention while Indians are inmates of the hospitals.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There always will be; but the fact is that now that the cost of attention and everything else is going down, the minister is yielding to these demands and letting the cost of attendance to the Indians go up. We have always allowed so much a day, why should this time be seized to increase that allowance?

[Mr. Ethier.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I presume my right hon. friend will agree that hospital expenses seem to be continually increasing, and I would personally think it rather a favourable arrangement, although I am speaking without knowledge as to the actual facts in this matter. Speaking without positive information, I think $1 per day would not pay full compensation for attendance upon an individual in the hospital, as I think my right hon. friend will agree. I understand that this hospital is maintained by private individuals. Perhaps I should not make the assertion, but I think that we have been trying to get off rather cheaply with the Indians who are wards of the Government. On a very superficial examination, I think that we have been delegating the care of the Indians very largely to private individuals and church organizations, when it seems to me that the responsibility is on the Canadian people. I am not suggesting radical increases, but I think, as I say, on a somewhat superficial examination, that we must increase some of the expenditures in connection with Indian affairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly we employ and co-operate with church organizations and charitable institutions, and the Indians will never be properly taken care of without that co-operation. Those are the organizations that can do the work best, as time has proved and as history has shown, and we shall have to continue to co-operate with them. The minister's present contention may be stated in just so many words, that, in this work, the late Government carried its economy to the point of penuriousness.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I would be inclined to say that perhaps that is true; my observations would lead me to say that. I say that in no critical mood; I agree with my right hon. friend that this work can best be done by the organizations that are already doing it; but I think, in fairness to the organizations and private individuals, we shall, perhaps, be called upon to be a little more generous in our dealings with these various organizations.

Mr. SHAW: What provision, if any, is made for medical attention to the Indians on the Stony Indian reserve at Morley, Alberta? I may be misinformed, but I understand that no hospital provision is made at the reserve and that occasionally some medical practitioner comes from some particular place and makes a cursory exam-

ination. I should like to be assured by the minister that proper medical examination of the Indians will be not only made, but continued.

Mr. NEILL: I can heartily endorse the attitude taken by the minister in regard to increasing the grants to Indians. The question is not one of economy, it is one of justice. These local hospitals have been grossly underpaid for a number of years. I have in mind a hospital in my district, but this can be duplicated in many others. We have, in my district, a hospital kept up partially by government grants, but largely by personal subscriptions and money contributed by means of dances or other entertainments. Every year, however, that hospital goes behind between $2,000 and $3,000. When we came to analyse the situation at a recent annual meeting, we found we were doing the Indian work at about half the cost. The question was raised—why should the white people put their hands into their pockets as a matter of charity in order to maintain the wards of the Indian Department? The question is not one of co-operation with churches and similar institutions. These Indians are certified by the local doctor to require medical treatment; they are put into the hospital, and hitherto the hospital has been drawing $1 a day per patient while the cost in our hospital has been somewhere around $3 a day. In addition, of course, we had the Government grant to help out; but we sustained a heavy loss on every Indian we treated. This is unfair, uncalled for, and I am heartily glad that the minister has taken the stand which he has to-day.

4 p.m.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The medical officer on the Stony reserve is Dr. A. W. Park at a salary of $600.

Mr. SHAW: Does he live on the reserve?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am told that his home is at Cochrane, Alberta.

Mr. CALDWELL: What items are covered by the vote of $335,805 for general expenses? This seems to be a very large item for miscellaneous expenses, if that is what it means, and there is an increase of $41,760 over last year for the same purpose. The New Brunswick appropriation is passed, I notice that the item for miscellaneous and unforseen expenses in that province is only $850.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give the items that make up this sum.

Mr. CALDWELL: I want just a general idea of what it covers.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think I can give that better by reading the items it covers. The increase is accounted for as follows: $2,760 provided for increases in salaries which will be granted under the Civil Service Act for the fiscal year; $39,000 to meet additional expenditures to carry out the terms of Treaty No. 11, negotiated in 1921 with the Indians of the Great Slave lake and Mackenzie river district, as explained in the special items of this estimate. This sum was voted for the last fiscal year, 1921-22, under the general vote, but is transferred now to the vote, "Northwest Territories," where it properly belongs. It is therefore not an increase in the appropriation asked for 1922-23 over that for 1921-22, there being a corresponding reduction made in the general vote. The $39,000 is a transfer from the general vote to this special vote.

Mr. COOTE: I should like to bring before the committee the condition of affairs which, I believe, exists on the Blood reserve in Alberta. When I was on the reserve this winter I was interviewed by about twenty Indians, who presented me with a lengthy memorandum setting forth a list of grievances which they have against the Government. In addition to those grievances, they personally stated that they had a lot of complaints against the treatment which they were receiving, and that they had nobody to speak for them; that the means of communication between them and the department at Ottawa seemed to be closed; that since 1918, when the Indian office was established at Regina, they seem to be able to get no relief from what they consider to be ill treatment. At their request I promised to take the matter up with the Government. I have brought it to the attention of the Minister of Indian Affairs, and I believe he will give it very sympathetic consideration. At the same time to satisfy some of the friends of the Indians in the vicinity of the Blood reserve I want to bring the matter before the members of this committee.

The Indians complained particularly that the department had broken faith with them. I think that is a very serious complaint, as the Indian always deals by word of mouth, not by written agreement, and therefore we should be very careful to do everything to maintain his belief that the word of the Government may be relied

upon implicitly. They claimed that faith was deliberately broken with them in connection with a lease of part of their reserve while the "greater production" campaign was on, and that whereas they were promised $24 per head in consideration of this lease, they got a cash payment of only $6 each; and they claim that the balance is due them. That is only one of the grievances referred to in the memorandum, although possibly it is one of the most serious. I am not going to weary the committee by recounting all the grievances covered by the memorandum, but I want to bring to the attention of hon. members and also of the minister, in case I do not have an opportunity to do so later, the complaint of individual Indians that they are often in want of food and have to go hungry. One Indian—who, by the way, is well educated and speaks perfect English—stated to me that no matter how many children he might have—and he had a family of eight—he would only be allowed to draw from the rations house ten pounds of meat per week. Now, that might seem enough for a white man and his family, but we must remember that Indians live largely on meat and bread. The same Indian informed me that any member of the tribe with a small family is allowed only five pounds of meat per week. I was informed that as a result of under-feeding many of the Indians are sick, particularly during the winter months, and that the more-than-usual amount of sickness among them is to be attributed to this cause. I was also informed that whereas they used to have a resident doctor on the reserve, all the medical attendance they get now is from the doctor in the neighbouring town when he makes periodical visits to the hospitals. I am speaking simply from notes which I took when I was on the reserve and these Indians made their representations to me.

It would seem to me that there must be mismanagement of this reserve. The area of the reserve, I am informed, is 354,086 acres. The last returns available show 1,161 Indians on this vast territory, or a total of over three hundred acres for every man, woman and child. It would appear therefore that if any ordinary business management were applied to the affairs of that reserve, sufficient would be produced to keep the Indians in decent comfort.

Before I sit down I wish to urge upon the committee and upon the minister the importance of not in any way cutting down the grants for the education of the Indian. I was greatly impressed with the beneficial results noticeable on that reserve in the improved homes of those Indians who had been educated in the industrial schools, they having very comfortable homes compared with those of the older Indians. I was told by some of the best friends of the Indians in the district that the hope of the Indian lay in education, that if all our Indian boys could receive a proper education in what we have called in the past industrial schools, the problem of the Indian would, so far as the Blood reserve is concerned, be taken off our hands within the next twenty years, for they would become self-supporting. Therefore I ask the committee, whatever estimates be pared down, that they should not in any way endeavour to reduce the estimates for the education of the Indian.

Mr. GOOD: I desire to call the attention of the minister and, incidentally, of the members of this committee, to a little pamphlet written by Doctor Peter H. Bryce and published in the city recently. I got a copy through the mails, and I presume that the pamphlet was distributed among all hon. members. It is entitled, "A National Crime," and contains rather serious charges of maladministration in the Department of Indian Affairs with respect to medical attention to Indians. I have not the pamphlet with me at the moment, but I read it with a great deal of interest, and if the facts are anywhere near as they are stated, then I think the minister ought to look into the matter without delay. As I say, I only wish to draw the attention of the minister and of the committee to the pamphlet; I do not wish to take up any time discussing the charges it contains, because the minister can peruse them for himself.

There is another matter which I think should be mentioned. In one of the Indian reserves in my constituency there has developed a situation of a rather serious character about which I have been in consultation privately with the minister. I do not know whether it would be worth while for either of us to make any explanation; I shall leave it to his judgment. But as there is one question at least of very general interest involved, I thought perhaps the committee would like to have a statement from the minister, and undoubtedly it would come better from him than from me. I do wish to emphasize the necessity of looking into the charges made in this little pamphlet.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have had a considerable amount of correspondence in connection with matters under dispute on the Blood Indian reserve. It would appear that the department was unfortunate in one or two of the agents appointed, but I am informed that the recent appointment of an agent will tend to remedy many of the complaints made by the Indians on this reserve.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend refers to appointments made, when?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last fall, I understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Before that, I think.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may be giving a wrong impression, but my understanding was that the difficulty was owing largely to the action of the local agent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, an agent some time ago.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. However, I intend to make it my business this year, as soon as the session is over, to visit as many of the Indian reserves as I can, possibly a few in each province. I confess that outside of a knowledge of the Indians of the northern portion of Alberta, their educational and hospital institutions, I know very little about Indian affairs generally; and one can get a very much better idea of the conditions if he visits the reserves. He may then form an opinion as to the best method of dealing with this question.

The matter raised by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good), is in connection with difficulty on the Six Nations reserve. This difficulty, which is one of long standing, may be attributed primarily to the fact that a great many members of the band do not consider themselves wards of the Government, but, rather, allies of Great Britain. There was also some difficulty about military service during the war; a large proportion of the band were opposed to any members of the band enlisting, and that opposition they expressed most vigorously. I would not have time to go into all the details of the difficulties existing in connection with this band; but out of the incident of the war appears to have arisen a state of affairs that is most unpleasant. During last season the reserve was visited by a hail-storm; conditions of drought prevailed, and there was a crop shortage. Many Indians on the reserve who had been obtaining employment at fairly remunerative wages found themselves out of work last winter, and a considerable amount of distress was occasioned. That, perhaps, along with other matters in dispute, led the council to make a demand on the government for a cash distribution of the capital funds of the band to the extent of $20 per head. But this we found it impossible to do. The accumulated band funds are held in trust for the general purposes of the band; under the Indian Act they may be distributed for various purposes, but this is not one of the purposes. If any such distribution were made, therefore, the authority of Parliament would have to be obtained. In addition, owing to the unfortunate circumstances of last year, the Indians found themselves in many cases in need of seed. The government offered to meet all cases of distress that were approved by the agent in charge—and there have been no complaints, so far as the representations of the council are concerned, with respect to the agent in charge. The department agreed to provide the necessary seed and to ask for an appropriation from Parliament for the purpose of doing so. This did not meet with the approval of the council; indeed, it was refused, and a peremptory demand made that consideration be given to their request for the distribution of $20 per head. We have not deemed it wise to accede to that demand; we have stood by our offer to give relief where relief was needed and to issue seed to those who found it necessary to obtain it from the department.

There is another difficulty that has now become very serious. Of the soldiers, six hundred in number, who enlisted from the Six Nation Indians, about 80 applied to the Soldier Settlement Board to be placed upon the land under the provisions of the Soldier Settlement Act. In one case an Indian named Hill obtained an allotment. Bear in mind that if there is any transaction in Indian lands it is with regard to improvements only; the ownership of the land is in the band itself, not in any particular individual. This man Hill was not prepared to go upon the land when he had met the requirements of the board and the money had been granted to him. A relative of his was in the meantime to take possession and hold the land until he was ready to go upon it. In all other cases, so far as I am aware, the men entered immediately into possession and pro-

ceeded to operate the lands allocated to them. But the council, or a portion of it at least, is opposed to the use of any of the Indian lands for the purposes of soldier settlement, and to the soldiers operating on the reserves under the provisions of the Soldier Settlement Act. I am not aware of the reasons for this, except that they feel that some of their rights are being jeopardized. In this particular case they have opposed by force any attempts on the part of Hill to take possession.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In referring to the council, does the minister mean the council of the band?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. In this case it is hereditary; it is not elective. The difficulty has come to the point where legal action has been taken and Hill's ownership has been sustained in the court. But still the band have resisted. The sheriff a few days ago undertook to oust the incumbent and place Hill upon the land, but he was resisted by force; and matters have come to such a pass now that he asks for assistance to enable him to carry out his duties in this connection. Throughout the whole affair I have endeavoured to avoid difficulties. We have had representatives of the council here on two occasions. The member for Brantford (Mr. Raymond) and the member for Brant (Mr. Good) met the members of the Council, I believe, or at least the chiefs of the band, to discuss the matter, but they did not seem willing to permit the operation of the Soldiers' Settlement Act on the reserve their intention being apparently, to resist this, if need be, by force. It is very difficult in a case of this kind to avoid what may develop into a serious situation, but personally I feel that we have a duty to stand behind the men who were willing, in the face of serious danger, to don the khaki and fight for us; it is our business as a department and a government to stand behind them. But we must also endeavour as far as possible to avoid any serious difficulty with the wards of the nation. At the moment the matter is in the hands of the sheriff of the county and the Attorney General of the province of Ontario. I do not know that I can say anything more on the matter. There are one or two things that might be said in regard to the desirability, if it were possible, of changing the system of the election of the council. But, again, these Indians stand very strongly upon their rights, and a conciliatory method would be the best if it could be effected. At any rate it should be tried to the limit before drastic steps are taken. I do think, however, that we must protect the men who were loyal enough, and who had our interests sufficiently at heart, to get out and fight for their country.

Mr. LEWIS: Just two questions: Does this Government recognize the council of which the minister has been speaking? And does the council claim the improvements made on the land by the Soldier Settlement Board, or just the land?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): They have not made any claim. They are resisting the method that is being pursued in dealing with the lands in their reserves. It is the land in every case that they are claiming.

Mr. LEWIS: But there are improvements?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Mr. GOOD: Perhaps I might supplement the statement of the minister by describing briefly the interview which my hon. friend (Mr. Raymond) and I had with a number of the chiefs the other day. The chairman of the council stood definitely and firmly by this position, that they were not subject to Canadian laws within the territory of their reserve. He said that the Canadian people, acting through the Canadian Government, were invaders of their rights as an independent people and an ally of the British Crown. That is perhaps a rather unique position, but they have taken it very definitely and it lies behind the difficulty which the minister has referred to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the particular matter concerning the Six Nations reserve, save to make this comment. I think the minister is not quite correct in saying that the Soldier Settlement Board operates the Indian reserves, treating the Indian returned soldier just as they have power to treat the white returned soldier. My recollection is that the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs was given the powers of the Soldier Settlement Board in respect of the Indian returned men, and he is enabled to operate the Act in regard to them. But the Soldier Settlement Board, as such, does not interpose itself at all. That, I am quite certain, is right, because the Soldier Settlement Board could not act, in view of the fact that the Indian, whether

a returned man or not, is not subject to the law, in that he is not liable to have contracts enforced against him. Consequently it is merely the Soldier Settlement provisions adapted to the Indians, which the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs supervises.

I do, however, want to say something as regards the general question of complaints from reserves. As superintendent general for something over three years, I came in contact with them frequently, and I have not the least doubt that the present superintendent general will have the same experience as I had. I do not want what I say to have any special application to the Blood reserve, or, indeed, to the Six Nations or any other reserve, although it has just as much application to these two as to any others. The Indian population, perhaps more than any other body of people, are easily susceptible to imposition at the hands of the cleverer white, and nowhere do the agitator and the charlatan reap a readier harvest than among the Indian people. I have gone into the complaint raised by the member for Macleod (Mr. Coote), and I have had some acquaintance, too, with the situation in the Six Nations, the complaint being very much in the nature of that brought up this afternoon. In respect of this charge from the Blood reserve, I want to say frankly that after the most careful investigation I was able to make, after all sides were afforded an opportunity to present their evidence, the case of the departmental officials was so overwhelming, and the complete crushing of the complainant's case was so marked, that there was no doubt left in my mind at all that it was mainly the result of agitation—

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Did you have Mr. Wilson's letter before you?

Mr. MEIGHEN:—agitation, I am afraid I must say, on the part of those who seek to gain something for themselves. The British Columbia Indians have been subject to this perhaps more than any other body of Indians, and although the matter has been up year after year for I do not know how many years, I do not think there is any one who would say that it has not been simply a matter of chicanery, an attempt to profit by and live upon agitation, in the case of these British Columbia Indians. Now, in respect of our dealings with these people, no one is more decided than I am that those dealings must be characterized by humanity, by stern fidelity to all our treaties, by justice always—as everything we do must be just—but, at the same time, by firmness. The minister in the discharge of his duties will be entitled to the co-operation, in this regard, of the members who come from the districts inhabited by Indians, and I for one propose to give him support in a policy of firmness in this matter. I purpose to support him against the operations of people who want to profit by agitation and stir up unrest among the Indians, because I came out of the department profoundly convinced that that is the attitude of mind that will be most useful and, indeed, most just on the part of my successor.

Mr. FORKE: I endorse the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen). I have lived for a great many years in very close proximity to a band of Indians, and I appreciate their child-like qualities. In many respects they are very easily imposed upon. I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will not think it egotistical on my part if I say that one of the things that gives me the greatest pride is that the Indians believe what I say, and I am just as pleased with that endorsement as I could be with a certificate of character from white people anywhere. I am sorry to say that the Indians where I live, that is the Oak Lake Indians, are almost always in a chronic state of pauperism. I do not think they are treaty Indians. They are not in receipt of any fixed income of any kind from the Dominion Government but are largely dependent on their own efforts for a livelihood. I cannot but think, Mr. Chairman, that the Indian question is one of the tragedies of our modern civilization, or perhaps it would be better to say of the progress of development in a new country, and I would like to impress upon the minister at this particular time the desirability of a most careful examination into all the conditions on our Indian reserves. I know individually the Indians in my own locality, I am thoroughly familiar with their circumstances, and my heart has bled for them many a time. We sometimes blame the Indian for the condition in which he finds himself. We say that he is not as persistent as he might be, and that he does not adapt himself to our modern way of living; but where in all history, have you ever found it possible for a people who have been living in a state of semi-barbarism to adapt themselves to civilization and all its methods of living just in one generation? We must treat these people with sympathy and consideration and give them

all the support and help that we possibly can. Unfortunately it is but too true that white people, to a very large extent, are blameable for a great many of the vices to which the Indians are addicted at the present time. When I knew the Indians on the Oak Lake or Pipestone reserve forty years ago they were a truthful people, you would trust them everywhere. To-day I am sorry to say, you cannot repose the same confidence in them, and I attribute that to their coming into contact with the white population dwelling all around them. That is a serious charge to make, but it is true. I hope the minister will give this class of our population his most serious attention and consideration.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What has been done with regard to the "greater production" scheme? Is it to be continued, and if so under what head shall we find the appropriation for it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not need any appropriation.

Mr. COOTE: While the minister is looking for an answer to that question I am prompted by the remarks of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) to say that I live a distance of sixty-five miles from the Blood reserve. The information that came to me emanated from a great many white people residing in the vicinity of that reserve, and I felt it my duty to bring the matter up as the Indians themselves are asking for an impartial investigation. I was very pleased to hear the minister say that he hopes to visit these reserves. If he will do that I am sure it will give great pleasure to the people who have been agitating in this matter. I would also like to say with respect to what my hon. friend from Brandon has said, that in talking with a former missionary on the Blood reserve he stated that the treatment which the Indians had received not only from their agents but from some white people living in the vicinity, was enough to make Bolshevists out of them. Under all the circumstances I hope that an impartial investigation will be held into the conditions which exist on that reserve with a view to seeing if the matter cannot be cleared up to the entire satisfaction of all concerned.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There is no vote for the "greater production" programme but there is a very substantial amount of cash on hand. Perhaps it would be interesting to the committee to know something about the scheme and the method adopted for closing it up. I may say that Mr. Graham has just left for the West and it is our desire that as soon as possible the area under cultivation under this scheme, and managed by Mr. Graham for the Government, shall either be turned over to the Indians to cultivate, or the work closed out in a manner that will not involve any loss to the department. On 20th February Mr. Graham showed a cash balance of $328,810.17. To this balance should be added cash, amounting to $32,055.41, which was realized for the cultivation of a farm which was handed over to the Blackfeet Indians to be paid for out of the Band's funds, making a total of $360,865. It is proposed to return at once to the department $250,000 from this amount, which will leave a cash balance of $110,066.21 in the hands of Mr. Graham to carry on his operations this year. That is, he turned over $250,000 of the original fund and retains $110,066.21 for the closing-out process. I may say that last year a very considerable proportion of this land was turned over to the young students who graduated from the schools, and that is the method by which we hope to dispose of the balance of the land under cultivation. It is not the intention of the department to continue the cultivation of this land purely as a departmental enterprise any longer than the time required to dispose of it. As soon as it can be turned over we shall, with just that speed, close out the greater production enterprise.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Can the minister inform the committee what the net profit was per acre each year the scheme was in operation, for example at the Blackfeet reserve?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that the department have that information. I presume it could be secured but it will take some considerable time. I would be very glad to prepare the information if it could be had by areas.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would draw the attention of the minister to the charges made by Dr. Bryce who was from 1904 until very recently Chief Medical Officer for the Indian Department. The charges made by Dr. Bryce against officers of the department, I think, are entitled to very serious consideration. Let me read two or three extracts from Dr. Bryce's report: The first reads:

> By Order in Council dated January 22nd, 1904, the writer was appointed Medical Inspector to the Department of Interior and of Indian

Affairs, and was entrusted with the health interests of the Indians of Canada.

Dr. Bryce goes on to say of himself:

For each year up to 1914 he wrote an annual report on the health of the Indians, published in the departmental report and on instruction from the minister made in 1907 a special investigation of thirty-five Indian schools in the three prairie provinces.

Dr. Bryce continues:

The annual medical reports from year to year made reference to the unsatisfactory health of the pupils, while different local medical officers urged greater action in view of the results of their experience from year to year.

Dr. Bryce, in conjunction with Dr. J. D. Lafferty examined the 243 children of eight schools in Alberta with the following results:

(a) Tuberculosis was present equally in children at every age; (b) In no instance was a child awaiting admission to school found free from tuberculosis; hence it was plain that infection was got in the home primarily; (c) The disease showed an excessive mortality in the pupils between five and ten years of age; (d) The 10,000 children of school age demanded the same attention as the thousand children coming up each year and entering the schools annually. Recommendations, made in this report, on much the same lines as those made in the report of 1907, followed the examination of the 243 children; but owing to the active opposition of Mr. D. C. Scott, and his advice to the then Deputy Minister, no action was taken by the Department to give effect to the recommendations made.

I would commend this report to the very serious consideration of the minister. I do not intend to discuss the matter at present but I shall bring it up at a future time, and I hope the minister will then be able to give some further information with respect to it.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I have not read the report mentioned by my hon. friend so that I cannot express any opinion upon it.

With respect to the request of my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland), I have the report here, but I know perfectly well, before giving it to him, that it is not the kind of statement that he is desirous of getting. It takes into account all costs in connection with operation and breaking land, and it shows a very large amount, of course, for which the department could get no remuneration, inasmuch as it is all turned over to the Indians. That would have to be deducted before I could give him the report. However I will be glad to get that information for him.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister gave us the items covering $41,760 in the general expenses of this item, but there is still $294,045, general expenses, not accounted for by the items he gave us, and in this connection I would like to deal on general principles with this matter of general and miscellaneous expenses appearing in every item brought down by every minister. Not wishing to criticize this more than any of the other departments. I find in this whole vote there is an item of $487,160 that is attributed to the different provinces as general expenses and miscellaneous expenditure, not itemized at all. Then we find a separate vote, item 281, $157,500, for general expenses, making a total of over $600,000. On general principles I think there is too much money voted as general expenses or miscellaneous expenses, without explanation of what it is for. The tendency seems to be growing, as I observe these items are larger than last year. I think we criticized these votes for general expenses last year, and I think we should warn, not only the minister for Indian Affairs, but the others as well, that in the future we will expect more of an itemized account when votes are asked for expenditure for purposes of government. I think it is no more than right that the House should have the information.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I confess I did not follow my hon. friend.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was referring to the matter of items in each of these votes for each province for Indian affairs under general or miscellaneous expenses, without any items, amounting in a great many cases to more than half the vote. If it were a small vote it would not be so bad, although the principle is the same. I was not criticising the estimates of this department any more than any other department, but I think there is too great a tendency with the ministers to ask for a vote in the shape of a blank cheque, without giving the items the expenditure is required for. I find in the part of the item for the different provincial votes for Indians an amount of $487,160. Then there is a separate vote for general expenses of $157,500.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): For the Northwest?

Mr. CALDWELL: No, in the general vote, No. 281.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We are dealing at the moment with the vote for the territories; $85,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: I know that, but I was just summing up the amount of the total vote, put in as general expenses. It amounts to $644,660.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The hon. gentleman is objecting to the total miscellaneous vote for the Indian Department, although it is allocated to various provinces and the amounts given for the various provinces.

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not know that I can meet that objection unless we bring down a statement for the various services for which they are used, but in the aggregate it looks like a large amount. Taken by provinces it is not very serious. For example the votes for the provinces are: Manitoba, $14,827; Saskatchewan, $13,158; Alberta, $9,868. This, with the $47,000, makes a total of $85,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Where do you get the $47,000? If this were a small item it would not look so bad.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I will give the allocation of the whole $335,000. The salaries amount to $152,990.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are salaries included in this?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Oh, yes. I will give the amounts making up the $335,825. They are as follows:

Salaries	$152,990
Employees rations	34,900
Miscellaneous	85,023
Fuel, feed and light	18,181
Livestock	2,050
Equipment	10,719
Buildings	31,924

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not objecting to the vote on the ground that possibly it is not needed, but I say that these items should be given in the vote. For instance, in the other provinces the items for salaries are given, and there is no item in this as salaries. Apparently the minister has the details.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The provinces are all alike in that respect. The salaries are not given, except lumped as they are here. If any hon. gentleman desires to know what any particular agent is getting in the way of salary, I can give him the information.

Mr. CALDWELL: In the Nova Scotia vote we find $6,240 for salaries, in New Brunswick, $3,184, and in Prince Edward Island $1,160. In British Columbia there is an item of $72,730. The salaries are not itemized in this vote.

Item agreed to.

Indians—Yukon, $15,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are carrying items at a speed just a little too fast for the celerity of my mind. The previous item is for $38,060 "miscellaneous and unforeseen", as against $19,560 last year, virtually a doubling of the estimates for the unforeseen. How can the minister know what is going to be unforeseen so accurately as that? Last year there was no increase at all.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Under the heading of "Office, miscellaneous and unforeseen" $19,560 was appropriated in 1921-22. It is anticipated that the same amount will be required to meet expenses in 1922-23, and that, in addition, it will be necessary to provide $18,500 for expenditure as follows:

5 p.m.

To provide for irrigation work on Kamloops Reserve, No. 1, which is in the "dry belt"		$12,000
To provide for payment of taxes which have been levied in the West Nicomen dyking district for dyking on the Sumas Indian Reserves, Nos. 4 and 10, on Nicomen Island, in the New Westminster agency, which work became necessary under the British Columbia dyking regulations. This year the interest and sinking fund charges amounted to	$ 312	
The upkeep to	150	
The maintenance charge was.	1,400	
		1,862
Probably the maintenance charge will be less next year. The total cost, therefore, is estimated at		1,500
To provide for alterations to Babine Agency House at Hazelton		3,000
To supplement band funds in defraying cost of dam at outlet of Scowkin creek and to irrigate approximately 500 acres of land south of the Thompson river, Kamloops agency, Department of Interior in charge of work		2,000

Item agreed to.

Indians—general, $157,500.

Mr. CALDWELL: Along the line of my recent criticism, I should like to know what these general expenses are.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see the decrease here is really not a decrease at all. The $39,000 is simply taken out of this appropriation and transferred to the appropriation for the Northwest Territories.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, for the payment of Treaty No. 11, which appeared in the Estimates, but it is a transfer only.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an obligation that we have to pay, and it comes under the Northwest Territories appropriation instead of under this, so that, in the end, the estimates for Indian Affairs will be increased very substantially, by something like $140,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have covered practically all of the decreases inasmuch as we shall have to come down with supplementaries covering the decrease in the educational item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no decrease in this at all, and there is no decrease in education; at least, what decrease there is, is going to be made up in the supplementaries?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Indian Education, $1,226,643.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Does this item cover anything outside of salaries and such like in connection with education?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The appropriation for the fiscal year, 1922-23 is divided as follows:

Per capita grants for residential schools:—		
Ontario	$119,375	
Manitoba	118,305	
Saskatchewan	142,180	
Alberta & N.W.T.	145,225	
British Columbia	173,800	
Yukon	14,300	
		$ 713,185
Bonus for residential schools at $20 per capita		100,000
Salaries for day school teachers and matrons:		
Prince Edward Island	$ 850	
Nova Scotia	5,250	
New Brunswick	5,750	
Quebec	20,265	
Ontario	22,600	
Manitoba	30,470	
Saskatchewan	20,630	
Alberta & N.W.T.	6,810	
British Columbia	41,025	
Yukon	5,520	
		159,170
Inspection of schools		9,000
Tuition and assistance to graduates		4,000
Fuel, rental, janitors, truant officers		27,000
Transportation of pupils		3,000
Class-room equipment, texts, stationery, desks		16,000
Repairs, alterations and day school buildings		195,288
Total		$1,226,643

Mr. SHAW: I confess that it is with some apprehension that I receive the reason of the minister for the reduction in this estimate for educational purposes. I am not blaming the minister, but to my mind it would seem to be a reflection on the officials of his department, because if there is one thing we must be particularly careful about it is to see that our treaty obligations with respect to education are fully and completely discharged. I say that, Mr. Chairman, also in the light of the fact that in answer to a question which I addressed to the minister with regard to the Stony reserve school namely: How many Indian children are there at the present time of school age on the Stony reserve at Morley, Alberta?—I was informed: "Approximately, 110." The information which I have been given indicates that there are probably 140 children of school age on that reserve, so I take it that "approximately" has perhaps a very wide interpretation in the department. The second question and answer were:

> Q. What provision, if any, has been made for the education of such Indian children?
> A. No provision since boarding school was closed in 1908 and the last day school closed in 1919.

Now, I suggest that that is a most tragic state of affairs, and I am delighted to know that the minister proposes to visit some of these Indian reserves during the coming year. If he will take the trouble—and I am sure he will—to visit the Stony Indian reserve, he will find the request for educational facilities for the children in that particular reserve comes from the Indians themselves. That band of Indians do realize, so I am informed—at least, a number of them—the necessity for educating their children and they are anxious that acommodation should be provided.

I should like the minister to give us his general idea as to how he proposes to carry on the education of the Indian children, and to co-ordinate with that education the taking care of their health, the gravity of which matter, I am sure, he fully appreciates. I do not know the policy of the former government, but I understand that in relation to the province of Alberta at least the intention is to erect a school at Edmonton and to transport the Stony reserve and other Indian children from points over two hundred miles distant and keep them there at school, transporting them back to their parents, I presume, at the end of the school year. I am frank to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not very much sympathy with that method of edu-

cation, especially where you find at least 120 children on the reserve of school age whose parents are anxious to secure school facilities. I should like the minister to give us some indication of the policy of his department in connection with educational affairs, and to advise us if he has any intention of co-ordinating his health with his educational activities.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I must confess that my knowledge of the particular reserve my hon. friend has mentioned is rather limited. From what I have observed of the system followed in the northern portions of Alberta, I would be in favour of recommending its continuance. There the children are gathered into schools, largely under the supervision of various religious bodies, and are provided not only with a good, sound general education, but are given religious instruction as well, which I think is decidedly helpful to them. My hon. friend has questioned the wisdom of that policy being carried out in all cases. The Indians on the Morley reserve may be of a different type, but from what I have observed of Indians generally, unless they are settled down at farming very few of them continue to reside in any particular spot during the entire summer season. Therefore the children can be better educated in schools of the character I have mentioned than in rural public schools such as we have throughout Western Canada. There may be cases where the rural public school system could be carried out, but I am inclined to think that the other method would be more successful. When the Supplementary Estimates are brought down, the vote for education will come up for discussion. A great many problems enter into the education of the Indian child, and it seems to me that a more lasting impression—I may be wrong about this—can be created in the mind of the individual child in the church boarding school, where the child is living continuously over a stated period, than when it is attending intermittently a local school, as undoubtedly would be the case in connection with any school of the character of our public schools. My own opinion at the moment is that the education of the Indian child can be managed much more successfully at such a boarding school.

Dealing with the whole question, I find this difficulty—that the religious organizations are pressing very strongly for increased facilities in the way of buildings for educational purposes. There is no doubt that I could ask the committee for a very large sum of money to be spent in this way. But I am going to ask for a considerable vote to repair some of the buildings that the clergymen in charge claim are almost useless, in order to avoid a heavy capital outlay all at once, and year by year, and to endeavour to meet the necessities of the case by expenditure of this character in the construction of new buildings. The whole matter is bound up between the department and the religious organizations that have undertaken this work. I think a great deal of credit is due to those religious organizations for what they have done and the sacrifices that many of them have made, particularly in the outlying portions of Canada, in connection with their work among the Indians.

With respect to the health of the Indians, the hon. gentleman has introduced another very difficult problem. I know the difficulty of handling the situation in our own province among the white population, and it is much more difficult to handle among our Indian population. Perhaps tuberculosis is the most serious menace we have to face to-day. I am not prepared on this occasion to make any statement with respect to what ought to be done, or what would be the policy of the Government, except to say that I am prepared to give the matter the most careful consideration, with a view to adopting that method which appears likely to produce the best results, and to stop, as far as is within the power of the Government, the ravages of this disease among our Indian population.

Mr. MILLAR: I wish to ask if the grants to the different educational institutions carried on by the various religious bodies are included in this item of $1,226,000. I would like to say a word in regard to educating the Indians in those institutions carried on by religious organizations. I have not had much opportunity of comparing the results of the two methods; I have seen the results on one side only. I live not far from an institution carried on by one of the religious bodies, and I must say that the results there are very satisfactory—so much so indeed, that it is my belief that the method suggested by the minister is preferable to that advocated by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw).

Mr. MEIGHEN: To what school does the hon. member refer?

Mr. MILLAR: Fort Qu'Appelle.

Mr. SHAW: I am not suggesting that the policy followed by the department was not a correct one. I am suggesting that in this particular case, where there are 140 children available, that policy might be followed—not at Edmonton, however, but on the reserve itself.

Mr. MILLAR: In the school to which I refer there are nearly 200 pupils, and they are making remarkable progress. The improvement in their manners is noticeable, and I can understand that their instruction by efficient teachers would have much to do with preventing the spread of tuberculosis. One of the greatest difficulties is to get the Indian to realize the danger of spreading the disease. With the children in an institution of this kind, the necessity of cleanliness will become apparent to them, and during their whole afterlife, as they move among their own people, the value of that education will be demonstrated. As I say, I have not had an opportunity of judging of the beneficial effects of the other methods of education, but this method is certainly very successful.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had not seen the answer to the question put by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), and as I was responsible myself when this action was taken I want to make a statement about it. In the first place, I really, with all respect, want to suggest that the answer is not correct. It is not complete; it gives an impression that really cannot be true. I remember very well coming to the conclusion that the day school as a means of educating young children had failed. As to the soundness of that conclusion I had no doubt at all; and in pursuance of it, day schools one by one were closed and we resorted in toto to the policy that we never had abandoned, of educating through institutional schools—large boarding schools under religious supervision. When this school was closed it doubtless was in pursuance of that policy; but to say it left these Indians wholly without any institution to which they could go for instruction and education is surely not correct. I remember, even in very difficult times, the acquirement of a tract of land for the purpose of going on at once with the building of the Edmonton school to take the place, among others—two or three—of the one that was at Red Deer.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The difficulty is that the building has not been put up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well; but has the Red Deer school been closed, and is there no school in Alberta to which they can go?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, it cannot be correct; that was never my intention.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: The Red Deer school is within a very few miles of my own home, and I have been there a great deal. It is a fact that that school has been closed and that the children have been practically transferred to Edmonton. In fact, that was the condition of the agreement on which the church which owned the property relinquished it. I am sorry to say that as far as I have been able to ascertain, the bulk of the children who had been attending the Red Deer school now attend no school at all, because the school at Edmonton, which was to have taken care of them, is not in operation—in fact, is not constructed. Most of the children in that district, therefore, are at present without adequate means of instruction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Neither the Red Deer nor the Edmonton school was intended to be the only school in the province. I have not, of course, looked the matter up preparatory to this discussion, but I remember now that the Red Deer school was in a somewhat dilapidated condition, and either unsafe or unhealthy for the pupils. But this I am positive of; it never was the intention of the department while I was Superintendent General that those Indians or any others should be without opportunity of attendance at an educational institution. I hope that since that time nothing of the kind has been allowed to take place.

Let me say, on the general question as to the means of education, that the day school is a failure. It was tried for many years; it had a long, winding, struggling, but by no means successful existence. The Indian, to be educated, must be in an environment that permits of education. You cannot get it on the Indian reserve; you cannot get it around his parent's home. There the Indian is under the influence of his parent; the parent is not very anxious that the child attend school, and there is a constant battle between the parent and the department in an endeavour to secure the child's attendance. The influences of the reserve are wholly alien to the purposes of

education. Furthermore,—hon. members can give such explanation of it as appears sound to them; I can come to no other conclusion—I do not believe you can ever educate Indian children unaccompanied by religious instruction, and you cannot have religious instruction unless you have it, for these purposes at all events, under religious denominations. For these reasons, therefore, only a boarding school such as is to be established at Edmonton, such as we have had always through the western country, is the institution for the care of the Indian child. Never was the intention that there should be an interregnum during which it would not be possible for children in any reserve to receive their education. Instead of the department having been niggardly during all these years in the matter of providing Indian schools, I am disposed to think it provided rather too many. That may not apply to Alberta, but it applies elsewhere. Why, I know of competition, fighting among different schools to get enough pupils to warrant the carrying on of the school at all.

Mr. FORKE: The Elkhorn school was closed, was it not?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, and precisely because of that. It has been established by experience that the larger institution gets better results: you can educate the children at a lower cost per capita and obtain a better grade of instruction, a more rounded education. As an example, the Qu'Appelle school to which the hon. member refers could be instanced. I have been through that school myself and I know the work it does. It is a large school; you should have a school of about that size to get the best results. On the whole, therefore instead of too few, I think we have had too many. I should be sincerely sorry, no one more so, if, through accident or any other cause, there has been allowed an interregnum in Alberta when there was no access to some suitable institution for all Indian children there.

The matter of health is still greater; at least, whether it is a greater question or not, it is more difficult. The Indian is disposed to tuberculosis. Why? Because Indian life, through the influences of civilization, has been changed. Down through the generations the Indian has led a wild life, roaming the prairies and the woods, and just in proportion as you coddle him and enable him to lead a life of ease, to that extent is he likely to drift into tuberculosis. One of the essentials is to enable him to take the gradations, from his old state to his new mode of life, by degrees, and to help him,—nay, compel him—as far as possible to live an outdoor life. That is one of the important things, and in pursuance of that policy the department, under my supervision, endeavoured, and successfully endeavoured, to re-establish the herds of reindeer up in the Ungava district, the eastern shore of Hudson bay, and elsewhere as well, in order that the Indian and the Eskimo might have means of livelihood in a manner comparable with those their ancestors had. We found that no matter how liberally or completely we supplied them with the means of living, and as rapidly as we did so, in that proportion the Indians were being eliminated by the ravages of tuberculosis. The same thing holds true throughout the length and breadth of the Indian world in this country. Of course, besides that, as my hon. friend says, the educational institutions do good in teaching habits of cleanliness and the prevention and spread of the plague, and so forth. But I think that most can be done by such a policy as puts the Indian on his resources and makes it his business to work in the open in order to gain the livelihood he must have. The worst thing you can do for him is to provide such conditions as enable him to live at ease—although, of course, that life would not satisfy white men—and without that hard work in the open air which made the ancestors of the Indians healthy and strong.

Mr. LEWIS: I am not so much interested just now in the merits or demerits of education under religious bodies or under a national system, because I presume that this subject will come up later for discussion. At least, we have been so informed by the minister. But I am interested in the education of Indian children, and in view of the statement of the minister that the educational authorities in the religious bodies were asking for increased estimates, I should like to know what accounts for the reduction in this estimate. Looking over the estimates as a whole I find that the amount is about the same as last year. In three or four places there is a large increase, but the large increase in connectioin with the three prairie provinces seems to have been deducted from the item for education in order to level the totals. Has there been any cause for this reduction? Are there fewer children today than there were a year ago, or fewer schools in operation, requiring a smaller

number of teachers? We should know these things before voting for this reduction, because we believe to-day that education is one of the most important subjects. There is something else I want to ask in regard to the health situation, as referred to by the leader of the Opposition. Are the religious schools subject to the same supervision in regard to air space and light as schools under the public system, or do the churches build schools promiscuously according to their own plans? If not, must those plans conform to certain federal regulations?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friend could not have been in the chamber earlier in the afternoon. I made an explanation covering the question.

Mr. LEWIS: Your explanation was as regards the repairing of buildings. You did not explain the reduction.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I explained that the reduction of $100,000 odd is made up in an increase elsewhere for repairs, and I stated that we would come down at a later date with supplementary estimates asking for a necessary sum for educational purposes. In the general estimates we are asking for an increased expenditure, which we have discussed item by item, and later on we will ask for practically the same amount as voted last year for education. With regard to the question of ventilation, air space per pupil, and so forth, I have no definite knowledge, but I should judge that this has been left to the bodies who build the schools. Possibly a great deal of attention may not have been paid to that particular matter, but in the newer bulidings which are being constructed by the Government it is being given the fullest consideration. Indeed, the plans are prepared practically by the architect in the department.

Mr. WARNER: I desire some information regarding the prospect of a new building at Edmonton. I have been asked to inquire regarding that matter, and I should like to know if there is likely to be any provision in the supplementary estimates for the erection of a new building there. I understand that there have already been erected other buildings on the farm that has been purchased in connection with the Indian school, but there is no suitable school building yet. It seems that it is necessary, in order to properly carry on the work of education there, that there should be a new building. The lack of a proper building has been a handicap for the last three years since the school was moved from Red Deer to that district. I have had several conversations with the man in charge, Mr. Woodworth, and since coming here have received several letters. The people are anxious to know whether they are going to have this building in the near future. I believe, as has been suggested by the leader of the Opposition and some other hon. members, that the religious organizations can best take care of Indian education. For the greater part of my life I have been in a position to observe the education of Indians, and it is my opinion that this education can be better conducted by the religious bodies than by any system of education on the reserves. I do not think there is any doubt but that the result is better. We are trying to educate these children to live as civilized people live, but on the reserve there is a greater influence retarding their progress in that direction than there is in districts where religious bodies can care for them entirely outside of and apart from the reserve. I understand that not only are children coming to this school from the old Red Deer school but that they are also coming from other localities in Alberta, or should do so when once arrangements have been made to take care of them. As my colleague from Red Deer has stated, many of these children who should at present be under instruction at Edmonton are receiving no instruction at all. The result is they are forgetting the religious and other knowledge which has already been imparted to them and are going back instead of progressing. I would like to have some information as to whether we are likely to have an appropriation in the supplementary estimates for the building at Edmonton, and if so what the character of the edifice will be?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I may say that on two occasions since becoming minister I have been visited by the representatives of all the religious bodies, who apparently come together to discuss this matter annually with the department, and a great deal of pressure, in favour of construction has been brought to bear by the Methodist body who are interested in this school. I think there can be no question but that the school is deserving of consideration and that there is a necessity for it. However, that does not mean that Alberta is being entirely neglected in so far as education is concerned because there are twenty-two other points at which educa-

tional facilities are offered, although perhaps not to the extent they should be, by this particular religious organization. What the leader of the Opposition has just pointed out I find to be true, namely, that there is considerable rivalry between the organizations as to who shall have the larger proportion of the amounts voted, and that each particular organization shall get its full share of consideration. It is one of the positions in public life where you have to be politic and delicate as well. It is a case in which you have to use your judgment as to what can be done, or as to what can be spent for the extension of this work. The matter of the Edmonton building is still under consideration by the department and I shall be able to give a fuller explanation when the supplementary estimates come down—that is the supplementaries because we have not asked for any new vote for the beginning of this school in the general estimates. Still, I have not decided not to ask for some consideration for this particular building this year. The difficulty is this: Apparently every one of the organizations has old buildings of the character mentioned by the leader of the Opposition —old buildings that should be abandoned. In regard to some of them, I am recommending a small expenditure for the continuation of the work for another year. At least one of them in British Columbia is represented to me as being dangerous to the pupils and liable to fall down upon them. But even so, I am taking chances and asking for a small sum of money for one more year hoping that perhaps prices will have been reduced next year. I want the committee to understand that any delay is not with the idea of depriving the Indian children of a year's education but rather that we may have fuller information. Then there is this other feature—and I think my hon. friend will understand the situation—that in delaying with the question you have to keep in mind the outlook as a whole and treat all fairly in comparison with the value of the work they are performing. That is also part of our difficulty. I will be very glad to answer my hon. friend, perhaps, more fully when we are discussing the supplementary estimates. All I can say at present is that the matter is under consideration as far as the Edmonton building is concerned.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like to know whether the minister is yet in possession of the information I asked him for earlier in the sitting in regard to the illegal cutting of timber on the Tobique reserve last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I do not appear to have that information yet but I will get it for my hon. friend.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton): Will the minister be good enough to give the names of the different religious bodies that are carrying on this work and the rule that is followed in allocating the government grants to them?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The government grants are not allocated to them as religious bodies; the grants are on a per capita basis according to the work performed. The religious denominations are—Roman Catholic, Church of England, Presbyterian and Methodist. These are the religious bodies that are carrying on this work.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are the Baptists doing any of this work?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not sure, but I know that the denominations I have mentioned are.

Mr. COOTE: Would the minister tell us how many Indian schools there are in Alberta and the number of children in attendance? The feeling is prevalent in Alberta that we have not enough schools to educate the children.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We do not happen to have the figures grouped separately. In the case in question they are for Alberta and the North West Territories. For that area there are 8 day schools; 22 boarding schools; and 1 industrial school. The number of pupils enrolled are: Day schools 198, boarding schools 1,020, industrial school 44. The average attendance is: day schools 77, boarding schools 886, industrial school 40.

Mr. COOTE: Is the Indian school at Dunbow open now, and if so how many pupils are in attendance?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Is it the High River school my hon. friend has reference to?

Mr. COOTE: Yes.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are 50 pupils in attendance.

Item agreed to.

Mines and Geological Survey—amount required by the Lignite Utilization Board for expenses in connection with the carbonizing and briquetting of lignite coal, $125,000.

Mr. GOULD: Some time ago I placed a question on the Order Paper concerning the briquetting plant at Bienfait, Saskatchewan. The replies to my question indicate that the plant is closed down at the present time. I desire to ask if this item has to do with the research work that is being carried on, which I maintain is a national necessity, and should be considered as a national expenditure, because the results obtained from these experiments may be available for any other industry or organization in Canada. I see the vote has been reduced, and I should like to know, if possible, why it has been reduced.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am very much interested in scientific research, as my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) appears to be. This is one of the problems that came under my notice since I became minister. There is no intention of discontinuing experiments. Without going into a detailed report of what has happened there, I may say, in the first place, that the organization which controls this experiment is the Research Council. The money is voted through the Mines Department and it became a live question with me, because of the fact that they had expended the appropriation last year and were out of funds. I was desirous of knowing what stage the experiment had reached and what they had learned by that experiment, and I had some difficulty in ascertaining the facts, but I think sufficient has been discovered to warrant continuance, at least for another year, of this experiment. I know my hon. friend will agree with me that it will be very important to low-grade lignite fields in the vicinity of this plant and to all low-grade lignite coal fields in Canada. The experiment had proved fairly successful up to the point of the carbonizing. They had some difficulty with the feeding of the carbonizing units. I think one of the questions asked by my hon. friend related to the damage done by an explosion up there. They have had some difficulty with the six units of the carbonizing plant. We are suggesting that they continue the experiment with one or two units only, to prove that the carbonizing, under the system they have adopted for the experiment is going to be successful without changing all of the units, and then to prove that the briquetting will also be successful. As this plant was built for experimental purposes, very great saving can be made in the construction of a new plant elsewhere. In the meantime we are asking for sufficient funds to prove the experiment in a small way, leaving the question of the possibility of the manufacture of those briquets, as a commercial undertaking, for another experiment altogether. I do not want to criticize anything that has been done in the past, but I do think it is impossible to combine a commercial experiment with a scientific experiment in connection with this problem. Therefore, we are anxious to devote this money to the purpose of pursuing the experiment in order to first prove that it is possible that the experiment will be successful, and then afterwards to work out the commercial problem. We are not asking for a large sum of money. Explanations have been given to the provincial governments and both have agreed to assist with the money in carrying out this particular experiment.

Mr. GOULD: The next question I would ask is perhaps unfair to the minister, but it is known that the deposits of coal tributary to this district cross the international boundary or the 49th parallel. I have wondered if the minister has any information as to, or whether he has seen, any of the experiments carried on by the United States similar to those carried on at Bienfait.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes, they have been carried on in Dakota. New Jersey has also carried on similar experiments.

Mr. GOULD: I was prompted to place the question on the Order Paper because I heard of the explosion to which I referred and I went to the plant in my car the same afternoon. A goodly number of pressmen had arrived, but the manager would not allow them to look the plant over; however, he courteously allowed me to go through, and, during the visit to the plant, I met the individuals who were experimenting with the binder for the holding up of the coal after it had gone through the carbonizer. At that time I think there were five small carbonizers being tested there, and one had previously been condemned. That is the one which was the cause of the explosion, but they were testing it out once more, under a different supervision, to see if it could not be made use of before being abandoned altogether. I understood the

carbonizers which would not stand the test would be replaced by those which were successful, and larger ones installed perhaps. But it seemed difficult to find a binder that would hold the ignite coal up under strong heat, and that is the reason I asked why the vote was being reduced, because I am very much interested in the work of the scientific department, and I had hoped they would soon make it a real success, so that, as a commercial asset, this lignite would be available for the people of the country. I believe there is enough coal in that southeastern country to energize all the wheels of industry in the southern parts of Saskatchewan, and I would urge upon the Government to explore the Bienfait coal fields on behalf of the people who live tributary to that point.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I share with my hon. friend some doubts as to the success of this experiment, and I do not want to ask Parliament for money unless we feel that success is in sight. I want to back up at every stage scientific research, but before venturing on heavy expenditure for plant to carry out scientific work, I think we should have a fair amount of assurance that there is going to be some success. I have been very much interested in this experiment. I had a long conversation with the chemist in charge, Dr. Stanfield, when last in the city of Edmonton. After discussing the matter very thoroughly with him and after having, since that time, had a report from him with respect to the whole experiment, I am convinced that there is a strong possibility that this experiment will prove successful. My hon. friend has, perhaps, touched the one doubtful phase of the experiment, that is, the briquetting rather than the carbonizing. We are, however, going to go to work at that, to ascertain all we can as to what success our friends across the line have had in this particular field, and to apply scientifically if we can, all we know about these experiments to the experiment at Bienfait this summer. There is, in the department, a report made upon the matter from the standpoint of commercial possibility but really we must first prove the possibility of the experiment itself before attempting to make it commercially possible.

Mr. LOGAN: How much has been spent altogether in the experiments?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): About $820,000.

Mr. SHAW: I take it that the first item for organization and equipment of the explosives division has reference to the Explosives Act, which was brought into force by proclamation a couple of years ago. I presume the equipment is for the purpose of testing explosives and determining matters of that kind. Has the minister considered the advisability of having that work done by the arsenal authorities under the Militia Department?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think my hon. friend will agree as to the necessity of this work; but the matter that he has just raised is one that the Government will have under consideration this year. It has come up from various angles, and I confess I am in favour of making a thorough exploration, at least, into various activities of the Government that seem to be duplicated. I cannot speak with authority; but as regards the explosives division, I can readily understand its great necessity and value for the safety of the public, as regards testing the safety and strength of explosives.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

For investigation of mineral resources or deposits; of the mining and metallurgical industries, and of mineral technology, wages, expenses of testing and research laboratories. For publications, English and French editions of reports; purchase of books, laboratory supplies, instruments; miscellaneous assistance and contingencies, $184,500.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): The minister might explain the increase here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I cannot locate the details of this particular item except to say that there is an increase of $10,000 in the mineral resources division to provide for marking the mineral deposits found in the various provinces. The major portion of the $5,700 required for ore-dressing plants goes to British Columbia. These plants appear to be necessary in order to bring our minerals to the attention of the general public. There is an addition of $2,000 for investigation of road materials and clay products. My information from the department is that the clay products industry is assuming more importance yearly, and that in order to carry on the investigational and chemical work in connection therewith this increase is necessary. In the fuel and fuel testing

item there is an increase of $900; a reduction of $5,900 in connection with the peat investigation work, and an increase of $18,300 in the other three divisions.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): In connection with the investigation of clay deposits, has anything been done along this line in Saskatchewan during the past year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Nothing in the past year.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I see an item for wages—which I presume is investigation of wages—occurs in the Labour Department as well as in this department. Does each department do the same work, or is this particular item with respect to a different line of investigation?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the wages of the men in the field.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I notice $100,000 for the establishment of an ore-dressing plant in British Columbia is left out. Needless to say, no part of the money voted last year for that purpose was spent. Has the Government wholly abandoned the idea of establishing an ore-dressing plant?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The matter came up particularly on the representation of members representing constituencies in the interior of British Columbia. The department has not abandoned the idea entirely, but has come to the conclusion that it would be well to delay construction of the necessary plant for another year at least. The information I get from interested parties is that this expenditure will have to be made in the interests of the mining industry of British Columbia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government seems to have a cold shoulder for British Columbia generally. Is the minister from that province inactive? So far, all the Government needed to know was that something was to be done there when they abandoned it permanently, or temporarily —which, perhaps may be only a disguise for permanence. There is no doubt as to the need of it; not at all. Outside of that there is an increase of $12,400 which the minister has given some explanation of. Is there any possibility of a saving in the publications? They should be cheaper now than before.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My right hon. friend means, I suppose, that the printing should not cost so much. I cannot say as to that; I have no information. The deputy minister informs me that at present the publications are all used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the money all used?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Of last year's vote, $12,568 was not used. I do not see why the printing should be very much larger than a year ago; the demand for publications should be about the same throughout the years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the minister might have saved $10,000 here.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It does not appear as though the full amount would be required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish to be pressing it unduly, because I have quite a lot of confidence in the departmental officials, but I suggest that the minister himself move to reduce that vote. May I ask the Government if they purpose to continue the services of the Editorial Committee? It is as appropriate to put the question on this occasion as on any other. About three years ago the late government established an editorial committee composed of three practical men in the service, one of whom is from his own department—Mr. Lynch. The business of this committee was to review all printed matter for all the departments where they thought money could be saved, because the expenses of printing were becoming prodigious and it was difficult for the minister to tell whether all printing asked for was necessary or not. Wherever they thought there could be reduction of the amount of printing done, the matter was taken up with the proper officer and gone into thoroughly. In practically every case, of course, the officer resisted; but by the persistence of the committee, which reported to a permanent subcommittee of Council,—I cannot recall the exact amount they saved to the country, but I know it ran into the millions, although there was no penury applied to the publication work of the government. I hope it is the intention of the Government to continue that committee, because if the work is abandoned it will not be long until all these publication items start to rise in amount.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand that this committee examines the printing in all departments, so that it would not affect only this vote. It would be a matter of the importance or necessity of the publications issued.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might, perhaps, answer the leader of the Opposition on that point. It is true, as my right hon. friend has said, that this committee has been revising the different publications. It is also true that two members of the committee are chosen from other departments to carry on these duties in addition to their regular work. They have represented to the Government quite recently that there should be some extra consideration in view of that additional service. If the work of the committee is as important as my right hon. friend indicates, probably the members of it might well give their entire time to those duties rather than be withdrawn from their work in other departments. The Government has thought it wise to look into the work of the Editorial Committee when the present session is over, along with the work of some other officials of the Government. In the meantime, the committee will continue.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My comment on the Prime Minister's statement is this. The difficult part of the Editorial Committee's work is done. The continuance from now on will not take anything like the amount of their time that the initial part took, as one can easily understand. This committee, consisting of Mr. Cook, Mr. Lynch and Mr. O'Hara, had to acquaint themselves with the details of the publications of every department of the government. They were able to do that and carry on their work as well; and they did their work very thoroughly. While, of course, there is no objection to the work being looked into I want to say right here that there is a lot more that might be looked into with better advantage than the work of the Editorial Committee. What I am anxious about is that it be continued. I do not think it is necessary to get men to give all their time to it. These men are capable of doing it and performing their other services as well. I am not in favour of additional remuneration to servants of the Crown, but if ever there was a case in which additional remuneration could be justified it is this one. I am not making any statement as to whether they should be allowed something or not for what they did. The great body of the work, the difficult part of it, is done. Speaking generally, though, as a principle, I think that servants of the Crown should be paid a salary and be expected to give all their time, for that salary, in whatever sphere the Government directs them to act.

[Mr. Charles Stewart.]

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I think on examination I can recommend a reduction in that $40,000 of $8,000. I move that the item be reduced by that sum.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. GARDINER: Is any investigation being made into the tar sands of Alberta? What has been done in the past, and with what result?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Ells has been employed by the department and for a number of years has carried on investigational work there. There is a great deal of investigational work done outside the purview of the Government in the matter of the development of tar sand, but Mr. Ells is the special investigating officer of the Government. There is a full report published by him on his work there.

Item as amended agreed to.

Dominion of Canada Assay Office—for maintenance of Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C., $26,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What are the receipts from this office?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We have not the exact information before us, but I am informed there are about $4,000,000 annually.

Item agreed to.

Geological Survey, $332,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In connection with the surveys, I addressed myself, shortly before leaving the department, to the question as to whether or not the survey work of the Government as conducted in many departments, in the Interior Department, in the Mines Department, in the Indian Lands, and, as well, in the Militia Department, could not be brought together under one branch of one department and thereby a considerable saving be made. I had a committee at work on it when I left. Has the minister given any attention to that question?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The same question was raised by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the other night, but I did not have the information then. The committee to which my hon. friend refers consists of the following gentlemen: for the Department of Interior, Dr. Deville and Mr. Thomas Shanks, assistant surveyor general; for the Militia Department, Major J. B. Cochrane and Colonel S. H. Osler, and for the Mines Department Dr. W. H. Collins and Mr. W. H. Boyd,

chief topographical engineer. The work of this committee is to see that there is no overlapping in connection with examination, and to provide for the preparation of maps, in regard to which, again, they see that there is no overlapping. The board has authority to advise on all questions that may arise in relation to topographical surveys, outline maps, modes of projection and selection, unification and improvement of scales, uniformity of symbols and conventional signs, the use of colours, and other topographical subjects.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would my observations on the previous vote for publications not equally apply here? I refer to the item of $60,000. There has been a reduction of $5,000, and it occurred to me that a larger one could be made. What was the amount spent last year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There was spent last year $42,409.78, and we have made a reduction of $5,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It should be $15,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is cutting it rather close, in view of the fact that the amount has been subject to careful supervision by the committee in charge.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is nothing that went up faster in price, and should come down faster, than the preparation of maps.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can assure the committee that I have no desire to have more money than is necessary. However, I move that we cut the appropriation by $10,000 which, with the $5,000 already deducted, makes a reduction of $15,000.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was done last year in respect of the purchase of specimens, and is anything special contemplated this year?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend mean museum specimens?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, geological specimens.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am informed that last year the purchases consisted of specimens of birds and minerals. I think they formed the largest items of the purchases that were made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I had in mind was whether the department was securing any of the dinosaurs that have been found in Alberta. I would hardly think the department would get them at the prices they paid last year. Is any effort being made to secure one of the largest of these specimens for our own museum?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand there are specimens in the museum already.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some of the largest specimens?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): So I understand.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Comparable with the largest that have been found, one of those tremendous specimens we have been hearing so much about lately?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I was in the museum last Saturday and there are some fairly large specimens set up there. I do not know whether there are any larger ones in existence or not.

Item agreed to.

Grant to the Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, $3,000.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This vote has been in existence for as far back as I have made examination.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the amount the same?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is the same as last year. It is intended to defray the cost of the publications of the Institute, and in general to meet the expense incurred by the Institute in promoting the interest and general welfare of mining in the Dominion.

Item agreed to.

Grant to Imperial Mineral Resources Bureau. $7,300.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I wonder if the minister would mind explaining in a word or two just what the functions of the Imperial Resources Bureau are?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The functions of the bureau as stated are:

(1) To collect, co-ordinate, and disseminate information as to resources, production, treatment, consumption and requirements of every mineral and metal.

(2) To ascertain the scope of existing agencies, with a view ultimately, to avoid any unnecessary overlapping that may prevail.

(3) To devise means whereby existing agencies can if necessary, be assisted and improved in the accomplishment of their respective tasks.

(4) To supplement those agencies if necessary, in order to obtain information not now collected which may be required for the purposes of the bureau.

(5) To advise on the development of the mineral resources of the Empire, or of particular parts thereof, in order that such resources may be made available for the purposes of imperial defence or industry or commerce.

The Imperial government contribute £10,000; the Dominion of Canada £2,500; the Commonwealth of Australia £2,000; India £2,000; New Zealand £1,000; Newfoundland £250; the Crown Colonies and Protectorates also make contributions. The total amount voted is £20,000. This year the vote has been reduced by £1,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: When was this vote first made?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): In 1917.

Mr. CHAPLIN: There must have been some reason for reducing the estimates; what was it?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): One reason is that I think a great deal of this work has been done. There is an annual convention and the British government reduced their vote—I am not sure whether it was this year or last year but they reduced their vote at all events. I felt that we could probably get along with a reduction of £1,000 in our vote. We will be represented at the convention and it would appear that we could make this reduction without impairing the efficiency of the organization or creating any difficulty.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the bureau of any advantage?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am told it is, I cannot speak authoritatively about the matter.

Mr. CHURCH: What value have you derived from this expenditure? The minister seems to have lots of money for these bureaux and also for the museum and for mummies in glass cases in museums, but he seems to have no money for the militia?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): The Department of Militia is not under my control, and therefore I cannot discuss it. I see no reason why the meeting of these experts and the information derived therefrom should not be of value to the various dominions of the Empire. I cannot speak with any great authority with respect to it, but it would appear to me that annual meetings of this character would have considerable value.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the vote is entirely justified. The purpose is not so much for the meeting as to make known in all the different parts of the Empire the resources of the other parts, in what form they are found, what is done with them within those dominions, in order that those minerals which may be the property of one dominion may be known to the other where in many cases they are not found at all and in order that trade may be thus secured and developed through the various dominions and a market found for the minerals of each. Canada, I think, shares in the benefit, proportionately to the money she spends, because she is more of a mineral country, with the exception, perhaps, of South Africa, than any one of the other dominions. Great Britain, for example, is supporting this Mineral Resources Bureau to the extent of the sum the minister mentioned, but Canada, proportionately, is much more a mineral country than Great Britain, and gains, I think, more proportionately than the amount she subscribes. I think the reduction is right, because the work of the Mineral Resources Bureau is, of course, mostly done when it is thoroughly established; from that time on it would take very much less money.

Item agreed to.

Amherst Drill Hall, grading etc.. ..	$ 5,000
Baddeck, Public Buildings—alterations to Post Office fittings..	1,000
Halifax, quarantine station, repairs and improvements..	11,000
North Sydney quarantine station—alterations and repairs..	2,600
Total..	$19,600

Mr HANSON: Will the hon. minister explain the first item in this resolution, $5,000 for grading.

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): This amount is required to complete the water-proofing, facing of the walls and construction of stone foundation and undergrading. Part of the work has already been contracted for. The amount required for completion of the contract is $3,219; for drainage and driveway, $1,300 and contingencies $481.

Mr. HANSON: Is that a new drill hall at Amherst?

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the contract for this work? When the Prime Minister was leader of the Opposition he very much objected to this item, gave an abundance of reasons why it should not go on and kept us discussing it for a long time.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract was entered into last year, I think.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Surely the deputy minister could tell us when the contract was entered into.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): November 1921.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Is the work now going on?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: Or is the contract let without the work going on?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Part of the contract has been completed. This is for payment when the work is complete.

Mr. CHURCH: Does the minister know whether the Government has made up its mind to discontinue drill halls or not?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is no provision in this vote for a new drill hall. It is to maintain and carry out a contract.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Could the minister tell us how much has been spent to the end of the fiscal year? The vote was $25,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $3,400 have been expended on the contract.

Mr. HARRIS: We are told that last year $25,000 was voted. How much of that was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $3,400 odd.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was till the end of last month.

Mr. McDONALD: Is this conversation carried on for the edification of two gentlemen across the table?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure the hon. gentleman has heard me all the time.

Mr. McDONALD: I cannot hear the minister and cannot hear the others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was there any money spent in the calendar year, up to the end of the year 1921?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, $3,400.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought the hon. gentleman said it was spent up to the end of last month, the fiscal year; I mean to the end of December—the calendar year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract was let in November.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was anything gone on with?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised they spent that amount before the end of the calendar year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And nothing was spent between the end of the calendar year and the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand not during the winter season.

Mr. MEIGHEN: December is the winter season too.

Item agreed to.

St. John quarantine station, Partridge Island, repairs and improvement ..	$35,000
Sussex, public buildings—improvements..	6,500
Tracadie Lazaretto—repairs and improvements..	7,000

Mr. HANSON: I regret very much to see that there is nothing in the estimates this year for the building of a post office and public buildings at the town of Edmundston in the county of Madawaska, represented by my friend who is not present to-night. That is the one town in Madawaska which, I am glad to say, is going ahead by leaps and bounds. I understand the post office quarters there are so inadequate that the banks and institutions who have money coming into the town, are obliged to bring it in a certain way, in order that it may not be necessary to leave it in the post office over night. In other words, the public service there in regard to postal facilities is wholly inadequate. The customs house is in another place, and, from my own observation, I can say is wholly inadequate for the business carried on there. The immigration service is in another part of the town, and that, too, is inadequate. If there is one place in the maritime provinces, at all events, that is crying for a proper Dominion building in order to carry on the public service in a proper manner that place is the town of Edmundston. While I quite appreciate that this is a very bad year in which to ask for any expenditure of that character, I might point out to the minister, as he probably already knows, that, at that point, there is great need for improvement in the public services to which I have referred. Money was found by the late government to pay its share of the cost of an international bridge. That bridge is about completed, and it will supply a great need to the community. This Parliament and the Government owe to the business people of that community, where one of the largest industries in the province is located a duty, to

supply post office facilities, and I would ask the minister if he would be good enough to give this matter his consideration between now and the time that the supplementary estimates are brought down, in order to see if he cannot find enough money to make a start, at least, by the purchase of a lot on which to build a new post office in the town of Edmundston.

Mr. GRIMMER: While supporting the proposition of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) in regard to post office and customs facilities at Edmundston, I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) and the Government to the fact that, in the town of St. George in the county of Charlotte, a post office was promised prior to the war. The people in that town have been perfectly willing to stand back and wait patiently until the Government were in a position to build a post office and customs office. I understand the department went so far as to look at lots and to purchase one; but owing to the war the people of the thriving town of St. George, in which are situated the granite quarries of the province of New Brunswick, were willing to wait until the war was over and the Government were in a position to grant their request. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works and the Government to the fact that the war is now over, that the people have waited patiently, and that the time has, I think, now arrived when the Government should undertake the building of a post office and customs office in the town of St. George, Charlotte. I hope the Government will give this matter their early consideration.

Mr. MacLAREN: I wish to support the remarks of the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) in regard to the need of better post office facilities in the town of Edmundston. I am quite satisfied that the need is an urgent one, and I, therefore, urge upon the minister that the suggestion that a new post office be erected at Edmundston receive his serious consideration.

Would the minister give the committee some further particulars as to what he proposes to do in the way of improvement to the quarantine station at St. John? Does he propose to extend and enlarge the buildings?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As regards the suggestion from hon. members in connection with post office requirements in the town of Edmundston, N.B., and also in the town of St. George in the county of Charlotte, I may say that representations have been made regarding these post offices, and they are receiving and will receive careful consideration.

9 p.m.

As regards the appropriation for the quarantine station at St. John, the amount of $35,000 is required to complete the construction of power, disinfecting and bath-house under construction, $25,000; general repairs and improvements, and towards construction of a new third class detention shed or building, $7,000; contingencies, $2,118.

Mr. MacLAREN: Can the minister inform the committee if the number of cases in the Lazaretto at Tracadie is diminishing, or is it about the same as it has been for the last ten or twelve years?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the information regarding the inmates of that institution, and that can be ascertained from the Health Department. This appropriation deals with improvements to the drainage and building, some painting and general improvements, amounting in all to some $7,000.

Mr. HANSON: This statement that the matter will receive consideration is a stock phrase that does not carry us anywhere, and I should like to know what hope is held out in regard to post office facilities at Edmundston. I am very serious about this matter. It is not in my constituency, and the constituency is one that I do not suppose, in the memory of living man, has ever been represented by a Tory or ever will be. But I happen to have business friends in that constituency who are interested in the matter, and they have asked me to supplement what should have been said to-night by the hon. member for Restigouche and Madawaska (Mr. Michaud), who, I have no doubt, is better engaged. There is a real need in that town for improved postal facilities, and things cannot be permitted to run along as they are or, perhaps, some night there will be a very severe loss to the Government and to the public by reason of the wholly inadequate facilities for safeguarding His Majesty's mails.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like to support the hon. member for York-Sunbury in his claim for better post office facilities at Edmundston. I know something of conditions there, and I would not want the min-

ister to rest on the fact that a post office which was good enough five years ago is good enough now, because no town has developed as rapidly as Edmundston, on account of the fact that a pulp and paper mill has been established there in recent years and the population has increased to a greater degree than can be accounted for by the natural increase in population. The town is getting to be an important centre; a large amount of business is done there and I should like to add my support to the hon. member for York-Sunbury in his request for consideration of this matter.

Mr. HANSON: We should have a statement from the minister that the department either is or is not going to do anything in the matter this year. We should have some declaration of policy.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As regards the post office at Edmundston, I believe statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite have been confirmed by information in the department, and it is true that there is a crying need for improved post office and custom facilities at that point. The matter is receiving serious and careful consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON: I have heard the criticism that sanitary conditions are very poor at the quarantine stations at Halifax and St. John. Has the minister any information on the subject?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Alterations have been made this year, and alterations that will be made during the coming year will do much to improve the sanitary conditions in both of these institutions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister advise me how much was spent last year out of this New Brunswick vote of $93,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $65,562 was spent on the quarantine station at St. John.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If $65,000 odd was spent out of $75,000 odd, how could there be a re-vote of $35,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A sum of $46,000 was transferred from the militia demobilization vote of last year, which no doubt the right hon. gentleman is familiar with.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not answer the question. What was spent out of the demobilization vote is not money spent out of the $93,000. I asked the minister what was spent out of that $93,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Out of the public works estimates last year $65,000 was expended on the quarantine station.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That could not possibly be.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of that sum $46,000 was from the demobilization vote; $1,500 was spent at Sussex. The total expenditure was $66,000 odd, and $20,000 was allowed to lapse.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sure no member of the committee is any the wiser since the minister got up, for, in the first place, very few could hear him, and. in the second place, those who did would not be enlightened. Here is a vote of $93,000 that was passed last year for New Brunswick and divided under three heads. So much money was spent and charged against that vote. There may have been some more money spent on St. John and charged against the demobilization vote, of course, but we are not asking about that at all. Now, the minister is not listening, and I will get just the same answer next time. It means nothing. I have asked three times, and now this is the fourth time: How much was spent and charged against that $93,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total expenditure last year out of the $93,000 was $65,552 on the quarantine station at St. John, and $1,500 on the public building at Sussex.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister not understand me? There could not have been $65,000 spent out of this vote on the quarantine station, because the minister this year asks to have re-voted $35,000 of the $75,000 allotted last year. How could you re-vote $35,000 out of $75,000 if you had already spent $65,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The appropriation in the public works estimates for 1921-22 was $75,000 for the quarantine station, and $65,552, I believe, was expended at that time. I am told that, in addition to that expenditure, $46,000 was transferred from the militia department demobilization appropriation. $58,688 was expended on the contract for disinfecting houses, and $6,864 on repairs, making a total of $65,552.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was transferred from demobilization?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $46,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Besides?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes. Those two items total $65,552, leaving $20,000 that lapsed, thus requiring this time a re-vote of $35,000 to complete the contract at that point.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope this is not my fault and that I do not appear to be unduly harrassing the minister, but really what he says is the result of wrong information or else he is misstating it. He says that $65,552 was spent on the quarantine station, and that besides $46,000 odd was spent upon it from the demobilization appropriation. Surely the minister follows me? Let him forget about this demobilization. We will deal with that amount when we come to the demobilization vote. How much money was taken and charged against that $75,000 for the quarantine station? Now, if the minister intended to say that of the $65,552 spent on the quarantine station, $46,000 odd was from the demobilization vote, then it follows that only $19,000 was spent on the quarantine station and charged against the $75,000. Is that right? If $19,000 odd was charged against that $75,000, then it is quite natural that the minister should only want $35,000 more. It may be that he intends to spend only that amount, and that the whole $35,000 is a re-vote. That is understandable. But let him say exactly what was spent and charged against that $75,000. Was it $65,552, less the demobilization amount of $46,000? If so, that is $19,000 odd. I hope the minister follows me. It is perfectly clear in my mind, and I am sure it is so in the minds of other members of the committee.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Does the right hon. gentleman want to know the amount of money that came from each vote?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I want the amount charged against the $75,000 vote of last year; the amount charged against the $5,000, and the amount charged against the $13,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $40,000 was charged against the $75,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And actually spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Actually spent. $25,000 was charged against the $46,000, demobilization.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will get to demobilization when we reach it. The first part of the minister's answer is understandable: that $40,000 was spent out of the $75,000. Now then, may I ask what was spent out of the $5,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The $5,000 was not spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent of the $13,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That amount was not required and not expended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So that the total amount spent last year out of the whole $93,000 was $40,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I congratulate the minister that we have reached it at last. The amount asked this year is $48,500, or $8,500 more than was spent last year.

Mr. MICHAUD: While I was out of the House on duty from 8 to 8.30, the question of the post office building at Edmundston, New Brunswick, came up. I may say that a delegation came from Edmundston to Ottawa and made representations with regard to this matter, to the Minister of Public Works, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp). I have watched this question very closely, and I am much obliged to the hon. members from New Brunswick who, in my absence, brought the matter up. There is not a town in Canada which needs a public building more than Edmundston does. I am not going into the reasons, but this town, the population of which is about 5,000, has contributed to the treasury of Canada about $1,000,000 during the last fifteen years. We were glad to do it and will continue to do it, but I think we are entitled to our share, in view of that large contribution. The present post office accommodation there is very small and does not meet the requirements of the public. I am sure the minister did not forget me when remarks on this subject were made not very long ago by my hon. friends from New Brunswick. He is aware of the efforts I have made in this direction; I hope that after I have resumed my seat he will express to the committee what I have endeavoured to do in connection with the matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The expenditure proposed for New Brunswick is $48,500. For the sake of comparison, take item 144, already passed, for Nova Scotia. Am I

right in saying that the only expenditure under item 144 for last year was the single expenditure the minister has mentioned, $3,600 on the Amherst building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the information as to the full amount expended last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister gave it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I gave the expenditures on the contracts we were proceeding with.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Evidently there was nothing voted but the four items in No. 144 that appear here. Was the total expenditure $3,600?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Out of the item of $25,000, shown in No. 144, some $3,400 or $3,500 was expended. That was all out of that vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And this year, out of the same vote, you propose to spend $19,600?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: Before this vote carries will the minister not give the member for Restigouche and Madawaska (Mr. Michaud) the certificate of character he asked for in the plea he made a moment ago? And if he will not answer me on the point, will he not be good enough to tell us what he has to say in reply to the hon member's representations?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The hon. member for Restigouche is well able to take care of himself. He has made very clear and concise representation regarding the necessity for public buildings in the town of Edmundston, and I have no objection to informing him that the matter is receiving the careful consideration of the department.

Mr. MICHAUD: My hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) appears to be very much interested in my behalf. I do not represent as large a constituency as his, with great public buildings, but I can assure him that we are making rapid strides, and although I do not want to make any rash predictions, I think in the near future we shall have substantial buildings in the northern part of New Brunswick.

Mr. HANSON: Are my hon. friend's optimistic remarks based on any promise from the minister?

Mr. MICHAUD: I can assure you the promises are to my own satisfaction for the moment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are they?

Item agreed to.

Maritime provinces generally—Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $38,000.

Mr. HANSON: There is an increase in this item of $13,000. How is it accounted for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the estimates this year Dominion public puildings, improvements and repairs are carried as one vote. Last year there was a special item for the city of Halifax, the city of St. John, and probably the larger city in the island. This year, under the advice of the chief architect, these are being carried as a separate vote. Last year there was a sum of $25,000 for improvements, etc., in the maritime provinces generally, $13,000 for Halifax, and $7,000 for St. John, or a total of $45,000. The vote this year is $38,000, and as it includes the whole of the provinces with the cities there is a decrease of $7,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not follow that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year there was just one bulk vote of $25,000 and this year the vote is $38,000, which is an actual increase of $13,000. What does the increase represent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not last year's estimates, but my hon. friend will find that for the maritime provinces generally there was $25,000, for Halifax Dominion buildings, $13,000, and for St. John $7,000, a total of $45,000 as against $38,000 this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have last year's estimates here and the minister is wrongly informed. Item 131 in last year's estimates asked for $25,000, just exactly the same as the year before that again.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What does it include?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is worded just the same as the item here, "Dominion public builds—improvements, repairs, etc." and the amount is $25,000.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my hon. friend will now turn to the item for the city of Halifax and the city of St. John he will find just what I have stated, $13,000

for Halifax, $7,000 for St. John. This year the amount for these cities is included in this $38,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are under another vote.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what the minister says. He has already taken credit for that reduction and he cannot get credit for it again. He cannot claim to have made a reduction above and seek credit for it again.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think I have made this matter plain to the committee. We are consolidating three votes this year, whereas last year we had $25,000 in one estimate for Dominion public buildings in the maritime provinces, in another portion of the estimates we had a sum for Halifax, and elsewhere a sum for St. John, making a total expenditure of $45,000. This year Halifax and St. John are included in the one vote of $38,000.

Mr. CHURCH: What is the principle on which this money is spent? I suppose the minister has some information in regard to this increase of $13,000. Now, some of the Government buildings in the maritime provinces are new and others are in a state of disrepair, and it is a poor policy for the Government to keep its buildings in such a state. This is a large item to pass without some details, with which the minister should make himself familiar. What are the buildings that are to be repaired; what is the principle on which the repairs are made; does the local engineer of the Public Works Department go over the buildings every year and see what work is necessary to be done: and what generally is the plan followed in regard to this work? The minister might give us some information on these points. Are tenders called for and does the department furnish the supplies, or is the work done by day labour?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): As I have already stated, there is no increase. As a matter of fact there is a decrease. This expenditure is for general repairs and maintenance of Dominion buildings in the maritime provinces. These buildings are reported upon from time to time by the representatives of the Government in these localities. Either the engineering or the architectural branch reports upon them and the work of maintenance is carried on. The definite amount that will be expended on each building is not stated, because that must develop as the season's work proceeds.

Mr. HANSON: Has there been a return to the patronage system in the minister's department in that part of the country? I believe that on the 6th December last the gentleman who did me the honour of opposing me in that election sent out a series of letters to parties in the city of Fredericton to the effect that the work in connection with the public buildings there would go to Mr. So-and-So, to this man and the other. I would like to know if that was done under the authority of the department, or if he did that off his own bat? I would also like to know who is the officer in charge of these public buildings in New Brunswick at the present time? Has Mr. Waterbury been retired, and if so has his superannuation arrangement been made; also who has succeeded him, and if no one has been appointed to the position who is acting as district architect down there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that Mr. Waterbury is retiring and Mr. Chambers is acting for the present. There has been no appointment made as yet.

Mr. MICHAUD: Has my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) any recommendation to make as to who should be appointed?

Mr. HANSON: Yes, if the minister will do me the honour of asking me I will be very glad to give him the name of a very competent man.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like to inquire what amounts were actually expended for this purpose upon public buildings in the cities of Halifax and St. John last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In the case of the Dominion buildings in Halifax the following expenditures were made up to 19th April, 1922:

Bedford Row Dom. Analyst. ..	$ 346 29
Custom House..	2,117 48
Post Office..	2,069 52
Bellevue Hospital..	2,946 92
Generally..	210 13
Rockhead Hospital..	135 10
	$7,825 44

In the case of the Dominion buildings in the city of St. John the expenditures to 27th April, 1922, were these:

Customs House	$2,403 37
Old Customs House	1,425 71
Savings Bank	588 02
New Post Office	2,629 70
St. John West P.O.	86 95
Old Penitentiary	39 05
Creaghan Building	4 50
Total	$7,177 30

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know now what the minister has sought to convey. It amounts to this, that whereas last year a certain amount was voted in respect to public buildings in Halifax and another item in respect to public buildings in St. John, this year, instead of having those items appear separately, the minister is adding them to the present vote. The former item appeared last year as one of the $195,500 appropriations not required as regards Nova Scotia and in the $13,000 appropriations not required for New Brunswick.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not required for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not required for this year. That is the way the appropriations of last year that are not required appeared. So the minister, after admitting he is asking for more than was spent, takes the credit for that lopping off. What I want to call attention to is this: Why has the minister made this change in the allocation? It just means that whereas last year we knew where some money was going, this year we know nothing about it. I call this particularly to the attention of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). It is making still worse the habit of gathering within one miscellaneous item various details that formerly appeared—and that ought, if possible, at all, to appear—one by one under the appropriate designation. Why has the minister made a change? Is it merely so that the minister—judging his course by the exigencies of the hour, and perhaps by the complexion of the locality—will be able to distribute his money where he thinks it will do the most good?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These expenditures are made for maintenance and repairs, conditions that are unforeseen, and the chief accountant of the department has advised that these votes be consolidated. There is no great advantage in setting out an expenditure of $15,000 for Halifax any more than to set out a vote of, say, $30,000 for the province of Nova Scotia when the details are not now known. They will be known next session, however, and can be given to the House at that time. I cannot see any objection to consolidating the votes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Apparently not. I made the correct guess all right.

Mr. LOVETT: Before the item is passed I would like to direct the attention of the minister to the inadequate accommodation provided for post office purposes in the town of Bridgetown in the county of Annapolis which I have the honour to represent. That accommodation is so limited that the citizens are compelled to stand out on the sidewalk while the mail is being separated and distributed. The people there feel that they have been patient in putting up with this drawback and now that the war is over are anxious to have better accommodation provided. I direct the attention of the minister to this matter, and ask his favourable consideration towards placing in the supplementary estimates an amount sufficient to provide a creditable post office for the town.

Item agreed to.

Quebec—Dominion Public Buildings, improvements, repairs, etc., $80,000.
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station—repairs, $10,000.
Montreal—Ordnance Stores Buildings, $27,200.
Quebec Post Office—Party wall, $10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much of last year's vote was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In round figures $55,000.

Mr. CHURCH: There is an item of $10,000 to provide a "party wall" in Quebec. Have you not sufficient seats in Quebec now without erecting a party wall to hold them?

Item agreed to.

Public Buildings, $349,200

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much of the appropriation was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $707,000 odd.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could the hon. gentleman tell us how that was divided?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not that information.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The total amount of the vote last year was some thing over a million dollars, and a line at the bottom says "Appropriations not required for 1922-23, $707,000 odd." Now the minister says some $707,000 was spent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That amount was used last year and was not required this year.

Mr. CHURCH: There are a number of post offices in Ontario in need of repairs. The returns from the Toronto post office are nearly $5,000,000 which is almost double the returns from Montreal. The main post office in Toronto to-day cannot handle the business, and the public have been greatly inconvenienced. A statement of that fact has been made to the minister on several occasions. The business of that post office is almost as large as that of Montreal and Winnipeg combined. The Government should do something to relieve the situation. Toronto people are busy and they cannot do their business properly at the present time. A new custom house is also needed. I might refer also to the city of Hamilton, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mewburn) representing that city is present to-night and can deal with that. When we are voting large sums of money for the various post offices throughout Canada, Quebec, Manitoba, or any place else, I think these post offices I speak of should be put in a proper state of repair, so that the public will not be inconvenienced. In order to operate a post office or a custom house properly, you require a proper plant. The Hamilton post office handles a large volume of business. I have a table here showing the business done in the various cities and towns throughout the country, but I will not read it to-night. Certainly, more money should be spent on the larger post offices and custom houses throughout the province of Ontario because they are in a bad state of repair and can not handle the business. Business men are complaining, but matters remain as they are and nothing is being done. The minister's deputies have been in Toronto post office and know the situation. If the business is to be handled properly, there must be some change. I wrote the minister in regard to the congestion in the temporary Toronto customs house, where people who are doing business have to waste a great deal of their time standing in line. The Government have a rented custom building in Toronto, and if they keep on the way they are going, they will have a tent next for their custom house. Surely the Government should take up this matter. The sum of $707,000 was appropriated last year for Ontario buildings, and reports were made in regard to necessary repairs throughout Ontario; the money was available but, for some reason or other, it has not been spent. The Toronto post office and custom house come under this item for repairs. I should like to hear what the minister proposes to do regarding the post offices of Toronto, Hamilton and other places where at present they cannot possibly handle the volume of business. The table I have before me shows they are making money out of these offices.

[Mr. Chaplin.]

Mr. MEWBURN: I am glad to know that the suburb of Hamilton still has a friend, as far as the post office is concerned. I notice the very extravagant figure of $2,000 has been placed in the estimates for repairs to the Hamilton post office. I trust that amount will be spent at an early date, because, goodness knows, it is needed badly enough. Has the Government considered what action they are going to take in Hamilton regarding the new building they intended to erect, which was to include both customs house and post office? The Government to-day are leasing properties in the city of Hamilton for which they are paying large rentals. I think the money they are paying for rentals would help pay the interest on the cost of construction on a building there which is badly needed. There are rumours around Hamilton that the Government is contemplating selling the piece of land on which it was proposed to build the customs house and post office.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I may advise my hon. friend, in regard to public buildings in Toronto and Hamilton, that the policy of the Government will be to maintain those buildings as best they can at the present time. The matter has received serious consideration. I think there has been a suggestion made in the department that there should be some exchange of property in Hamilton. That matter has not yet been very seriously considered.

Mr. MEWBURN: How could there be any exchange? Not for any other Government property surely?

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is the minister's policy on the matter of revotes? A few years ago a sum was voted by Parliament for the very much needed repairs to the St. Catharines post office. It was carried a second year as a revote, but has been dropped now. Can the minister not go back and revote the amount proposed to be expended several years ago? If the engineers in the department thought it was

necessary three years ago to put an item in for repairs on the building, what must be thought of the proposition now?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The fact that a vote has lapsed does not necessarily mean that it will be revoted the next year. I would not like to be held accountable for the many votes that have been lapsed throughout Canada.

Mr. CHURCH: What does the Government propose to do, to take care of the increased volume of business in the Toronto post office? If the minister does not know, he can ascertain from his deputy. The same question applies to the customs house. The Government has bought a large lot of land for the new custom house. The customs receipts of that port are very considerable. The Government has a vacant lot, and has rented a temporary customs building, and perhaps they will have the customs building eerected on that lot. Surely the minister can tell the committee what they propose to do to handle the business, which has been increasing 15 to 20 per cent each year. They have the same equipment now that they had years ago and it is very poor. The Government should have one policy for the whole of Canada and I am not asking anything for Toronto that other municipalities should not get. The minister has the reports of his deputy, and I think the committee should be informed as to what is to be done to provide increased facilities to handle the post office business.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Improved facilities have been provided in Toronto recently, and a new postal station, and, I believe, new equipment has been provided at the Union station. I should be very glad to see the business increase in Toronto, and when it does we will, as in the past, provide further facilities. It is not proposed to make any further capital expenditure this year.

Mr. MEWBURN: In answer to the question I asked the minister about the Hamilton post office, I understood him to say that the department was considering the question of exchange or sale of a portion of the property on which it was proposed to build an extension. Would the minister be willing to bring down the papers in connection with that, because the matter is one of vital interest to the citizens of Hamilton?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a suggestion that has been made, probably newspaper talk; but no consideration has been given to the matter by the department, and I am not sure whether there are any papers in connection with the matter in the department.

An hon. MEMBER: There must be some papers in connection with it.

Mr. ELLIOTT (South Waterloo): I should like to call the attention of the committee to the condition of affairs in the post office in the city of Galt. This post office was built many years ago when Galt was but a town; it has grown to be a city now, and the post office facilities are quite inadequate for present conditions. On some occasions when a large quantity of mail is received, some of the mail has to be dumped outside, because accommodation inside the post office is not nearly adequate for existing conditions. I understand that last year an appropriation of $15,000 was made for the building of an extension to the post office in the city of Galt. Is an addition to the present post office still in contemplation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I believe that was for an addition to the present building, but the work was not gone on with last year.

Mr. ANDERSON: I should like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that we have also a town in the county of Halton, where an appropriation was made early in 1914 for the building of a new post office. A site was purchased, and it still remains without a building having been erected on it. The minister can find in his department a good deal of correspondence in regard to this post office. The one that is there at the present time is not a post office, but simply a store. The place has grown from a village with a population of 1,000, to a town of over 2,000 population. It was incorporated last year; the surrounding country is developing very much, and the consequence is that the present post office is very inadequate. Would the minister look up the correspondence and inquire into the matter a little further in order to see if, now that the war is over, the appropriation can be made and the post office built?

Mr. ELLIOTT (South Waterloo): Is the appropriation for the Galt post office still extant?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It has lapsed.

Mr. ELLIOTT (South Waterloo): I might say further, in this connection, that

in the city of Galt we have a large rural centre which further aggravates the situation. I think the Government and the minister would be well advised to take into consideration the enlargement of the present building, or the sale of the present building and the erection of a new one which would accommodate the customs as well as the post office. Under present conditions, the customs is in a separate building and this entails quite a rental every year, the expenditure, as a rule, being very largely increased on this account. It would be well if the minister would look into this question and give the city of Galt proper consideration in the way of postal facilities.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite agree with hon. gentlemen that it is highly important that we should have proper customs houses and post offices, and that the country generally should receive necessary accommodation in public matters of that character. I am rather startled, however, at the general hue and cry which comes to us to-night from the great province of Ontario. I have been sitting in this House for the last ten good, long years of Tory rule, with my good friends from Ontario, who, with a few exceptions, are here to-night, sitting behind the then Prime Minister, the then Minister of Public Works and the then Postmaster General, and I cannot recall any complaints whatever about accommodations that were handed out to the people of Ontario. They may have been in the secrets of this chamber with the then Prime Minister; but I invite him to search the pages of Hansard when the estimates of his ministers were going through, to find any complaints, for instance, from hon. members for Toronto. It is true that the people of that city had but third or fourth or fifth-rate men compared with what they have been sending us lately; but nevertheless those men thought that they were doing the best they could, and yet we heard nothing about the post office. I believe Toronto was on the map during the last ten or fifteen years; at all events, it was on the map while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Church) who represents that city, was mayor. He was on the map during those years; he is on the map now, and it is too bad if the city was so badly neglected that, to-day, when there is a change of government for only three or four months or less, the deplorable condition of things, which hon. members for Toronto present, and present truthfully,

10 p.m.

[Mr. Elliott.]

exists in that city. I am surprised that they should have put up with this, but they have put up with it until they are beginning really and thoroughly to understand that they are being neglected in the way that they are. I am sorry that the affairs of the province of Ontario, in Hamilton, in Galt, in Toronto itself and all around, have been so neglected; and I think it is only fair that I should mention that, if the government of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) who now leads the Opposition, was such a good government as hon. gentlemen used to say it was, and if it was doing its duty to the people of Toronto in public matters, it is surprising that, after it has been out of power only for three or four months, conditions which have been put forward to-night should be found to exist. There is only one way in which that could have occurred. Ten years ago when the Laurier government went out of power, we had no such complaints. Although we had, in those days of the Laurier regime, a very vigorous opposition from Ontario, we heard very little about those things. I cannot recall any particular complaints; and for that reason and because that vigorous opposition did not find much fault, I can only explain the matter in one way, that a fair distribution of public money was being made and that public buildings were being kept in excellent repair. Ten years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite have passed by, and the condition we find is as it has been described. I would be sorry to think, for one moment, that hon. gentlemen would give a description of the condition in which that province is left other than what it is. If it is what they represent it to be, there is only one story, and that is that their friends, in whom they had such confidence and in whose hands they left the administration of this country and would have continued to leave it, have neglected them to the extent they have. It is hardly fair that the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), who is here but a few weeks, who is a stranger to his department, who is making the most of the legacy that has been handed down to him by the outgoing Minister of Public Works of the Tory administration, should be catechised unduly. It is proper to ask questions; but it is hardly fair that with bell, book and candle he should be criticised and held responsible for conditions that have been handed down to him and that he has just begun to acquaint himself with.

I am not trying to be critical of anyone, but I think it is only fair to point out to the committee and to the country that the present ministers who are getting along as best they can with these estimates are taking up the burden that was laid down but a few days ago by their predecessors in office, who of necessity were better acquainted with their departments than the present ministers can be expected to be after having been in control for only a few months. It is well to point out that such improvements are necessary, but I do not think that hon. gentlemen can afford to give themselves such airs and be so critical and fault-finding when they reflect for a moment that this is a legacy which they themselves have handed down to the present Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, the committee could not help but lament while listening to the masterly speech of the Solicitor General that a gentleman of his talents should now be cribbed, cabined and confined within the comparatively inactive environment of the Solicitor General's office. It is too bad that a large department demanding the application of business talents is not under his charge.

I will try first to extract the point he intended to make and that perhaps somewhere is drowned in the deluge of his words. He says: If there is a dearth of public buildings in Ontario the fault is with the late government, and you should have made bitter complaints during the tenure of office of the late government, rather than address those complaints to the novice ears of the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), who really, so the Solicitor General intimates, knows nothing about the department. That apparently is the point the Solicitor General tries to make. Yes, there is a dearth of public buildings in Ontario, a dearth for which the late government holds itself coresponsible. But what the Solicitor General forgets and has too often forgotten in recent years is that the late government carried this country through a war, that the late government turned the energy of the nation into the war, that the late government devoted the resources of the country to the war, and that consequently public works throughout that period had to wait. We said to our members, and they accepted our words, that until we got through the war, and the after effects of the war, we could not go on with the construction of further public works unless imperatively necessary and we did not, as evidenced by the words of the Minister of Public Works to-night, as respecting one item after another, he tells us only a small amount was asked for of which only a trifling portion was spent. That is the actual fact, and members accordingly did not press unreasonably for public improvements. We had to go along with just as little expenditure on public works as possible, having in mind the major necessities of the nation, and that we did so is a matter for general congratulation. That was the position we took on the floor of Parliament, and hon. members and the country accepted our answer, because it was a good answer. That is the reason why these needs face us to-day. We have needs, it is true. We do not want to press any more than do hon. members for expenditure beyond the financial resources of the country. I do not think we should go on with large public expenditures—none except those which are quite unavoidable. But I cannot help recalling that though I went through province after province, and made no promise of public expenditure for the sake of getting a single vote, made, for example, in Prince Edward Island, near the minister's home, a frank statement that we would not claim to be able now to go on with the widening of the railway gauge in that island, I was followed by his leader, who criticised me from the stump throughout the Island because I failed to make a promise to spend millions of dollars on that enterprise. Possibly the recklessness of his leader's promises and intimations counts in some degree for a measure of the support that is found in his party in the House now; I do not doubt that it does; but upon their fulfilment depends what little there is left of the reputation of the Government, and there will be some penalty to pay in respect of their nonfulfilment, just as in recent days we have witnessed the penalty that the Government has had to pay in respect to other pledges that they have abandoned.

Mr. CHURCH: Perhaps the Solicitor General takes his politics and his religion too seriously. He is, I understand, a doctor; he is a D.D., anyway—I do not know whether a Doctor of Divinity or not. I think the hon. gentleman might be better employed in helping his young colleague to explain this item. I wish to give the Minister of Public Works every support, and it may be that he is not getting the support that he should receive. But the

Solicitor General must understand that there are no politics in this so far as Toronto is concerned. I have already laid it down very clearly that what we want is a proper post office and custom house to efficiently take care of the great volume of business there. These public utilities should be considered from the commercial aspect only. Away back when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in power the then member for South Toronto, Mr. Claude Macdonell, year in and year out called the attention of the government of the day to the deplorable state of affairs of the Toronto post-office and customs house. The government tore down the old customs house, but no new accommodation has yet been provided. If they did not intend to build a new customs house, adequate to the present day needs of the city, why did they tear down the old building? I complained for seven years about these things to the late government. It is the duty of the government to give proper administration of the post-offices. There should be a reduction in the rate on drop letters. Although $5,000,000 is taken out of the pockets of the citizens of Toronto, they are still charged two cents for drop letters. The rate should go back to one cent for drop letters. It is not creditable to public ownership that the administration of our post-offices and customs houses either in Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg or any other city should be so inadequaate that the public suffer through the lack of proper plant or service. Only a few days ago the Postmaster General of the United States said that the time had come when the public should be given the best accommodation in the shape of post-offices and customs houses. And the public are entitled to it. Why should the people have to line up at the customs house in Toronto or any other city to wait as long as seventy-five minutes before they get up to the wicket? Why should politics be brought into this matter? I would make the same complaint in regard to Montreal, or any other post-office in the minister's own riding. I may be a little unfair to the Minister of Public Works in asking him about post-offices and customs houses which are not under his department, but this is the only opportunity we get under the rules of the House to bring the matter up. When the Government derives $5,000,000 revenue from Toronto's post-office, they should certainly provide a proper plant for the accommodation of the public. Those who have to go to the customs house are losing thousands of dollars every day owing to the grossly inadequate accommodation. I do not care whether a Liberal government, a Conservative or even a U.F.O. government be in power, the people are entitled to proper post-office and customs house accommodation. I venture to say that a great deal more revenue would be derived from the Toronto post office if proper accommodation were provided, and from fifteen to twenty per cent more revenue would be received from a customs house in which the public could get proper service. Adequate accommodation should be provided, whether it be in Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver or any other of our cities. I hope during the recess the Minister of Public Works, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Finance will look into these things and give the people some relief. They have been clamouring for this for ten or twelve years, but nothing has been done. The Solicitor General would be better advised if he would preach fewer sermons and give us more information; there is plenty of time for sermons on Sunday. There is one minister on the treasury benches who is a pulpit orator and takes his turn on Sunday; the next to do that, I suppose, will be the hon. Solicitor General.

Mr. HARRIS: How is this $95,000 for improvements, repairs, etc., to be distributed through Ontario?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am not able to give that information. It is to meet the requirements as they come up throughout the year.

Mr. HARRIS: In view of the fact that Toronto and suburbs have postal receipts equal to those of Montreal or any twenty other cities in Quebec, is it possible to say how much of the $95,000 will be devoted to the Toronto district?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No; it will depend on the requirements of that district.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister's answer to me a few minutes ago with respect to that revote at St. Catharines was not, in my estimation, a very satisfactory one. Would he, when his estimates come up again, give us some information with regard to that revote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The Solicitor General twitted us with not having last year pressed the then government to make improvements in our respective counties. The Solicitor General himself was never back-

ward in coming to the committee and pressing very hard for whatever was wanted by Nova Scotia.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is why I expected hon. members to have the courage of their convictions when they believed things were needed in Ontario, and to put their case before the House. When no such complaints were made, I had reason to suppose that everything was all right. But when it was a Tory government and there was Tory neglect, everything was regarded forgivingly and nothing was said. The ex-Prime Minister told us to-night that they could not spend any more money for these purposes. Up to the sixth of December, any requests for these things were met by the answer that all the money had been used and was being used for war and demobilization purposes, but what a tremendous change took place following the election! The first week in the House under the new administration that excuse was forgotten; it was no longer good. Well, if the lack of money on account of war expenditure was a good answer to these requests while the war was on and for the three years following the war, surely it ought to be an answer to be given by this Government, at least until it has an opportunity of settling the bills left unpaid and unprovided for by the late administration. These are the reasons I give for expecting hon. gentlemen to be reasonable in their criticism.

Mr. HANSON: I am sure we are glad to have the second instalment of the hon. gentleman's lecture. But I do not think the minister has been unfairly treated; he has asked for no quarter and has made no complaint. I know I have been courteous in my remarks, and I do not think the lecture of the hon. gentleman is called for. But I would say this in reply to his remarks: we are getting further from the war every day, and as the business of the post offices increases, as exemplified by Toronto, for instance, these necessities become more pressing. The situation in Edmundston is due to a large increase in the activities of the commercial life of the community, and it is absolutely necessary that postal facilities be provided there. It is for that reason, and not because there has been a change of administration, that gentlemen on this side are doing their duty in directing the minister's attention to these circumstances. There is no necessity, therefore, for the Solicitor General rising up in his righteousness and giving us a lecture on propriety.

Mr. CHURCH: At the last election the Liberal candidates in Toronto district promised a new post office and customs house for Toronto if their party was returned; the public were assured that they would not have to suffer long. I hope that during the recess a survey of the situation will be made; there have been a hundred surveys in the past fifteen years. I hope something will be done to do away with the condition under which the people have to transact their business owing to congestion. The custom work will be transacted next out on the sidewalk if it continues—because that is what it is coming to. The same state of affairs prevails in Hamilton; there is positive congestion, and I do not see how they get on with the business. I hope the Government will look into these things in the interests of efficiency and with a view of retaining the confidence of the people in these public services.

Mr. STEWART (Hamilton): I wish to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. McKenzie). I was somewhat surprised at the argument he put up to-night. If he lived in Hamilton as I do and saw the treatment which has been meted out to that city for the past few years, he would tell a different story. Some years ago the old buildings were torn down, two or three hundred thousand dollars spent on the purchase of land and an appropriation of $300,000 or $400,000 put in the estimates for a new post office building. In 1914 the war came on and the matter was allowed to stand. I do not blame the government for that; they had their hands full, and I do not think anybody could find fault with the way they acquitted themselves. But three years have passed since the conclusion of the war, and for the last six or seven years we in Hamilton have not received a cent of money for improvements of any kind. Hamilton has not been fairly treated, particularly in view of the revenue it produces, and I think it is about time we got some money for the buildings that we so badly need.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year the total vote under this item was $1,012,267. I understood the minister to say that the sum of $700,000, in round numbers, was spent last year. Is that correct?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The sum of $700,000 was either spent or lapsed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What proportion was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the items.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is now drawing towards the hour of adjournment, and my leader, who has just gone out, is anxious to have this information before this item is carried. If the minister has not the details now perhaps he would be so good as to let the item stand and give us the information on another occasion.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): It seems to me that the discussion on this estimate is somewhat different from what we have been accustomed to in connection with all the various other estimates that have come before us. Usually we have been striving for economy, but to-night it seems that everybody wants a new post office or public building of some description. Some of us since coming to Ottawa have come to the conclusion that there is rather a surfeit of public buildings, and we have failed to understand the reason for this. How many public buildings are there in this city occupied by the Dominion government, and are they occupied to capacity? I should like particularly to have some information regarding the item for departmental buildings, fittings, etc., amounting to $75,000. I note that there is a reduction of $25,000, but on the next page I see an item of $700,000, which seems pretty much to cover the same thing. Is that an annual charge for depreciation against office fittings, etc.? The next question I would ask is as regards the Daly building. What is that building used for? I observe an increase in connection with it of $54,000. These things appear rather important to some of us as we go around the various departments, especially in view of the bombardment to which we are being subjected by the civil servants in regard to the bonus; and I at any rate have been forced to the conclusion that possibly the Civil Service has after all been overmanned. If it is overmanned is it not possible that the buildings provided for the service are also more than the actual necessity calls for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The $75,000 referred to is required for the purchase of metal file casings, shelving, and other things required in the departmental offices in Ottawa. There are five hundred drawer steel cabinets, at $45 apiece, amounting to $22,750; Supreme Court library special fittings, $3,000; Trade and Commerce Department, $110; special metal fittings, $49,140, making a total of $75,000. The Daly building was bought in 1921 on the instalment plan. The first payment was made in 1921-22 of $100,000 and the payment this year will be $154,000, the total being $1,270,000, payable in ten years.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I also asked the minister whether the buildings occupied by the Dominion government in this city are not more than are required. Was it necessary to purchase that building at the time to accommodate the Government?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The Government deemed it cheaper to purchase than to pay rent.

Mr. HARRIS: In view of the fact that the minister cannot give me a precise answer to my question and is unable to give the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) the information he desires, will he not let this item stand?

Mr. CHURCH: The public business is greatly expanding in Ottawa, and in my opinion the individual buildings which the Government is buying cannot adequately accommodate the public service. The business of the various departments year after year is increasing enormously, and now that the war is over I hope the minister will look into the policy adopted at Washington, of co-ordinating the different properties in the capital city with a view to economy. In the next ten years there is bound to be a tremendous expansion of public business in Ottawa, and instead of having rented property on every street, buying small buildings here and there, and renovating old buildings which are really of no use for the purposes for which they are required, a great economy might be effected by a proper system of co-ordination, besides the advantage that would be gained from such centralization of Dominion property. Look at the new House of Commons as an example of it. Ottawa needs a modern office building built for to-morrow. As it is, it is difficult for one to find his way around if he wants to get in touch with the various departments. I realize that the Government has been in office only a few months, but if they gave this matter careful consideration they could economize considerably not only on capital account but in regard to maintenance, because the upkeep of these various old buildings is a serious item.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is the Income Tax office at Hamilton situated in the post office building?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No; it is in the Imperial building.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is that a Government owned building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. CALDWELL: An item in one of the Toronto newspapers says that four of the North West Mounted Police have been guarding the building with automatics and carbines although there was only $2.90 in the vault. If that is the case it would appear hardly worth while having this force keep guard over the place.

Mr. GRAHAM: Probably they did not get there soon enough.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no objection to letting the item stand. As a matter of fact I have a summary of the expenditures making up the $707,860, but I cannot say now whether it has all been expended. There may be payments that have lapsed. If my hon. friend desires that information it can be obtained and given later.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What the leader of the Opposition wanted was the amount that had been actually expended on each of the items during the past year. If my hon. friend will give us the information at the next sitting of the committee he will probably expedite the matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will be very glad to do that.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to know where the vote for the Dominion government's share of the new International bridge at Edmundston can be found?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On page 42, I think, under the vote for roads and bridges.

Item allowed to stand.

Saskatchewan. Dominion Public Buildings: Improvements, repairs, etc., $17,000.
Moosejaw, Public Building: Improvements, $10,000.

Mr. EVANS: What is contemplated regarding the Saskatoon post office? The rent being paid out at present would be more than sufficient in a couple of years to provide ample room in the existing building to properly carry on the work there which is at present suffering from lack of accommodation. I know that a survey of the present building was made some two years ago and it was decided to enlarge the premises. Why that determination was not carried out I do not know, but certainly with the labour at present available the work should be gone on with this year. I would also like to know if the government owns any vacant property in Saskatoon upon which it is contemplated to erect a new post office; also the cost of that property and what is proposed to be done in that connection?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand that the Government has property in Saskatoon that is available as a site for building, but it is not intended to proceed with construction this year.

Mr. LEWIS: The vote for the province of Saskatchewan is the smallest but one of the votes for all the provinces, and evidently not very much money is going to be expended on public buildings in that province. I would like to know if the department owns the post office at Swift Current. The present building there is very small and wholly inadequate for the purpose, being on the ground floor of a business block. I would not wish the department to build a post office because in that city there are numerous empty buildings quite adequate for postal facilities, but certainly something should be done promptly. I wonder whether the item of $17,000 had any reference to Swift Current.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): For the information of my hon. friend I would say that the Government owns property in Swift Current but not any public buildings. It is renting premises there now, but there is no intention to build this year.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I would like to emphasize the remarks of the previous speaker as to the small vote for public buildings for the province of Saskatchewan. The name Saskatchewan is of Indian origin but the people out there are not all Indians, nor does the land consist of desert or Indian reserves either. In line with my hon. friend who preceded me, I maintain that this vote is the smallest appropriation made for any province. The apportionment of public money for Nova Scotia would look to be smaller but if you combine the vote for Nova Scotia of $19,600, the vote of $48,500 for New Brunswick, and the vote of $38,000 for the maritime provinces generally, it will be seen that the average for each of three maritime provinces is over $35,000. Our province of Saskatchewan

is a real large block of land and the population is 200,000 larger than that of either Manitoba or Alberta. Now it seems to be that an injustice has been done the banner province of Canada—so far as wheat producing goes it is the banner province. I would like also to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that in the town in which I have the honour to live the post office is housed in a small rented shack, and I was informed by the postmaster that he is compelled to move, as the Bank of Commerce which owns the building, is going to haul it away out on the prairies in order that risk of fire may be eliminated. The postmaster accordingly will be compelled to move and find other quarters. It seems to me that this young and growing province should have more consideration in the way of public buildings than apparently it is receiving judging from the estimates before us. However I do not advocate following the policy of the hon. members for Toronto, who believe that money should be spent lavishly. I recollect that our national debt is large and that money is needed for other purposes. I simply desire to point out that justice should be done to the prairie provinces because comparing the votes for this purpose with similar votes for the other provinces of the Dominion we are suffering from a glaring injustice.

Item agreed to.

Alberta—Dominion Public Buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $17,000.

Edmonton—Public Building—alteration for post office accommodation, $14,000.

Mr. SHAW: In the general discussion regarding post offices perhaps I may be in order in asking the minister what provision, if any, has been made for building a post office in the city of Calgary. I do not know if the minister is aware of the situation in that city, part of which I have the honour to represent. The fact is that the Dominion government have a very valuable site there on which a stone post office was constructed many years ago. The late government, I believe, pulled down that post office so that at the present time there is absolutely nothing but a hole in the centre of the city to represent where the Dominion government building formerly stood, and in the meantime all the public offices which could properly be housed in a properly constructed post office building are located in rented premises in various portions of the city. Some time ago I asked for a return showing the amount of rental paid by this Government for public buildings in the various parts of the city of Calgary, but that report has not come to hand. I have not any doubt that it was a very large item indeed. The amount paid for rental for post office purposes alone must be very considerable. In view of these facts, has the minister under consideration, or does he contemplate in the Supplementary Estimates, provision for the erection of a post office in Calgary in the not too distant future?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I can well understand the nature of the hon. gentleman's inquiry, because there has been great disappointment in the matter of public buildings in that city for a number of years. It is true that a building was torn down, and plans and excavations were made for a new building, but I do not think it is within the power of the Government, or that it would be wise this year, to undertake the construction of a large and expensive building such as the post office in Calgary would be. I am afraid it will have to go over until financial conditions improve, and the Government can adopt a more aggressive policy in regard to public buildings. We can rent buildings, and probably will continue to do so, at least for the present.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Reference has been made—and I cannot refrain from repeating it—to the comparative insignificance of the grant to the Prairie provinces for public works, and I could not help but wonder if that was a continuation of the policy from which those three provinces have been suffering for a number of years. We have not been asking for much in the West in the way of public facilities and public works. I rose to point out that unless the Western provinces are granted the measure of relief for which they have been struggling so hard for the past few years, they might just as well eliminate themselves, because they have not been given anything.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) and the gentleman who preceded him, that all these votes the committee are being asked to pass this evening are for repairs of existing buildings, and there is no way of measuring the necessities for repairs by the population of one portion of the country. I suppose it is true that in the older provinces,

there being more towns and cities, there are more public buildings; consequently, the annual repairs would be larger than they would be in Saskatchewan, which, I think, has fewer towns and buildings than any of the older provinces.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Public Buildings—improvements, repairs, etc..	$35,000 00
Vancouver post office, fittings, electric wiring and elevator.. ..	5,500 00
Vancouver, R.C.M. Police Barracks at Fairmont, improvements.. ..	4,000 00
Victoria post office improvements.	6,500 00
Victoria, old post office—taxes due city for 1921..	1,019 77
Williams head quarantine station repairs and improvements to existing buildings, fittings, etc..	7,500 00

Mr. TOLMIE: Can the hon. minister inform me as to the repairs made to the Victoria post office?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The items are as follows:—

New box installation equipment	$6,500
Installation clearing house in registry branch..	500
Installation of observation gallery..	1,600
Contingencies..	400
Total..	$9,000

Mr. McBRIDE: I have heard a good deal this evening about post offices. I was not asked to get much when I came down here. I was merely asked to get four post offices, but I am not asking that to-night. If there is a place in British Columbia which needs a post office it is Kamloops. We need a building from several standpoints. We have in Kamloops no land or no forestry office accommodation, no telephone office, and several other branches of the Dominion government need accommodation. We should have a post office building there. Money was voted for it some years ago, and I do not see why that money should not be voted again, and, at least, a start made on it. The present post office is a menace to public health. It has been condemned twice by the health inspector of that district. Kamloops is in a central location. It is a distributing point for the North Thompson, for the southern portion of that district and for both east and west, and they have no facilities there for such business. I think it is up to the present minister to take action, and I would like to know what he intends doing with regard to the Kamloops post office.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think I have any further explanations to make in regard to post offices. I know that my hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. McBride) has made representations previously to those he made in the House to-night, and, although we sympathize with him, and the conditions in some parts of the constituency which he represents and the necessity for better buildings, still the conditions must be applicable to British Columbia at this time, as well as to the other provinces.

Mr. LADNER: I should like to ask the minister for two or three post offices for Vancouver South or Vancouver, but we are most interested in a dry dock out there.

Mr. DUFF: Cannot get it—nothing doing.

Mr. LADNER: Did the hon. gentleman say there was something doing?

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. LADNER: I have been looking through the estimates for some clue or suspicion that perhaps the minister has given the matter consideration. The minister should know that an anxious public awaits the fatal word which may fall from his lips and messages by wire of one kind or another have permeated to and from the coast. Some tell us that a dry dock will be built at Victoria, others say one will be built at Vancouver, and still others say a dry dock will be built at neither place. I think it will be an appropriate occasion at nearly the eleventh hour—having regard to the clock—that we should have from the minister some information as to whether the project of a dry dock at Vancouver will receive some encouragement in the way of an appropriation during the coming year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think we will confine ourselves to the estimates for public buildings. Later on, when we reach capital expenditure, the question might be considered.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am not quite satisfied with the minister's answer. We have out there a large number of idle men, and Kamloops has not been asking the Dominion government, or any other body, for assistance to give the idle men employment. I think the least this House can do is to revote the amount that was voted to do the excavating and to put in the foundation of that post office at Kamloops, this spring, which will give the men some employment. A large number of them are returned men.

who are out of work and who have been living there from hand to mouth. Many of them went there for their health, and I think as little as this House or this Government can do is to revote what was voted some years ago in order, at least, that the excavating may be done and the foundation put in. I trust the minister can see his way to have that done.

Mr. FIELDING: I think, on the question of buildings generally, I ought, in fairness to my colleague the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King), to take more than a fair share of the responsibility. He is a kindly disposed new member, and I believe he would like to yield to the many requests made for new buildings; but ever since he came here, indeed, almost before he came, I have been preaching to him, warning him against putting into the estimates items for new public buildings. If there is anything in which we can afford to economize this year, it is along that line. I am not referring to any particular building; but I have taken the responsibility of urging all my colleagues along certain lines of economy, and particularly I have asked the Minister of Public Works to resist the applications, many and urgent, for the construction of new public buildings. If that is a bad policy, do not blame the Minister of Public Works entirely for it. I am largely responsible for it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is a small item of $1,000 odd for taxes. How does that item arise? Is this not government property?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I am advised that this is an old post office property which the Government rents, and this is an item that has been appearing in the estimates for years. I thought probably it was a local improvement tax. I know there are local improvement taxes which the Government have from time to time, consented to pay in the province.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a local improvement tax, I understand?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a general tax.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Crown is not supposed to be taxed for general purposes.

Mr. GRAHAM: The building is rented to people for stores.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In Ontario, and in, perhaps, a number of other provinces, certain local taxes appear in the larger cities and towns and are imposed upon the principle of so much per front foot. We have, in a number of western Ontario cities, under the authority of our municipal law a tax known as the garbage tax. This is assessed on all the streets of the cities and towns; but when you come to government property, the Government refuses to pay the tax, and I think the refusal is very improper. This tax amounts to a good deal in some of our smaller cities, and complaints have been made in St. Thomas, Galt, Kitchener, Guelph, Stratford and other places. A city council, for instance, divides up the tax over the different lots on the main street, and everybody on that street is taxed so much per front foot for the collection of garbage. When you come to government property, the waste paper and ashes are thrown out and the city garbage man takes them away; but when the bill comes in, the Government has made it a rule to refuse payment. The Government will pay for local improvement, for city water; but when the question is one of collection of garbage, it makes a distinction and refuses payment. This is most unfair; it means that people who are on a street on which there is government property—and sometimes the government property covers a large block—have to pay so much more than they should have by reason of the refusal of the Government to pay this tax. The minister should take this matter into serious consideration.

Mr. DUFF: Is that a new tax? When was the law put into force?

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have had it in Ontario for some years.

Mr. DUFF: Why did the old government not fix the matter?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Payment has always been refused.

Mr. HANSON: It will be news for members from New Brunswick to learn that Crown property in the Dominion pays any taxes at all. At all events, I never heard of any in the province of New Brunswick paying any local improvement taxes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is a general tax.

Mr. HANSON: I understood the minister to say that this Crown property in Ontario paid some local improvement tax. I venture to say that the Dominion Government own half a million dollars worth of

property in my city, and it has not paid one dollar of municipal taxation or local improvement taxes or anything else from the beginning of time. If the Government property pays taxes in Ontario, then I think the Dominion government should, in all fairness and justice, contribute something towards the municipal burden of keeping up sidewalks in front of its property. It does not even do that in New Brunswick. To what extent is that practice prevalent?

Mr. GRAHAM: As I understand the garbage tax in Ontario, the Government has refused to pay the garbage tax which was very high on its large blocks; but it gets no service from the municipal garbage collector. It looks after the collection of garbage and pays for that. Consequently, it pays no taxes when it does the work.

As regards Government property, the Government is not a landlord; it is not going into the landlord business. When it has property which it leases to some other person, as that other person, if he were on other property, would pay taxes, the Government, under those circumstances, acts like any other landlord and pays the taxes. When, however, the property is used by the Government for Government purposes, it does not pay taxes.

Mr. STORK: In reference to the post office situation, if there is anything in the way of precedent in the matter of getting your order in early or of having some justification for your claim, I wish to state that Prince Rupert has been on the map for fifteen years, and it very urgently requires a post office. We have heard a good deal of criticism to-night against the minister for his failure to provide post offices. When the proper time comes, we shall be on deck with our demand for a post office; but I wish to pay a little tribute to the minister. We have had, in Prince Rupert, under the system started some years ago, a very extravagant system of rentals. We have had in that city a federal building housing the post office and the customs department, and various other buildings, for which the Government has paid an annual rental of $11,100 a year. The minister, I understand, has a proposition before him to remove these offices to other premises at a rental of $6.540 a year, and that, I think, is a step in the right direction. The Government is practising economy; it is practising economy in the right direction as regards Prince Rupert. We approve that at present; but when the proper time arrives, Prince Rupert will be on deck for a post office of its own.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was much interested in a statement made by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) that, if the Government owns property and rents it to someone else, it invariably pays the tax. The matter has not worked out in that way in my province. As regards soldier settlement farms, farms that have been salvaged from the original settler by the Government and rented to a private individual, the Government is possibly getting a larger revenue from the private farmer than from the soldier settler, and yet it has refused to pay the taxes, even the school tax. This is crippling quite badly school districts in my immediate part of New Brunswick. Perhaps I may be out of order; and if I am, I presume the proper time to discuss this matter will be when the committee's report on Soldiers Civil Re-establishment is before the House. I want however an opportunity of hearing the minister's statement, in regard to the Government paying taxes, and then I shall be pleased to follow it up to see that we get some of these taxes.

Mr. GRAHAM: It should be understood by all members that the Minister of Public Works is not responsible for the erection of buildings. Consequently, criticism should be directed against all the rest of us in the other departments for whom the Public Works erects buildings or rents them, because we really are responsible, and the Public Works Department is merely the agent for providing us with that accommodation.

Mr. NEILL: I wish to add my little wail to the complaints that have already gone up in connection with post offices. I will spare the minister getting on his feet to give us the usual excuse, for the department has already turned down my request for the only post office I wanted, the claims for which were so great as to make the claims of Kamloops, Prince Rupert, Victoria and Vancouver shrink into absolute insignificance. I will not weary the committee with details, because I am sure they will take my word for it. I was going to suggest, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that he with the Minister of Public Works should form a roster, so to speak, and begin it to-night, of those post offices in British Columbia which were to get attention next year, and in order to prevent any disagreement among hon. members I would suggest that the list

be made alphabetical in its character; the post office I want is Courtney.

I was somewhat struck by the modest violet-like innocence of my friends from Vancouver and Victoria when they sought to criticize this vote and, like Oliver Twist, asked for more. I find some $59,000 in this vote, every cent of which will be spent in the constituencies of Victoria and Vancouver from which my hon. friends come. I would remind the Government and particularly the Minister of Public Works, that there are places in British Columbia outside the confines of those municipalities, incredible as it may appear from looking at the public accounts of the last five or six years. I am almost compelled to think that the right hon. leader of the Opposition is a man of far vision and sympathetic touch, for I heard him to-night in the House, unsolicited by anybody from British Columbia, tell one of the Cabinet ministers that in his opinion British Columbia always got the cold shoulder from this Government—an opinion which I very heartily share in, as I think do some other members. I hope the Government will take that into consideration when some of the other public works estimates come down, of a more important character perhaps. I wished to refer to another item but I have forgotten it. I do not suppose it will materially advance the interests of the post office, and probably the House will be glad to be spared any details.

Mr. TOLMIE: I should like to tell the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that I did not criticize the vote for Victoria. I may have thought a little about it, but I did not say anything. All I wanted was some information about how the money was to be spent.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1921-22

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting Supplementary Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1922, was presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

Friday, April 28, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

DEBATES COMMITTEE

On motion of Mr. Geo. H. Boivin (Shefford) the first report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates was concurred in.

REPORT

Report of the Chief Electoral Officer, of the Fourteenth General Election, 1921.—Mr. Speaker.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ROBERT GARDINER (Medicine Hat): I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he intends to take the House into his confidence with regard to the question of the bonus to civil servants. I understand that on the last pay day the civil servants did not receive their bonus. I would be much obliged if the Prime Minister could give us any information on the subject.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The matter of the bonus to civil servants is still under consideration; the Government has not reached a final decision on it. The House will be informed in due course.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Public Works—Ontario—public buildings—improvements, repairs, etc., $349,200.

The CHAIRMAN: This item was allowed to stand yesterday.

Hon. J. H. KING (East Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) inquired yesterday with regard to St. Catharines. In 1919-20 an appropriation of $28,000 was voted for an addition to the public building in that city, but was allowed to lapse. An appropriation of $34,000 was included in the estimates for 1920-21, but after it had been given some consideration it was dropped, and since then it has not been further considered. In reply to the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Stewart), I beg to table the correspondence with regard to public property and public building sites in Hamilton. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) asked that a statement be given with regard to the ap-

propriations amounting to $707,867 not required for 1922-23 and which were included in the estimates for 1921-22. I now wish to give them in detail, as follows:

	Appr.	Expenditure
Alexandria—To reconstruct public building destroyed by fire	$ 32,000	$ 965 17
Barrie—Post Office—improvements	1,600	1,797 07
Collingwood — Public building — improvements	2,600	.....
Hamilton Post Office —improvements	8,000	.....
Hamilton—Postal Station "B"	5,000	2,820 46
Kingston R.M.C.—Enlargement of educational block	62,500	60,367 00
Leamington — Public building — fittings	1,000	880 60
Leamington — Government's share of local improvements	1,131	1,282 21
Lindsay—Post Office—fittings	3,500	3,494 84
London—Carling Block —repairs	4,000	2,074 00
Ottawa—Addition to S. C.R. Buliding on Vittoria St., alterations to Daly Bldg. and moving expenses	25,000	12,765 12
Ottawa—Fitting up testing laboratory in West Block	2,000	1,811 38
Ottawa — Departmental buildings—heating plant equipment	8,500	2,680 83
Ottawa — Repairs to Langevin Block	2,000	853 48
Ottawa—Office accommodation for Chief Electoral Officer	15,000	11,670 77
Ottawa—Partial reconstruction of ore dressing plant destroyed by fire	2,500	1,256 00
Ottawa — Parliament Library — alterations for stock room	13,000	9,168 08
Ottawa — Post Office— improvements	10,000	10,052 18
Ottawa — Repairs to Wellington St. pavement	62,000	57,792 53
Ottawa—Royal Mint—improvements	7,000	15,093 87
Ottawa—Royal Mint—new boilers	9,000	
Ottawa — Victoria Memorial Museum—restoration	5,500	4,686 45
Pembroke—Public building—tower clock	3,200	2,115 46
Port Arthur — Government's share of cost of local improvements	10,084	10,084 01
Sault Ste. Marie—Public building—repairs and improvements	5,000	600 00
St. Thomas — Public building — improvements	1,000	712 70
Toronto — Dominion buildings—repairs, etc	32,500	32,284 96
Toronto — Postal Station "A"—To complete	350,000	129,751 37
Toronto — Postal Station "A"—Tractors	10,000	8,000 00
Toronto — Post Office—alterations	6,000	4,650 75
Toronto—St. Andrew's College — Government's share of cost of local improvements	4,252	.....
Walkerton — Public building — electric wiring	2,000	29 40
Total	$707,867	$390,774 69

Mr. GUTHRIE: What did the minister say was the total?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total appropriation was $707,867, and the expenditure $390,774.69.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister not realize that that is very substantially different from the figure he gave last night?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes. The minister last night stated the expenditure was some $700,000 odd. That is what it sounded like across here, although we have some difficulty in hearing.

Mr. ANDERSON: Can the minister now state the policy of his department with reference to the revote for the post office at St. Catharines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Perhaps the hon. member was not in his seat, but I have already stated that no consideration has been given to that expenditure this year.

Mr. ANDERSON: What is the policy of the department with regard to revotes for other places?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is open for consideration each year. It does not necessarily follow that because the revote has not been used, it should appear in the estimates next session.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has the minister considered the question of a post office at Weston? The minister knows that the public have no proper accommodation there. The very small quarters are shamefully overcrowded, the congestion is tremendous. Three rural mail routes come in, and there are no proper conveniences for them. I understand that the department have requested insistently that something be done. Has the minister considered the matter?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Representations have been made, but we are not considering new construction this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How does the matter stand? Is it a case in which the department think the work ought to go on, and it is being held up on the ground of economy?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): On the ground of economy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister did not seem to think my memory was correct when I referred to the fact that he informed us last night that $707,000 odd had been spent on public buildings last year. On reference to page 1289 of unrevised Hansard I find this:

> Public Buildings, $349,200.
>
> Mr. Meighen: How much appropriation was spent last year?
>
> Mr. King (Kootenay): $707,000 odd.
>
> Mr. Meighen: Could the hon. gentleman tell us how that was divided?
>
> Mr. King (Kootenay): I have not that information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the committee will understand why I replied as I did. The statement I had before me showed as do the estimates the expenditure not required of this $707,000. When questioned last night I told the committee it was not possible to give the information. In fact, it required the work of an official this morning to get it. I think that was understood by the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should not say that. The minister was asked, not the amount that was not required this year, but the amount spent last year, and the information he gave was $707,000 as clear as words could give it. Why does he seek now to avoid it? He simply made a mistake.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—Chargeable to income—Generally, $225,000.

Mr. CHURCH: With reference to the item of $5,000 for flags for Dominion public buildings, is this for flag waving?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the expenditure under these different heads last year?

Mr KING (Kootenay): I have not that information here. I am informed that it has not been the custom in the past for the minister to be familiar with these details, and as far as I am concerned, I am not, and I have not the figures here.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have no doubt the deputy will have the information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He may possibly have the information in his head, but he has no information in writing, I understand, of the expenditure under these heads.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: He can send for his folio.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: How is the item of $30,000 divided by provinces?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This item is required for certain items of expenditure which have to be met every year in connection with public buildings, together with such special outlay for works, and so forth, that cannot well be charged against any one particular item of the general appropriations made by Parliament. It covers such items as travelling expenses, stationery, drawing instruments, printing, telegrams, miscellaneous.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What are the details for last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure for 1921-1922, up to 21st January, 1922, which is as far as my information goes, is as follows:

Brantford, Ont., general shed—taxes		$601.67
Calgary Post Office site, legal services		81.00
Charlottetown Post Office—taxes		220.87
Chatham public building, paving		231.77
Cumberland, Ont., post office—taxes		215.44
Dunville Post Office site—wrecking building		200.00
Essex, Ont., Post Office—taxes		532.50
Generally—		
Telegrams	$3,894.89	
Express	495.43	
Insurance premium	22.50	
Repairs to transit	19.00	
Auto hire, disbursements, etc.	497.36	
Gas analysis	106.58	
Blue Prints, etc.	8.25	
Repairing clock	2.00	
Removing stone at Saskatoon	4.36	
		5,050.37
Kamloops P.O.—Taxes		143.30
Kingsville P.O.—site—legal services		16.94
Milverton, Ont., P.O.—taxes		20.46
Montreal Ordnance Stores		
taxes	$103.29	
legal services	322.80	
		426.09
Moosejaw, Custom House, site, printing, etc		13.22
Norwich Pub. Bldg.—taxes		301.18
Ottawa Daly Bldg.—legal services		555.16
Perth P.O.—site—snow removal, etc.		9.84

Printing and Stationery	3,791.86
Photo Supplies	4,190.01
Photo Work	2,163.06
Prince Rupert P. Bldg.—photos	56.40
Renfrew P. Bldg.—taxes	327.30
Regina, Asst. Rec. General Office—taxes	133.61
Regina Immigration Bldg.—taxes	173.38
Royal C. M. Police—Arctic region—advertising	84.90
St. Jacques L'Achigan P.O.—site—sidewalks	288.60
St. John Old Penitentiary site—prtg.	2.27
St. Ours, Que.—P.B.—remove snow	25.75
Sarnia P.O.—Taxes	374.92
Saskatoon New P.O.—site—repair fence	6.40
Southampton P.O.—site, grounds	50.00
Tilbury P.O.—taxes	435.83
Toronto, Duchess St. Lots—snow cleaning	8.39
Toronto, New P. Bldg.—printing	793.13
Toronto, Spadina and Oxford St. Lots clearing snow	14.05
Travelling expenses and disbursements	3,958.64
Truro P.O.—site—advertising	2.40
Verdun, Que.—P.O.—site—grounds	4.14
Victoria Astronomical Obsty.—survey	464.39
Winnipeg Postal Station A—fees	36.00
Winnipeg Postal Station B—taxes	170.32
Wininpeg Postal Station D—taxes	674.45
Yarmouth Bingay Bldg.—advertising	31.05
	$26,881.00

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Having found those particulars I wonder if the minister cannot turn up the other items and show the total spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not got them.

Mr. GUTHRIE: During my experience in this House in Committee of Supply, as we are at this moment, it has always been the custom to ask at the outset what amount was spent on votes the previous year, and it seems strange to me that the deputy minister of this department, who has been a long time in the service, does not remember that such has been the practice. It it not very full information that we get from looking at the printed estimates. For instance in the present vote the first item is:

Armouries—Fittings and Alterations—Revote, $40,000; 1922-23, $50,000; 1921-22, $87,000.

Apparently there is a saving of $37,000 this year in that vote; but the committee want to know how much was spent last year. Now, in the case of the information given by my hon. friend a few minutes ago in regard to item 148—Ontario—in the item after the vote that he enumerated there was a very small expenditure apart from the money spent in Ottawa and Toronto. Last year we voted $87,000 for fittings and alterations to armouries. This year we are asked to vote $50,000. Did we spend the $87,000 we voted last year? If we did not, what was the reason? Why should we be called upon to vote $50,000 this year? And so with every item on the list. I notice there is a re-vote of $40,000 in connection with fittings and alterations to armouries, consequently there could not have been more than $47,000 spent, although $87,000 was voted. There is one other item that appears this year that did not appear last year:

Military Hospitals—repairs and improvements, $65,000.

I would like some information regarding that item. I assume, although I do not know, that it must be in regard to the military hospital at Winnipeg. Every year we have had a tremendous amount to pay out in connection with that hospital. Nobody grudges the expense for a military hospital where the expense is necessary; but I should think the time was now approaching when the expenditure, for military hospitals at least, should not be extended. The expenditure and the establishments for this purpose ought to be wellnigh complete by this time, but apparently we are asked to spend $65,000 more this year on the military hospital in Winnipeg. I would like to know how many patients there are now—the number must be pretty well reduced—and what the money is wanted for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend no doubt is familiar with the fact that this work is being carried on by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and that they indicate from time to time to the Department of Public Works, as other departments of the Government do, their building requirements. They have indicated to us this year that they need a certain amount for the repair of, and improvements to, the military hospitals throughout Canada. This matter has been gone into by departmental officials and the amount of $65,000 has been asked for.

Mr. GUTHRIE: This is not, then, for work in connection with the Militia Department, it is for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. I can understand the latter may have requirements, but the military patients must be reduced by this time to almost the vanishing point.

Mr. HOCKEN: Cannot the minister tell us where this money has been spent? Has he not got the details?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, I have; the details are as follows:

Ste. Anne's Hospital, Ste. Anne de Bellevue	$10,000
Unit "A" Office, Montreal, Que.	1,500
Campbell Hospital, Halifax, N.S.	2,500
Jordan Sanatorium, River Glade, N.B.	1,500
Unit "B" Office, Halifax, N.S.	500
Sydenham Hospital, Kingston, Ont.	4,000
Mowat Sanitorium, Kingston, Ont.	2,500
Christie St. Hospital, Toronto, Ont.	10,000
Euclid Hall Hospital, Toronto, Ont.	5,500
Brant Hospital, Burlington, Ont.	1,500
Westminster Hospital, London, Ont.	10,000
Sunnyside Hospital, Calgary, Alta.	12,000
Shaughnessy Hospital, Vancouver, B.C.	1,000
Contingencies	2,500
Total	$65,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is the title "Military Hospitals" given? These are Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Hospitals.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think that is the title they have always carried, at least I am so advised. Of course the work in those hospitals is under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. The expenditure heretofore has been from demobilization votes, but this year we are asking a vote for that purpose; there is no demobilization vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a vote for the very same purpose as demobilization. Surely it is sufficiently large without transferring items which were formerly under it to this vote. If there is one enquiry more important than another in connection with votes, it is the inquiry, how much money was actually needed last year, how much was spent. Time after time we come to this Committee and ask the question and we are told by ministers "We do not know". We get an estimate given the next day and find the original amount was twice too large. Why is it we have to ask and beg for this information on almost all items of the minister?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Last night I discovered after reducing my estimates for the year 1922-3, that the payments for 1921-22 are not completed. Unfortunately for me, my deputy was not aware of that, and I cut the estimate for the present year not understanding that the expenditure is bound to be greater than I thought. Now, I discover that practically the whole vote of last year will be required, that there are accounts yet to be paid. It is only fair that the minister should be protected on accounts still unpaid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I quite agree, and I think it is well to warn the officials that the information furnished should be correct.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the fact that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) is furnished with incorrect information is no reason why the Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) should refuse to give any information at all. Let him give the best information he can.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): My hon. friends, who are well informed about all the departments, who have been in charge of those departments, must of necessity have more knowledge with respect to these matters than a new minister who has to depend absolutely upon the information given him. Once in a while we make a mistake in regard to information, and it is fair to assume that those amounts that were criticized severely last year, when they were under control of members opposite, were cut down to about the minimum. The hon. gentleman asks for the definite amount spent, but that cannot be ascertained, because the accountants in the departments do not know what the items outstanding may amount to. They show, to a certain date, what is paid. When you apply to a department for information of that sort it is sometimes hard to get it. I am not complaining of what happened to me. I will get along with the money, but it is fair that the committee should know that the accounts of the departments are not yet closed, and that all the accounts for 1921-22 are not yet in.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There may be very exceptional cases where the accounts would not be in, but the accountants would know that they were not in. Take the case the minister presents to us. Yesterday he came here with his deputy or officer, Mr. Camsell, beside him, and told the House this was the expenditure. Mr. Camsell goes back to the department and finds that that was not correct and that there was more. Are we going to understand that that information just came in between the time it was asked for in the House and the time the minister went back to his office, or this morning? Not at all. That information was all there yesterday, but the minister with his deputy came without it. That is what I am complaining about. The information the minister has was available yesterday.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is not a correct impression at all. The department does not know what is outstanding, though the officials may have an idea of it. Take the $22,000 which was cut last evening by $15,000; nearly all of it will be required to pay the accounts of 1921-22. But I cannot, nor can the accountant, tell definitely what the amount will be. It is perfectly reasonable to say I should have had that information yesterday, but I think it is fair to assume that the most of these votes are pretty well exhausted—at least that has been my experience—and those two particularly which were cut yesterday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With reference to an account such as the minister presented yesterday for publication, there is no excuse for any deputy or accountant not knowing, on the 28th day of April, what the amount required was. Everything was ordered—must have been ordered—long before, and though they may not be paid, the totals are there, and they know the particulars.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is pretty difficult for the accountant to know what the costs for publication will be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, not will be, but have been.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): It is difficult to know what they have been. The fact remains that the accounts are not yet in. Of course, 31st March is the end of the fiscal year, but accounts come in after that date which are charged against the appropriations of the year just ended. There has been an extension. I did not allow for that yesterday; I know it to-day. Therefore I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that many of these accounts may turn up, and that a statement of expenditures down to to-day or to the date the estimates are made up, does not always show the true state of affairs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It ought to; if not, it should be for some very special reason; and if there is a special reason the committee should be told of it. What reason is there, in the world, why we do not know what money was spent last year on armouries—fittings and alterations?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am not discussing the particular items.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that. But my remarks apply to the minister's estimates. I have not the slightest doubt that if I had five minutes with the secretary of the Mines Department, or with the deputy minister with the secretary present, they could tell me all the commitments last year for publication, though they might not all have been paid, but here we are now discussing the item "Armouries—fittings and alterations" and the minister cannot tell us what has been paid.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I understand the votes will be practically all expended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. There is no reason why the minister cannot tell us what has been spent for fittings and alterations of armaments.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my hon. friend wants that information, I have it here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I was asking for.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, I think not. My hon. friend was asking for appropriation not required for 1921-22.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is what I was asked to bring down last night, and I have brought it down to-day—a special return. With regard to the expenditures last year, I will give the House the items.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why does the hon. gentleman say that? We know what the appropriation not required for 1922-23 is. It is right in the estimates, is it not?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, that is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We know that, but we want to know what is not given in the estimates—the amounts spent last year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend knows that last night the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) insisted that we give details of that amount, and I have brought it down to-day.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is on the last item.

Mr. FIELDING: There are two classes of information which the minister was publicly asked to give; that is, as to the estimates of last year in comparison with the amounts as set forth here. We are now just at the close of the fiscal year. That year is actually closed, and the accounts are still coming in, and the actual expenditure of the past year changes from day to day, and must change until the final day when it is closed; and, therefore, I am not

surprised the minister is not able to give it to-day. But there is no difficulty in getting it, if it is desired. The minister could bring down to-morrow the actual expenditure to date—and the next day it would be a different thing altogether. There is no difficulty in obtaining it. If the hon. gentleman wants the actual expenditure on any item up to to-day he ought to have it, and it can be given, if desired.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister tell me whether any Order in Council has yet been passed extending the time for closing the books, and if so, to what date? The books are closed now.

Mr. FIELDING: No, my information is that the time will be extended till the 15th May, but, as a matter of fact, the Order in Council has not been passed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As the matter now stands, the account is closed.

Mr. FIELDING: No, because we have the power to expend the money.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I thought we exercised that power in advance. However, I appreciate my hon. friend's delicacy in connection with the Order in Council.

Mr. FIELDING: They are very necessary.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I quite agree with that. While there is difficulty in stating what the exact payment will be, having reference to dates and that sort of thing, I have never experienced the same difficulty with reference to the commitments. I thought our officers understood what obligations they had entered into, and what contracts they had made. We do not want to know merely what is paid, but what has been paid already and also what we are obligated to pay. I think that is practically the same thing. I do not think my hon. friend wanted to hold himself down to the first question. The proper information is the cost of running this service for the last year, as represented by what has already been paid, and what may have to be paid.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total amount authorized up to March 7, 1922, was $42,714, and the estimated expenditure from March 7, 1922, to the end of the last fiscal year is $4,286, making a total expenditure of $47,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Last year we actually spent on armouries $47,000. This year we intend to spend $50,000. Is that right?

[Mr. Fielding.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the expenditure last year on experimental farms?

Mr. HUGHES: In this item I see an amount of $30,000 for Dominion public buildings generally. I wish to ask the minister whether from this amount or from the amount in item No. 146, "Maritime provinces generally," a sufficient sum can be taken to make some very necessary repairs to the post office at Montague, P.E.I. I do not wish to ask the Government to expend one dollar unnecessarily. I appreciate fully the present financial condition of the country; but necessary repairs to public buildings are very often the wisest economy. I have already communicated with the minister in regard to that building, which is very much in need of repairs. I see no special item in the Estimates for that work, and I should like the minister to see if it is possible to make the necessary repairs to that building.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure on experimental farms, out of an appropriation of $100,000, was $81,043, to the 31st January, 1922.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Flags?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure on flags was $2,897.65 to the 31st January, 1922.

Replying to the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Hughes), a few minutes ago I read out a statement showing how those expenditures were made. I do not think it will be possible to make a large expenditure from that appropriation on the public building to which the hon. member has referred.

Mr. HUGHES: I think the expenditure would be small. If it cannot be made from this appropriation, it would be desirable to have an appropriation made for the purpose.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I see no reason why the matter should not be considered.

Mr. DUFF: I noticed the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) asked how much money was expended last year on flags for public buildings. If he had been taking a proper interest in the proceedings of this House, he would have noticed an answer to a question which I asked earlier in the session. If he will look up Hansard, he will find a reply to that question giving the cost of all flags on Dominion public buildings to December 31, 1921. In this

appropriation there is an item of $5,000 for flags for this year. When everybody is speaking of economy, this is an item the larger part of which might be saved to the Canadian taxpayer. I have no objection to every public building in this country possessing a flag, and I believe that flags should be flown, say on Dominion day, the King's birthday and other special occasions; but, in my opinion, it is a great waste of money that a flag should be flown on a public building every day of the year and, sometimes, not only flown all day, but left flying all night. This $5,000 may seem a small sum; but if you capitalize the $5,000 voted for this special purpose, that would mean $100,000, which would not only cover the cost of repairs to a number of small public buildings in this country, but build a number of post offices in rural districts. It is not necessary that flags should be flown on public buildings from one end of Canada to the other, day after day for 365 days in the year. I would suggest that the minister issue instructions to janitors and other people, who have charge of flying flags on public buildings, that money could be saved to the country if instead of these flags being flown every-day, they were flown only on special occasions.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not sure but, possibly, I have more faith in flags than has my hon. friend (Mr. Duff). I like to see the flag flying on our public buildings. When we stand on the border line between the United States and Canada, we find the American flag is everywhere in evidence, and we, in our modesty, do not make enough use of the flag of the nation. Far from complaining of the flag being flown 365 days of the year, I think, if we made a better use of the national flag on our public buildings, that would help to stimulate and interest us all in what, I hope, is the loyal spirit of the country generally.

Mr. DUFF: I do not think I will take second place even to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in the matter of flying flags, because it is my business to fly flags more than it is, perhaps the business of any other member of Parliament. But I do not profess to be a flag-flapper in this country; I cannot see the necessity of flying flags every day in the year, and I do not think that to do so will make us more loyal. It is a useless expenditure of public money at this time, when, if I want $1,000 or $2,000 for repairing a breakwater, or establishing a postal route, or building a small post office in my constituency, or if any other hon. member wants these things, we cannot get them, because, we are told, there is no money. We could very well do without expending money on flying flags except when it is absolutely necessary that flags should be flown. I do not think the flying of flags will make us any more loyal or disloyal. If we are to depend upon flying flags to maintain the loyalty of our people, then I say: Heaven help the people of Canada.

Mr. HOCKEN: I was very glad to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) speak in favour of displaying the flag. We all know his loyalty, and we appreciate his sincerity in speaking in the way in which he has done. There is this to say for the flying of the flag. This country of ours is composed of a good many races; we live under one flag; we ought to venerate that flag, and one of the ways in which we can teach loyalty to our institutions under the Empire of which we form a part, is to have evidence, before the rising generation and newcomers to this country, the emblem of authority, of our country and our Empire. This Government surely can afford to pay for the flags necessary to be flown from the public buildings of the country. In some of the provinces the law requires the flag to be flown from all public schools. That is particularly the case in the West, and it is one of those things, small, I admit, and probably to some people of insignificant value, which in my judgment are of distinct importance as serving that very much desired end we all have in view, national unity. Let there be one thing on which all the people can agree,—the veneration of the flag of the Empire and of the country. Manitoba and Ontario are other provinces where the flag must fly on the public schools every day, and if these provinces can afford to put the flag on every schoolhouse in all sections of the country, this federal Parliament should be able to afford flags for all public buildings.

Item agreed to.

Public Buildings—rents, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $4,959,600.

The CHAIRMAN: It is proposed to take this vote up item by item. I shall therefore read the first:

Ottawa Public Buildings—Dominion Observatory and Geodetic Survey Building—repairs, maintenance of grounds, etc., $5,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does it cost $5,000 a year to keep this building in repair?

Every year, it seems, we vote $5,000. The building is a very small one, and I should not think it would require that amount of money to keep it in repair.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure varies. In 1920-21 it was $4,158, and last year as low as $2,683. Since 1919, however, the average appropriation has been $5,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not see where they spend it; however, I do not object.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the total amount spent last year out of the entire vote, taking all the items together?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the summary but I will give the detail for each item as we proceed. On the first item the amount spent last year was $2,683.42.

Mr. FIELDING: It must be understood, in all these cases where the expenditure of the past year is given, that the sums must necessarily be incomplete, and in some cases there will be substantial additions. If that be clearly understood there is no reason why the information my hon. friend asks for should not be given.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not agree that they must necessarily be incomplete. They may be, but if they are there is no reason why the information should not be given. I think, however, that it is rather unlikely that these sums would be incomplete.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa Public Buildings—water, $42,000.

Mr. HOCKEN: What accounts for the increase in this item? Is the water any dearer this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The expenditure last year was $35,000 as compared with $42,000 this year. The increase of $7,000 is due to the increased consumption of water in government-owned buildings, as a result of the taking over of the Daly building on Rideau street and the new Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment building. The quantity of water supplied during the first half of the year 1921-22, on which the estimates of 1922-23 are based, was greater than in the corresponding period in 1920-21.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is this water purchased on meter rate?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is not the water rate for the city of Ottawa?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood it was for the special water in the Tally-Ho water bottles.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Provision for that water is in the House of Commons expenditure.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That water is supplied to every department.

Mr. ANDERSON: I see further down in this vote $60,000 for water. What is that for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is for buildings throughout Canada, outside of Ottawa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Spent $35,000.

Item agreed to.

Elevator attendants, $70,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the expenditure for the fiscal year on elevator attendants?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $59,940.

Mr. FIELDING: The minister's information seems to have been prepared up to the end of December with the expectation of the estimates coming on earlier, and as the actual expenditure will vary from day to day I quite understand why the minister may not have it. The figures given up to December 31 would be for only nine months.

4 p.m.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some of the figures are given up to the end of the fiscal year; there is no use taking this one for nine months. All the commitments are known. Every man's salary is known; he is under the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. BOYS: Does the minister say the total expenditure up to 31st March was $59,940?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. BOYS: That is a pretty safe estimate, because I presume the minister would know exactly what these attendants are paid. That being so, why the increase of $10,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Uniforms are not included in that amount—$2,205; and contingencies are estimated at $7,855.

Mr. GOOD: Do I understand that included in this item of $70,000 for elevator

attendants there are some other expenses not so described? If so, that would explain the apparent discrepancy.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is no discrepancy. There is temporary help, and that is provided for in the contingencies.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand the minister to say that last year's expenditure was $59,940. If that is the case, is there any reason to anticipate a larger expenditure this year? While in the total vote there is a slight reduction from last year, the main estimate this year is higher. What we want to know is whether there cannot be a reasonable reduction in these main estimates.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have given the expenditure on salaries for last year; with contingencies, uniforms and wages, it would amount to $70,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the minister has given us wrong information. He said the expenditure last year was $59,940; now he puts it at $70,000. Which is right?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The $59,940 was for salaries only. With uniforms and contingencies the estimated expenditure last year was $70,000. We are asking for the same amount this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is clear now.

Item agreed to.

Ottawa public buildings—lighting, including roads and bridges, $90,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the expenditure last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Up to the 31st December, 1921, we had expended $69,059.44, but it is expected that the full $90,000 will be expended during the current year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really do not like these statements about expecting certain amounts to be expended. A certain amount was spent or committed up to the end of the year; if there is special reason to expect anything else this year, we should know that reason. The mere statement that it is expected it will all be needed is of no value to the committee. What is the actual amount that we are committed to pay? There is no reason why it should not be known; if the information is not here, we should adjourn until we get it.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend is asking for the expenditure to date. The notes which I am using were prepared, I believe, before I entered the Government. I am giving the expenditure up to December 31, 1921, and it is expected that the $90,000 will be expended. I have not the accounting of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may be true that this information was prepared before the minister came into the department, but that does not absolve him from the duty of bringing his information up to date, because information up to the end of December is almost valueless to this committee. Now that he is coming at the end of April to get his estimates through Parliament he should have the information up to 31st March; there is no reason why he should not have it here.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If this item is to carry and all items are to carry without any information at all, this committee might just as well adjourn and go home. There is really no consideration being given to these estimates; they are just asked to flow by at the word of the minister. Now, I am not going to be meticulous about a single item, but if the minister is in the same position about all these items as he is about this one, I do not see what value this committee is.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My right hon. friend knows I am following the usual procedure in this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, I know the minister is not.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To revise these estimates would mean a good deal of work. I have no objection to having any particular item stand over so that the information may be brought up to date, but I am told we are following the usual practice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister need not come to Parliament and in his first session tell me that it has been the usual practice to give information as to expenditure only up to four months before the date on which the information is given. If this was the month of January, it would be all right; the figures would run up to December 31 and might not be absolutely accurate; but the minister could give them, together with the reasons for any inaccuracies. But to come to the end of April and say that because these figures were made up in December the minister is doing the usual thing and cannot take time to bring them up to date—that surely

is a statement that does not do very much credit to the minister. Last night he gave us this information as to item after item up to the end of the fiscal year. When it came to Ontario he said he did not have it, but gave a total which turned out to be wrong. We asked that the item stand until to-day, and he comes back to-day with the full information. Now, all we ask is that he do as to this what he has done as to Ontario. It is no answer, and it is not in accordance with the facts, to say that it has been the practice in this Parliament to give the House information only up to four months before the time the information is given.

Mr. BOYS: There is no trouble at all in getting it. I have sent for and hold in my hand a copy of the Canada Gazette, the second number for April, where the expenditure for the minister's department is shown in detail up to the end of February, $8,640,615. If we got the Canada Gazette of just two weeks ago, we should find there the total expenditure in connection with public works up to March 31. Certainly the Finance Department has that information, and the minister could easily get it on the items we are discussing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the total is given, the details must be known to the officers of the department.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Some items are brought up to 31st December, and some later. I am giving them as I have them here. I regret they are not all brought up to the end of the year.

Mr. BOYS: When the minister says the items are not brought up to the end of the year, he is referring to the portfolio before him, but the Finance Department has an absolutely accurate statement of the cash disbursements not only up to 28th February but to the end of the year. I think it is the issue of the Canada Gazette for the second week in April which has the complete cash statement up to the 31st of March. I have sent for it and will give the minister the total. The total is all it gives, but we want the items that make up that total.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is getting to be a farce—

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the objector to the flags agrees with me.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. DUFF: I wish to object to any such remarks from the hon. leader of the Opposition. I think that is a contemptible remark to make, and it could only come from a contemptible gentleman in this House. He is Meighen by name and mean by nature.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will not disturb the level of the discussion by paying any attention to the hon. member.

Mr. DUFF: You have got down to a pretty low level.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It has been shown and, of course, hon. members have known, that the totals of these departmental expenditures are not only known but recorded up to the end of the month. Now we are voting the details. Let the minister be fair. He must agree that his department knows the expenditure for each detail. Otherwise, how can his department supply the Finance Department with the totals—you cannot get the totals unless you have the details. The minister may not have the details before him, but they are in his department, and he should have that information here before he asks the committee to vote this money.

Mr. GOOD: May I make a suggestion? This seems to me a very unfortunate condition of affairs. In order to satisfy everybody, would it not be better to let the item stand over until next week when the minister can have the information for the committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion, and further, to go on with any estimates the minister may have complete.

Mr. BOYS: May I ask what is the practice in the payment of these amounts? Are they paid by the Finance Department in every instance, or some by the Finance Department and some by the minister's own department? If they are all paid by the minister's own department, he does not have to go to the Finance Department, for he will have a complete record himself. I presume that when the Deputy Minister of Finance prepares this statement in the Gazette, what he has before him is the expenditure in detail in the Public Works and other departments; this he audits in some way, then signs the statement, and it is printed. If that is the case, the minister must have in his own department the information we are asking for.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have the details in the department and the totals are

supplied to the Finance Department. There is no question about that.

Mr. BOYS: Then they can easily be got.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are there any of these items on which the minister can give us the details? If so, I have no objection at all to going on with them.

Item stands.

Harbours and Rivers—Nova Scotia, $182,680.

Mr. MEIGHEN—Can the minister give us the expenditure for last year?

Mr. FIELDING: I do not see how the minister can give the expenditure for last year, because these votes are not for continuing the service. Wherever you are continuing the service, you could give the information as to each item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be only three in which he could give the information; the rest are new.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It would appear that last year the total amount voted for harbours and rivers of Nova Scotia was $365,000, and that of that the amount not spent was $270,000, leaving the actual expenditure for last year the comparatively small amount of $95,000, in round figures. The proposal this year is to double that and bring the expenditure up to $182,000. We treated these improvements just as we treated our expenditure on public buildings. It was considered that they should be pared down to the very core, and that unless an expenditure on harbours and rivers was an absolute necessity, it should not be made at all. We treated post offices and all public buildings in the same way; not a single new building appeared in the estimates anywhere. This year public buildings have been similarly treated in the estimates. Glancing over them I see no provision for new public buildings. But here is a proposal to double last year's expenditure for harbours and rivers. I think we should have a good deal of information before we agree to doubling our expenditure in the province of Nova Scotia, notwithstanding the fact that Nova Scotia did return a solid block of supporters of this Government.

Mr. FIELDING: If the hon. gentleman's idea is that this expenditure is being doubled, he is entirely mistaken. If it is thought desirable to have a statement of the actual expenditure on those items, and the hon. member wishes the vote to stand over, I have no objection, but I am perfectly sure he is mistaken in his calculations.

Mr. HANSON: If you deduct the amount of $270,000 appropriations not required for 1922-23, from $365,900, the amount in the third column, it leaves exactly $95,000, representing what has been expended. That seems to me to follow as day follows night. If it does not, the estimates are entirely misleading.

Mr. FIELDING: This term "appropriations not required" is misleading hon. gentlemen. It does not mean anything of the kind. It is a mere book-keeping entry in balancing the accounts so that we may show the total appropriation of last year on one side and the estimated expenditure of the new year; but it does not imply that all that sum was voted and not expended. If my hon. friends have got that idea I hope the minister will bring down a statement showing what the total expenditure for that item in Nova Scotia is. It certainly does not mean what has been contended.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not wish the Minister of Finance to think I understood that because an item appeared in the "appropriation not required" for this year none of the money was spent last year. I understand the matter exactly as the Minister of Finance does. It means that the items that were in last year amounting to that sum are not in this year.

Mr. FIELDING: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But still we ought to have—and I understand we do have it or the minister would not have called this item—details of what actually was spent.

The CHAIRMAN: The first item is:

Baddeck—repairs to wharf, $3,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are new items and of course we cannot ask for details of what was spent last year because there was no expenditure.

Mr. HANSON: Under the head "Harbours and Rivers, Nova Scotia" we ought to know what was spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We ought to know what was spent under the head of this entire item, No. 155, and charged to that vote last year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I can have that information prepared and brought down at the next sitting, I have not got it here.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then the item had better stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Prince Edward Island, $39,700.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister give us the information as to the amount spent last year on the total of this item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If my right hon. friend is insistent on this information it will require considerable time before we will be able to proceed with these estimates. I understand it is an unusual request, one that has not been made before, and compliance with it will involve a considerable amount of work. This item will therefore have to stand like the other one.

Mr. CANNON: Before the item is allowed to stand, will the minister state to this committee what official in his department is supposed to prepare the information respecting the estimates for the Public Works Department to be submitted when we go into committee on them and particulars regarding them are asked for by hon. members?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The staff of officials in the department known as the "Estimates Branch" prepare this information for use in the House.

Mr. CANNON: Then that staff ought to be improved.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that, next year, if the minister hopes to be in his office, he adopt the plan that I feel certain from memory was adopted in the Interior Department, in accordance with which the items appeared in a series of columns and there was one which gave the expenditure, if not for the year before, up to the last date on which it could be given, and that applied throughout.

Mr. FIELDING: My recollection is that the information is not commonly given. I am not objecting; in any case where an hon. member desires information it is our business to produce it; but I rather think the question asked in this case is an unusual one. The estimates are brought down and weeks elapse before the minister is able to bring them before this committee, and in the interval there is a change every day in the amount expended. The information sought by my hon. friend is not usually asked. I am not objecting to it. I think perhaps in a particular case when an hon. member asks for such information, I would give it to him even though this involves holding the estimates over to meet his wishes. I repeat that I am not objecting; I believe in giving the fullest information to the House, even when it is not reasonable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Surely the Minister of Finance does not suggest that it is unreasonable to ask for the amount expended the year before, months after the year has expired, subject to any reservation that might reasonably have to be made. The minister says it is not usual. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. I will not stand here and say it is always done. I know I have given the information frequently. And I do say this—it is manifestly the most important information the committee could ask. It may be that information manifestly the most important is not always asked, but I know it is often asked, and I know it should be asked. The minister says the information will have to be revised from day to day. Not at all. If we came here a month from now no one would expect information but to the end of March. If we were here a month earlier, no one would expect the information quite to the end of March, but we should expect it to the end of February. We expect such information as makes up the total that is furnished to the Department of Finance. That is all we ask. That does not need any day-to-day revision at all. I am not doing this—I do not think the Minister of Finance had any impression that I have—to embarrass the minister in the least. I want the information—and it should go forth adequately—as to what was spent last year for the purpose of throwing some light on what should be voted now. There has been very much reduction already and in the light of the information to be given there may possibly be more estimates to be reduced.

Mr. FIELDING: The information that is asked for is usually given in the Auditor General's Report at the end of the year. My right hon. friend is trying to anticipate by a year. That may be a very commendable object, but I am sure the question is a very unusual one. I cannot recall an occasion when the request has been made as my hon friend makes to-day. However, I am not going to object to it; members of Parliament should be given all the information they desire.

Mr. BOYS: Will it involve any extra work to give the information to the end of any month? Because, if I am not mis-

informed, under the prevailing practice, a statement is prepared at the end of every month containing all these details and is handed to the Finance Department. Of course, if the preparation of such a statement meant costing the country a great deal of money there might be some objection to it. But if I am rightly informed no more work will be involved in preparing such a statement for the House than is necessitated by the preparation of the statement given to the Finance Department?

Mr. FIELDING: The information given to the Finance Department consists only of totals, in order to make a general statement of the financial condition of the country; but if each item is to be set forth from time to time giving what has been expended in every case up to a given date it will involve a good deal of work and will not serve any good purpose.

Mr. BOYS: If I am wrong I want to be corrected, but it seems to me that before the Deputy Minister of Finance puts his signature to the statement referred to he must have an itemized account from every department showing exactly what the expenditure is. The Minister of Finance shakes his head. I realize that he knows far more about this matter than I do. It would seem to me, however, to be a most extraordinary thing that the Deputy Minister of Finance should certify, as he does over his own signature, the total expenditure for each department without having the details supplied to him from each department showing what the total for the month is. They give it for the month and for the year. Let me give one illustration; we are dealing now with the Department of Public Works. The statement I have is only down to 28th February, but there is one available for 31st March and it is certainly published, for I saw it myself. We find that for the month of February the total is given at $948,995.92. Is it not perfectly manifest that there must be a statement with details furnished which permits of arriving at that total?

Mr. FIELDING: There must be a statement in the Public Works Department to make the total, but it does not follow, in publishing this statement, that we deal with totals. It is not necessary to do so. My hon. friend omitted to read—I am not complaining because he did not reach it—something which is always put in with that statement. I had a hazy recollection of it, and I find it appears in this statement and reads:

> The above statement represents only receipts and payments which have passed through the books of the Finance Department up to the last day of the month.

Mr. BOYS: Quite so.

Mr. FIELDING: And we get those statements in the other departments, and have to refer to them for details.

Mr. BOYS: I quite agree with the hon. minister, and, if I rightly understand the matter, this relates to cash items. I am told that, between the departments, they have some credit system, for which reason these statements are not complete, and, although the fiscal year ends 31st March, because of the credit system prevailing between the departments we cannot be certain of the totals until these credit systems are squared in some way. I quite appreciate that, but the minister does not get my point. All I am saying is that in the department we are now dicussing, which is Public Works, for the month of February the total expense was $948,995.92, and for the year, up to that date, $8,098,664.82. Surely there must be some statement with details which shows how these figures are arrived at, and we should have that statement.

Mr. FIELDING: That statement is in the Public Works Department, and you can take the totals and compare them without much labour, but if you are going over the pages of the estimates, taking all the estimates, taking every item every month, all that has been expended, all that I can say is that, while you have been anticipating the report of the Auditor General, you are going to add a considerable amount to the labour of the department. Whether the game is worth the candle is a question.

Mr. BOYS: The only statement I am asking for is the one on file with the department, which is completed for the purpose of this financial statement published every month, which statement is given by the particular department to the Finance Department. I admit it might be a month old, but it could not be more than a month old. That is not going to entail any extra labour on the part of anybody, but will give the information we want.

Mr. FIELDING: In view of the desire of the hon. gentleman, I am quite content that the minister shall make an effort to procure it, and, if that is the disposition of the hon. gentleman with regard to this

whole estimate, we might as well pass this estimate and get on to another, so that I will ask the House—

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If we give the hon. leader of the Opposition the total expenditure on each vote, rather than each item, would that be sufficient?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not feel like holding the House, if the hon. minister can give the totals, but the item would be more useful if we had the details. I refer to the totals for Nos. 144 and 145. If the hon. gentleman is getting the details for to-morrow, one by one, there is no reason why it should not be brought down.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the total vote, but that can be had within a reasonable time. If the total vote for each item is required, it will take up a considerable time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it is going to delay the work of Parliament, I will not ask for it, but if the hon. minister will give the totals for each vote in item 144, without going to any special labour, up to as late a date as he has it for each item, so that we can get the fair estimate for the year, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. DUFF: Take for instance item 156, referring to Prince Edward Island; there is absolutely no information which the minister can bring down to-morrow, or at any time, with regard to all those items. There is a new item for repairs to wharfs and breakwaters, and consequently the minister has no information in his office, except what is contained in his estimate. Therefore, there is no reason why that item should not pass. Then take the item for Nova Scotia, $182,000 odd, every item is new except harbours and rivers generally. Every item from Quebec to Yarmouth Bar —I am not referring to any particular bar —is new. For that reason, I think we could very well pass these items, and if the hon. gentleman wants any information about "Harbours and rivers generally, $60,000," the minister could bring down the information and details with regard to the item. It is impossible to get information as to every item in the Nova Scotia vote. The same remark applies to New Brunswick. The only item with reference to which the minister has any information as to the expenditure is the fifth item in the list, "Harbours and rivers generally, $40,000." The first item, "Black's Harbour, wharf extension, $8,200; Burnt Church, repairs to wharf, $900," and every item in the list is new work, except "Harbours and rivers generally." The same remark applies to Quebec. Every item in that long list totalling $396,000 on page 40 is new work except "Harbours and rivers generally, $75,000." What is the use of moving that the committe rise and report progress on the estimates of the Public Works Department when we can get through a lot of work? If the Opposition desires certain details, the information can be obtained. The same remarks apply to Ontario. I notice that the Government have been good to that province. They give them $398,-000 odd. All these items are new and some of them very large. The amount for North Bay is $30,000, and Owen Sound $34,000, Port Colborne, $75,000. That is almost as much as the whole vote for Nova Scotia. I have no objection to it, but the minister can give no information about it. The only item which he can give information about is the fifth item, "Harbours and rivers generally, $65,000." The same remark applies to Manitoba. There is only one item there, "Harbours and rivers generally, $15,000," on which this committee can get any information. Saskatchewan and Alberta, item 161, are given $21,000 for harbour and rivers generally. That is the only item for those provinces, and I presume if the Opposition want the information they can get it on the whole item. Then the vote for British Columbia is $193,000, all for new work, except $95,000. It seems to me there is no necessity for us to delay this committee. We can pass all the items with the exception of those to which I have referred for harbours and rivers generally.

Mr. GOULD: While these large sums are under consideration, I should like to interject the remark that we all have recollections of the time when agriculture stood up and asked for certain appropriations and assistance in the various districts and there was more or less criticism from different quarters. The items under discussion pertain particularly to urban centres—

Mr. DUFF: Not at all.

Mr. GOULD: To a great extent.

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. GOULD: The agricultural districts provide a very fair proportion of the funds required to meet these expenditures. As the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) suggests, the Manitoba and Saskatchewan appropriation in this connection might well be continued because it is a small amount.

As a matter of fact, I think those provinces deserve a little more money in this connection.

Mr. DUFF: How many breakwaters are there in Saskatchewan?

Mr. GOULD: The amount voted for the province of Ontario under the present appropriation should satisfy even the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), who protests vigorously that Ontario does not receive her fair proportion of the revenue. It is only just to interject the remark that agriculture, while it has not said very much this afternoon in this regard, has its eyes open, and is following the debate with much interest.

Mr. MACLAREN: Is it possible for the minister to bring forward item No. 157, New Brunswick, this afternoon? It would be convenient if he could do so.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we shall have to adopt the same principle as regards all hon. members. If we select a province and select an item for the convenience of one member, others will want other items brought on. I think the suggestion made by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) is reasonable. There are many items that might go through without discussion; but if my hon. friends opposite wish to delay them, let them all be delayed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The point which the hon. member makes is that, in connection with items that are wholly new, items that are not a continuation of last year's appropriations, we might go on; but the exceptions are far more than he stated. There are always the appropriations not required. In connection with the new items, it is of some importance to know what was spent under the whole appropriation of last year; in fact, that is of more importance than any other single piece of information. Consequently, I would not very seriously object to going on with the new items; but I do not think any time would be saved, because it takes very little time to have these considered and passed after we have information as to the total amount spent last year under the appropriation.

Mr. FIELDING: I think, instead of putting the items through en bloc, we can hold over, not the whole item, but any particular item for a province, concerning which item any further information is needed. Subject to that, we might go on and put them through.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will illustrate what I mean. Supposing it turns out that in New Brunswick, although $118,000 was voted, we spent only $42,000. In that event, it would seem to be the part of wisdom to consider the items very carefully before voting all these sums for new items. The same thing applies to Ontario, Quebec and every other province.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend will realize that each item must stand on its merit, and that what was spent last year will make no difference. If a particular wharf requires repairs, the question, whether we are willing or not to vote the money for that purpose, must depend on its merits.

Mr. DUFF: These are not new items. These are wharves or breakwaters constructed, perhaps, ten, twenty or thirty years ago, and the amounts put in the estimate for their repair are very necessary. During the last seven or eight years, it would have been a great deal better had more money been spent on breakwaters in this country. These breakwaters were allowed to go to wreck and ruin, with the result that larger amounts have to be inserted in the estimates. These large amounts would not have been necessary had proper care been exercised when the breakwaters needed slight repairs. There is, however, no reason why items which are new should not be passed. The leader of the Opposition is quite right in asking for information as to the total amount expended. That can be given on Monday when the Minister of Public Works will also explain expenditures in connection with harbours, rivers and improvements generally; but I do not think it is fair that the committee should rise and report progress on these new items when no information can be given by the department.

Mr. FIELDING: My suggestion is that we return to the question of harbours and rivers, take each item individually, and if, in any case, there is a desire for further information which can be given later, we can hold over that item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is no other minister ready to go on,—

Mr. FIELDING: Yes, there is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I think it would be better to go on with a minister who can give information and let the other minister come back later.

Mr. FIELDING: Very well. We will call an item of the estimates of the Minister of Justice, and take up his estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that we take New Brunswick.

Mr. DUFF: Nothing doing.

Mr. FIELDING: We will not agree to that.

Mr. DUFF: The right hon. gentleman does not get anything like that off on us.

Mr. MACLAREN: As regards New Brunswick, my remarks were going to refer to what was not in the estimate.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Administration of Justice—Supreme Court of Canada:—

Contingencies and disbursements, salaries of officers, (sheriffs etc.), books, magazines, etc., for judges, not exceeding $300, $7,500.

Law books and books of reference for library, and binding of same, $10,000.

Printing, binding and distributing court reports, $10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would the minister give us last year's expenditures on these and also explain why an increase is asked for?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): The registrar reports as follows:

I am asking for an additional $2,000 on account of law books. There have been no changes in the requisition for this item for some fifteen years, notwithstanding the increase in the price of law books, but as a matter of fact I have been running behind in recent years and carrying over some of my obligations into the next succeeding year, and have not bought so freely as I felt the requirements of the library demanded. For this purpose I require the additional amount.

You will also see that the amount for printing and binding the Supreme Court reports is now placed at $10,000. This item practically appears only by reason of the requirements of the Audit Act as the results from the sales of the reports to the Law societies and others, plus the value of the stock on hand for future requirements, will equal the amount of this vote.

It is only a question of audit.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: There is just one thing to which I should like to draw the minister's attention. It is something that I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is interested in and that again shows the necessity for a reform which we have already discussed. I think my hon. friend and I are entirely at one as regards the necessity of the Finance Department having some real control over expenditures and the real necessity of having a proper system of pre-audit. The letter that has been read from the registrar shows that that officer of the Supreme Court does not conceive himself bound by the appropriations which are voted for his department. Instead of keeping within the appropriation, he goes on and carries over liabilities. I am surprised to see that in connection with such a high tribunal. The Supplementary Estimates which were tabled last night show that on this very head, as to the further amount required for publication of the Supreme Court reports, they overdrew their account last year no less than $6,000, and I suppose the Minister of Finance has to pay it. How long has the matter been dealt with in the way the registrar points out? Are we cleaning up everything now with that $6,000?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: When we come to the supplementary estimates I shall be able to explain that. This has been running for years now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It has been running behind some years and that is what I want to find out.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would gather from the letter from Registrar Cameron that all the money was spent last year on each of these three items, and more than the vote.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: More than the vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then I would suggest to the minister, that, in pre-election years at least, he instruct the registrar to keep within the vote and not spend the money himself and have it charged against the late administration that did not authorize him to do so at all.

Item agreed to.

Exchequer Court of Canada, $10,833.34.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The item does not seem objectionable on the face of it. How much of the vote was spent last year?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The contingencies were all spent. The money voted was sufficient to meet all obligations for the year. The details are found at page L-7 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. POWER: Last year when this item came up several members from Quebec city and district called the attention of the minister to the fact that in Quebec city at the present time in Admiralty cases the pleaders have to pay for justice. When a case comes up we must pay the fees of the judge from Montreal before he will consent to sit. I do not remember how much it is per day, but we have to pay

it, and also the travelling expenses, before the judge will come to Quebec to deal with the matter. Judge Routhier, the judge in Admiralty in Quebec, has never been replaced. The Hon. Mr. Doherty, the late Minister of Justice, stated on several occasions that the matter was before him and that he intended to give it his best consideration. I hope the present Minister of Justice will see his way to appoint a judge in Quebec. At present Judge MacLennan comes from Montreal and must be paid his fees in advance before any cases are tried before him.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: By 9-10 George V, Chap. 59, section 2, it was provided:

> No salary shall be paid to any local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court under the provisions of this section who is a judge of any provincial Superior Court. Provided, that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any Local Judge in Admiralty who was or is appointed before the coming into force of this act.

In November and December last judgeships in Quebec and Nova Scotia became vacant by the death of Sir Adolphe Routhier and the retirement of Judge Drysdale, and their successors, Judge MacLennan and Judge Mellish, receive no salaries as Judges in Admiralty. I did not know that the pleaders had to pay the fees of the judges. I will see what can be done to remedy this condition of affairs, which is somewhat extraordinary.

Mr. POWER: The situation is simply this, that before the judge will sit he must be paid his fees.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: On what date was Judge MacLennan appointed?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I do not know the exact date, but I can ascertain and inform my hon. friend later on. He was appointed last fall.

Item agreed to.

Yukon Territory, $36,800.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There has been a slight increase in salaries. The former court stenographer, George Craig, received a living allowance of $1,800. Mr. A. G. Blankman has been temporarily appointed, at a salary of $2,100,
5 p.m. to replace Mr. Craig, who was retired under the Calder Act. Owing to reduction of business a decrease of $4,000 appears feasible in miscellaneous expenditures, which during the last few years have been going down.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent of the vote last year?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The first three items were spent in full. Of the $20,000 voted for miscellaneous expenditures only $2,000 was spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If only $2,000 was expended out of a vote of $20,000, it seems that a reduction of more than $4,000 is warranted this year. With the diminishing population of the Yukon, the per capita cost of administration has really become very great. I know that only a portion of it comes under the Department of Justice; a greater proportion comes under the Public Works and the Interior. I am safe in saying that a reduction of almost half was made in the Interior estimates, and in the Public Works Department the maintenance of that long telegraph line is the chief item. We find that the Yukon is costing us possibly $23 per head for the administration of justice alone. It is, of course, abnormal. I know the minister's difficulty: judges have been appointed for the Yukon; sheriffs have been appointed, and it is difficult to interfere with them. In fact, the judge is appointed for life, and unless he were transferred, any interference would be unfair. But I would ask the minister to consider, and to make effective at the earliest possible day if he deems it wise, the union for judicial purposes of the Yukon with British Columbia. If that was done, a judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia could attend to the requirements of the Yukon, with great saving to the national treasury. As it is now, we keep up an entire judicial system there for what is really the population of a very modest-sized town.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: We spent only $2,000 last year. I assure my hon. friend that we will not spend any more than is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would it not be well to reduce the item to $10,000? The minister is new, and I do not like to place too much temptation in his way.

Mr. BLACK: The right hon. leader of the Opposition is correct in his suggestion that the population served by the courts of Yukon territory is much smaller than it was, but I do not think it may exactly be compared to that of a modest-sized town. The Yukon covers a very large area in which very important interests are involved; and I am not prepared to agree with the leader of the Opposition that the needs of justice

would be well served by uniting, as it were, the judicial matters of the Yukon with those of British Columbia. It would entail the travelling of judges from British Columbia into that territory at various seasons of the year, and at great expense. In the earlier days of the Yukon we had there a comparatively large population. Of recent years the business of the mining of placer gold has decreased; the mines have passed into the hands of large companies which mine by means of up-to-date machinery at a smaller margin of profit than had been made by individual miners. But I am happy to be able to tell the committee that in very recent times,—since 1919—large discoveries of silver ore have been made in that territory; industry is fast developing, and I think I am quite within the mark when I predict that within two or three years we will have in the Yukon some of the largest silver-mining camps in the world. The administration of the Yukon is now carried on on the most economic basis—too much so, in some cases, for efficiency. One branch of the service that has been properly maintained there through all these trying years has been that of the Department of Justice, and I submit that it would be a mistake at this time to cut down this estimate. If the money is not required, it will not be spent. Notwithstanding the fact that the present administration is a new one, I myself have every confidence in the Department of Justice of this Dominion, under whatever party may be in power. I submit that the estimate should be allowed to stand as it is.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses of litigated matters conducted within the Department of Justice, $33,000.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amount varies from year to year and the expenditure cannot accurately be foreseen. The expenditure for 1919 was $1,200; for 1920, $7,600; for 1921, $13,000. The usual annual vote is $13,000. The additional $20,000 is asked this year to provide for the expenses of the reference to the Privy Council of the Newfoundland-Labrador boundary question.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—expenses under Pecuniary Claims Convention with U.S.A., $10,000.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: For some years previous to the war the annual appropriation for this service was $25,000, which covered the expenses of preparing the Canadian schedule of claims and one-half the remuneration of the United States and Canadian arbitrators, Mr. Charles Anderson and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. As negotiations are pending between Great Britain and the United States for the preparation of a second schedule of claims, and a resumption of the activities of the convention is hoped for during the year, it becomes necessary to provide for working expenses. We have quite a list of claims that are to be submitted to that tribunal.

Mr. HANSON: I must confess I never heard of this convention before. Would the minister be good enough to explain just what it is?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The Pecuniary Claims Convention between Great Britain and the United States providing for the settlement by arbitration of pecuniary claims outstanding between the two countries was signed at Washington on 18th August, 1910. The first schedule of claims was prepared and several cases argued before the tribunal in 1914 and awards made in many cases, while in a few cases the awards have not been yet made. A second schedule was in course of preparation when the war interrupted the proceedings. The United States national arbitrator is Mr. Chandler Anderson; the Canadian, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick; the umpire is Mr. Fromageot, of Paris. Under the arrangements the Canadian Government is responsible for payment of half of the expenses and remuneration of the two arbitrators and the umpire at $40 per diem during the sittings of the tribunal.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries, $1,670,900

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The main items of increase are as follows:

$69,500—Statutory increases, retiring allowances and extra officers due to increased population which amounts to 421 inmates in the first 8 months of fiscal year 1921-22, or about twice what it was in the whole of the last fiscal year, (1920-21.) Statutory increases 1922-23 will total $18,690. Gratuities paid in 1920-21 totalled $71,709.41 and gratuities paid to date in the fiscal year 1921-22 total $20,710.00.

12 times current month's pay roll amounts to..	$559,295 76
Add statutory increases payable 1922-23..	18,690 00
Amount available for retiring gratuities and employment of any extra officers..	38,014 24
Amount asked in above estimate under this sub-head..	$616,000 00

$55,000—Increase asked for maintenance of convicts. This is necessary to provide for the food, clothing and medicines necessary for in-

creased population. Population, March 31, 1920, 1,931; March 31, 1921, 2,150; November 30, 1921, 2,571. Most of this increase has taken place in the past few months and shows every sign of continuing in increasing ratio. In the month of November last, 93 was the total increase of all penitentiaries.

$133,000—Increase asked for completion of buildings now under construction, or urgently required, due altogether to the increase in population. Less than four years ago our population was 1,463, and it is about 2,600 to-day.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to criticise these items at all. No doubt the money is necessary, but there is one matter I wish to bring to the minister's attention. I have received from different organizations a number of communications in support of prison reform which I am going to hand to the minister. Canada is away behind the times in this respect. After all is said and done, the war taught Canada a lesson, and particularly did the Red Cross, which through its noble work discharged seventy-five per cent of the soldiers passing through its hands, fit to go back to the front. The population of these penal institutions are an economic wastage in Canada. Many men steal to-day trivial things who would not think of doing it if it were not for the hard times and being out of work, and they are sent to these institutions. Their wives and children suffer and are left to shift for themselves.

I would like to know from the minister what is being done in Canada along the line of prison reform. I appreciate the fact that this Government has been in office only a few months, and I suppose the minister has been over-worked and perhaps may not be in a position to give me any information to-day, but he has a number of technical experts in his department and during the recess at all events they should be able to gather some information along this line. What about the commission's findings being adopted at Kingston?

I received a pamphlet and report from the federal government at Washington only the other day showing what they are doing all over the United States to restore these people to a useful civil life. Fancy!—a postman, a returned soldier in my constituency, who stole $1.27 out of a letter because he was paid a small salary and his bonus was cut off—and it was a deplorable thing to cut the war bonus off postmen's salaries—was hauled before the police court, and although a petition was presented in his favour by the Salvation Army signed by one hundred and twenty-seven business men on the street where he delivered letters, this young soldier. hard-up, unable to make ends meet on his small salary—coal $15.50 a ton and so on—was sent down by the magistrate for three years. The magistrate said, "I have no discretion," he felt he had to send the man down. This young soldier has a wife and family. In the United States, in the Old Land, in Australia, and New Zealand, they are taking up prison reform in a very vigorous way. The minister should send his experts down to Atlanta, Georgia, to see what they are doing there. A prisoner works at some useful trade and can earn up to $18 a week, and his wife and children do not suffer. Toronto has gone into this question of prison reform and has established two municipal farms, at a cost of nearly $1,000,000, on Yonge street, one for men and another for women. This jail farm is about 800 acres in extent, and I wish some of the Progressives would come up and see that work. They would learn something useful on prison reform because it is an up-to-date farm run in a model way. There is a farm for women as well, about two miles from the men's farm and similarly conducted. They can earn a living there and some of them receive $12 and $14 a week for the work they do. Their families get what they can in money. I only mention this to-day because I am afraid that a number of the men appointed at the head of these penitentiaries have not the necessary technical qualifications. I do not say this or that government is blameable, but we had a government of the same type of politics before and I know some of the appointments they made. All the governments have been in the same category and have done little or nothing for modern prison reform. The adoption of patronage in connection with this particular department is entirely wrong—there should be no patronage at all. I know a liveryman, a man who kept a livery stable in an Ontario town, who was appointed to one of these institutions out west. He was afterwards transferred to one of the largest institutions in another province. He had no technical training and was appointed on the patronage basis.

Mr. CANNON: Would my hon. friend permit me a question? Does he mean that this Government or the late government was exercising patronage to send people to the penitentiary?

Mr. CHURCH: I do not want to answer for any government—all governments are alike in the matter of patronage. Patron-

age is the only thing they consider when making these important appointments. Politics should be entirely eliminated when it comes to the consideration of appointing leaders and officials for institutions of this kind. The trouble is that when commitments are made to these institutions the families of those sent down in many cases are the ones that suffer and many become a charge on the municipalities and charities of this country. I am not blaming the present Government and my friends opposite in connection with this matter any more than past governments, but I do say that we want to get somewhere on this particular question. The Government, in the recess of Parliament, should get together and take this matter up and start some prison reforms. Toronto is doing this reformation work in the interests of society. It is a prime necessity to get this work made Dominion-wide and where possible re-establish these people back as good citizens.

It is necessary to recover this economic wastage that has gone on all these years in Canada.

Some of these individuals when rescued would work at some useful employment and thus provide for themselves and their families, and at the same time cease to be a charge on their friends and society. I appeal to the minister to take this matter up and seek to provide a method of checking this human wastage that is going on. Think of youths of sixteen being sent to these institutions. Only the other day I read in the Montreal Gazette of a boy at Fredericton on his sixteenth birthday being sent to one of these penitentiaries in New Brunswick. Is that a proper institution to care for youths of that age? This child may not have had a proper start in life; he may have literally been dragged up without being brought into contact with any beneficent or humanizing influence. Such institutions are not proper places to care for them. Last year I wrote the then Minister of Justice on the subject and enclosed some communications sent to me on the subject. The present minister will find the documents on file in the department because it resulted in a communication being sent to the government of the maritime provinces where they have not a gaol farm or a proper institution, I understand, for caring for those of the age mentioned. If the minister would only send an official down to Atlanta, Georgia, as I suggested, he would learn what excellent work is being carried on there. It is an education to learn how successfully they are caring for human wrecks and rehabilitating them in society. When that stage is reached they no longer become a charge on the public and are able to care for their families and are restored to society. I sincerely hope the Minister of Justice will take this matter up.

[Mr. Church.]

Mr. LOGAN: The subject which has just been discussed should be very seriously taken up, but this, I think, is scarcely the right time. The treatment of criminals, as we all know, is changing all over the world, and in my opinion the treatment of criminals throughout Canada deserves consideration by this House. I think it would be well worth while to appoint a special committee to consider the question of penitentiary reform, if you can call it that. Under our present system a man may be committed to penitentiary for some small offence although perhaps he may not have been in his right mind at the time. Nevertheless he is made to suffer as well as his wife and family who are bereft of his companionship and support.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would not the Criminal Code have to be re-considered too in that connection? That seems to be an important point.

Mr. LOGAN: Doubtless my hon. friend is right but I throw out the suggestion to the Minister of Justice to appoint a committee of this House to consider the matter of amending the provisions of the Criminal Code with respect to the treatment of prisoners in this country and any other questions relating thereto. While on my feet may I be permitted to pay a tribute to one of the penitentiary wardens in Canada who I believe is endeavouring, in so far as he can, to carry out a system of humanitarian treatment of prisoners, and that is the present warden of the Dorchester penitentiary. I think it is only just to him to state that he is doing splendid work in that institution along that line. Our idea should be, not to keep a man in gaol simply to punish him for crime; we should endeavour to restore him to society as a reformed citizen. That is the kind of work that is being successfully carried on to-day by the warden of Dorchester penitentiary, and I hope that his splendid example will be followed by other wardens throughout Canada.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I brought this question to the attention of the Minister of Justice the other day, when I asked if the Government was prepared to establish

prison farms in the interest of young men condemned to the penitentiary. The answer of the Minister of Justice was that the matter will be dealt with by an amendment to the Criminal Code. I think this announcement should settle the question for the present.

Mr. McBRIDE: Do I understand the Minister of Justice to say that the number of penitentiary inmates is increasing?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. McBRIDE: And that under prohibition?

Mr. CHURCH: I would suggest the desirability of amending the statutes so as to provide that the grand jury when assizes are held should have the power of visiting these institutions in the towns or cities where they may be located. There should be some protection for the inmates of these institutions; it will not do to leave that duty entirely to inspectors. They have this principle in Great Britain where, under the law, a Grand Jury can enter and inspect any one of these institutions. What protection to the inmates does the present system provide? The officials know when the inspector is coming. The Grand Jury is a bulwark of liberty, and should be given the right to enter and inspect these federal institutions in the interest of society.

The CHAIRMAN: I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that this item is for expenditure upon the penitentiaries; it has no relation to the amendment of the Criminal Code, or questions dealing with the suppression of crime.

Mr. CHURCH: All right, I will bring the matter up again.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with the general sentiments expressed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) in relation to the matter dealt with by him, but I rise for the purpose of again pointing out the necessity for fiscal reform. These estimates were fully considered by the House last year and the amount was set aside which could be legally used for each and every division of the department. Nevertheless, I notice from the supplementary estimates brought down for the last fiscal year that the department has committed itself to the extent of $150,000 more than Parliament gave it any right to do, and that was done without the passing of a Governor General's warrant. It is quite true we have to look after this amount, but there is a proper way of doing it, which will still leave the Finance Minister in a position to know where he stands. He is very apt to be in the position—and Parliament is apt to be in the position—of having to look after $150,000 of moneys which have been spent without the Governor General's warrant. It is a trouble which I had, which I do not think we ought to have, and which, I think, the present Minister of Finance will agree we ought not to have. I entirely agree that we will have to look after our obligations. I do not know that I can particularly congratulate the new administration upon the tremendous success they are making of immigration into the penitentiaries. That is a line of industry which has received an impetus in the last few months.

Mr. FIELDING: Not as late as that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think so. I think we have had an increase of 600 in the population of the penitentiaries—an increase of 30 per cent.

Mr. COOTE: What percentage of the inmates of the penitentiaries are foreign born and what percentage native born?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Two-thirds in the West and about one-third in the East for foreign born.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—Capital expenditure, $75,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I had an idea that we had just finished with capital expenditures on account of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; that, while we would have a lot of expenses, and properly so, in looking after the work, our capital expenditure was at an end.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment): This amount of $75,000 includes $30,000, which is part of the $235,000 voted last year as a grant to the Calydor Sanitarium. Members of Parliament who were here last session will remember that, by reason of the recommendation made by the Re-establishment Committee last year, an amount of $35,000 was put in the estimates as a grant to the Calydor Sanitarium. It was supposed to represent one-half of the cost of an extension to it. The amount has been reduced by $5,000, because it is expected the extension will cost $60,000. I understand the authorities of the sanitarium are having the plans prepared and work will be proceeding shortly. An agreement has

been arrived at, that the department shall have the privilege of sending there, I think, as many as twenty patients for special observation. The sanitarium is very well equipped for that work. The balance of $45,000 will cover ordinary capital expenditure on a very small scale. As my hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Finance will notice, there is a very large deduction. It is supposed to cover fixtures, equipment, and so on, for the hospital in the sanitarium. We have eighteen different hospitals under our care.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister inform the House what expenditure was made under that head last year?

Mr. BELAND: $161,000 was spent last year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Out of a vote of $235,000?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners, $4,000,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister inform us how many patients have been looked after as of to-day, and how many were looked after as of the same date a year ago?

Mr BELAND: On the 31st December, 1920, we had 5,893 in-patients, and 8,599 out-patients On the 31st December, 1921, we had 5,450 in-patients, and 5,785 out-patients. On the 31st December 1921 we had in our hospitals and in hospitals with which we have definite arrangements, a total of 5,930 patients.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Altogether?

Mr. BELAND: Altogether. There is a large number of out-patients, of course, who are not included here, but who come somewhat irregularly into the hospitals to receive treatment.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand the minister correctly as stating that we have now 5,930 patients as compared with something like 14,000 in 1920?

Mr. BELAND: No, the last statement covers only in-patients. We have 5,930 in-patients. If you want the whole number of patients that were being attended on the 31st December outside and inside, you will have to add 5,785 to 5,930.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have difficulty about the figures, because the minister first gives me as of December 31, 1921, 5,450 in-patients and 5,785 out-patients. Then he says that altogether this makes 5,930, as I understood it. That does not jibe with the other figures.

Mr. BELAND: Yes, there are 480 out-patients included in the 5,930. I should put my hon. friend right. He is, in one instance, including the out-patients. There is a very small difference in the number of patients in hospital between the 31st December, 1921, and the same day of the previous year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: 440, is it not?

Mr. BELAND: About 440.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the actual expenditure last year?

Mr. BELAND: Last year, to April 20, $3,885,082.41.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is against the appropriation of $5,250,000.

Mr. BELAND: That is not complete, I am informed, because the last accounts have not been received from the different hospitals.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That brings the accounts down to what date?

Mr. BELAND: The accounts that were in on the 20th of April.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: That is pretty late.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it not a fact that, within the last year, a change has been made in the method of examining pensioners? Has the department not done away with certain district officers and substituted a board for the examination of pensioners?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that there is no change in this regard.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has there not been a change within the last two years?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is quite right. Travelling boards were established about two years ago.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the minister find that that cuts down the expense of this branch of the service; that it is giving as good satisfaction and that it is as efficient as the former method?

Mr. BELAND: It provides for an examination by a board instead of by an individual doctor. It is considered that a little economy is effected thereby.

Mr. CALDWELL: Has the minister found any criticism regarding the services rendered by the travelling board?

Mr. BELAND: I must admit that a certain number of complaints have come into my office, but not so very many.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is it the policy of the department to pay those who have less than 14 per cent disability a lump sum, and to tell them that their pension will be discontinued?

Mr. BELAND: A pensioner, who has a disability ranging between 5 and 14 per cent, both inclusive, is at liberty to commute his pension for a lump sum which, of course, is determined by the Board of Pension Commissioners and is rated according to the degree of disability. A pensioner, with a disability above 14 per cent, has no option.

Mr. ANDERSON: And with a disability below 5 per cent he has no option?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is quite right. A man with a disability below 5 per cent has no option; his case is settled by payment of an amount, which is called a gratuity, depending upon the extent of disability.

Mr. ANDERSON: Has that change been made in the last year or the last few months?

Mr. BELAND: If my memory serves me aright, the commutation provision was adopted by this House in 1920, the session before last, upon the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON: The point I wish to make is that certain members of the Expeditionary Force, who are receiving pensions and who are rated at 5 per cent disability, received notices that they could have the privilege of having their pensions paid monthly or of taking so much as commutation. Those who took their pension monthly and who received it in that way for a year or more, were finally told that they would be given a certain commuted amount and discharged from the service.

Mr. BELAND: That is only in case of disability below 5 per cent, and, as my hon. friend is aware, it is in accordance with the provisions of the Pension Act.

Mr. CALDWELL: In case a man, who has under 14 per cent disability, commutes his pension and his disability subsequently becomes greater, is he not entitled to go back for further examination and entitled to a pension for that increase of disability?

Mr. BELAND: If his condition changes, he is entitled to re-examination, and then he may receive treatment or his pension may be increased, if that is deemed advisable by the board.

Mr. CALDWELL: But if his condition has not changed, he is not entitled to hospital treatment?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, he is always entitled to treatment, as long, of course, as the disability or the illness from which he suffers can be traced to his service.

Mr. CALDWELL: Notwithstanding the fact that he had commuted his pension and had received the lump sum?

Mr. BELAND Notwithstanding that.

Mr. CALDWELL: The reason I asked the question was this: Certain cases were brought to my attention where a man had been refused medical treatment in a hospital because of his having received final payment by way of commutation of his pension, and his disability had not increased.

Mr. BELAND: That must evidently be because the illness, of which he complained and for which he claimed treatment, was not recognized as being due to service.

Mr. CALDWELL: That might be possible.

Item agreed to.

Vocational expense, $85,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What amount was spent last year?

Mr. BELAND: Last year, only $154,900 was spent for vocational training.

Mr. MacLAREN: How many men underwent vocational training last year?

Mr. BELAND: On February 29th, 1920, the department had on strength for training purposes 17,222 disabled and 8,800 minors, or a total of 26,022. In the previous year there were only 16,000 disabled. On the 31st of December, 1920, there were 4,714 and on the 31st of December, 1921, only 605 disabled men and 29 minors, a total of 634. My hon. friend will notice that there is a big difference between 4,714 and 634.

Mr. CALDWELL: When did the time expire at which applications could be made for vocational training?

Mr. BELAND: On the 1st of February, 1920, unless the men are still on the strength.

Mr. CALDWELL: As the time has expired for applications for training what will the $85,000 be used for?

Mr. BELAND: The amount is to complete the training of men on the strength, but my hon. friend must remember that all men now receiving treatment are always admitted, regardless of the date of expiry previously set, if they wish to receive training.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—DAYLIGHT SAVING

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: Before moving the adjournment of the House, I desire to call attention to the fact that daylight saving comes into effect in Ottawa on Sunday. It was understood some time ago, in answer to a question, that while it was not proposed to make any general law on the subject, the policy of the Government was to adapt itself to the local decision in the matter of daylight saving. That being the case, I trust it is now generally understood that on Monday, when we meet again, we shall meet under the local municipal law. In other words, while there is nothing legal on the subject, we will observe daylight saving because it is the rule of the municipality.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the Government is acting wisely in following the example of the late government in this regard, as in all others, and I commend them. I cannot help observing that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was not at all influenced by the resolution of the hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Kay), and so far from restraining municipal regulations we are, on the contrary, complying with them.

Mr. FIELDING: There have been cases in which the attitude of the late government was excellent, and they are so exceedingly rare that it is perhaps well that we should mention them. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister did well to move the adjournment and so shut off any comment I might make. We will observe on this side with interest, and the country will observe with pity and remorse, any departure of the present Government from the precedent of the late administration.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Monday, May 1, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 61, respecting Niagara Bridge Company.—Sir Henry Drayton.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 52, respecting The Canadian Transit Company.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 53, respecting Itabira Corporation Limited, and to change its name to "Itabira Corporation."—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING

Bill No. 20, respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—Mr. Charters.

ROOT VEGETABLES AND FERTILIZERS—POINT OF ORDER

On the Order for the first reading of a bill to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables—the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell):

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member proceeds I would point out that this Bill, "An Act to regulate the Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables," and possibly also the third bill on the Order Paper, "An Act to regulate the sale of Agricultural Fertilizers," would come within rule 50 which provides:

> No bill relating to trade, or the alteration of the laws concerning trade, is to be brought into this House, until the proposition shall have been first considered in a committee of the whole House, and agreed unto by the House.

I would, therefore, ask the hon. member to let these bills stand. As his other bill on the Order Paper, a bill to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, seeks only to amend an act, he may proceed to introduce it by way of motion.

Bill stands.

ANIMAL CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 62, to amend the Animal Contagious Diseases Act.

Mr. TOLMIE: Explain.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: This bill provides for a rearrangement of the scale of indemnities paid upon animals slaughtered under the original act, in accordance with reductions in values. The new scale proposed will be subject to any change that the Committee of Agriculture or the House thinks it is desirable to make.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Will that apply to swine?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I move that this bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Mr. SPEAKER: That motion can only be made after the second reading of the bill.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I desire to call the attention of the Government to the delay or dereliction in bringing down returns to Orders of the House. I refer, first, to an order passed on the 24th March regarding correspondence between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Quebec Harbour Commissioners with regard to dismissals. The 24th March is now about five weeks and a half past. The correspondence, I am informed, consists of only three letters. I do not know why it takes over five weeks to have three letters copied.

The next to which I call attention is an order for production of the correspondence relating to the appointment of Sir Robert Borden as Canadian representative at the International Disarmament Conference. This was moved for by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and amended to meet a fuller requirement by myself. While there would be more than three letters in this correspondence, yet there would be very few, sufficient perhaps to occupy an hour in the copying. That has been three weeks delayed.

Then there was an order passed on the 3rd of April for correspondence passing between the late government and Hon. E. C. Drury respecting the activities of Hon. Manning Doherty in England. That correspondence consists of two letters, but the External Affairs Department apparently has not yet had time to copy them.

There was an order passed on the 27th of March regarding the dismissal of employees at the Sorel shipyards. That would take longer in preparation, but I cannot see why it would take any length of time. There has been no return as yet.

There are others, notably the correspondence relating to the deportation of Lee Holland, the order for the production of which was passed on the 24th of March. There has been no response as yet. It is a mystery to me why more than one or two days should have intervened before that return was brought down. I am quite aware there have been orders passed by this House that required lengthy correspondence with people far away to be brought up to date, gathered in, and copied, but these to which I called attention are not in that category at all. I do not know why any one of them should have been delayed more than two or three days, and I think they should be brought down at once.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In regard to some of this correspondence, I may tell my right hon. friend that where it is marked secret or confidential it has been thought advisable and necessary to seek permission from the British Government to bring down such parts as the British Government are parties to. I refer now particularly to the correspondence relating to the appointment of Sir Robert Borden as representative at Washington.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the only instance.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps my right hon. friend will remember in that connection that there was also correspondence with General Smuts of South Africa: the Government thought it advisable to communicate with General Smuts before bringing down that particular correspondence. These cables have occasioned delay, but I am happy to be able to inform my right hon. friend that the Government has permission to bring down practically all the correspondence. There are one or two communications that my right hon.

friend would probably like to see before they are placed upon the table. If so I would be glad to let him see them and he can exercise his own judgment as to whether they should be brought down; but in the opinion of the Government all the correspondence for which permission has been given should be brought down.

As to the other correspondence: It has been a little difficult to locate some of the communications which have been asked for. It is quite true, as my right hon. friend has said, that this correspondence ought to be available; but in making inquiries from the different departments we have been unable on two or three occasions to locate any of the correspondence. So far as correspondence in the Department of External Affairs is concerned, some of it has come to light one week, and some of it two or three weeks later. Of course an incoming minister has to rely on the officials of the department to get for him all the information that is required, if it is to be found. I will have inquiry made into all the cases my right hon. friend has mentioned, and if there is no special reason for delay the correspondence will be brought down immediately.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I might mention the correspondence as regards the Quebec Harbour Commission. That has all taken place under the present Government, and there should be no difficulty in getting it.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I thought this correspondence had already been tabled. My right hon. friend refers to letters exchanged between the Harbour Commission and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I understand?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Letters to the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend mentioned the word "dismissal." There were no dismissals. As far as the Sorel shipyards are concerned, a question was asked in the House and answered. I do not know that any correspondence was asked for in that connection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say "correspondence"; I said there was a motion for a return passed on the 27th of March in regard to the dismissal of employees at the Sorel shipyards. The return has not been brought down. The minister says there was no dismissal of any of the Quebec Harbour Commission. I hope he will not reaffirm that, unless he says that a request for resignation is not a "dismissal."

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think there is quite a difference between the two modes of proceeding. I know my right hon. friend was accustomed to the first mode during his time; we have not gone so far.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When I do a thing I like to do it directly.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards the correspondence respecting the appointment of Sir Robert Borden I have it under my hand. I am quite prepared to lay it on the table at once unless my right hon. friend wishes it to stand. If he wishes to look it over and withhold any of it I shall hand it over to him to do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know of no permanently confidential correspondence at all with which I was concerned in regard to the appointment, although there may have been some. I know of no reason why it should not be laid on the table. The hon. gentleman has read the correspondence, and therefore he is in a position to know whether there are letters of a confidential character which should be still withheld.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I see no reason why the correspondence should not be laid on the table.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has read it, and I have not.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am giving my right hon. friend the alternative. If he wishes to read it, I will give him the opportunity; if he does not, I will lay it on the table.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no request to make, because I remember nothing concerning it. My hon. friend must exercise his judgment and do as he thinks fit.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CANADA STEAMSHIP COMPANY—LIFE SAVING EQUIPMENT

Mr. ST. PERE:

1. Are Canadian navigation Companies doing business in Canadian waters compelled to comply with the terms of the Lavergne Act?

2. If so, why does the Canada Steamship Company, in many of its boats, omit to publish in both languages the advice or instructions, as to how to use life saving equipment?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. There is no legislation of the Parliament of Canada known as the Lavergne Act.

2. No information.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION

Mr. FONTAINE:

Why are many appeals regarding the Civil Service classification in the Post Office Department still in abeyance, and when will the results of such appeals be given?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

All personal appeals in the Post Office Department have been finally disposed of with the exception of a small number of cases in the Money Order Branch which were reinvestigated at the request of the department to determine if any error had been made in the final decision reached by the Trial Board in the original investigation. The supplementary reports referring to these are now before the Board of Commissioners and it is expected that they will be finally disposed of at an early date.

SUDBURY MAIL CONTRACT

Mr. LAPIERRE:

1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails from the Algoma Eastern Station to the Post Office, in Sudbury, Ontario?

2. How much is being paid for the above service, and was the lowest tender accepted?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. Charles Penny.

2. $300 per annum, this being the only tender received.

STURGEON FALLS POSTMASTER

Mr. LAPIERRE:

1. Who is the Postmaster at Sturgeon Falls, Ontario?

2. How long has he held this position, and what salary does he receive?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. J. D. Cockburn.

2. Since 15th November, 1884. Salary and allowances, $4,146.45.

STURGEON FALLS INDIAN AGENT

Mr. LAPIERRE:

1. Who is the present Indian Agent at Sturgeon Falls, Ontario?

2. How long has he held such office, and what remuneration does he receive?

Hon. CHARLES STEWART:

1. Geo. P. Cockburn.

2. Since February, 1904; $1,920 per annum.

MILITIA EXPENDITURE

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What were the total expenditures on maintenance of the Militia of Canada for each of the years 1890 to 1913?

2. What were the expenditures on the same for the fiscal years 1919-1920-1921?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The total expenditures for Militia Services, as shown in the Auditor General's report for the fiscal years 1889-90 to 1912-13, including Civil Government, were:

Year.	Militia Votes.
1889-1890	$1,334,426 09
1890-1891	1,328,726 15
1891-1892	1,309,429 59
1892-1893	1,468,750 76
1893-1894	1,359,597 34
1894-1895	1,631,102 72
1895-1896	2,193,372 95
1896-1897	2,478,179 00
1897-1898	1,746,730 60
1898-1899	2,561,056 17
1899-1900	3,684,294 25
1900-1901	3,168,716 00
1901-1902	2,669,038 00
1902-1903	2,587,476 00
1903-1904	3,603,714 00
1904-1905	4,012,742 00
1905-1906	5,664,192 00
1906-1907	4,377,309 00*
1907-1908	6,871,397 00
1908-1909	6,578,574 00
1909-1910	6,166,658 00
1910-1911	7,067,723 00
1911-1912	7,794,671 00
1912-1913	10,342,779 00

*Includes 9 months only. The date for closing accounts was changed this year from June 30th to March 31st.

2. The total expenditures for Militia Services, as shown in the Auditor General's reports for the fiscal years 1918-19 to 1920-21, including Civil Government, were:

1918-1919	$3,649,330 00
1919-1920	4,844,428 00
1920-1921	10,163,887 00

MILITIA CAMPS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What annual camps were held by the Militia Department in Ontario in the year 1921?

2. What units attended each of these camps?

3. What was the total number of all ranks composing each unit in camp?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:
1, 2 and 3.

1 Camp	2 Unit	3 Strength All Ranks
Cove Rifle Range, London, Ont.	The Royal Canadian Regiment	100
Carling Heights, London, Ont.	The Royal Canadian Regiment	34
	1st Hussars	312
	12th Battery, C.F.A.	50
	1st Infantry Brigade Headquarters	8
	The Middlesex Light Infantry	214
	The Bruce Regiment	246
	The Huron Regiment	223
	No. 15 Field Ambulance	30
	No. 16 Company C.A.S.C.	6
Wiarton, Ont.	9th Grey's Horse	246
Niagara Camp, Ont.	Camp Staff	65
	Royal Canadian Dragoons (attached Camp Staff)	8
	Royal Canadian Regiment—"B" Company	70
	Royal Canadian Machine Gun Brigade	73
	Royal Canadian Engineers	6
	Royal Canadian Army Service Corps	26
	Royal Canadian Ordnance Corps	8
	Royal Canadian Army Medical Corps	3
	Royal Canadian Army Veterinary Corps	3
	1st Mounted Brigade, Brigade Staff	7
	Governor General's Body Guard	247
	2nd Dragoons	243
	Ontario Mounted Rifles	202
	1st Composite Infantry Brigade, Brigade Staff	9
	The York Rangers	410
	The Grey Regiment	420
	The Simcoe Foresters	298
	The Peel Regiment	109
	The Halton Rifles	254
	The Haldimand Rifles	167
	The Lincoln and Welland Regiment	264
	Details—Attached Camp Staff	9
Niagara Camp, Ont.	Canadian Army Service Corps	53
	No. 2 Field Ambulance	15
	Canadian Postal Corps	2
Petawawa	Headquarters, Royal Canadan Artillery	3
	Headquarters, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery	56
	"A" Battery— Royal Canadian Horse Artillery	80
	"B" Battery, Royal Canadian Horse Artillery	66
	No. 3 (H) Battery, Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery	47
	*4th Battery, C.F.A.	36
	*32nd Battery, C.F.A.	34
	*1st Battery, C.F.A.	36
	*2nd Battery, C.F.A.	36
	*34th Battery, C.F.A.	36
	*2nd (H) Battery, C.A.	45
	*3rd Battery, C.F.A.	30
Peterborough	3rd P. W. C. Dragoons	153
	4th Battery, C.F.A.	51
	Canadian Army Service Corps	1
Barriefield	4th Hussars	131
	9th Brigade— CF.A.,—Headquarters	7
	3rd Battery, C.F.A.	76
	32nd Battery, C.F.A.	83
	Canadian Army Service Corps	1
Rockcliffe	Princess Louise Dragoon Guards	196
	1st Brigade, C.F.A., Headquarters	
	1st Battery, C.F.A.	168
	2nd Battery, C.F.A.	
	The Governor General's Foot Guards	270
	The Ottawa Regiment	352
	Canadian Army Service Corps	2
Belleville	34th Battery, C.F.A.	85
	Canadian Army Service Corps	1
Cobourg	2nd (H) Battery, C.A.	51

*Firing Detachments only.

MILITIA DRILL TRAINING

Mr. PREVOST:

1. What has been the yearly expenditure for drill training, of Canadian militia, in each of the provinces of the Dominion, from 1911 to the end of the fiscal year 1921?

2. Where are the various armouries in the province of Quebec located?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

EXPENDITURE BY PROVINCES FOR ANNUAL DRILL, DURING THE YEARS SPECIFIED

Province	1911–12	1912–13	1913–14	1914–15	1919–20	1920–21
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Ontario	549,408 46	925,522 83	778,116 90	882,327 31	18,176 39	235,392 49
Quebec	195,523 79	221,041 06	287,347 20	239,368 94	4,603 88	85,582 72
Nova Scotia	123,581 14	125,976 43	251,207 71	64,700 49	2,053 12	13,426 23
New Brunswick	76,742 71	74,368 29	25,147 24	116,708 13	3,699 29	20,302 44
Prince Edward Island	13,038 51	19,360 65	21,532 66	26,453 39	.....	1,339 65
Manitoba	106,188 19	187,970 43	221,866 50	298,542 38	4,012 50	21,645 10
Saskatchewan	5,914 89	9,314 62	18,309 27	16,310 76	590 00	17,744 16
Alberta	54,637 84	85,602 49	104,407 55	108,782 44	441 71	35,553 40
British Columbia	37,718 70	60,407 14	73,537 86	99,658 42	482 10	23,058 26
General	6,352 84	9,693 25	23,941 08	23,092 10	.....	26,982 68
	1,169,107 07	1,719,257 19	1,805,413 97	1,875,944 36	34,058 99	481,027 13

NOTE.—Owing to the war there were no Camps and no funds provided for the years 1915–16 to 1918–19 nclusive.

2. Government Owned Armouries

Montreal, P. Que., 65 Craig street.
Montreal, P. Que., 101 Esplanade.
Montreal, P. Que., 37 Cathcart street.
Montreal, P. Que., 200 Pine street.
Montreal, P. Que., 429 Bleury street.
Montreal, P. Que., Wellington street.
Sherbrooke, P. Que., William street.
Sherbrooke, P. Que., Belvidere street.
St. Hyacinthe, Que.
Joliette, Que.
Coaticook, Que.
Three Rivers, Que.
Magog, Que.
Quebec, Que., Grand Allee.
Lévis, Que., St. David and St. Antoine streets.
Fraserville, Que.
Rimouski, Que.
Montmagny, Que.
Beauport, Que.
Bury, Que.

Rented

Montreal, P. Que., 91 Stanley street.
Montreal, P. Que., 23 Mance street.
Montreal, P. Que., 1215 Green avenue.
Verdun, Que., No. 10 Fire Hall.
Granby, Que.
Lachute, Que.

MILITIA EXPENDITURE

Mr. PREVOST:

What has been the yearly expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence from 1911 to the end of the fiscal year ending March 31, 1922?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: The expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence exclusive of war expenditure for the fiscal years 1910-11 to 1921-22, according to the Auditor General's Reports, is as follows:—

1910-11	$ 7,067,723.00
1911-12	7,794,671.00
1912-13	10,342,779.00
1913-14	12,082,311.00
1914-15	11,862,770.00
1915-16	5,399,664.00
1916-17	4,495,187.00
1917-18	4,100,037.00
1918-19	3,649,330.00
1919-20	4,846,407.00
1920-21	10,163,887.00
1921-22	10,796,245.00

GRAND RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. SENN:

1. What repairs were planned by the engineers of the Public Works Department last year, to be undertaken on the Grand River bridge, at York, Ontario?

2. What was the estimated cost of said repairs?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1 and 2. The county of Haldimand was notified by letter dated February 18, 1922, that the Public Works Department did not intend to make any further expenditure on the Grand River bridge at York, Ontario, for the reason that this bridge is not one that should be maintained by the federal Government. The district engineer made an examination of the bridge and reported that, in his opinion, the replacement of the timber trestle for a length of 132 feet, ap-

proximately, with a reinforced concrete trestle, at an estimated cost of $6,500, was required.

WAR CLAIMS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

What are the detailed items for the vote $7,380,000 brought down in the estimates of 1922-1923 under number three hundred and seventy-six?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

	Adjustment of War Claims
Pay and Allowances	$ 192,000.00
Separation Allowance	158,000.00
War Service Gratuities	346,000.00
Printing and Stationery	26,000.00
Postage on Medals, Records, etc.	60,000.00
Ordnance Service—Repairs to Rifles and Machine Guns from Overseas	6,000.00
Engineer Services and Works	30,000.00
War Employees	265,000.00
Transport and Travelling (Land)	120,000.00
Transport and Travelling (Ocean)	4,555,000.00
Historical Section	8,000.00
Pay and Allowance Board	2,500.00
Camp Borden Site	20,000.00
Medals	535,000.00
Difference in Exchange—Redemption at par	86,500.00
Miscellaneous and Unforeseen Expenditures	470,000.00
	$6,880,000.00
Battlefield Memorials: (To be included in adjustment of War Claims Estimate in accordance with Order in Council No. 3944, dated 17th October, 1921)	500,000.00
	$7,380,000.00

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. BALDWIN:

1. How many armories were built in Canada during the years 1912, 1913, 1914 and 1915?
2. Where are the said armories located, and what was the cost of building and equipment in each case?
3. What is the annual cost of maintenance of each of said armories, including caretakers, heating and other expenses?

Mr. VIEN:

1. What amount of money did the Canadian Government advance to the Imperial Government, each year, from the declaration of the late war up to the present date, and on what dates were the said amounts advanced?
2. How much, if any, has the Government of Canada received as reimbursement for these advances?
3. Was this reimbursement made in cash or in kind?
4. If in kind, what articles were received, and of what value?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to operate the greater production farms on the Blackfoot Indian Reserve at Gleichen, Alberta, this year?
2. If not, how does the Government intend disposing of them?
3. Will proper precautions be taken to prevent the country being seeded with weeds from these neglected farms?
4. How many acres were broken by the Government on these farms?
5. What was the cost per acre?
6. From whom, at what place, and at what price was the seed wheat for these farms purchased?
7. From whom, at what point, and at what price, were the feed oats purchased during the first and second year of operation?
8. What was the average yield each year of operation?
9. What was the net price received per bushel for the wheat grown?
10. To whom was this wheat sold?
11. What was the net profit per acre each year?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What are the names of the employees of the Department of Customs and Excise, Montreal?
2. What salary is paid to each of said employees?
3. What were the respective dates of employment of said employees?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What are the names of the employees of the Montreal Post Office?
2. What were the respective dates of employment of said persons?
3. What is the salary of each of the said employees?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What are the names of the persons employed in the Income Tax Office at Montreal?
2. What is the salary, and the date of appointment of each of said employees?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What are the names of the employees of the Canadian National railways in the district of Montreal?
2. What are the respective duties of each of said employees?
3. What are the respective salaries of each of said employees?
4. What was the date of appointment of each of said employees?

Mr. PREVOST:

1. From whom did the Government purchase stationery necessary for election purposes and the various Government Departments, during the years 1914-15 to 1921-22, inclusive?
2. What amount of stationery was purchased from each firm during the said period?

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION INTO CANADA

On the question being called:

Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Under what conditions and regulations are Japanese immigrants admitted into Canada?
2. In what way are the rights of Canadians in Japan limited as to ownership of land, franchise, mercantile pursuits, fishing, shipping (coastwise and foreign), mining, agriculture, and other pursuits and such as are engaged in by Japanese in Canada?
3. What is the number of Japanese immigrants that have entered Canada yearly in each of the ten years ending March 31, 1922?
4. How many Japanese have left Canada for Japan, each year, during the same period?
5. How many Japanese have returned to Canada from Japan each year during the same period?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Stands.

Mr. TOLMIE: Could the hon. minister tell me when I may expect an answer? I would like the information as soon as possible as the matter will come up later.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might say, in regard to this question as to certain rights of Canadians who obtain lands in Japan, that has necessarily been the subject of communication with the Foreign office in the Old Country, and we had some difficulty in getting replies which would enable us to make the returns my hon. friend is looking for, but I shall do the best I can to get the information as soon as possible.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved

For return showing a list of the names of the permanent employees of the Montreal Harbour Commission, the salary of each, date of appointment and salary on appointment, age, occupation, and the respective previous occupations of said employees.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This motion asks for the information which is contained in the answer to question No. 9, by Mr. Denis (St. Denis). I suppose the question might be dropped, and we will adopt this motion?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. MACLEAN (Prince):

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, contracts, tenders and other documents, relating to the employment or use of the tug "Pekin", and any other tug or tugs hired or used by the Government in connection with the Government dredges, in and around Prince Edward Island, from June, 1911, to March 31, 1922.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence and reports exchanged directly between the Health Department of Canada and J. A. Foisy, Dominion Drug and Chemical Company, and the North Eastern Drug Chemical, Limited, of Montreal, regarding narcotics reports in the years 1919-20-21, and principally reports made by the Mounted Police.

Mr. PARENT:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Post Office Department at Ottawa, and the Officers of the said department at Montreal, and the Civil Service Commission, regarding the appointment of Mr. Taylor as Assistant Superintendent at Montreal Post Office.

TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

On the Notice of Motion:

Mr ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence and reports exchanged directly between the Health Department of Canada and J. A. Foisy, Dominion Drug and Chemical Company, and the North Eastern Drug Chemical, Limited, of Montreal, regarding narcotics reports in the years 1919-20-21, and principally reports made by the Mounted Police.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, reading over this motion, I am somewhat doubtful as to the advisability of rendering public some of the reports made by the Mounted Police in connection with the traffic in narcotics in Canada. For that reason, until I have had an opportunity of discussing the matter with officials of my department, I would request that the motion stand.

Motion stands.

FINANCIAL CREDIT

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House a representative Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I trust I may be permitted what may seem for a moment to be a digression, but which I consider to be a reasonable avenue of approach to my theme. I think it will be agreed that what we call the science of government trails far behind other sciences to-day, and this is due chiefly to its lack of facilities for experimentation. Not only are no means provided for scientific inquiry and experimentation with a view to improvement; but party government, as it has been conducted in the past, practically prohibits such. For instance, no allowance whatever is made for mistakes on the part of either

a government or a government department. The ordinary Opposition feeds itself and grows strong on the mistakes of the Government in power, and consequently, a government is so afraid of making mistakes that it succeeds in making more of them than of, perhaps, anything else. This is a natural consequence, because, through sheer fear of mistakes, as a rule, not only a government, but everybody, would rather continue to make the mistakes that we know best how to make, than to risk a new way which, while it might possibly lead to a new mistake, on the other hand, might culminate in an improvement. In this way we continue, for example, to tax ourselves wealthy by a tariff, and that has been the policy of governments of this country for a long time. We continue to increase the national wealth through such a means as unemployment, and to borrow ourselves to opulence by paying an eternal interest on our credits which, if we would, we might use for nothing. So, perhaps, the greatest advance that could be suggested in this transition period, when all methods are crumbling in our hands and when thousands of new theories are being propounded, would be to establish what might be called a sociological laboratory. What the world, what the Canadian people, are asking for is analysis and demonstration, because they recognize that, by these means is found safety. These are the ways that are followed by other branches of science—by the chemist, the astronomer and the biologist. In what better way, for instance, could the agitators, generally, and the Bolshevist, the socialist, the single-taxer, and numerous others be settled than by giving a demonstration of either the fallacy or the value of what they are advocating? But we make no attempt to do such a thing; we go on drifting from one course to another until the crash comes, and then the nation is taking a leap in the dark, not knowing where it is going to land.

While the resolution which is before the House does not go so far as to ask for what I have termed a sociological laboratory which, if it were established, would, I admit, by the nature of things, be seriously limited in many important respects, yet it asks that provision be made by this Parliament for gathering data in connection with one very important factor in our national life, namely, the credit system. You will notice, Sir, that the resolution is so modest, so reasonable and so necessary, that I do not anticipate much objection to it, excepting that there may be amongst us those who are invincible opponents. I will read the resolution carefully in order that each one may have an opportunity of listening to it and of knowing whether there is anything objectionable in it or not. It reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House a representative Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

This resolution, it will be observed, makes no rash demands; it does not even hint at establishing a new credit system or attempting to uproot the old. It merely asks for a committee to secure, for the benefit of Parliament, all possible information on a subject of vast importance, a subject with which this Parliament has to deal. Not only has this Parliament to secure credit for national purposes, but it decides by whom and on what basis the whole credit of Canada is to be handled by the banks. I therefore claim that this resolution is opportune. The Banking Act, I understand, is to be revised by this Parliament at the next session. Not only so, but the industrial machine has broken down; it has failed and is now failing to provide for the nation's requirements, and many are ascribing this failure on the part of the industrial machine directly to the credit system. If then, credit, its control, the manner in which it is issued, the rate at which it is issued, be deemed fundamental to industrial progress—and who will deny that those things are so fundamental? —and if it is considered to be such a complicated development of our industrial process that it baffles the average layman, surely the layman who is called upon to deal with this fundamental, complicated affair will not object to all the knowledge that it may be possible for him to attain on the matter. While dealing with the interpretation of the resolution, I might add that it also asks for a representative parliamentary committee. By that I mean simply that the various groups in this House shall have representation on any committee which this Parliament may see fit to appoint; that that committee may be selected with a view to having upon it members of the Government, of the Opposition, of the Progressives and of Labour.

I do not propose to enter into an analysis and criticism of the credit system that is in vogue, because to do that would be to anticipate the work of the committee which, I hope, will be appointed as a result of this resolution; but will say briefly that

there are suspicions, of such import and to such an extent, of the credit system being one of the chief contributing factors to the present world-wide industrial collapse as to warrant any parliament in taking the step which this resolution calls for. No one would deny that we are to-day menaced with what might be called a lop-sided industrialism; that is to say, we have developed the power of production to such an extent that we can produce not only enough for the world's needs and our own national necessities, but more than could possibly be consumed, and through the control of credit by a few we have never been able to reap the full benefit of man's inventive genius. No sooner has some one invented a way to increase productive power than we find, through the decrease in purchasing power brought about by the credit system, that we are unable to avail ourselves of that which has been produced by the invention. And so, as I tried to point out in the speech which I delivered in reply to the speech from the Throne, credit has perhaps more to do with the present industrial collapse than anything else. The unemployment situation which we have heard so much about during the last two years at least has now reached a point which is serious, and I believe that the present credit system has more to do with that unemployment than any other single factor.

I desire in passing to call the attention of the House to one or two other points in connection with the credit system, and what I say in this particular regard will not be considered as giving an analysis of the system but merely as offering a comment or two touching some of the most important phases of the subject. I want to refer, for instance, to the gold standard or basis of value. Now, there are great signs indeed that the financiers of the world are going to make an attempt to bring back the old gold basis. I think most of us will agree that gold is neither a basis nor a real standard of value, for a standard of value must be constant,—it must be the same at all times. If you had a yardstick which to-day measured two feet four inches, to-morrow two-feet eight inches, next year three feet, and thereafter two feet six inches, or something like that, you could not possibly use it as a standard of measure. And yet that is precisely how the gold standard of value operates. The financiers are trying to bring back this standard, and it will be interesting for the committee proposed, if we are successful in having such a committee appointed, to find out how they purpose doing this. How can it be done? Let us look for a moment into the question.

The total amount of gold available in the world is £2,000,000,000. Now, the national debt of Great Britain alone is approximately £8,000,000,000. And yet we are going back to the gold basis of value when the national debt of one country alone is four times greater than the total amount of gold available in the world. As a matter of fact, our national credit is to-day the basis of our currency system, and it is appalling to me why we should see fit to exchange our own superior credit for the inferior credit of a bank, and have that charged to us at a high rate of interest.

The next point I want to emphasize is this: The banks are run on faith, there is much more faith than money in the banks; but so long as people are not conscious of that fact the banks are permitted to carry on. When we put money into a bank we expect to be able to have it produced to us as, when, and where, we desire it. But as a matter of fact the banks could not do that if every one should decide to demand his money. The banks therefore do business on the strength of the belief that people will not come back for their money, which is consequently lent out. The banks to-day are actually handling what might be called community power for private interest; and inasmuch as that community power so handled for private interest is very fundamental to the industrial life of the people, it is well worth while inquiring whether there is any possible means by which we can issue and control our own credit and thereby prevent individuals from using that which is essential to our national welfare.

The old idea was that credit was possible only by reason of the prior production of a surplus stock of food, clothing, etc., desired for consumption, by those who owned and might have consumed it, but preferred to save it. The idea of credit advanced by modern thinkers, on the other hand, is that credit is the power to produce goods as, when and where desired; that is, you are actually getting credit on the future producing and consuming potentialities of the nation; and it is not based on what you have already gathered in store. If we look at it from that point of view we shall find that Canada has a great credit power indeed. It has the

power to produce a great deal more than it is producing to-day if it were desired. It has the plant, the natural resources and the workmen; and it has need or demand for consumable goods. Consequently, if we accept the latter theory of credit, this country's credit is very excellent.

Those who control credit—which I claim is community power, and which to-day is in the hands of individuals—dictate, for instance, whether a capitalist shall produce or shall not produce. They dictate what we shall and shall not produce, and they also control the purchasing power of the nation. The purchasing power is affected very materially by such acts as the creation of new money and the recalling of loans, and these result in stopping the wheels of industry. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the Brussels Conference, held some two years ago, when the financiers of the world were in session. Professor Gustave Cassels, who is now one of the representatives at Genoa, said of that conference that it had been deliberately brought about by the leaders of finance in order to increase the value of money. They wanted to bring about deflation so that money might increase in value, and the average citizen or consumer would be called upon to pay the difference, the financiers not being affected by the alteration.

In conclusion I desire to make a suggestion. Hon. members may not agree with me, but I ask them, at any rate, to consider what I have to say as a possibility. I think it is possible that we could handle our own credit and lend it to ourselves, thus becoming a lending rather than a borrowing nation. Let me instance what I mean. I understand that we have just floated $100,000,000 worth of bonds in the United States. Now, what is behind that issue? Is not the real wealth of Canada back of it? If the real wealth of Canada be considered by Wall Street as being sufficient security for that loan, why should not Canada consider that is is sufficient for her own credit and lend the money to herself? Moreover, if we had lent ourselves this money, we should save, to begin with, $2,500,000, which these brokers earned by one-half of a day's work. That, I suggest, is rather a high-wage. Those of us who have been speaking about the high wages paid workmen will surely have something to say about paying two and a half million dollars for a half day's work in order that we may obtain a loan.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Now, are there no means by which we can issue our own credit on the strength of our own real wealth, thus cutting out brokers' commissions and the interest that we have to pay? That is one of the questions which, I would suggest, is necessary to be investigated by such a committee as this resolution calls for. If there is no better way than that which we are following now, we shall set our teeth and go on to the bitter end, dying gamely; but if there is any better way, it is only right that we should seek until we find it; and that is really all that my resolution calls for.

As I have said, I am not going to enter into a detailed discussion of a subject that I have been informed from many sources Parliament has no ears to listen to, even if I had the ability to do so. I merely put forward this resolution that a committee be appointed in order that they may collect the information necessary and bring it before the House, for it is of vital importance that we should be fully seized of all information on the subject before we deal with our credit system further, as I believe we shall have to next session.

In conclusion, let me say that as far as I am aware there is no good reason why this resolution should not pass. Here are the reasons that I can think of why it should not pass:

In the first place, this resolution should not pass if we are already in possession of all the knowledge it is possible to have of the credit system which we as a Parliament have to do with, and which we delegate to the banks to handle.

In the second place, this resolution should not pass if this Parliament has nothing at all to do with the credit system. But I think we are very intimately interested in the subject when we are dealing in loans involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and when we place this great power in the hands of our banks by a vote of this House.

In the third place, this resolution should not be passed if we can deal with our banking system to better advantage without any knowledge of our credit system.

Those are reasons why we should not pass this resolution; there are no others. If we are sincere, as I believe we are, we want to get full knowledge of all subjects that come before this House. If we consider our credit system as fundamental to industry, if we believe that our credit is the actual wealth of Canada, if we believe

that this community interest should not be controlled by any individual or clique, then it is necessary that we get all available information to discover if it is not possible to issue all credit to ourselves and so save interest, and thus be able tc get enough new money, if you will, to run the business of Canada without those periods of inflation with their corresponding periods of deflation incident to the present system when new money is created.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): In the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I would ask the hon. member to allow his motion to stand. I do not know that the Minister of Finance has any objection whatever to the resolution, but I should like him to have an opportunity of expressing his views upon it. Perhaps my hon. friend would be agreeable to the resolution going over until the minister's return?

Mr. IRVINE: Mr. Speaker, I am quite agreeable.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the debate was adjourned.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

PROPOSED CONNECTION WITH THE EASTERN MAINE RAILWAY

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is advisable that a branch line connecting the St. John and Quebec railway with the Eastern Maine railway be built as soon as financial conditions permit.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my object in moving this resolution is to point out to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) and to the House a means of cutting down the operating expenses of the Canadian National Railways in the maritime provinces. I had this matter up with the then Minister of Railways in 1920, when I arranged a meeting between him, the president of the Eastern Maine Railway and the president of the St. John and Quebec Railway with a view to forwarding this proposition. The minister was very favourably inclined towards the project, in fact, later when it was discussed on the railway estimates, he expressed himself in these words, which will be found at page 3376 of Hansard, 1920.

Mr. J. D. Reid: I am familiar with the proposal to which my hon. friend (Mr. Caldwell) refers. About four years ago it was suggested that the Government should build that connecting line; it was shown that its construction would result in a great saving in the matter of traffic originating in the lower province and destined to the Eastern States. On account of the financial situation, action was delayed. There is no doubt that the construction of this line should be carried out.

A little further on he said:

I have no doubt at all that when we get back to normal conditions the Government will take up a scheme such as the one suggested and deal with these matters in the way that it is practically understood by the department and the railway officials that they should be carried out.

At the present time the Dominion Government is operating the St. John and Quebec Railway under lease from the provincial government of New Brunswick. The province guaranteed the bonds for the construction of this road by the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, but that company having failed to carry the road to completion, the provincial government took the work over and to-day practically owns the line.

4 p.m.

As I stated on a previous occasion, under the agreement between the provincial and Dominion governments it was provided that as the road was built in twenty-mile sections, the Dominion government should take it over and operate it as part of the Canadian National Railways. This has been done, something in the neighborhood of 160 miles having been constructed to date. For the year ending December 31, 1920, the operating deficit on this railway was $346,015.49. The agreement between the Dominion and provincial governments provides that the Dominion government shall have 60 per cent of the gross earnings to pay operating expenses, the other 40 per cent going to the province of New Brunswick to pay interest on the cost of construction. The 40 per cent of the gross earnings received by the province has failed to pay interest on the construction cost by $220,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House may say: Well, this is not a very good showing on which to base a request that the Dominion government build a further extension of this road. But the reason for the deficit is that the road has never been completed as first contemplated. As originally planned the road was to run from St. John to Grand Falls, there to connect with the Transcontinental. Only part of that construction has been completed, there being still about 40 miles running from Centreville to Grand Falls to be built. On approaching the provincial government of New Brunswick at the head of a delegation some two years ago to see what promise we could get for

the completion of this northern section, we were informed that unless this connecting link between the St. John and Quebec Railway and the Eastern Maine Railway were built it would not be possible for the province to undertake the construction of the balance of the road as originally planned.

If the Government road is given no connection with the Eastern Maine Railway, then in all traffic to the United States we are confined to the Canadian Pacific. Now, there are two facts to be considered. The first is that two-thirds of the traffic which originates on the Canadian National Railways in the maritime provinces is destined to the United States; the second is that shipping to the United States by the Canadian Pacific we have to send our products over three railways. Every hon. member who has had any shipping experience knows that you pay a much higher freight rate to ship over two roads to a given point than over one, and if we have to ship over three roads, it makes it even more expensive. I believe it has been estimated that, due to this fact, we pay in excess freight yearly $100,000. The proposed link of railway I am advocating today is estimated to cost $1,000,000. Therefore, the saving in freight alone would pay for this piece of road in ten years. More than that, if this link is built it will enable the provincial government to construct the balance of the Quebec and St. John railway running north, which will open up that country and provide railway facilities for possibly the best section of New Brunswick, a section that has been settled a long time with the prospect of this road coming in to give them transportation facilities at a much earlier date than this.

This road was projected before the war. You will remember that last year the charter granting a subsidy of $6,400 a mile by the Dominion government was extended two years. It would have expired on 31 December last, but it was extended by this House on the request of the premier of New Brunswick. In the discussion that took place at that time it was shown why this road had not been constructed sooner. It was under construction when the war broke out. The Dominion government had agreed not only to give a subsidy of $6,400 a mile for every mile of this road that was completed, but it had also promised to build three very expensive bridges that would be necessary on this road, one on the northern section and two on the southern. Owing to war conditions and the fact that railway material had advanced in price very rapidly, that labour had also advanced, and money was dear, this construction was not gone on with. The federal government at that time was under just as great an obligation with regard to the completion of this road, so far as the building of bridges and a subsidy of $6,400 per mile was concerned, as the provincial government. The subsidy for the bridges has lapsed, and has not been renewed, but the subsidy of $6,400 per mile was renewed by this House last year. Now, in order to make it possible for the province to complete this road and for the government railways to operate economically, it is very necessary that the section I am advocating to-day should be built. At the present time the Eastern Maine Railway have a road surveyed, and I believe that construction is taking place, beginning this month from Houlton to Bancroft, Maine. The Eastern Maine Railway Company have agreed to build a spur from that road to the boundary line to meet the extension proposed by me to-day. They came to that agreement with the Minister of Railways two years ago, and they even agreed that if the Dominion government would build its section in 1921, they would build theirs in 1920, for the Minister of Railways, at that time Hon. Mr. Reid, asked these people, "What guarantee have we that you will build your end if we will build ours?" Hon. Mr. Reid promised the delegation, in my presence, that if he was Minister of Railways in 1921, he would bring in a bill for an appropriation to build this 22 miles of road. Last year, due to the heavy railway deficits, the stringency of the money market, and other conditions, the government did not see fit to go on with that work, although I think they could very well have done it at that time. To-day I think we are back pretty nearly to normal conditions so far as railroad construction is concerned. The price of labour and material has gone down, and I think the members of this House will agree that unemployment never was so acute as it is now. The building of this section would not only provide employment for the unemployed in the eastern provinces but, as I think I have clearly shown, though it would mean an initial outlay by the Government, it would pay for itself in ten years in the saving in freight alone, and the St. John and Quebec railway, the part now built and the balance that will be constructed if the section I am advocating is gone on with, instead of being a liability to the

Dominion government and the province of over half a million dollars a year, would become the best paying railway in eastern Canada, due to the fact that all the freight originating on the whole government system in the maritime provinces and destined for the United States would be routed over the St. John and Quebec Railway to get to this outlet. That would make the St. John and Quebec railway, instead of a deficit producer a revenue producer. I do not wish to take up the time of the House at any greater length, but I would urge upon the minister the advisability of the proposition I am putting before him at the present time.

Mr. RICHARD B. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I do not wish to delay the House, but as this proposed road would start and end in my constituency, I should like to give the House the benefit of my views on the matter. This is not a new proposal by any means. I have no doubt that had it not been for the war this piece of railway construction would have been carried out by the government. The idea of building this section dates back to 1915, when Mr. Gutelius was the general manager of the Canadian Government railway lines. He was the originator of the idea, and it appealed to him because he felt the necessity of having an independent outlet for the Government lines into the New England states in order not to be obliged to turn over to the Canadian Pacific railway all the traffic originating on the government roads in the maritime provinces to reach the Boston and Maine railroad and through it to be distributed to the New England states.

I quite appreciate that this is not a very favourable time to ask the Government to embark on any new railway proposals, but I would suggest to the Minister of Railways that in the files of his department he will find, I am sure, data which will well repay his perusal, and which will, I believe, fortify and justify him when the time comes, as I have no doubt it will if he remains in power, in asking Parliament to build this branch line so that the Government railways may have an independent outlet into the New England states. I am not at all sure that it should be done through the Eastern Maine Railroad Company which has been referred to by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Caldwell). I hope that the company will be able to carry out its proposals, but I have very grave doubts as to their financial ability to do so. However, I would not like anything I say in that connection to prejudice the mind of the minister against that particular company.

As to the principle involved, and as to the benefits that would be derived by the Government railways, I do not think there are any two opinions. While I have no doubt the minister will not be able to do anything this year, I would suggest to him that this is one of the construction proposals that he might well keep before him is any construction programme that is undertaken in the immediate future. I am sure that he would find the building of this section beneficial from a purely business standpoint to the department over which he presides.

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways): As my hon. friends have said, this matter has been before the House on former occasions. I am informed by the board of directors of the Canadian National railways that they have investigated this project, and while they are willing to admit that from the standpoint of interchange of traffic there is much that might be said in favour of further construction, yet they do not feel that the time is opportune to go on with it at the present time.

There was another point brought out by the mover of the resolution. The board is called upon to decide which of the railroads mentioned by my hon. friend would be the proper line to make connection with. As I understand there are five possible connections with two different railroads, and for the management of the National railways, or for the House, to commit themselves for the present time to either one might prejudice their views when they come to definitely decide which would be in the interset of the Canadian National lines. For the reason I think my hon. friend will agree that it is perhaps not desirable that we should state definitely at the present time with which line the connection should be made. However, I can assure my hon. friend that we will take the earliest opportunity of again bringing the matter before the attention of the Board of Directors. The attention of the board will be directed to what my hon. friend has said this afternoon, and I am sure that when the time is opportune they will give the matter every consideration. Under the circumstances I would therefore ask my hon. friend to withdraw the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: The mover of the resolution is now about to exercise his right to close the debate. If any other hon. member wishes to speak he should do so now.

Mr. CALDWELL: I merely want to assure the Minister of Railways that I hold no brief for the Eastern Maine Railway Company, and I realize the force of what my hon. friend for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) has said. In this connection, Sir, it might be well if the Eastern Maine Company were willing to give the undertaking they did two years ago that they would build their section of the line this summer, and that our Government would agree to build theirs next summer. I may say further that I am not particular as to which road our government system makes connection with, so long as we get an outlet to the United States. So long as we can get connection with some road leading immediately to the centre of the eastern states, so that we may get an outlet for our traffic, I am not particular which road they connect up with.

I am pleased with the statement of the Minister of Railways although I cannot help recalling the promise I had from his predecessor both last year and the year before. We now have a new Minister of Railways and I would urge that he should give us something stronger than the mere assurance that the matter will be given due consideration. I would like the minister to give us an assurance that if the Eastern Maine, or any other railway company, is willing to build its share of the connection this year our Government would build our share next year—I think he might well go that far. I repeat that I am not particular which of the American roads he connects with; I certainly would prefer to leave that to the judgment of the board of management of the National Railways because they are in a much better position to decide what is feasible than I am. We desire this connection not only because of the outlet it will give to the centres of the eastern states but also because it will open up a splendid tract of country in our own province to the north which has been settled to some extent owing to the prospect of this road coming in at an early date. I hope the minister will give an assurance that he will connect with an American road which will provide the necessary facilities.

Mr. McKENZIE: What would be the mileage involved?

Mr. CALDWELL: It would be twenty-two miles by the route called for under the resolution. A road built up through the valley of the St. John would run through an easy piece of country, I understand. I do not know what the mileage involved by the other proposed connections would be.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. KENNEDY: I think my hon. friend will agree with me that in so far as recommending the road being built this year, or next year, it is the duty of the Board of Directors of the National Railways to advise the minister rather than for the minister to advise the directors of the National Railways. I am not in the position to say to these gentlemen that this or that road should be built; it is their duty to recommend to the Government that a particular road should be built in the interest of the National system.

Mr. CALDWELL: May I ask the minister—

Mr. SPEAKER: The debate is closed. Is is the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his motion?

Mr. CALDWELL: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I have not asked for the withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the Minister of Railays asked the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. KENNEDY: I did ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. CALDWELL: My hon. friend asked me, but I did not agree. If I may be allowed to say so, I do not think it is advisable to withdraw motions like this. The resolution only expresses the hope that the Government will take this matter into consideration and the minister has already stated that it will do so.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost on division.

Resolution declared lost on division.

FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the fact that the present federal Elections Act disfranchises a person who moves his residence from one electoral district to another during the two months previous to the issuing of writs for an election, action should be taken to amend said Elections Act, Article twenty-nine, paragraph C, so as to preserve the right of said elector to vote either in one or the other electoral district.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to support this resolution with a long speech. Its purpose is so evident that it will suffice, I am sure, to bring it to the attention of the Government and the House to ensure its adoption. It deals with an obvious omission in the present federal Elections Act which seems to have escaped the attention of the last Parliament, but which the practice of the general elections of 1921 has made very clear, and demonstrated to be very annoying. According to the provisions of the present electoral law, adopted in 1920, a person who happens to move his residence during the two months preceding the issuing of writs is virtually disfranchised, and the law offers no way to reserve his right to vote. At least this is the condition that obtains in provinces, like Quebec, where new lists require to be prepared at every election. If you turn to paragraph 29 of that electoral law you will find that the qualifications for an elector are: (a) Must be a British subject by birth or naturalization; (b) Must be of the full age of twenty-one years; and (c) Must have "ordinarily resided in Canada for at least twelve months and in the electoral district wherein such person seeks to vote for at least two months immediately preceding the issue of the writ of election." That seems a very simple provision, but you will understand at once, Mr. Speaker, that a person who happens to move during that period of two months cannot qualify in the new riding to which he has transferred his residence because he has not lived there two months. On the other hand he cannot safeguard his right to vote in the old riding either, because he has not been there during the required full period before the issuance of the writs.

This applies both to the rural constituencies and city ridings, but cases which are very scarce in the rural parts of the country can be very numerous in city ridings. The last election was held on 6th December, and writs were issued some time in October. October first is moving day in large cities like Montreal. It happened to fall within this two months specified by law, and, by that omission, persons who should have had the right to vote, who merely happened to move their residences a few blocks in some instances, perhaps only across the street, from one riding to another, were actually disfranchised. A much greater number retained the right to vote, in spite of the law, simply because no demand was made to have their names struck off the lists, but if such a demand had been made, the revising officer would have had to comply with the law and strike their names from the list. When the candidates become keener to the possibilities of this election law, if it remains as it is, in a city like Montreal alone thousands of voters could be disfranchised, if the election happened to be held in May or in October, the two moving dates in large cities. In order to leave no doubt in the minds of hon. members as to the effect of this statute, I should like to place on Hansard the opinion of no less an authority than Colonel Biggar, Chief Electoral Officer of the Dominion. During the last election he had to give decisions in cases similar to the one I have referred to, and in every case he authorized the statement that the law disqualified such persons, and gave instructions to the registrar and revising officers accordingly. When I placed this resolution on the Order Paper I wrote him asking his opinion, and his reply reads, in part, as follows:

> During the election campaign I received a large number of inquiries on this point, and in the later edition of the Election Instruction (31st December 1921) prepared for the by-elections at which the procedure was considerably different from that followed at the general election, I made an addition to paragraph 137, as appears by the copy of these later instructions which I also enclose. This addition further emphasises the undoubted effect of the provisions of the statute on the point.

I have here the election instructions prepared for the by-election of a new minister, and here is the addition which Colonel Biggar refers to in his letter. It will be found on page 48, section 137:

> The effect of the statutory provisions on the subject of residential qualification is that everyone whose residence has been out of Canada during the year immediately preceding the date of the issue of the writ, and everyone who has changed his place of residence in Canada from one electoral district to another within the two months before that date is disqualified from voting.

The most remarkable feature about this is that if the elector happens to move after the issue of the writ then he can retain his right to vote in the electoral district where he has resided before that date, but if he happens to be unlucky enough to move at the very moment—that is at one of the sixty days preceding the issue of the writ—then he cannot qualify in the new riding, and he is bound to be disfranchised, if proper application is made to strike out his name. I think there

can be no doubt, after the authority I have just given, as to the effect of the present law.

This resolution does not specify any remedy. If I were to give my humble opinion, I think there should be a provision to allow the voter to retain his vote in the old riding, where he resided before he moved, and not in the new riding where he has moved his residence, because, in the latter case, the door would be opened to many misunderstandings and frauds. But I am not stressing that point. Earlier in the session the Government led the House to understand, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Marcile), that the electoral law would be amended in some way. My opinion is that the act with which I am dealing would stand amendment on more than one point. I consider that the theory of allowing these lists to be revised just previous to the election may seem very equitable, but its practice is full of danger and may lead to abuses, and even to frauds of the worst kind. I think the whole system of preparing electoral lists at fixed dates during the time of peace—so to describe the period between electoral campaigns—is much better than the present practice. If we are to retain the present law, I say we should, at least, remedy the evil referred to in my resolution. It is altogether unfair to have a law which allows an individual voter to qualify at the last moment for an election, when this same law will disfranchise that voter simply because he happened to move at a certain date from one electoral district to another. I trust that when the occasion arises the Government will consider this matter. I would ask the House to accept the resolution in its present form. It is not contentious, and it only embodies the expression of a wish. I, therefore, beg to move, seconded by Mr. Prevost, the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. JULES EDOUARD PREVOST (Terrebonne) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, It is with pleasure that I support the motion of the member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) because I consider it points out a rather serious omission in the Elections Act, a deficiency which should be remedied immediately and an amendment to the act brought down at this present session. By enacting that a person's name cannot be inscribed on the voters' list unless he has resided in the division where he wishes to vote, for at least two months previous to the issuing of the writs, hundreds of persons are, as a natural consequence, disfranchised, and it is always a serious matter to disfranchise a citizen.

I admit, the question is of special interest to large cities which comprise numerous electoral districts where citizens often move from one district to another, but it is also important to small towns and rural parts. With reference to the last general elections, those who find fault are not so much the candidates who were returned by large majorities, but the people who bitterly regretted, and are still sore of having been deprived of their vote.

I mentioned that the question was an important one for the rural districts, and I believe it to be so. I am aware that the act allows a voter, even on election day, if his name is not on the list, to register his vote. However, he must be in a position to swear that he possesses all the qualifications prescribed by the act. Now, amongst these qualifications is to be found the one which we are at present discussing and which requires of a person, in order that he may exercise his franchise in an electoral district, to reside in such district for two months previous to the issuing of election writs; so that, notwithstanding this clause in the act which seems to open up a wide door to the voters who are not registered on the list and to enable them to make use of their right to vote, the omission which we pointed out would prevent the voter from exercising such franchise. I therefore deem it advisable to submit the question to this House and we have reason to hope that the Government will bring down an amendment to the Dominion Elections Act, such as mentioned in the motion of the member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) and which will be in the whole country's interest.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I should like to give the House the benefit of my experience in this regard, and it will, perhaps, be a surprise to some of the members. I am thoroughly in accord with the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Rinfret). I am not sure that such a provision is required in the rural districts, because moving and shifting about in rural parts of the country is perhaps, not very great. When, however, we came to make a canvass in my riding in the last election, we found that between fifteen and twenty per cent of those whose names were on the list could not be found in the riding. Those people had moved, and, by moving,

they had opened the way, if any person had desired to be corrupt, to having all their names voted. Furthermore, a man is deprived of his vote, because he has moved, say from one side of Spadina avenue, in my city, to the other; that is, if he moves merely across the street, he is disfranchised. The only fact which I want to bring to the attention of the House is this, that, in a large city like Montreal or Toronto, many people otherwise entitled to vote are disfranchised on account of moving their residence immediately prior to an election. Perhaps, the percentage is greater in Toronto than in Montreal, because houses in Toronto are rented on a monthly tenancy basis, and in my riding between fifteen and twenty per cent of the people were disfranchised under the present act.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to approve the resolution also, because I know, even in rural or semi-rural places, many worthy citizens who were deprived of the privilege of voting at the last election under the law as it then stood and still stands. Therefore, a change is very desirable.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the matter referred to in the resolution of the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) is one worthy of consideration. It was considered when the present Dominion Franchise Act passed the House. Our difficulty then was our difficulty now, namely, to find a remedy. The same question came up in this House in 1897, when there was a discussion on the subject; and it was then felt, as it was felt two years ago, that probably less difficulty would arise from leaving the law in its present position than if we were to seek to change or amend it. The question arose more particularly in 1897 in regard to school teachers and, I think, also in regard to Methodist ministers. School teachers, particularly in Ontario in the rural sections, change their places very frequently; the ministers of some of our churches also change their residences periodically; and in many cases the teacher or the minister was disqualified simply by reason of the change. Then, in cities, it always occurs that men and women will move from one division to another. Nobody, however, has yet suggested a proper remedy for this condition of affairs. If you permit men, who have actually moved away from a riding, to come back and vote you may be opening a door to the payment of expenses and to bringing voters from all parts of Canada, and that was looked upon as a great objection, both in years gone by and in the discussion that took place in this House two years ago. But it is certainly a hard thing that any large body of our citizens should be disfranchised simply by reason of the fact that they have changed their residences immediately prior to the issue of an election writ. There may be something in the suggestion of my hon. friend that they could be permitted to vote in the place in which they formerly resided, but that would not, I believe, cure the evil for men and women who had moved to any great distance. Men from Ontario, from Quebec, go West, and these men would certainly be disfranchised; but the greatest hardship, I think, takes place in cities where a voter moves from one division to another, but still remains practically in the same municipality. The motion is one well worthy of consideration, and I only wish the hon. member for St. James had suggested something like a remedy for the difficulty. I agree with him that when the Franchise Act comes up for amendment or consideration, this is a matter that should be considered.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I take it, from the expression of opinion on both sides of the House, that there is no objection to accepting the resolution of the hon. member for St. James. As has been stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie), perhaps, the difficulty is to find a ready remedy. Of course, the first and natural impulse with every one is that he wants to have the right to vote, and after having the right to vote, he has some predilection for one place or another. The natural and most effective place for one to vote in is where he resides or where he proposes to reside for some time to come. The basic philosophy of the right to vote or the purpose of voting is that a person has a right to select a representative in Parliament; and if a man who lives in Montreal finds that he is moving to Toronto, he says: "Well, you may give me a vote in Montreal; but I am leaving Montreal; I am going to live in Toronto, and, after this I want to put myself in touch with the representative of the city in which I am going to live." To allow that man the right to vote in Montreal would not satisfy him, because he wants to have a representative in the city or province in which he goes to reside. It is more difficult to find a remedy for the situation of

that man. It is a simple proposition to legislate or to amend the act so as to leave with the man the right to vote where he is qualified and where he resides, so to amend the act that his right to vote shall continue for the first election that may take place after he has left that particular residence. It is not, however, so easy to furnish machinery by which you qualify him to vote in any other part of Canada to which he might move. I have not been able to come to any definite conclusion, but the only thing that suggests itself to me as practical in a case of that kind, would be that he might be permitted to vote on the certificate of the chief electoral officer. A man living in New Brunswick, for instance, might satisfy the Chief Electoral Officer that he was fully qualified to vote in any riding in Canada, and on going, say, to British Columbia, he could get from that officer a certificate under seal which, on presentation to any presiding officer in the latter province, would give him the right to vote at the first election thereafter. It is possible that some such machinery as that might meet the case. The other case is far less difficult, and if a voter were given the right to come back and vote where he resided, I do not think there would be any room for hardship. Most of these cases arise in the cities, and the matter of travelling one way or the other would not be very important. As has been suggested, many of these moves are merely across a street or alleyway, and it really does not make very much difference. It is quite likely, and I believe almost certain, that this matter will be dealt with and a proper remedy provided.

The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), referred to our present franchise law, and the law as it stood years ago. Personally I think that the old franchise system was better. When we entered Confederation in 1867 the provincial franchise was adopted all round. In every province then in Confederation, members were elected to this House, I understand, under the local law, and that continued until 1885 or 1886, when a Dominion franchise was adopted by legislation of this Parliament. At that time officers, who were entitled revising officers, were appointed to prepare the lists in all the provinces. That practice was observed until 1898, when by common consent—I was not in the House then, but I understand there was no objection at all from either side—Parliament went back to the old condition and once more adopted the provincial franchise. That continued down to the election of 1917, which was the first Dominion election since the reinstitution of the provincial franchise, at which members were returned to this Parliament under a Dominion system. The election of 1917 and the election of 1921 were both held under Dominion franchise. But the very large majority of the elections in Canada since Confederation have been held under the local law. In our own province we have what I regard as ideal conditions in regard to the franchise. Our lists are revised every year whether there is an election or not. On the 27th of April of each year the lists are closed and are ready for any election that might be called. Of course, they are not now used in Dominion elections; they are subject to certain additions and subtractions before they can serve the purposes of a Dominion election. I should have no hesitation whatever in recommending ours as a general system for Dominion elections. I am not speaking for the Government, but solely for myself, but in my judgment it would be the ideal practice for every province in Canada to have the lists prepared every year so that they might be ready at any time an election might be held. The expense, in our province at any rate, is not considered any objection at all. As a matter of fact, there is no great expense involved in preparing these lists every year.

However, the matter with which we shall have to deal in this connection will be simply the introduction of some slight amendment to secure the right to the voter to come back and vote where he resides, or otherwise to carry the franchise with him. There must be some such certificate as I have mentioned that he could carry with him so as to enable him to vote at the first Dominion election held after he has received it. I think the resolution of the hon. member is quite timely and I am sure the House will be pleased to deal with the matter when it comes up.

Mr. A. J. LEWIS (Swift Current): I think we are all agreed that every Canadian citizen eligible to vote should have the right to do so, and the mere fact that a man is forced sometimes, by circumstances beyond his control, to go to another constituency should not penalize him and prevent him from exercising the franchise as a Canadian citizen. I can readily understand that the provision that has been incorporated in the Election Act on this point has some basis in reason. It may have been placed there to make sure that no

individual would vote twice. But we are told by various hon. members that it appears to infringe upon the rights of voters more in the cities than anywhere else. In the rural districts very few people are penalized in this respect by moving; but in the cities, where people are continually on the move, it may be a great hardship, and I can see that there is likely to be some difficulty, no matter what you may do, to remedy the existing law. We do find, however, that in the resolution No. 12, relating to proportional representation and the alternative vote, there is a safeguard not only to the man who wishes to exercise his franchise, but also to the public interests of Canada, and I believe that when this subject is brought before the House and we have time to study it carefully we shall be able to remove a great many of the electioneering difficulties that at present exist. In this connection, I might refer to proportional representation in the cities. Under proportional representation I understand that no matter where a man may reside in the city, or whether he changes from one district to another within the pale of the city, he still has the right to vote; and I think that when that system comes up for consideration it will be time enough to indicate the benefits to be derived by the removal of a great many of the difficulties and anomalies of the Franchise Act. By the adoption of a proper system then we shall be able to ensure, not only to the individual who votes at an election, but also to collective bodies of voters, in the actual returns of men to this Parliament, a fair proportion of representation for every constituency. If it is necessary to change the existing law for rural districts, well and good. But as we have been told that the great majority of inequalities that result from the present law are to be found in the cities, and as these inequalities can be finally removed only when we have a system under which every man will have the right to exercise the franchise under a city list rather than under a list in an electoral division, I believe that action should be delayed until the question of proportional representation is before the House for consideration.

Motion agreed to.

INCOME TAX ACT 1917

PROPOSED AMENDMENT RESPECTING ALIENS

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act, 1917, as amended by subsequent acts by providing that there shall be paid upon the annual income of all aliens, not being residents of Canada, who are employed in Canada or derive income for services rendered in Canada 8 per cent upon all such incomes exceeding one thousand dollars.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not of a particularly compulsory character, because it simply suggests that "the Government should consider the advisability of amending the Income Tax Act, 1917." It is quite possible that many hon. members do not quite grasp the true meaning of this resolution, and therefore I desire first of all to point out why it has been introduced.

Prior to November, 1921, the Income Tax Act of the United States was practically the same as our Income Tax Act, giving similar exemptions to married and unmarried men and fixing the rate of taxation at the same rate on all those earning incomes in the United States whether resident in that country or elsewhere. But in November of last year Congress amended the Income Tax Act and made section 210 to read as follows:

> That, in lieu of the tax imposed by section 210 of the Revenue Act of 1918, there shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net income of every individual a normal tax of 8 per centum of the amount of the net income in excess of the credits provided in section 216: provided, that in the case of a citizen or resident of the United States the rate upon the first $4,000 of such excess amount shall be 4 per centum.

The exemption provided for in section 216 subsection (e) is as follows:

> In the case of a non-resident alien individual or of a citizen entitled to the benefits of section 262, the personal exemption shall be only $1,000, and he shall not be entitled to the credit provided in subdivision (d).

But an American citizen is entitled to an exemption of $2,500 or $2,000.

This Act of Congress does not expressly mention Canadians, but there are no other non-resident aliens that I know of working in the United States. There may be some from Mexico, but those need not be taken into account.

The result is distinctly to the disadvantage of Canadians. Take the concrete case of the county of Welland that I have the honour to represent—and I know the same thing prevails in the county of Essex, and no doubt in the county of Lincoln and in every other constituency bordering on the international boundary line—Canadian citizens working in the United States—and there are at least 400 working at Niagara

Falls, New York, and Buffalo—if they have an income of $5,000, whether married or unmarried, their exemption is only $1,000, and they are taxed 8 per cent on the balance. In contrast with that the American citizen is allowed an exemption of $2,500 if he is a married man or a man with dependents, and he is taxed at the rate of only 4 per cent on the balance of his income.

Our law makes no distinction between Americans and Canadians. For instance, a United States citizen working in Canada is granted an exemption of $1,000 if he is an unmarried man, and he is taxed 4 per cent on the balance of his income; if he is a man with a family or other dependents, he is allowed an exemption of $2,000 and is still taxed only 4 per cent on the balance.

Now, as a rule I am not inclined to favour the adoption of retaliatory measures, but it seems to me that in so far as this Act of Congress affects Canadian citizens, it works a very grave injustice. Although a good many of our citizens work in the United States and live in Canada, it must not be forgotten that so far as our border constituencies are concerned there are just as many United States citizens working in Canada and living in their own country. Therefore, I claim that unless Congress remove this discrimination and make their law the same as our Income Tax Act, we should do our duty and place the same burdens on United States citizens that are now imposed on our citizens by this discriminatory legislation.

I have a letter from the president of a large manufacturing concern at Niagara Falls, Ontario, and I should like to place his views on Hansard. He is a United States citizen, and he writes as follows:

> I am pleased to note that you have handled this matter in a very fair and reasonable way. We certainly trust that the problem can be solved without retaliatory legislation, although it is manifestly evident that such legislation should be taken by Canada if the situation cannot be corrected in any other way. We think that the move which you are taking may help to bring the seriousness of the situation before the United States Government.
>
> As we have written, we are doing everything possible in the way of soliciting pressure from as many sources as possible to have this corrected and we have made the situation known to a large number of senators and representatives in Washington.
>
> The situation is serious and aggravating to all manufacturers along the border and a great hardship to many employees of such manufacturers.

There is practically nothing more to be said about this subject. What I want is that Parliament should approve of this resolution, which will fortify the Government in saying to the United States Congress, "We have the authority of Parliament to pass retaliatory legislation if we choose to do so, but we hope that you will consider it in the best interests of friendly relations and in the best interests of the people who are working on the two sides of the international boundary line to amend your law so as to make it conform with the law of Canada. In default of your doing so, it is quite possible that we may be forced by Parliament to pass retaliatory legislation that will place the same burden of taxation on your citizens working in Canada as is imposed on our citizens working in the United States." That is what I want this Parliament to do, and that is what I think this Parliament should do, irrespective of the friendly relations which now exist and have existed for so many years between the United States and Canada, and which I trust will continue to exist for many more years to come. I think it is our duty to stand by our own citizens and see that they are properly protected and safeguarded in regard to such legislation as this that has been passed in the United States. We hope of course, that conditions may be such in the near future that this burdensome taxation may be done away with, but it is in existence yet, and in all probability will remain in existence for several years to come—longer than we would like. That being so, I ask Parliament to approve of this resolution so that the Government may with the authority of Parliament say to the United States: "Unless you change your legislation and give our citizens the same rights that we accord to American citizens we will be bound to pass retaliatory legislation—it is a harsh term perhaps—"

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Why not call it reciprocal treatment?

Mr. GERMAN: Gentlemen on the opposite side and perhaps some on this side were opposed to reciprocal treatment some years ago. We will call it retaliatory legislation. It is more emphatic, I think, and suits the situation better. That is the object of the resolution, and I sincerely trust that the House will approve of it and that it will be adopted by the Government.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I was not quite certain from the terms of the resolution until I heard the address of the hon.

member for Welland (Mr. German) just what he had in mind. I was aware of the legislation, though not in any detailed way, that gives rise to his resolution, that is to say, the legislation introduced in November last in the United States legislatures. To that legislation we in Canada cannot take exception from our special standpoint; it is legislation that is applicable everywhere; it is not discriminatory against our country, nor is its purpose to deflect the course of domestic policy in Canada. Nevertheless, it is legislation that of itself invites retaliatory action; it is legislation against which another country can protect itself only by retaliatory action. If the United States chooses to place upon the citizens of this country and of countries other than itself, earning money within its borders a burden beyond that borne by its own citizens, there is only one thing, it appears to me, for the neighbouring nation to do, and that is to act in a similar way. Otherwise, it places its own citizens at a disadvantage as compared with those across the line. Consequently, this would appear to me to be a timely resolution and one well worthy of the consideration of the Government and of this House.

There is, however, a class of legislation to which I think we in Canada can take just exception. It is that class of legislation which is directed not against all outside nations equally, but directed solely against ourselves, legislation designed to deflect the course of domestic policy within this country. There have been efforts made in recent times to have such legislation passed by the United States. I fear those efforts have been, or appear now to be, more or less successful. Such does not seem to me to be a course of policy designed to foster and improve the good relations that have subsisted between us for so many years. At the same time, if it is the course of policy that in their best judgment they see fit to adopt, it will be one that will have to be met in our country, not in a spirit of antagonism, not in a spirit wanting in friendship, but in a spirit of stern and immovable self-reliance.

I have pleasure, indeed, in offering commendation to the hon. member for Welland, and I hope that his suggestions will receive at the hands of the Government serious and sympathetic consideration.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Meighen.]

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Dominion Government should consider the advisability of devising ways and means for the establishment of a system of old age pensions in Canada.

He said (Translation): At the outset, Mr. Speaker, allow me to urge upon this House the desirability of legislation enabling the Government to grant a pension to old men. In so doing so, I am impelled by a deep sense of humanity and justice. Indeed, having for the last twenty-five years resided in the city of Hull,—an essentially industrial centre,—I have been able, more than any one else perhaps, and many a time, to realize that a great number of workmen after having spent the best part of their lives in factories and worn themselves out, become, in their old age a burden to their children, unless they seek refuge in a poor house. Is it not a painful sight, Mr. Speaker, to see these old employees, after contributing their share towards their country's welfare and development, after labouring for thirty, forty, nay fifty years to enrich others, once they have expended the whole of their assets,—for their physical fitness is truly an asset to them,—the moment they are disabled, worn out by age and work, reduced to poverty. I say that it is the duty of the state to assist these old men by paying them a pension in the form of annuities or endowment. Some might perhaps object that these men should have economized and laid aside their savings whilst they were young; but every member of this House knows perfectly well that their salaries are never sufficient to allow savings, because wages paid are always based on the cost of living. The following is an illustration. During the unfortunate war just ended, workmen obtained an increase of wages because the cost of living was increasing continually, and now the war is over, employers insist on a reduction in wages because, according to them, the cost of living has been reduced. It is therefore a well established fact that wages are fixed by the cost of living. We figure out how much it costs a workingman to live and support a family of five or six children, and the result of this calculation determines the salary he shall receive. How can he economize when he is paid just enough to provide his family with the strict necessities of life? Yet, the working man is entitled, as well as the rich man, to some comfort in this world. The working man

has a heart, he loves his children as much as the rich man loves his own, and he would like to give them better means than he has himself had for the battles of life. How can he attain this end with such meagre wages as two or three dollars a day? —I especially refer to the working man, because it is he who would benefit the most from such a Pensions Act, but it should be fully understood that all those who attain the age, say of 65 years, man or woman, and are in need, whatever may have been their trade or business, would benefit from such a pension, provided they had been honest citizens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to discuss the question from another point of view. You know how the late war has expanded the outlook of classes in this country; the farmers movement has spread, the labour movement has developed; and the labourer now says to himself, and not without cause, that if he has been useful during the war, if he has participated in destroying German militarism and in saving civilization, he is fully entitled to some reward. Truly, amongst all the classes of society, it is the labouring class which supplied the most men and which was the first to respond to the call to arms, and now that the war is over, they bear the greater part of the burden of taxation. Therefore, I believe that an old age Pensions Act would only be evidence of our gratitude. I believe that it would help materially in creating a better understanding between capital and labour; it would be a public acknowledgment by the Government of this country that it wants justice for all classes, and it would perhaps abolish forever this unfortunate conflict between the capitalist and the labouring class. In proof of the soundness of our contentions, I have received, since I inscribed this resolution on the Order Paper, a number of letters and resolutions of labour unions in support of my views. They all wish me the greatest possible success in regard to this old age scheme. Amongst others, I might mention the following, from Mr. Beaulé, president of the National Catholic Unions; from Mr. Tom Moore, president of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada; from the secretary of the Liberal Labour Union of the city of Hull; from Mr. Achille Morin, vice-president of the National Catholic Unions. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, this question is not a new one. An act for old age pensions was passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1908, and in 1911 the present Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Lloyd George, brought down in the British House of Commons a bill under a different form, known as "The People's Insurance." In presenting this bill, he gave the following explanation: "Considering that the people are willing to help in furthering the progress and welfare of this country, the State, on the other hand, should give ample proof of its willingness to foster the welfare of the labouring class.

For ever so long France has had pension laws for old age and the disabled; it is, however, since 1905 that pensions have come to the fore. As early as 1883, there existed in Germany, insurances to provide for the workman, but it is especially the act passed in 1889 and amended in 1899 which brought relief to old age and the disabled. There exists in Denmark, an old age pension law; in New Zealand, parliament adopted such legislation in 1908.

After having shown what has taken place in Europe, Mr. Speaker, are we not allowed to hope that soon, we also shall have a law enacted which will provide for old age. Moreover, this question has already been considered by our own statesmen and the Canadian Parliament. I see, in Hansard, that during the 1907 session, Mr. Pringle, then member for Stormont, moved the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this House, the subject of improving the condition of the aged, deserving poor and of providing for those of them who are helpless and infirm, is worthy of and should receive the early and careful attention of the government and of Parliament."

This motion, after having been discussed, was withdrawn. However, Mr. Pringle returned to the attack during the session of 1908, and moved the following resolution: "That a select committee be appointed to inquire into and consider a scheme or schemes by state aid or otherwise for making provision for the aged and deserving poor, with special regard in case of any proposals of which they may approve, to their cost and probable financial results, and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses on oath and affirmation." This resolution was adopted but nothing further was done. During the session of 1912, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the then member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), the same person who was defeated by the present Deputy Speaker (Mr. Gordon), had both placed on the Order paper of the House a motion which called for the naming of a select

committee to inquire into and report on a scheme of life-annuity for old age in Canada. As you will notice, Mr. Speaker, it is already more than fifteen years ago since the Canadian Parliament first took up this important question of old age pensions. I believe that public opinion is ripe and that the Government should not delay any further action on this question. A pension fund has been provided for all those brave warriors who went overseas to protect civilization against German militarism and who have returned to this country sick and disabled, and it is quite right. A pension fund has been provided for the Civil Service; banks and other financial concerns provide a pension for their employees; alone these brave toilers, this army of workmen who were the pioneers of our industrial life, have not a pension fund to sustain them in their old age. I maintain that it is the duty of the nation to act immediately. It seems to me that men who have given thirty or forty years of their best years to the development of the resources of our country have a right to claim a pension when they come to the age when they are no more able to provide for their own support.

I have heard as an objection to this scheme, Mr. Speaker, that it would discourage thrift and personal ambition; the workman would not be as provident, knowing in advance that the Government is going to grant him relief in his old age. Well I do not consider this as being a serious objection. If this law should lead to abuses, as some people believe it would, the European countries where it is now in force would abolish it; but, on the contrary, they improve on it every year. Then the Government ought to abolish the retirement fund of the Civil Service and the banks and corporations ought to discontinue the pension fund for their employees. My opinion is that the law would stimulate the energy of the working men who would feel that they are backed up by the state. Immigration would also greatly benefit by the scheme when it would be known that in Canada we look after our people when they have grown old and disabled.

I do not intend going into details, for instance as to the age at which the pension should start, or the means of raising that pension fund; this can very well be determined when the bill is presented. What I want now is simply the recognition of the principle by the House, so that the Government would realize that they cannot delay any longer the passing of such legislation.

I have before me now the copy of a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier at a large meeting, held in Montreal, on the 27th of September, 1916, at which you were present, Mr. Speaker. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that as soon as the war would be over —the great Canadian foresaw already the victory of the Allies—one of the greatest questions would be that of the establishment of old age pensions, and to this end, he said he had entrusted to some of his most prominent Liberal supporters the task of inquiring into the subject. At the great Liberal convention held in Ottawa, in August, 1919, a special resolution was moved and adopted to that effect.

I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to raise a political question out of this resolution; I am fully confident that hon. members of this House, whether they sit on your right or on your left, will consider it on its merit. But I hope I shall be permitted to say that it is an essentially Liberal idea and that it would be proper for the Liberal party to carry it out. We, on this side of the House, should consider that wish expressed by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1916 and embodied in a resolution at the great convention of the Liberal party in 1919, as an order to be cheerfully complied with.

I know that we are in a rather serious financial position, that we have an enormous debt and that the Government is endeavouring by all possible means to balance their budget for which they have the unqualified approval of the people. But this question of old age pensions should not be delayed any longer. Moreover I do not believe I am committing an indiscretion when I say that knowing the feelings of the hon. Prime Minister as I do and owing to the fact that he has made a thorough study of the social and economic conditions of our country, he is agreeable to this resolution and he will find a means of placing it on our statutes which will be a credit to him and a great asset for this country.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS TO WIDOWED MOTHERS

Mr. CHARLES G. POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the act to provide pensions to or in respect of members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces, 1919, so as to provide that the pension of a widowed mother of a member of the forces who has died on

active service shall not be reduced on account of her income; and further that pension shall be granted her of right whether or not there are other living children.

He said: This is a resolution which, in one form or another, has come before the House for the past four sessions. In 1918, under the terms of the Pension Act for members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, the widowed mother of a deceased soldier was entitled to a pension of so much per month; but in case she earned anything, by working at any occupation whatsoever, the amount which she earned during the month was deducted from her pension. This provision, I am happy to say, has now disappeared, and the widowed mother, generally speaking, does not have any deduction made from her pension on account of her earnings. Further improvement was made in her lot somewhat later, when it was decided that even if she owned her own residence no deduction would be made from her pension by way of an amount to be attributed to rent; and a still further improvement was made somewhat later when it was decreed that the fact that she had one or more living children who were in a position to earn money and look after her should not be used as an excuse on the part of the Board of Pension Commissioners to take away the small pension which was given to her. At the present time the widowed mother, provided she is in a dependent condition, is entitled to $48 per month. Should she, however, have any income whatsoever the amount of this income is deducted from the pension. Should she have an income of $25, or $35, or $40 per month she receives that much less pension—that is to say in case her income is $30 per month, her pension would be only $18 per month. The object of this resolution is to place the widowed mother on exactly the same basis as the widow of a soldier who fell in France—in other words to give her a pension irrespective of whether she has or has not any income. As the members of the House are doubtless aware—and as I am sure, you, Mr. Speaker, know—the widow of a soldier who was killed at the war receives a pension without it being necessary for her to show that she is in a dependent condition. The object of this resolution is to place the widowed mother in exactly the same situation. During the past few years, those who are interested in soldiers and their dependents have noticed that there are a large number of complaints continually coming in to the Board of Pension Commissioners, to members of Parliament, to clergymen and others, that the widowed mother is being almost constantly visited by representatives of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment who enter into this lady's home, ask her how she is getting along, take a survey of the furniture, and inquire as to what her means of support are. If the old lady—because in the majority of cases, as the House can easily conceive, the recipients of these pensions are fairly well up in years—is unfortunate enough to explain her financial position and to state that she is doing nicely and getting along very well, the chances are that within two or three weeks a letter arrives from the Board of Pension Commissioners saying "You are in receipt of such an income; therefore your pension will be diminished by so much." It is with the object of avoiding any such occurrences that I would ask the House to approve of this resolution.

I have a number of cases which have been cited to this House and which have been brought to the attention of the pension commissioners on a number of occasions, and I do not think it is necessary to recite them here. I base my claim on behalf of the widowed mothers on the ordinary natural law and natural right. It has been urged on behalf of the former government that the mothers were not entitled to support from their children in other provinces of Canada except the province of Quebec. In that province the son, or the children, in fact, must support their parents, and an action at law will lie against those who will not do so. In other provinces of Canada, I understand, there is no such legal sanction to what, to my mind, is a natural right and a claim based on natural law. If it does not exist in the other provinces, I am sorry for those provinces, and I am sorry their legislators did not see fit to inscribe on the statutes of those provinces a law which has existed since the beginning of the world, and a law which should exist on the statute book of every province and every country. It is a purely natural law, and it is a natural thing that the son should support his mother when his mother is not in a position to support herself and should, in all cases, look after the mother who bore him, to see that she lives in comfort, if it is possible for him to do so. I submit it became the duty of the government of this country, as soon as the support of the

family fell in battle, to look after those whom he left behind. In such a case I think it is the duty of the state to step into the breach and take the place of that son, who, no doubt, if he had not answered the call on behalf of his country, would now be able to keep his mother in good circumstances. There is the further argument, that we have recognized in the Pension Act a class, which though it is entitled perhaps to some consideration on the part of the government and of the state, surely is not entitled to as much consideration as the class of widowed mothers. Section 34, subsection 1, of the Pension Act says:

> A parent or any person in the place of a parent with respect of a member of the forces who has died shall be entitled to a pension when such member of the forces left no child, widow, or divorced wife who is entitled to a pension, or a woman awarded a pension under subsection three of section thirty-three of this act, and when such parent or person is in a dependent condition and was, at the time of the death of such member of the forces, wholly or to a substantial extent, maintained by him.

Let us see what that means. The widowed mother of a soldier is entitled to a pension when the soldier has left no children—there is no objection to that,—or has left no widow, no divorced wife under certain conditions, or no woman awarded a pension under subsection 3 of section 33 of this act. Let us see who the woman referred to under subsection 3 of section 33 of this act is. That subsection says:

> A woman who, although not married to the member of the forces, was living with him in Canada at the time he became a member of the forces and for a reasonable time previously thereto, and who at such time was publicly represented by him as his wife may, in the case of his death and in the discretion of the commission, be awarded a pension equivalent to the pension she would have received had she been his legal widow. The Commission may also award a pension if in its opinion an injustice would be done by not recognizing a woman as the wife of a member of the forces, although there is no evidence that she had been publicly represented by him as his wife.

Here is a case. The widowed mother whose son was killed at the front may obtain a pension, provided the man's mistress is not alive. If the mistress is living she has a prior claim to a pension from the state to that of the mother who bore him. It is not for me to criticise the legislation which has been placed on the statute book for what has been called the unmarried wife. I know that in a large number of compassionate cases something had to be done where there were children and where there was fraud on the part of the man who was unfortunately killed. I recognize that, and I do not ask to have this provision removed from the act, but I do ask that the widow be placed at least in the same position as the woman I have just mentioned. I think it is only fair, and only plain justice, to give to the mother, who, after all, has probably suffered more than any other class of person in this war, an opportunity of obtaining a pension. Let us, at any rate, be fair enough to admit that if there is one class that did suffer, if there is one class from whom bitter tears were wrung during the war, it was the widowed mother. It is more likely the widowed mother had more to endure, spent more anxious nights and wept more tears than any other class in the community. We have given pensions to almost everyone else, but this particular class. We have in the past, I think, been sadly deficient in our duty. It should be the duty of the House to support this resolution and put an end to the anomaly which exists in our present legislation.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) brought to its attention the question referred to in his motion. Therefore, I have been unable to appreciate the argument which he has submitted. As my hon. friend stated in the last part of his remarks, the particular case of the widow who has been deserted or abandoned by her husband is pitiable in the extreme. Although I am not in a position to discuss the question on its merits at the present moment, I would not prolong the discussion and would very humbly suggest to my hon. friend that he consent to withdraw his motion and submit the matter to the special parliamentary committee which has been appointed for the purpose of studying these questions, particularly, those relating to pensions and re-establishment. The committee would hear the representations which have been submitted by my hon. friend and could then offer a recommendation to the House when the time comes to prepare a report. I hope my hon. friend will find it agreeable to him to comply with this request. If, however, he desires to secure the opinion of the House on this question, I have, of course, no serious objection; but, as I said a minute ago, I think it is advisable that the committee should be advised of this matter, study it thoroughly, examine it in all its different phases and aspects with the idea of making a recommendation on the subject.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, this question of pensions is, day by day, becoming a matter of education; that is, we are receiving, as the days go by, more information as to the condition and the situation. Since the war and since the passage of the act, conditions have arisen that probably were not contemplated when that act was being passed, and I think we ought to have an open mind to deal with all these matters in the light of the new information we have. The hon. member for Quebece South (Mr. Power) spoke of instances in his experience where injustice had been done, unwittingly, of course, under the pension scheme provided for by the Pension Act as formerly drawn, to widowed mothers on account of their having some income from some other source. I must not criticise the Pension Act, of course, because one's hind-sight is wonderful; but, in the town in which I live, I came across two or three instances where the widowed mother was plainly entitled to a certain pension, but, as she had from a house a rental that did not begin to keep her and two or three other small items of income, she was deprived of a pension which, to my mind, she really ought to have received, as her two sons, one of whom was killed, performed magnificent services overseas. Under the peculiar working of the act she did not receive her pension, but that matter has been remedied.

In justice to my province, I might call attention to the fact that, in Ontario, we have an act such as the one my hon. friend mentioned, whereby children are compelled to support their parents. My hon. friend has given the House good reasons why this act should prevail throughout the Dominion of Canada; and if it were within the province of this House to make this a federal act, I would say: "Do so," because I firmly believe that there is nothing so lamentable in the world as to see parents moping about, uncared for, living, perhaps, in penury, depending on the charity of friends, while their children live in fairly comfortable circumstances and some far beyond comfortable circumstances. If a child has no regard for his or her parent, that is a time when the law ought to step in and compel him or her to perform that duty. I feel confident that, during the last two or three years, we placed such an act as that on the statute books of Ontario.

I am heartily in sympathy with the main point brought up by my hon friend in his resolution. As the House has undertaken to cure the defects which applied to the widowed mother as regards the war land forces, the same action cannct be wrong if applied to the naval and air forces.

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is away, I am not in a position to know how much this involves; but I am heartily in accord with the principle of the resolution as proposed by my hon. friend, and I should like to see some way by which it could be placed in a statute of this Parliament.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, possibly my hon. friend (Mr. Power), in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), would not press this particular motion to a division. I think it would involve some consideration as to the extent of the financial liability that is likely to be incurred, and the House should have knowledge on that point. In the meantime the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) has suggested that the committee might consider the matter. My hon. friend will know what to say as regards that; but I would like to ask him to consider the advisability of allowing his motion to stand, at any rate, until the Minister of Finance shall have an opportunity of speaking on it.

Hon. Sir HENRY L. DRAYTON (West York): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what we ought to do at the present time is quite clear, perhaps, in some way, the motion of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) goes a little further than he intended it to go. There is no doubt as to the intent of the act, and that is to recognize the mother as she ought to be recognized, but, at the same time, treating the matter, as many other matters of pension are treated, namely, as a matter of application having regard to her necessity. If, in other words, she were a wealthy woman, I do not think my hon. friend believes that she should get a pension. I think his attitude is that the money should be left for other widows, widowed mothers and soldiers who are badly in need of it and that, as was the attitude of the late government, the need of the beneficiary of the pension was something that should be very much considered, and that the mere sacrifice itself was not sufficient, because it is impossible for Parliament to do justice to the sacrifice. It seems to me that the proper thing would be, not to have the motion withdrawn, as has been suggested, but to have it referred to the Standing Committee on Pensions where proper evi-

dence can be taken and the matter properly considered and not lost sight of. I would suggest to the hon. member for Quebec South that the motion, instead of being withdrawn, should be referred to that committee.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Pensions Committee, I should like to say a word of assurance to the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who moved the resolution. This point has been and is at the present time under discussion in that committee, and I can say that it is being discussed from a sympathetic standpoint. I think the ground we have taken in the discussion so far as it has gone, is that, as regards the point of having that pension cut down by the amount of income which the widowed mother received from other sources, every dependent, whether a widow or a widowed mother is entitled to a comfortable livelihood. We are trying now to amend the act so that that comfortable livelihood will be secured; but, as my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) says, the money will be applied, as far as possible, where it is most necessary. There are many cases of widows as well as widowed mothers where a small income is received from their own labours, where, in spite of lack of strength, they take in washing, or do small jobs around the place, or go out sewing, or take up different classes of labour for which they are not fitted, in order to augment the pension so as to make it sufficient to enable them to live in decent comfort. In those cases, the opinion of the committee is—perhaps I had better not say—

Mr. POWER: In those cases, legislation has already been introduced and passed to the effect that widows and widowed mothers do not lose any of their pension owing to their earnings, so that the committee was probably discussing something that was passed two or three yeas ago.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was going to say that we included in that small incomes from other sources which were not sufficient in themselves to keep the widowed mother in decent circumstances. Our aim is to bring in a recommendation as soon as possible that will amend the act to cover these cases and provide as far as possible for the decent, comfortable maintenance of those women who have given their sons to the service of the country. We believe that the foundation principle is this, that the country owes them this as the least it can possibly do for them; and that is what we are trying to do. I am not speaking against the motion; I am in favour of it. But I simply wish to reassure the hon. member that if the matter is referred to us it will be treated from a sympathetic point of view.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): While possibly it is not strictly relevant to the subject before the House, nevertheless I think that the matter to which I wish to call attention now is apropos of the motion that has been proposed by my hon. friend. I wish to refer to a case that occurred in the constituency I have the honour to represent. Four or five weeks ago a woman, whose son was killed at the front and who was receiving separation allowance and assigned pay, found herself in need of a pension. At the time her son was killed she was in receipt of separation allowance and assigned pay. She had a son-in-law who was assisting her and by means of that assistance, and other small aid and with what she had saved from her separation allowance and assigned pay, she was able to make out. But about six months ago she found herself absolutely without means, and she was faced with the alternative of securing a pension or going to the poorhouse. She appealed to me and I took up the matter; but I am sorry to say that the department at Ottawa ruled against her. This woman's son met his death overseas; yet it was held that she was not entitled to a pension because three years had elapsed between the young man's death and the date of application for the pension. If that is the system that obtains in the matter of granting pensions in this country, then the sooner our people are informed to that effect, and the sooner we have done with this idle pretence about providing for the relatives of returned men, the better it will be for us all in Canada. I wrote to the minister and I think that probably I was very plain in the observations I made. I received very little satisfaction.

It is all very well for people to say that they have sympathy with the relatives of the men who were killed overseas. But sympathy will not support people of old age who have given their sons to the country's service. Sympathy and fine words will not keep them from going to the poorhouse, and the sooner we put away such maudlin pity and get down to the realities of life, the sooner we administer

pension affairs on a basis of what is fair and equitable, the better it will be for all concerned. A few minutes ago the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham) was telling the House that he would like to see a federal act, if it were within the competence of this Parliament to pass such, that would compel sons and daughters to protect and support their parents. I believe that there is at the present time a law similar to this, if not on all fours with it, in the province of Quebec. My hon. friend should remember that that province sets this Dominion a lesson in her urbanity and filial affection. Indeed, the people of Quebec are princes of the principles of urbanity, and the fact that an English-speaking minister rises in this Parliament and says that he would like to see enacted in this country such a law as he has described, is not going to better things. Quebec has been very much abused, and coming, as I do, from the province of Nova Scotia, I must say that every true Canadian is thankful for the fact that there is such a province as Quebec where filial affection reigns supreme and urbanity prevails everywhere. I advise the Minister of Militia to go to his own province of Ontario and ask them to put this sort of thing into effect, rather than to ask the House of Commons to do it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I might remind my hon. friend that we have such a law in Ontario.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker, some other hon. members, I think, desire to speak on this subject.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, the resolution of my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power) certainly commends itself to hon. members, particularly to those who have had any experience of pension matters. Therefore I am not going to take up the time of the House, except to express my concurrence in the resolution and to suggest that its subject matter be referred to the committee which is now inquiring into pension grievances, as proposed by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Speakman).

We could multiply many times the grievances of fathers and widowed mothers in reference to refusals of pensions on the ground of the parents still having some earning power, but to do so would be only to repeat what has been already said this afternoon, and what is known to everyone who has had anything to do with pension matters.

I remember one case in particular of a mother whose four grown up boys volunteered for service when war broke out and went overseas. Her husband was subsequently injured in the spine in a mining accident and became an invalid. Three of the soldier boys were killed in action, and the survivor is still suffering physical injury due to war service. The invalid father died after lingering a few years, and the widowed mother is now compelled to maintain her other children, all quite young, and to do so she has to undertake work of the most menial character. She is a dear little woman, is an active worker in the Salvation Army, and has all the attributes of a good mother. This widowed mother of three sons who "lie in Flanders' fields" has now to maintain her family by cleaning the men's waiting-room in a railway station the floors of which are generally in a nasty condition. It is not creditable to Canada that this brave mother should be forced to do this disagreeable, menial work to maintain her family. She was granted a pension of $48 a month, but not long ago the Pension Board, on the ground, I believe, that this little mother was earning something, reduced the pension to $40—and to earn that "something" she has to go down on her knees and wipe the filth from waiting-room floors. That condition of affairs is a disgrace to this country and should never be allowed, and I hope that when this and like cases are reported to the committee they will make such strong representations that there will be no occasion for these mothers being any longer subjected to these indignities in order to discharge a duty to their dependents that should be discharged by the state.

I know of another case where a boy was forced to leave school at 14 years of age to maintain his mother. He volunteered when only eighteen or nineteen, went overseas, and was subsequently killed in action. His mother is now forced to maintain two little children by getting up at seven o'clock in

the morning and working for nine hours in a casket factory sewing shrouds on coffins. The Pension Board refused one cent of a pension either to her or her crippled husband, stating in their letter to the husband, dated March third last:

> Under the provisions of the Canadian Pension Act pension may be awarded to the parent of a deceased soldier when such parent is in a dependent condition and is incapacitated though mental or physical infirmity from providing for his or her maintenance.
>
> The Board of Pension Commissioners has decided that as you are not totally disabled but able to accept certain kinds of employment when available—

I may say that this man is without some fingers of one hand and naturally is not able to secure employment when it is very difficult even for a man with both hands to get work.

> —and as your wife and son are both earning, it is not possible to award you pension under the act.

I have already referred to what the wife is doing. The boy who is left, and who has now reached the age of fifteen years, has had to leave school in order to earn the paltry sum of $5 a week to help keep his mother and father from starving to death. His mother works in the casket factory, and the board have refused to pay her any pension although the boy was the means of her maintenance before he went overseas. These are cases, it seems to me, which will bring into disrepute the pension scheme of this country. Of course, we all realize how dangerous it is, from the financial standpoint, to open the door perhaps too wide. There are cases brought before the Pension Board which are not deserving, and no doubt somewhere the endeavour will be made "to put one over" the board, to use a common expression. But, Mr. Speaker, there are also cases such as the two I have mentioned, which show the necessity for an amendment to the act or for giving more discretion to the Pension Board of this great country.

I am not going to take up time further, believing that this matter will be thoroughly investigated by a committee, and that there will not be in the future such instances as I have brought to the attention of the House this evening, of parents whose children have made the supreme sacrifice being refused a decent pension because, forsooth, they are able to scrub a floor or work in a factory.

I would suggest that the hon. member have this matter referred to the committee, but if he does not do so, I shall vote for the resolution.

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I unfortunately left the Chamber about half-past five this afternoon and did not hear the discussion, but in reading over the resolution again—I had read it before—I feel that it has practically my total sympathy. I have had a number of cases at different times where the widowed mother of a soldier who was killed overseas in some branch of the service was receiving what seemed to me to be a very unfair deal. Such a case as my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Logan) has mentioned is an example of that kind. While it is true we are paying out an immense sum of pensions in this country, and true also that somebody may attempt to impose upon the Pension Board, at the same time I believe it is the duty of this Parliament and of the people of this country to do everything in their power to see that the mothers, as well as the wives and children, of the men who served overseas get a fair deal. I had a case very recently, which I think I have mentioned just in passing on another occasion, where the mother of a boy who was killed overseas had a couple of small houses rented in Port Arthur—she was not in my constituency but wrote me regarding the matter—and she went to England while she was getting a small rent from these houses. Later they became vacant, but because her case had been investigated and it had been reported that she was receiving a small rent her pension was cut down, or cancelled altogether, if I remember rightly, and according to her letter, which was almost pitiful, she was then receiving no rent at all. There is a great danger, I think, in taking into account some income which a widowed mother may have, because the investigator may be a little careless in his investigation, or even if he is thoroughly sincere, circumstances may change after he has made his investigation.

I am wholly in sympathy with such a resolution as this. I also agree with the last speaker (Mr. Logan) in his suggestion that perhaps this is a proper subject for discussion before the committee that is now sitting; but if the resolution should go to a vote, my sympathies would be entirely with it, and I should be compelled to support the mover.

There is just one other point I would mention. Occasionally there may be cases where some mother who does not receive

a pension may impose upon the Pension Board and so upon the people of this country, but I believe the mothers of that type will be small in number. At any rate, it will be far better for this country to make the mistake of being too generous than to err on the other side and be too parsimonious in a matter of this kind.

Mr. T. W. CALDWELL (Victoria and Carleton): As a member of last year's Pensions Committee I should like to say a word on this resolution. In the first place, it has my hearty sympathy and support. Although the act was amended last year to penalize the widowed mother more than she had ever been penalized before, it was done simply on the majority vote of last year's committee. As one of the committee, I was very much opposed to the amendment last year, which was to this effect: The original act provided that a widowed mother who had sons living at home with her would be supposed to be receiving $10 a month from each. The amendment last year widened that to include girls as well as boys. I believe the word "children" was substituted for the word "boys". Further than that, the amendment left it to the discretion of the board to decide whether or not that $10 should be deducted from the pension. I believe the exact wording was "any of the children either living at home or abroad who are contributing or are supposed to be contributing to the widowed mother's maintenance". That was partially offset by another provision which was made last year. Up until last year the widowed mother's earnings were deducted from her pension, I think, in toto, but last year it was provided that she could earn up to $20 without any deduction being made, this $20 including what was supposed to be contributed by the children.

With regard to referring this matter to the Pensions Committee, I sincerely hope that the mover of this resolution will not do that, for this reason: I was a member of that committee last year and am again this. We had a difference of opinion over this question in the committee last year, and we had a difference of opinion over it the year before, and the act as it now stands was only approved by a very small majority of last year's committee. I think the House itself should decide this important question rather than shelve it on to a small committee. Therefore, I hope that the mover will not withdraw the resolution or have it referred to the committee. I think the House itself should settle the matter.

Mr. POWER: There seems to be a slight misconception with regard to the purport of the resolution due, I think, to a misprint on the Order Paper. The resolution as printed on the Order Paper reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to amend the act to provide pensions to or in respect of members of the Canadian Naval and Military Air Forces.

The resolution should read:

Canadian Naval, Military and Air Forces.

Some hon. members were under the impression that the widowed mothers of members of the Canadian military forces had already obtained certain benefits which members of the naval and air forces had not obtained. In order to correct this impression, may I state to the House that the widowed mothers of all ex-soldiers and sailors and airmen are all on exactly the same basis?

I forgot to state this afternoon that not only are the ordinary widowed mothers, that is to say, the widowed mothers of Canadian soldiers, affected adversely by this legislation, but certain widowed mothers of Canadian soldiers who do not reside in Canada are more severely affected than others.

For instance, take the widowed mother of a soldier who enlisted from the United States. Take the widowed mother of a soldier who enlisted in Canada and was killed, who now resides in Scotland or in England. She is not treated with the same generosity as the widowed mothers who reside in Canada. Certain legislation was passed improving the lot of the Canadian widowed mother, but it was expressly stipulated that these improvements would only affect her so long as she remained in Canada. If she were to return, possibly to her old home, in Scotland or in England, her pension would be reduced by so much. If she returned to the United States the same thing would occur. I submit that the loss to the mother who resides in Scotland or the United States, or anywhere else in the world, is the same as the loss to the mother who resides in Canada; and legislation such as is aimed at in this resolution would do a great deal to improve the circumstances of these people.

Now with reference to the request which has been made by the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, by the Prime Minister, and by the Minister of Militia, I have

no objection out of deference to them, to referring the matter to the Pensions Committee; but let me say this: For five sessions I have moved this resolution in the House. On every occasion when it was debated as a resolution it would meet with almost unanimous support. Member after member has risen from his seat and given examples of the manner in which widowed mothers were treated throughout the country. The resolution was always sent to the parliamentary committee with the best wishes of, and a strong recommendation from, the members of the House; yet invariably when the findings of the committee were brought down and put in the form of legislation we found that the committee had been unwilling to go further than grant a paltry five or ten dollars a month extra to the widowed mother. On every occasion when the report of the committee came before the House I have endeavoured to have this legislation amended in order to give greater opportunity for this class to obtain proper pensions, and on two occasions at least, and possibly on three, my amendment has been ruled out of order by the Speaker on the ground that I have no power to amend the resolution of the committee on matters pertaining to a money bill. So that though I agree with my hon. leader and his colleagues, and, out of deference to them, have no objection to referring the resolution to the committee, I have very little hope that it will be put into legislation unless the members of the committee who are now present make it their business to see that a hard, strong fight is put up in the committee and that the wishes of the House are for once carried out by them.

Mr. SPEAKER: Am I to understand the motion is referred to the committee?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot amend his own motion. Another hon. member will have to propose that such motion be referred to the special committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nobody can propose that now. The hon. member has closed the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: It can be done by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know at the moment what it is that the House is asked to give unanimous consent to, but the debate on this motion is now closed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS TO MOTHERS OF DECEASED SOLDIERS

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Board of Pension Commissioners be given discretionary power to award pensions to mothers of deceased soldiers in cases where such mothers have been deserted by or become separated from their husbands, such pensions to be paid at the same rate as those awarded to widowed mothers.

He said: There is very little to be said with reference to this resolution. It asks the House to go on record as approving of the principle of treating the mothers of deceased soldiers who have been deserted, or become separated from their husbands, on the same basis as widowed mothers, provided always they can show their case a deserving one. It is in order to give effect to the latter provision that the resolution proposes to grant certain discretionary power to the Pension Commission. I may say it has been the experience of most of those who have had to do with the Board of Pension Commissioners that the less discretion we allow them the better it will be for the pensioner; but the number of and variety of cases dealt with here under this resolution is so great, that I do not wish to tie down the commission by any hard and fast rules. It may be possible later on to amend the law so as to give greater justice to all concerned; but I fear that if discretion is not allowed to the commissioners, a certain number of undeserving cases may obtain pensions.

In order to illustrate the cases I would like to see covered by legislation, allow me to cite one instance which occurred in my own constituency. There is a certain family in Quebec the children of which I have known for a number of years. When war broke out there were three boys, all of whom enlisted for service overseas. Two returned very badly wounded, so badly wounded as to be unable to earn a living. One is now, I understand, under the care of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and the other is drawing a full disability pension. The third boy was unfortunately killed at the front. After some time his mother, whom I had always known as a widow, obtained a pension. Subsequently she was able to

obtain a small position as a charwoman in the post office. This year, two years and a half after the pension was granted, a visitor came to see this lady, and after making inquiries as to her financial condition, etc., went away. Two weeks afterwards a letter arrived which stated that the pension was cut off owing to the fact that this lady was now earning a certain amount of money at her employment at the post office. The case was referred to me, and I wrote to the chairman of the Board of Pension Commissioners calling their attention to the legislation which provided that the pension of a widowed mother was not to be reduced on account of her earnings. The reply I received from the Board of Pension Commissioners was, that everything I said was quite right but that the lady was not a widow. On making further inquiries I found that she had been deserted in the year 1894 by her husband —who would to-day be eighty-eight years of age if he were alive—and she has never heard of him since.

She will not obtain her pension unless she proves that she is a widow. It is to remedy cases like that, where, taking advantage of pure technicality, the Board of Pension Commissioners decided to cut off the pension that I propose to give them power to treat a woman in a case such as I have mentioned on the same basis as a widowed mother. It is not necessary to explain to the House that it would be a very costly proceeding for this old lady to employ detectives to find out where her husband was, and to advertise in the newspapers for him.

I need not say to the House that, under the law, at any rate of the province of Quebec, with regard to civil rights and with regard to property, after five years' absence a man can be declared an absentee; nor need I explain that in criminal matters—and this applies to the whole of Canada—a person can plead against the charge of bigamy that he or she has not heard from the other party for seven years. So that, when we have such provisions in our statutes already with reference to these matters, surely there should be a similar provision with reference to pensions. I submit it is absolutely unjust and unfair to ask a lady, in a case such as I have mentioned, to go to the expense of proving that she is a widow. I have been informed by the Board of Pension Commissioners that a large number of such cases exist throughout Canada, and that it would be a good thing if legislation were introduced to cover them. I think the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment (Mr. Béland) agrees with me that such cases should be looked after. I know a number of cases where, perhaps, there might be attempts at fraud, and it is for that reason that, at the present time, I propose to give a certain amount of discretion to the Board of Pension Commissioners. I think this resolution should, at least, on the face of it carry, and that it would not be necessary to refer it to any committee whatever. The case is absolutely plain and I look for an expression of approval on the part of the House.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

House resumed, from April 19, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Kay.

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that legislation be introduced during the present session to prohibit the adoption of Daylight Saving Time in any part of Canada.

And of the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. Duff.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Som hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Lost.

Mr. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATERWAY

House resumed, from April 26, consideration of the following proposed motion of Mr. Church:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should give early and favourable consideration to the report of the International Joint Commission on the St. Lawrence River Waterway, and request the Government of the United States to join with Canada in making an international agreement for carrying out the work so recommended.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): When the House adjourned on the day that this question was previously under consideration I had not had an opportunity to say the few words that I had in my mind on the subject. I commend, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Church) for bringing this question before the House. It is a subject of very great importance to the Dominion of Canada, and one which, I think, it is quite necessary to discuss more thoroughly than it can be discussed this session before we can bring the House and the country to realize their responsibility for carrying out this great project. For that reason I entirely disagree

with the hon. member from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) who indicated that it was a loss of time for the House to discuss a motion of this kind. It is only by discussing a project like this that the House can be brought to understand what it really means and that the country can be educated as to the necessity of so great a work.

My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle seems to think the object of this scheme is to increase the size of the city of Toronto. He may have got that idea from the fact that a representative of the city of Toronto brought it forward, but I think, if he will give it a little closer examination, he will discover that it is really to serve those parts of the country that are not congested in the form of great cities. To my mind this is a well balanced project that will be of benefit to every province of Canada, and it is one that has the approval of the International Joint Commission, and all members of the House have the report of that commission, I believe. It not only has their approval on the basis of an exhaustive examination of all the phases of the work, but it has the support of the President of the United States.

One of my hon. friends, I think the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) rather argued that that was an objection to it, that a partnership between the Dominion of Canada and the United States in a project of this kind was not desirable. I entirely disagree with that idea, because I think that a partnership that might be entered into by these two great countries to carry out this work is something that is desirable, and brings the project easily within the possibilities of the next few years. I am not at all alarmed, Sir, about entering into a partnership of this kind with the United States. I think these closer relationships in the development of both countries by a great project such as we are discussing is one of the things that bind us closer together, without bringing us under the same flag or under the same political system, and is calculated to continue for another century that hundred years of peace we have had between the two countries. I think, Sir, that the amity that has existed between the United States and Canada is due very largely to the maintenance of commercial and financial relations, and it is a happy thing to find the Dominion of Canada and United States co-operating with the International Joint Commission to carry through a work which is calculated to be of tremendous service, in my judgment, to every province in confederation.

This country has been endowed by Providence with the most wonderful system of inland waterways that can be found in any part of the world and while we have, in the past, done a good deal to improve those waterways, we are now face to face with a greater development than has ever before been conceived, and one which, I think, a close examination will show to be well within our financial resources and calculated to produce such results as would warrant the two countries in going on with the work. If we should sit down and refuse to develop the possibilities that are within our reach, we would surely be charged by later generations with lack of vision and courage. In the history of this country, there have been times when the amount of money involved would have been staggering; but, during the last ten or twelve years, we have got into the habit of speaking in terms of millions and sometimes of billions; and $100,000,000 or $250,000,000 is not to-day nearly so staggering a sum as it was a few years ago.

The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) drew attention the other day to the remarkable economy of using water instead of railway transportation. I do not think I need emphasize that further than to point out that, having such possibilities for water transportation, we ought to show some courage in developing them, because the saving in cost of transportation is going to be so enormous and because, with a recurring period of prosperity, the railway systems of this country and of this continent will be overtaxed as they were a few years ago. Canada has more miles of railway per thousand of population than, perhaps, is entirely necessary for the trade of the country. At the same time, if we can reduce the cost of transportation, especially to and from the great West, we are going to save the farmers of the West a tremendous amount of money, and we are going to make it possible for them to puchase goods manufactured in the East, and thus make our trade run east and west under the best and most economical conditions.

About two years ago, what is called car shortage occurred in Canada; men could not get cars to carry their goods. That was due to the remarkable prosperity that we enjoyed at that time. That condition is coming back, and it will not be many years, two or three, perhaps, before we shall be again

faced with the same conditions that existed two or three years ago, when there was not a sufficient number of cars to handle the trade of the country. We cannot, of course, construct this waterway in time to meet that condition; but as we are certain to be faced with that in recurring periods in the future, we ought now to begin considering at what time we shall undertake this work in order to increase the transportaion facilities.

I said I thought this project was of great advantage to every province in the Dominion. What will be the effect of it upon the maritime provinces? I believe it would enable the miners of Nova Scotia to sell their coal in the greater part of Ontario. With a deep draught in the canal, with large boats carrying, perhaps, 10,000 tons, Nova Scotia coal could be sold as far west as Hamilton and the Niagara peninsula; it might go as far north as North Bay or further. If we could produce a condition of affairs by which coal from Nova Scotia could be sold throughout Ontario, that would be one of the greatest boons that could be given to that province. What is true of coal is true of steel, which is manufactured in Nova Scotia in large quantities. Steel is a kind of freight that requires cheap transportation, and vessels could be loaded at the steel mills and the product of those mills carried as far west as the head of the Great Lakes. Surely that would be of advantage to Nova Scotia. What is true of Nova Scotia is, of course, true of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island if those provinces have anything to sell. Probably the potatoes of New Brunswick would still go into Maine; but there have been times when potatoes of New Brunswick would have been very welcome in Ontario, and potatoes require a low freight rate. It would be easy to market, in the great centres of population, all that the maritime provinces generally produce. if we had cheaper transportation, and the only way of getting cheaper transportation is by water instead of by rail. This plan proposes and provides for that.

I think this project would be of equal value to Quebec. I know some hon. gentlemen think that Quebec will be injuriously affected by the canalization of the St. Lawrence. They probably think that the head of ocean navigation would be extended from Montreal further west. That would be true as regards tramp steamers and other regular lines of freight vessels; but Montreal would continue to be the head of ocean navigation for passenger traffic, because it is not designed, at least not in my mind, that passenger ships should go further west than the city of Montreal. The benefit that would accrue to Quebec, as I see the proposition, would be to have the products of the factories and industrial establishments of that province carried from the place of manufacture to the head of the Great Lakes at one-fifth or, perhaps, one-tenth of the freight cost that is now imposed by the railways. Many different manufactured products of Quebec could be sold in the western provinces under very much better conditions, if the cost of freight were reduced so enormously as it certainly would be by having the goods carried by water instead of by rail. In addition to that, no part of the Dominion of Canada can prosper without the great city of Montreal and other manufacturing cities of the province of Quebec enjoying their share of that prosperity.

I do not think any province in Canada can be prosperous without all the other provinces having their share of that prosperity; what makes for the good of one, makes for the good of all. And in this particular this proposed project, which has the approval not only of the men who have studied it most exhaustively but also of the great Republic to the south of us, is one that ought to commend itself to the business men of Quebec who are conducting the great industrial establishments there, as well as to the financial interests of that province which are all more or less tied up, inevitably and inextricably, with the prosperity of the manufacturers and industrial enterprises down there.

I do not think that any place would profit more by the carrying out of this project than would the city of Montreal itself. It is the great financial centre of Canada, and in that fact alone it would draw to itself a very large share of the prosperity resulting from the completion of this undertaking. I sometimes compare those who are writing against this project in the press of Quebec to those workmen who resisted years ago, and those who still resist, the introduction of labour saving machinery. I take it that increased efficiency in any part of our industrial or transportation systems would work to the general advantage of the whole country, and in that way the province of Quebec stands to gain quite as much as, if not more than, the province of Ontario. Ontario, I think, would gain, but not nearly as much as the province of Quebec. Que-

bec has a longer distance to carry its manufactured goods than Ontario and has to pay higher freight rates. But if we had a waterway with regular lines of ships leaving Montreal and going up the St. Lawrence to the head of the lakes, any advantage western Ontario now has in the way of freight rates as against the province of Quebec would be wiped out; for the difference in the freight rate on a ship between Montreal and the head of the lakes, and between Toronto and the head of the lakes, is the merest possible fraction. So that I emphasize my argument that the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec stand to gain more than the province of Ontario.

I should think that all hon. gentlemen to my left would be among the protagonists of the project. It has been estimated that the cost of carrying grain from the West would be reduced by between five and ten cents a bushel. Let us put it at seven cents, and my hon. friends can figure out from that what a saving there would be in carrying the grain of the three western provinces by waterway instead of by rail.

Mr BROWN: On my hon. friend's calculation, how many million bushels of grain would it require to save the interest on the amount that would be spent on the undertaking?

Mr. HOCKEN: I shall come to that question later. If we could reduce the cost of carrying grain to somewhere about 7 cents a bushel, and if we could proportionately reduce the cost of carrying manufactured goods to the West, the people of the prairie provinces would gain both ways. They would buy what they required from the East at lower prices, while they would sell to the East and to the markets overseas at a higher rate. So that it is my conviction that, if we except the province of British Columbia, every part of Canada stands to gain enormously by the construction of this work.

I am not going into the details of this matter, because they are to be found in this book to which reference has been made; and my hon. friend from North Toronto gave a great many details the other day. I am rather trying to deal with the subject in a general way. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown) wants to know how much it would cost. Well, Sir, I am going to argue that it would not cost anything; I contend that the building of the canal would not cost the Dominion a cent. I have no doubt that that assertion strikes my hon. friend from Lisgar as rather a startling one. But the basis of my argument is that in building the deep water canal in the St. Lawrence there would at the same time be developed for use in the Dominion of Canada—particularly in Ontario and Quebec—two million horse-power of electrical energy; and there would also be developed two million horse-power of energy for the United States. I venture to say that that four million horse-power of energy could be sold for enough to pay all overhead costs of the work both from the electrical and from the navigation point of view. If you take four million horse-power at $20 or $25 per horse-power, you have $100,000,000 a year, which, besides paying overhead costs, would probably pay all the costs of distributing the electrical energy and administering the navigation of the canal.

Mr. HUGHES: Would there be a demand for that horse power?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not immediately, but if this work were started it is conceivable that it would take two or three years, or perhaps longer, to complete it, and during that time a good deal could be done to prepare the market for the energy that would be developed. But I would point out in this connection the fact that in the United States they are finding it not only desirable but profitable to electrify their railways, and a market would be found for a great deal of the power that would be developed as a result of this undertaking, in the electrifying of the railways of eastern Ontario and perhaps the western part of Quebec. At all events, it would not be a difficult or costly thing for the National railways to make preparations to operate all the line from Montreal to the Niagara frontier by electrical energy. And the time is coming when that system of transportation will be much more widely employed than it is to-day. There are a great many hundred miles of railway in the United States that are operated by electricity, which is by all odds the best motive power that a railway can have. In the first place, it saves about 10 per cent—I think it is estimated at 12 per cent—of the total weight that a locomotive has to haul. In water and fuel the steam locomotive has to haul 12 per cent of the weight of the train, and this could be eliminated by the use of electrical energy. In the next place, electricity is much more efficient in cold

weather, such as we have in this country occasionally. The electrical locomotive never freezes up, so that it is more dependable the colder the weather becomes; and, as an hon. member suggests, it absolutely removes the fire risk wherever it is employed. I think it will be found, before ten years have passed, that electricity will be recognized throughout this continent as the ideal motive power for all railways, and there is going on in the United States at the present time a discussion as to whether they should not construct great central power plants to develop electrical power by coal at the pitmouth, transmitting that power to operate the railways two or three hundred miles away.

I am quite satisfied, Sir, from my amateur study of the railway problem of this continent that that is a development of the near future, and I make this digression in order to answer my hon. friend who asked me if there would be a demand for this power. I can tell him, as my hon. friend from North Toronto pointed out the other day, that where electrical energy is developed in large quantities there industrial activity is intensified, and what were formerly little villages or small towns soon develop into great industrial communities. Take the city of Welland alone, where there is an abundance of electrical power, and we find an outstanding example in our part of the province, of the growth of a small place into a considerable city. In the whole of western Ontario you will find few industries that are not operating with electrical power. In a word, electrical power is one of the principal factors that make western Ontario such a prosperous part of the Dominion. Electrical power has three great advantages over steam power—it is cheaper, it is cleaner, and it is more efficient. I could give you facts out of my own experience, Sir, if that were necessary, but I do not think I need do so to bring myself within the judgment of hon. members. I have no fear that within a reasonably short period of time after this power were developed there would be a sufficient market to take up every horsepower of energy generated.

My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown) asked me about the financing of this project. There is a plan, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed with one of the men who have been prominent in advocating this movement in the United States, and it commends itself to my judgment at least; whether it will satisfy the House or not is another question. The plan is that this Government and the government of the United States might constitute a commission, for service and not for profit, with power to issue bonds to be guaranteed by both governments. I am afraid there are some persons in this country who do not like that expression; they would like to develop this great power on the St. Lawrence if it could be done for private profit. I think that would be a mistake. I am of opinion that we have gone far enough to discover that there are some things that can be done successfully by the public for the public; in fact, we have demonstrated this so fully in our own province that I feel satisfied this undertaking could be worked cut in an equally satisfactory manner.

Let us suppose, Mr. Speaker, that an international commission such as I speak of were created to carry out the plans that have been or will be prepared at a cost, say, of $250,000,000 or $300,000,000. That commission would undertake to work upon a reasonable recompense for their services; but not a cent would go to pay dividends; there would be no stock to pour water into. The commission would have power to sell the bonds, and I do not think any hon. member would hesitate to believe that if an international commission were created they could sell twice over all the bonds necessary to carry out the project, those bonds to bear a reasonable rate of interest, for they would have at their back the security of the whole North American continent, and would rely upon the earning capacity both of the canal and of the power to be generated, but particularly of the latter. It is primarily a navigation project, designed to take advantage of the great endowment that Providence has given to us; but with it goes the possibility of developing an enormously valuable asset as a by-product of the extension of our deep-water navigation system from the gulf of St. Lawrence to the head of the lakes.

I should like hon. members to consider this project, not from any narrow, provincial or sectional standpoint, but from every standpoint. I have no expectation that we are going to settle it to-day, nor at this session, nor perhaps next session, but I anticipate that some member, if not my hon. friend from North Toronto, (Mr. Church) then his colleague from West Toronto (Mr. Hocken), will certainly bring this question before the House at some subsequent session. If in the meantime hon. members will examine and study its relation to every province and

realize the benefits that will accrue to each province from the completion of the project, I am satisfied that in the course of another session or two—I hope next session—the House will see its way clear to take a decided step towards inaugurating this work and carrying it to completion.

If we were asked to-day to raise $150,000,000 or $250,000,000 to carry out a work of this magnitude, I think we would all hesitate to take action. That is what my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) put to us the other day as an alternative. He said: If we are going to create a new navigation system, let us develop the Ottawa river practically from Montreal to lake Nipissing. Well, if we did that, we would have to go down in our own pockets to raise the necessary funds. We could not get a joint international commission appointed for such a purpose, we could not get assistance in financing from any other quarter. That consideration alone would seem to me to put that alternative out of the question at the present time. All the horsepower that could be developed from the Ottawa river, according to the figures of my hon. friend, is a million and a half. And that would be developed where? Not where it is needed, not where there is a market for it, but hundreds of miles away, with the result that much of that power would be lost in transmission. Besides, you cannot develop industrial communities of any size along the Ottawa river from this city up to lake Nipissing; that is absurd. Therefore any such electrical development would not amount to anything; but the development of electrical energy along the front of the provinces of Ontario and Quebec is something entirely different. There you already have a market, and there are the possibilities of a much more extended market. Further, by the use of this power that market would be constantly increasing and new industries would be established all the time, resulting in these two provinces becoming the great manufacturing centres of the Dominion—they are now, in fact, but they would then be much more so—and they would bring within reach of our country the possibility of developing foreign markets for our goods, because with cheap power we ought to be able to get lower costs of production, and with cheap transportation a vessel could load at any place in lake Ontario, lake Huron or lake Superior, as well as in the gulf or on the St. Lawrence river, and carry our manufactured goods to any part of the world.

Surely that is an alluring prospect that we ought to regard with keen sympathy and deep interest. I submit, Sir, that there is no undertaking facing the people of Canada to-day that is so promising of results, so promising of increasing our national prosperity and of such extraordinary value to us as the carrying out of this great work; and the adoption of this resolution submitted by my hon. friend from North Toronto would be the first step to this desirable consummation.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): I cannot allow this resolution to be finally disposed of without taking some part in the discussion. Knowing the circumstances surrounding this matter and the conditions in connection with electrical power development fairly well, I feel that there is no question of greater importance or of greater interest that could come before this Parliament at this or any other session than the resolution which is now under discussion.

I notice that my hon. friend from St. James (Mr. Rinfret) in his speech on Wednesday last said:

> As to improving the navigability of the St. Lawrence, there is a lurking suspicion that this is only the ostensible purpose, and that the real purpose of the promoters is to promote water-power—

I wish to disabuse my hon. friend's mind of that idea at once. He is quite mistaken in supposing that the ostensible purpose of the promoters is to promote water-power, and when he speaks of promoting water-power, I apprehend that he means promoting water-power in so far as the development of electrical energy by water-power is concerned.

This proposition took its rise, in the first place, in the middle western states. Some eighteen or twenty of these important states feeling that it was necessary for the wellbeing of that great country that there should be better water transportation facilities between the Great Lakes and the ocean, formed an organization called the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the United States government the necessity of making the St. Lawrence river navigable from the Great Lakes to the ocean. That was practically the inauguration of this scheme, and the electrical power development only came into it when Canadians here interested in this matter took the question up themselves.

The American Tidewater Association had its formation twelve or fifteen years

ago, and spent enormous sums of money in propaganda and publicity through the United States. Some four or five years ago a number of enthusiastic gentlemen in Canada felt that there should be a greater interest taken in this matter not only by our Canadian citizens, but by the Government of Canada, and they formed in the city of Windsor an association known as the Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association, to act in conjunction with the United States association for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the two governments the benefits that would accrue from the undertaking and completion of this project, and through the Canadian association the great possibility of paying for the whole project by the development of electrical current. That is where the electrical element entered into the consideration of the matter.

A good deal has been said about the enormous expense, and I intend to-night to devote my time and what ability I have to dealing with that side of the matter. I notice my hon. friend from St. James in his speech the other day said:

> I want to remind the House also of some of the very good reasons which have been advanced why the Government should be very cautious in this matter—

I agree with him that the Government should be cautious.

> —should approach the whole question warily—

I quite agree that we should act warily.

> —and should refrain at the present time from taking the least practical action.

Why refrain? We can act cautiously, we can act warily, but it would not be the part of courageous citizens of Canada for us to refrain altogether from taking up this matter and endeavouring to deal with it as a business proposition in connection with an application to the United States government with a view to arriving at some practical understanding in regard to it. I think that we are quite capable, so far as the business end of it is concerned, of taking care of ourselves. We understand the matter as fully as they do, and I have no fear at all from that point of view.

Let us see in the first instance what the expense of this project will be. We have the engineers' estimates. It was stated by my hon. friend from St. James that possibly their estimate would not cover one-half the cost. Let me state that the engineers prepared their estimates last summer. They were published in August, and the details of the expenditure were also published. Those details have been in the hands of engineers who have been opposed to this project from that hour until now, and the fact that they have not up to this minute pointed out one error in the calculations of the engineers is the best evidence to my mind that their estimates are correct.

What do the engineers say? They say that the cost of the project will be $252,723,200, and that this amount will be required to make the St. Lawrence navigable from the lakes to the ocean and create an electrical power development on the international section of the river by which there will be developed 1,464,000 electrical horsepower. Those figures $252,723,200 are rather staggering, and it is necssary that we should know where this is going to lead before we attempt such enormous expenditure, even in conjunction with the wealthy United States of America. What does it mean? I agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Hocken) in his remarks as to the financial end of this proposition. I understood him to say that he favoured the appointment of a joint commission. If the Government should incorporate what might be called the Joint International Navigation and Power Company with authority to issue, say, fifty year debentures, those debentures to be guaranteed by the governments of the United States and Canada, I submit to hon. members of this House that those debentures so issued could be readily sold at four per cent interest. Assuming that to be the case, the annual interest at four per cent on the capital expenditure would be $10,108,928. The annual cost of operation and maintenance as outlined by the engineers amounts to $2,562,000. The sinking fund to pay off that capital expenditure in fifty years would amount to $3,300,000 a year, making a total expenditure of $15,970,928 a year. This is an enormous expenditure but what have you got for it? You have electrical power amounting to 1,464,000 horse-power and at $12 per horse-power on the switchboard that would amount to $17,568,000, or a surplus over the annual expenditure sufficient to wipe off the whole indebtedness, upkeep and maintenance of $1,597,072.

Now I appeal to my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Rinfret) if the Montreal Light Heat and Power Company sell current at the switchboard at their works in the St. Lawrence river at $12 a horsepower? That is an exceedingly cheap elec-

trical power at the switchboard, and if you sell the current at $12 per horsepower you have an annual surplus over what will be the whole cost of construction, the interest and sinking fund, in a period of fifty years, leaving a balance of $1,597,072 a year. Speaking broadly, that answers the financial situation. And these figures are not fictitious or visionary; they are the figures given us by the engineers who have made a thorough study of the situation. All these figures are agreed to by the joint commissioners of Canada and the United States, who have made a thorough study of the whole situation, and state that as far as they can ascertain by the evidence given they are actual. That would be on a basis of an equal share between the two countries, but we find that it is not at all to be the situation if this report is adopted, and it is only the adoption of this report that is asked. The United States Government may say that they want better terms than that report gives; but we are asking this Parliament and this Government to proceed on the basis of the adoption of that report. Now what does this report say in so far as expenditure is concerned.

In the first place let me point out what the report says in relation to the Welland canal, but first I want hon. gentlemen to remember this: We are at the outset faced with an expenditure of $80,000,000 for the construction of a new Welland ship canal. The Government of Canada is faced with that proposition. The estimates for the expense of that work were made in 1912, and the original estimate made at that time was for $50,000,000. The work would have been completed long before this, and well within that expenditure, had it not been for the cruel war which upset everyone's calculations and set the world back many years. Now with the increased cost, that expenditure is extended to about $80,000,000. The commissioners say this:

> Another factor in the situation that should not be lost sight of is the peculiar relationship to the proposed improvement of the new Welland ship canal, a portion of which is now under construction. As pointed out in an earlier part of this report, the completion of the Welland ship canal and the adoption and completion of the St. Lawrence improvement would remove the only barrier to the creation of a deep-water route from the head of the lakes to the sea. This would give at least 25-foot navigation from the sea up to the Detroit river, with a present minimum of about 20 feet above lake Erie. Although entirely outside the strict terms of the reference submitted to it by the two governments, the commission has been impressed by the fact that the new Welland ship canal is such an integral part of the waterway, and is so inseparately interwoven with the project under immediate consideration, that it should properly be considered as a part of the whole scheme and the expense of its construction should be apportioned between the two governments upon the same basis as the works recommended for the upper St. Lawrence.

So that we have at the outset this International Joint Commission recommending that the Welland ship canal be taken into consideration as a part of the whole project, and that the cost of this construction be apportioned between the two countries on the same basis as the upper St. Lawrence. Then they say in their recommendation:

> 1. The governments of the United States and Canada enter into an arrangement by way of treaty for a scheme of improvement of the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and lake Ontario.
>
> 2. That the new Welland ship canal be embodied in said scheme and treated as a part thereof.

Now how is that to be apportioned? It is recommended:

> That, except as set forth in recommendation (11), the cost of all "navigation works" be apportioned between the two countries on the basis of the benefits each will receive from the new waterway: Provided, That during the period ending five years after the completion of the works—and to be known as the Construction Period—the ratio fixing the amount chargeable to each country shall be determined upon certain known factors such as the developed resources and foreign and coastwise trade of each country within the territory economically tributary to the proposed waterway, and that that ratio shall be adjusted every five years thereafter and based upon the freight tonnage of each country actually using the waterway during the previous five year period.

Now will any hon. member say that if that proposition of the commissioners was carried out, the ratio of cost would be a fifty per cent ratio? Everyone knows that the United States will benefit eight or ten times more than Canada will for the next fifty years from the construction of this St. Lawrence waterway, and that is the basis of their calculation but, assuming the ratio is three to one, that we pay one-quarter of the expense and the United States government pay three-quarters—I am not committing myself to that ratio of expenditure; I think it would be too great so far as Canada is concerned, but let us assume as a basis of argument for submitting this question to the people that the ratio of expenditure would be as three to one, three to the United States and one to Canada—what does that mean at once? The Welland canal will cost $80,000,000. Instead of Canada paying $80,-

000,000 for cost of construction of the Welland ship canal, this country will pay $20,000,000 and the United States will pay $60,000,000.

Now what will be the expense of the St. Lawrence waterways? Figuring on that basis—because that is the basis I submit we should figure it on, not a fifty-fifty ratio but something in the nature of the proposition submitted by the commissioners—the St. Lawrence river is divided in so far as this project is concerned, into five sections. The first three sections are below lake St. Francis leading into Montreal. The cost of those sections amounts to $93,531,000. That cost is unquestionably on navigation. One-fourth of that, which would be the proportion assigned to Canada, would be $23,382,750. Then the commissioners recommend that Canada should pay one-half of the cost of sections 4 and 5, which constitute the international section. One-half of the cost of these two sections would amount to $79,596,100 or a total to Canada of $103,178,850 for the cost of navigation of the St. Lawrence and for the cost of the electrical development proposed in connection therewith.

The interest on that amount—I am devoting myself here to Canada's proportion of the expenditure—the interest on that amount at four per cent would be $4,127,154. The cost of operation and maintenance would be $1,671,000 according to the engineer's report; and the sinking fund to pay off that total amount in fifty years would amount to $1,300,000 or a total per annum of $7,098,154, which would be Canada's separate liability in connection with this project assuming that Canada was to pay one-fourth and the United States three-fourths of the total expense.

Now, what do we have? Canada's part of the electrical power development would be 732,000 horse-power which at $10 per horse-power would give $7,320,000. At $10 per horse-power it would pay Canada's whole liability in connection with that matter and leave about $300,000 per annum of a national profit. At $12 per horse-power the proceeds of the sale of the power would be $8,784,000, or a surplus over and above Canada's share of the expenditure of $1,500,000 a year. If those figures are accurate, if that is what it will produce, if the construction of this project, the development of the electrical current, the completion of the waterway, will work out in that way truly from the figures, surely it is a good financial proposition for Canada to enter into and we need not fear the consequence. Those figures are accurate, so far as we have them up to the present time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the very next question which will be asked will be: Can that power be sold in the market? Can 732,000 electrical horse-power be sold either at $10 or $12 per horse-power readily and speedily? I submit, without any hesitation, that it can. In connection with the electrical power development and the disposal of electrical energy, there can be no market for that electrical energy until the electrical energy is produced. It does not create a market itself, in advance of production. The experience of the past has shown that. People will not prepare for taking electrical energy, or establish plants for using electrical energy until it is ready to be distributed to their plant and their operation. Let us see what happened in the case of Niagara Falls; because it seems to me that what has happened in the past is very likely to happen in the future, and that we can govern our future action by the experience of the past. Twenty years ago there was not one horse-power of electrical energy developed at Niagara Falls, or in the Niagara peninsula. At that time the Ontario Power Company first began to develop its power, and it was said publicly and privately that it would be practically impossible to transmit electrical current from Niagara Falls to Toronto with commercial success. From that day till now there has been developed in that Niagara district. Niagara Falls and DeCew Falls, and is being distributed, used and paid for, not throughout Ontario, but from Toronto west to the Detroit river, about 600,000 electrical horse-power, the existence of which was not known twenty years ago. It has developed the resources of that whole country most tremendously. There is now in course of development, ready to be distributed within a very short time, about 400,000 further electrical horse-power, which will make altogether 1,000,000 horse-power, which will be developed and sold, used by the people of Ontario between the city of Toronto and the Detroit river. So that when you say that large blocks of electrical power cannot be disposed of, you cannot regard it in the same way as you would regard a cargo of wheat, barley, pork or any other commodity that may be uesd or manufactured. It produces its home market when it is created. But let us see what the commissioners say. They had the opportunity of investigating the uses of horse-power, and the possibilities

of the future in regard to the electrical development and this is what they say:

The commission has before it graphs Nos 3 and 5 showing the present use of power on both sides of the boundary within a radius of approximately 300 miles of the Long Sault rapids, and also the probable future demand. It appears from these graphs that at the present time (1921) the total primary power installation on the United States side of the 300-mile area is approximately 9,900,000 horse-power and on the Canadian side 1,900,000 horse-power. The estimated demand on the United States side in 1925 is 11,000,000 horse-power and on the Canadian side 2,350,000 horse-power; and in 1930 on the United States side 12,500,000 horse-power, and on the Canadian side 2,875,000 horse-power.

That is within 300 miles of the Long Sault rapids, which is the place of development of this electrical power which we are now discussing; so that by the time this work would be completed, we would have, to be used, according to this report, on the Canadian side, in 1925, 2,350,000 horse-power, and in 1930 2,875,000 horse-power. That is the report of the commission, and, in the face of those figures, I submit we can safely take it for granted that there will be a market for that electrical power as soon as it is developed and ready for use.

But, Sir, you may say that is conjecture. Let us get down somewhat to the actual. There was a resolution moved in this House some weeks ago in reference to electrifying our steam railways. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Hocken) referred to that question to some extent, but I wish to enlarge a little, because I have some figures as to the actual power which will be used. In the first place, in operating railroads with electrical energy they do not consume anything like the amount of power that is required in the case of operation by steam, because, by some system in connection with the operation, the electrical energy is returned to the line. When the electrical locomotive is standing still the current is not being used, when it is going down grade the current is not being used, but it is being returned to the line, whereas with the steam locomotive the fire is kept up and the steam is being generated continually, whether it is in motion or not. Let us, in the first place, consider whether the railroad can be economically operated by electrical energy. I have in my hand a little pamphlet which has been issued by the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad, and in this pamphlet I find the following:

From the outset the operation of electric locomotives has been a success, and he states that they have practically eliminated the mountain grades. The large number of helper engines originally used to handle the passenger and freight trains over the mountain grades has been replaced by one or two electric locomotives, which alone are sufficient to handle the greatly increased traffic of the present year (1915). The movement of trains is so uniform and failures of electric locomotives so infrequent, that one set of train despatches takes the place of two sets employed under steam operation.

Electrification has made, it possible to increase the tonnage on maximum grades from 1,700 to 2,500 tons per train and this latter will be further increased to 3,000 tons shortly. This increased tonnage is now being handled at a speed of 15 mp.h. as compared with 8 m.p.h. by steam.

The winter of 1914-15 demonstrated in a practical manner that while the steam engine is at its lowest efficiency in cold weather, the electric locomotive, on the other hand, is at its maximum.

There were long periods, in the Rocky mountain district, when the thermometer registered 40 degrees below zero and it was impossible to move the trains by steam locomotives. The electric locomotives, however, were always ready for service, and always able to work to the maximum.

In the practical operation of the transcontinental trains of the C.M. & St. P. over the Rocky mountain grades the train is brought to the summit at a speed of from 23 to 25 miles per hour. There is no difficulty in obtaining a speed of 60 m.p.h. on level grades, with 10 all-steel cars.

Experience has shown that the electric locomotive handles about 3½ times as many ton-miles per month as the steam locomotives, and it also appears that the electric locomotives cut 30 per cent from the time necessary to do a given business, partly by running faster and partly by moving heavier trains.

This is conclusive proof that steam railways can be electrified and operated to advantage by electric current. There would, to my mind, be no better place on the North American continent to test out the working of electric railway operation than over the Canadian National lines between the city of Montreal and the city of Toronto. Between Montreal and Toronto there is used approximately 25,000 steam horse-power for road service and yard service.

Mr. GRAHAM: Over what period?

Mr. GERMAN: Per annum. It costs $120 per annum to generate one horse-power by steam. That figure is likewise authentic, and it can be borne out by the evidence of experts who are operating steam railways. What does that mean? It means $3,000,000 per annum for operating by steam trains on the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto. What can be done by electricity? Everyone who knows anything about electrical operation, knows that it takes very much less electrical horse-power to operate the same train service

than steam horse-power, and that that 25,000 steam horse-power would be represented, at any rate, by 20,000 electrical horse-power. I think it would be less than that: but if we take it at 20,000 electrical horse-power at $12, per horse-power, that would mean $240,000 a year for operating the trains on the Grand Trunk railway between Montreal and Toronto by electricity, as against $3,000,000 by steam, a saving of $2,760,000 thus being made. Is that worth going after? That is not a visionary proposition; those figures will stand scrutiny and bear investigation. Such a saving should, by itself, be sufficient to warrant every hon. member and, indeed, everyone in this country in considering very carefully whether this proposition should be entered into or not. I have no doubt that test could be extended. It is only about 300 miles from Montreal to Toronto. Electrical current is being transmitted now from Niagara Falls west 250 miles. The Long Sault rapids, at which the development of the electrical energy now under discussion would be, perhaps, 200 or 250 miles from Toronto; 250 miles east of that would take you a long way beyond the city of Montreal. All the railroads running north from the international boundary line to Ottawa and further north could be electrified and operated by electric current.

Of course, I know quite well that the electrification of steam railroads is not a cheap proposition. It costs about $30,000 a mile to electrify a steam railway without taking into consideration the cost of electrical locomotives; but I submit that we should not take into consideration the cost of electrical locomotives, because they are replacing steam locomotives which can be used elsewhere, and which, in course of time, would have to be replaced anyway. Therefore, it would cost, perhaps, $18,000,000 or $20,000,000 to electrify the Grand Trunk between Montreal and Toronto; but if you can save, as without a doubt you can, at least $2,760,000 per annum on the cost of operation of that line between those points, how long will it take to pay the $20,000,000 which it costs to electrify the line? When that is paid, you have that for all time to come. You need have no fear of a coal shortage or a strike; you have a perpetual source of supply of electrical energy which you can take to the utmost pound, and still there is as much to give. The Canadian Pacific, if the proposition is the financial one outlined, would very shortly electrify their line between Montreal and Toronto. Further lines could be developed; and in this time of deficits in railway management, in this time of high freight rates, should we not exert all our energies to bring about a reduction in the cost of transportation and freight rates?

Mr. HUGHES: Would the electrical energy developed by the water-power be divided between the two countries in the same ratio that the expense of development would be divided?

Mr. GERMAN: Not at all. That is not the suggestion of the commission. The suggestion of the commission is that the electrical power developed on the international section of the St. Lawrence river, which is from lake Ontario down to the foot of the Long Sault rapids, should be divided equally between the two countries. That total is 1,464,000 horse-power, and each country would have one-half of that and each pay one-half of the expense.

Mr. HUGHES: Of developing that power?

Mr. GERMAN: Of developing that power, and I have given the figure of what that would be. Below the Long Sault, there are sections 1, 2 and 3, and let us see what the result of those will be. The people of Montreal, when they consider this proposition carefully, cannot be opposed to it. The city of Montreal is now the head of, perhaps the greatest railway organization in the world, and when this project is completed, the city of Montreal will be the centre of the greatest electrical development in the world. According to the engineer's report on section 1, which comprises the Lachine rapids, there can be developed 1,076,000 horse-power, at an approximate cost of $83,797,000. I believe, not one of the cheapest, but the cheapest electrical power development in the world, less than $80 per horse-power. I understand that the development of the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company is not only exceedingly efficient, but exceedingly inexpensive. But I will venture to say that its expenditure is greater than $80 per horse-power. Then the second section is from the head of lake St. Louis to the foot of lake St. Francis, and there can be developed 1,560,000 horse-power at a cost of $150,688,000, or about $100 per horse-power, which is as cheap as any electrical development I know of in the country. So that we are only on the verge of electrical development when we have solved the problem of dividing the power

that can be developed on the international section of the river.

It can very fairly be said that if there were no market in Canada for the one-half of the electrical power that can be developed on the international section of the St. Lawrence, it would be advantageous to us to sell it to the United States, temporarily at any rate, until we could secure a market for ourselves. But when, practically within a stone's throw of the great metropolitan city of Montreal, we can develop 2,636,000 horse power at a cost of very much less than $100 per horse power, how can any one stand up and fairly argue against this project being not only undertaken but carried to completion at a very early date? The power that we shall have is not for a day, nor for a year, nor for a hundred years. So long as the sun shall shine, so long as moisture rises from the earth, and rains descend from the clouds, so long as the eternal hills shall stand, so long will this mighty St. Lawrence roll that enormous wealth of power from the Great Lakes to the ocean. And shall we stand idly by and allow this wealth to go past us undeveloped and unused? My hon. friend from St. James said the other day:

> If the flow of the St. Lawrence was as abundant and tumultuous as the faculty of speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Church), we might take chances with it, but in my view the St. Lawrence is too precious an asset to this country for us to lightly and without the strongest motives either attempt to alter its navigability, or enter into partnership with another country in regard to it, or place a mortgage on our property rights in it.

We are not asking any one to enter into partnership with any country, nor do we propose to alter the navigability of the river. It is navigable now going downstream, but it is not navigable upstream. It has a mighty current of power going from the Great Lakes to the ocean, power which will flow for all time and furnish the motive force to turn every wheel of commerce within the radius to which electrical energy can be transmitted; and if that mighty power is to be put to use, now is the time to do it. Now is the time for us in Canada, with all the enormous obligations we have to shoulder, with our great railway deficits, to put to use this, the greatest available power which this or any other country has. Enter into partnership with other countries? Let me assure my hon. friend that at this hour the United States government, under treaty rights with Great Britain, has the free right to the navigation of the St. Lawrence, just as we have. We could not stop them without violating that treaty, and all that they are asking for now is that that river be made navigable, so that ocean going ships can go from tidewater to the head of the Great Lakes. We say that we in Canada could not possibly consider that enormous expenditure for one instant unless there were coupled with it a development which would pay the cost of that construction; and we point out to this House and to the country the advantages, not only possible but certain which would accrue from the electrical development, and we ask the House to join us in supporting the resolution.

Now, can we not go further? If this is a financially feasible proposition, is the navigable channel not in itself advantageous? Can we not with confidence appeal to our Progressive friends from the prairie provinces to assist in the completion of this project? Hon. gentlemen from that section say: "We want the Hudson Bay railway built." Very well, I supported appropriations for the construction of that railway in the past, and I am prepared to support appropriations for the same purpose in the future. I believe the Hudson Bay railway to be a necessary part of the transportation system of the great Northwest. Will the people of the West not more speedily secure the construction of the Hudson Bay railway by increasing the national wealth of the country? And can you not increase the national wealth by constructing this St. Lawrence waterway? The people of the West say they want cheap freight rates and greater transportation facilities. Then let hon. gentlemen from that part of the country join with us in bringing about the completion of this project, which would reduce freight rates by at least ten cents a bushel on over 300,000,000 bushels of wheat which is to be moved from the great prairies to the city of Liverpool. My hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) figures upon a saving of seven cents a bushel. I say that undoubtedly ten cents a bushel could be saved on wheat shipped from the prairies to Liverpool if the grain were carried by water. It is well known that water transportation is by far the cheapest system of transportation there is. I urge hon. members to support the completion of this great undertaking. We cannot afford to stand idle any longer in this important matter. As was said of Britain's statesmen by one of her noblest poets, "Let us know the season when to take occasion

by the hand and make the bounds of progress broader yet." That is the idea we have in mind in endeavouring to carry through this proposition.

Let me put three points in a nutshell. In the first place, at the lowest calculation, we could save $60,000,000 in the construction of the Welland ship canal. Is that worth going after? In the next place, we could save $3,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year in the operation of the Canadian National Railway system. Is that worth considering? In the third place, there would be saved to the farmers of Canada 10 cents per bushel on over 300,000,000 bushels of wheat shipped from the Northwest to Liverpool. Is it worth while trying to secure that advantage? Place those three factors by themselves and then say to yourselves: Can we secure these three things without costing the taxpayers one dollar? If we can, it is our duty as citizens of Canada, true to our country and true to ourselves, to enter into this project wholeheartedly and carry it to completion at the earliest possible date.

We cannot, I say, afford to wait. I have no fear of any complications arising between Canada and the United States regarding a few acres of submerged land in the St. Lawrence river; that land is covered by water now, and it will be covered by water for all time to come. I have no fear of any serious questions arising between Canada and the United States regarding any agreements which we may enter into in respect to this matter. Peace has reigned between us for the last one hundred years, and I feel confident that peace will continue to reign for hundreds of years yet to come. We are all Anglo-Saxons talking the same language and holding the same religious convictions practically, and there can be no serious differences of opinion between these two great countries.

Let us enter into this undertaking energetically, let us carry it out intelligently and as economically as possible, and then this great Canadian ship of state will be headed down the channel of time to a sure harbour of unbounded prosperity.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, this question must be looked at in the broadest manner, for it is a continental question; it concerns the whole North American continent and not merely the United States or Canada. It is part of the policy of the development of the St. Lawrence river by the United States, and there should be the same policy in Canada for this development of our St. Lawrence waterways. We have a splendid example in the achievement of the United States in building the Panama canal. That canal is a little slow in bringing its usefulness to the world in cheaper transportation, but it is doing so now. That canal cost billions of money to build, and it was completed in less than ten years. It was undertaken largely through the enterprise and foresight of the late President Roosevelt. Now President Harding has taken up this question, and he has been moved to do so by two main arguments put forward by the farmers of the United States for cheaper transportation. The Farmers' bloc at Washington is now so strong that at every point they are securing the majority support of Congress and of the President's cabinet, and only the other day the President himself made a deliverance in favour of the development of the St. Lawrence waters that committed him and his party to its support.

The farmers of the western states have found out, just as have our farmers in the western provinces, that railway rates are too high, principally due, perhaps, to bad management of their railways. Indeed, all the railroad organizations of the United States have come to the same conclusion, and they are now shaping up a policy for the rehabilitation of their properties, and through their chief speakers and organs they have declared that to lower freight rates and so increase traffic they must electrify their roads. There cannot be the cheap transportation we expect from our railways unless they are driven by electrical energy. There is an abundance of electrical energy along the St. Lawrence, coupled with other water-powers, to drive the trains on every railroad line in the northern portion of the states from Chicago to Philadelphia.

As my hon. friend (Mr. German) pointed out a few minutes ago, until quite recently electric energy could not be transmitted for more than fifty miles because of the excessive leakage of current; but the latest discoveries of science point to the feasibility in the near future of electrical energy being transmitted for five hundred or even a thousand miles without any appreciable leakage. The electrical art is developing very rapidly, and the employment of new methods render possible to-day what was out of the question a few years ago. Take the introduction of aluminum, for instance: only a few years ago it was regarded as a curiosity, but to-day it is being used for transmission wires, and in that way the

length of transmission is greatly extended. The first company to discover its possibilities was the Aluminum Company of the United States, and ten years ago they very nearly obtained control of valuable water power at Cornwall on the St. Lawrence. It was just by a mere chance that a few members in the railway committee at that time prevented that great water-power passing into the hands of United States citizens.

The pressing need of the railways of the United States to-day is electrical energy. I quoted some of their articles to that effect when I last spoke in this House. They are now trying to reorganize their railroads into ten regional divisions and electrify them. That electrification will cost a lot of money, but it will be spent in labour and equipment to the advantage of the country generally, and with electrification will come reduced freight rates.

Our farmers know that the supreme question to-day is cheap transportation. They know how high freight rates have been and still are by reason of the use of steam power and other circumstances, and they have reached the same conclusion as the President of the United States and the Farmers' Bloc, that electrification of the railways must come and will come almost immediately. The United States railways have their plans prepared for this electrification, and the president's move to develop energy on the St. Lawrence waterways has two objects in view—first, the improvement of the waterways for navigation and transportation purposes, and, secondly, the production of energy for the electrification of the railways of the United States.

Now, all the American railways to-day have placed themselves on record in favour of the substitution of electrical energy for steam. They have done so for several reasons, among others, because electrical energy is cheaper, because it is more reliable, and because the supply is unlimited, and they all know that scientific discoveries are proceeding at such a rapid rate that the transmission of electrical energy is already practical for long distances.

Let me tell you what took place in our own province of Ontario on the Niagara river. Sir Adam Beck has been much criticised for the expenditure involved in developing the Chippawa-Queenston generating plant. In one year from now that plant, owned by the municipalities of Ontario, will be developing 500,000 horse-power, and I believe within two years 1,000,000 horse-power, and will be driving every train in Ontario not only from the Detroit river to Montreal but even up to lake Nipissing. That may be merely a dream in the opinion of some people, but I do not think so. Would anyone have dreamed twenty-four months ago of the present radio development? No one would have prophesized that such rapid progress would have been possible. No one can foretell its ultimate development, nor what it may mean in revolutionizing the whole world through the use of radio waves. The use of these radio waves is going to reorganize probably the whole world. The hope of scientists is that they are going to be able to transmit electrical energy even without the wiring. That is not a dream; it is almost at hand. So we do not need to go by visions; it is in sight now. In twelve months there will be a quarter of a million, and in two years half a million horse-power developed at that one plant. There may be a change even in the developing plants on the river bank there. The Chippawa plant would probably scrap some of the plants now developing near the river in not so advantageous a position. This project, then, is no impractical vision.

The statement is made in this House and in some of the papers that Montreal would object to this project because its supremacy in transportation would be threatened. The effect will be to make Montreal a greater city. How could Montreal people talk that way, living within a few miles of the home of La Salle, when they think of the dream he had of what the St. Lawrence would eventually become? He was the first man to go up the Niagara and build the first boat near the Falls and sail up to lake Superior. So as far as Montreal is concerned, this project will make it an even greater city. Most of the water-power is near that city, and this development will make it one of the greatest cities on the continent. No matter how much power is developed there, it will always find an immediate market. The American roads will be ready to buy it, for they have already made up their minds that they must electrify, and they must get power. The President of the United States has committed the government of that country to this development, and the farmers in the United States are behind him, just as our farmers here are beginning to see that the relief to transportation must come

from the competition of the waterways. The competition of the waterways in former days failed largely because of the opposition of the railways, but the new doctrine of to-day is that the railways are the complement of the waterways and the waterways the complement of the railways, and both working in competition will produce lower freight rates. They will be bound to produce lower freight rates, and the saving will be such that it will justify ten times over the commitment in connection with the construction of the waterways on the St. Lawrence as outlined in the commission's report.

I had intended when the railway question came up, which we may be discussing in the House this next week, to refer to these things, but the opportunity seemed to present itself to-night to speak on the line I have followed. Certainly I have not come to my conclusions in a short time simply by reading what has been said recently, for the whole tendency of investigation and of scientific discovery is in the direction of the development of water-power and of the development of waterways for transportation. In this case it will work out both for the development of power and the improvement of transportation. That development of power will be for the benefit not only of the railways but of the cities. It will make the provinces here in the East better off, and the provinces in the West better off. To say that it might stop at this city or that, or that what is now in Montreal would go to Toronto, is not to appreciate the effects of this development. There need be no rivalry; there is room for all. All the cities will improve, and they ought all to join together in the proposition, as I believe they will eventually.

I want to tell my friends from the West that years ago there were men in this country, as there were in the United States, who not only saw these waterways being extended to lake Superior, to the so-called head of navigation, but that canalization could be carried on to Winnipeg and to the foot of the Rocky mountains. That has all been worked out, and it is quite a feasible proposition to canalize the waters of the St. Lawrence up to lake Superior and right through to the valley of the Assiniboine and the Saskatchewan, connecting them up with other water systems up there to provide a system of canals that would carry the freight of the West right down to the seaboard. Some might say, would not that injure our railways? I say, no; it would develop the West. Link up these waterways and there will be all the business our Canadian railways could ever want or ever handle. There is room for both; one improves the other; they are complementary, not in opposition. This development would carry improvement to other cities and provinces. As for Montreal, it has a great future before it. There are millions of horse-power right at her door. She has developed her horse-power in the past. All I would like to see is that hereafter the great development of this electrical energy shall be done by the state, and not by private owned companies. We are doing that in Ontario, and we have set an example to all the world in that one plant at Chippawa. It is a new river that has been made use of, and a most powerful one; on that river we see the greatest development of electrical energy yet known to the world, and within two years or a little more, it will be producing one million horse power with a revenue of $10,000,000, and it will not have cost $100,000,000 for its construction. That power will be the life blood of Ontario just as the development of the water-power on the St. Lawrence will be the life blood of Montreal and the province of Quebec.

There is no question of rivalry between cities or provinces, for the whole project works out to the benefit of all the cities and provinces, and not only for the benefit of Canada but of the United States as well. It is a great continental question. The United States is looking at the great problems of the day from the national point of view. I have been reading to-day, and I have read a good deal of late about it, the report of a special Senate committee in Washington in the way of improving the banking system of the United States. They have made a great deal of progress in their banking system. They have a scheme now before Congress for the creation of a great organization backed by the credit of the United States to develop some kind of national marketing of the wheat and cotton crop and all the products of the Mississippi valley so as to get the best prices, and in connection with that they are going to develop the water-powers and waterways so as to give cheap transportation. All of these questions are in the air now, and you will see them move very rapidly. You will see the people of the United States who built the Panama canal prepared to do their share in the development of the St.

Lawrence waterways, both for power and transportation.

The expense is comparatively a small one, after the experience of the United States with the Panama canal. I should not like to say how many millions it has cost, but it cost a very large sum of money, and the United States never felt it. The Panama canal is one of the things that has made the United States the commanding power it is in the world to-day. They have built the Panama canal and they propose now to assist us to develop the St. Lawrence waterway. They have set an example to the world in great legislation for improving transportation, for improving the condition of the farmers; in making these issues national issues, and making them national propositions instead of company propositions. I have nothing to say against the railway companies which have done so much both in Canada and the United States in the way of developing transportation. But in the United States they have not been very successful. The net result of their exploitation of the railways there is that eighty per cent of those railways would be bankrupt to-day if it were not for the assistance which the American government gave them in connection with the war. The same authority will have to find money for them now for the reconstruction of those roads and they are going to do it; but the end will be that the railroads, like the waterways, will be publicly owned. The great thing about a waterway is that it is like the King's highway. It is the people's road. The King's highway has never passed from the people; and the railways never should have passed from the people any more than the waterways have passed from them. In this new birth which is coming to America, which is coming very rapidly, the idea of newer and greater propositions in the way of transportation, in the way of developing power, in the way of using the national credit for the benefit of all the people and securing co-operative marketing —all these things will be taken up in the United States and in this country. And there will not be any trouble to get the money necessary to carry them out.

There is a lot of capital in the world which is ready to-day to be invested in propositions of this kind. There will be no trouble in selling bonds. And no portion of Canada need fear this development. The Canadian Pacific Railway, even though it is located in Montreal, need not fear it. There will be all the railroad business which the Canadian Pacific Railway and the National Railways can ever do in this country, even if they do have the competition of waterways. And the traffic will not move in one way. Traffic will come from Europe; return cargoes will come into our country. It may be of a nature that will make competition with our manufactures but they will have to accept that situation and adjust themselves to it. All the information that I have been able to gather, either by my reading or by talking to people, has led me to believe that the president and the government of the United States have struck the right idea. They are organized now to develop these things and to develop them immediately. Even if the money we need could not be found in this country the United States would perhaps be ready to be our bankers for a portion of the needed sum. But we do not need even to go to them for it—we can get our comparatively small portion of it in our own country and in Great Britain. I agree with my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) when he said that our portion will be a good deal less than one-half; the Americans have already admitted that. I also agree with him when he says that we have not any exclusive control of the St. Lawrence river or the Great Lakes, and that these waterways belong to both countries. It is a good thing that such is the case. It will have a tendency to maintain good and friendly feelings between the two nations; it is a bond of friendship and not a cause of jealousy between them. It is also cause for congratulation to ourselves. I hope the House will continue to discuss this question session after session until we reach some conclusion. It is not going to be long until that time arrives. Pressure is at work in the United States for applying these two means of relief—transportation for the farmers of the West in both countries, and water-power to electrify the railways. These two things are so pressing and so great that I have no doubt the necessary legislation, either in that country or this country, will be forthcoming at a very early date.

It was not hard to put the Panama canal scheme through the Congress of the United States. When they once took hold of it in earnest they soon accomplished it. As I said, the project has not brought results as quickly as was anticipated but it has given the United States the control of navigation in a surprising way. They are dominating the American continent to-day and the American continent above all others is our continent. We are an American

people but we are of British tendencies and believe in our own system of government. There is no reason for jealousy between us and the United States. Each of us can work out our own destiny whether it be in transportation or economic issues, and if we do that we will have no reason to regret it. We have had occasions in the past to disagree with the United States, and have had one or two small wars with them; but now the whole sentiment of that country is for our co-operation in a continental way, to develop these waterways just as they have developed their own. They have been somewhat misled by trusting too much to railways in the past but now they are coming back to waterways; and I have no doubt that before they are through the American government will own their own railroads just as we are finding we have got to own the railroads in this country. That does not mean any disadvantage to the Canadian Pacific railway, even though it is a company owned enterprise it will have to adjust itself to the new condition of affairs.

It is with pleasure and with a keen sense of duty that I intend to vote for the present resolution and to argue in favour of it on every occasion that may present itself. As I said before, I hope this discussion will not end now. I hope our friends from the West will assist in the improvement of these waterways just as the American farmers began to do when they realized the importance of them. If there is a Farmers' bloc in the United States there is also perhaps a Farmers' bloc in this House. I am glad to realize that our farmers are imbued with the idea of progress, that they have come here with the idea of assisting in the solution of these problems. The best way to solve such problems is by the nation working them out rather than individuals. that has been proved in the case of the development of power in Ontario. Power development has also been well worked out in Montreal by private companies; but in Ontario we are going to set an example to all the world in the development of water-power for the people by the people, and to make that power as cheap as possible, not simply to realize profits for shareholders. It will be with some pride that we will be able to show that Ontario, under all the criticism that has been passed by the men who favoured the private development of power, has worked this project out thoroughly and is making a successful use of the power developed. I make this prediction: that within ten years every railroad in Ontario—certainly from the Soo right across almost to Hudson bay—will be electrically equipped and will be able to carry freight at lower rates. The train services will be broken up into what I may term street car services. As to the passenger service, instead of there being three or four trains a day between cities like Toronto and Montreal, or Ottawa and Montreal, cars will run at frequent intervals. They will run every hour, the speed will be greater, the service will be better and the cost much less. It will be economical, we will have improved service, our western plains will be filled up with farmers and that is what we want in this country. It will reduce the cost of transportation. Whether this scheme began with the United States or this country, it is now a continental scheme, bigger than Ontario and Quebec, and bigger than our East and West. It is as big as the whole continent of North America, and the greatest continent in the world to-day is the North American continent. The richest valley in the world—and I do not like to have to say it—is the valley of the Mississippi, but we share largely in it, and we have our portion of it. The next greatest valley in the world is on the American continent, and it is the wheat valley of the Assiniboia and Saskatchewan. I believe the canalization of those valleys will come and the provinces in the West will soon have a great farming population, they will have reduced transportation rates, and we will soon get improved combinations for marketing.

That is the whole tendency of the discussion going on in Washington and in Canada, at the present time. That is why we have this talk of the Grain Growers, and why people in Canada say it is unconstitutional to have a grain board in Canada and that we cannot have it. But we will have a grain board, and the constitution and the lawyers will have to adjust themselves to it. That is one of the new signs of the times which have come into prominence since the war. The war is going to broaden the views of the nation and make the lawyers think differently. When law officers come to us and say we cannot have a wheat board and the farmers cannot organize a co-operative association, they cannot read the signs of the times. And this House will not read the signs of the times if it fails to do its share in the development of the St. Lawrence waterway for two great objects—the improvement of transportation and the devel-

opment of water-power, not only for railways but for all the industries, for lighting the farmers' houses and driving their machinery.

All this is immediately in sight, because the simplicity of transmission of electrical energy has wonderfully improved. Hon. members may say I am a dreamer when I say that electrical energy will go through the air without wires, but it is all coming. Did anybody ever believe two years ago that you would have seen this radio development? It is a mystery but it is there. It is going to make great changes in the world, but it will be for the benefit of humanity. I observe that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) is in rather a humourous vain to-night, because he is smiling. The hon. Minister of War, as Peter Mitchell used to call him, will perhaps see that electrical energy, if war is to continue, will be of assistance. The greatest thing in the war—and it only came out in this war—was the radio wave, which transmitted some kind of energy through the air, and put an end to the war. It was a discovery the United States was able to disclose just at the end of the war, and it meant the destruction of scores of great warships by a man up in a balloon, directing by radio waves through the air attacks on warships. That is what put an end to the war, and that is the reason the navies have been scrapped. That is the real story of the war, it is coming out now, and I think the Minister of War will change his views somewhat. I do not know where the minister was at the time an effort was made to take away all the water-powers of the St. Lawrence and to give them to the Aluminum company of the United States, but thank goodness we have those great powers, and I hope we will keep them. While the United States have said in a way that they were against public ownership, they are going to have public ownership in the water-powers of the waters of the St. Lawrence. That is the greatest progress made in favour of public ownership.

Mr. BUREAU: What is that?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The United States to-day is developing these water-powers as a public ownership proposition for the electrical energy that can be developed by them. When somebody comes to me and tells me the United States are against public ownership, I will be able to cite that case. The United States has had to go to the assistance of the railways, in order to save them from absolute wreckage. The American railways are organizing themselves into ten or twelve regional systems and are going to the government to get the credit they require. They cannot find the money for the reconstruction of the roads, especially for their electrification.

Mr. BUREAU: The railroads were ruined by public ownership during the war.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Which railroads?

Mr. BUREAU: The United States railways.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): When?

Mr. BUREAU: During the war.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They were taken over by the United States during the war as a necessity.

Mr. 'BUREAU: And the United States ruined them.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): And we ourselves have had to adopt public ownership. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) does not quite like the idea of publice ownership. Would he like to see the King's highway go to private ownership. He does not like this new idea of the King's highway helping out the farmers to market, nor the idea of the public ownership of the waterways and the development of electrical energy, to be distributed to everybody at the cheapest possible price. It will not be ten years till electrical energy of some kind will be sent to every farm house in America. This is not a dream. The scientists are all working at it. When you see what they have done in the last two years by these radio waves, you will not have any doubt as to what the future is likely to be. The effect of the development of electrical energy by public ownership will be to increase the number of the common comforts of life, and to widen their distribution at the smallest possible cost. That is the theory of government ownership, I do not care how you put it. It is coming to the front very rapidly in Canada and the United States. I hope to see the day—and it will not be very long—when sufficient power will be generated right on our rivers to drive every train, not only in Quebec, but in Ontario. Sufficient power will be developed on the St. Lawrence and Niagara rivers to drive every train almost all over Canada, and to put cheap light and power in every house. It is coming.

The ground plan of the whole scheme is before us to-day in that report issued by this commission, and endorsed by President Harding, as he did the other day. As soon as he got the facts he went right to the people, and while the railroads have been able, by reason of their influence, to stop the discussion to some extent, the people are all thinking about it. The farm papers are all thinking about it, and the newspapers of the cities are coming to realize that their cities will all be greater, that if a city is greater on account of railroad development, it will be still greater when that railroad development is supplemented by the development of waterways and of electrical energy. Therefore, I am going to vote for this motion. There is going to be another election in this country—it may be soon or it may be some time off—but I am going to make a newer and broader national policy out of the development of our waterways in co-operation with the United States, if we can secure the co-operation of that country, or of a smaller development on our own account. We have started on our own account; we shall be able to improve the St. Lawrence and the Welland canal of our own motion, if we have to rely on ourselves, and it may be a good thing if we do this work ourselves. But I want to see it done for the benefit of this whole continent, as a great continental proposition, not as a national proposition in the United States or Canada; least of all do I want to see it discussed in this House from the point of view of provinces, or classes, or cities. America is great enough to take care of all our cities, of all our provinces, of all our peoples; and the greatest continent to-day and the one continent on which the hope of the world rests more than in any other country in the world is the continent of North America. That continent of North America happens to be possessed by us and our neighbours to the south of us. As my hon. friend opposite said, the United States and Canada have the same ideas in regard to government, and things economic, and we have no fear of the future. While Europe to-day is discouraged and broken into pieces by reason of racial and trade jealousies of one kind or another, there is a much better outlook for the whole North American continent and, I hope, also for the South American continent if we set the example. The beginning of this new development will be brought about by the co-operation of the United States and Canada

for the development of the waterways of the St. Lawrence, and that proposition, which happens to be embodied in this resolution, is the greatest question that has ever come up in this Parliament of Canada.

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

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes, two, if my hon. friend so desires.

Mr. BUREAU: One is enough. Do I understand him to say that he suggests the development of the St. Lawrence river power by a partnership with the United States if we cannot do the work ourselves?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, I said that I should like to see it developed by both countries; but if it has to be done by us, we can develop it ourselves on a smaller scale. As the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) has said, we have the Welland canal under way now. Is my hon. friend opposite not prepared to co-operate with the United States in the development of the St. Lawrence?

Mr. BUREAU: I have no opinion to give. My hon. friend is advocating his side of the question.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The hon. member is a minister of the Crown, and I am sorry to see a minister of the Crown has not an opinion on this question.

Mr. BUREAU: I have an opinion, but I say I do not have to give it.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): All right; keep it, and Heaven be with the hon. member while he has it. This Parliament must tackle this question and do something with it.

Mr. BUREAU: That does not answer my question as regards a partnership with the United States in developing the St. Lawrence water-power.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would not object to that, and I hope my hon. friend is in favour of the proposition of developing the St. Lawrence water-power.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not worry about me. Let the hon. member speak for himself.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am speaking only for myself. Sir Wilfrid Laurier had no fear of joint action; I have no fear.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. member had —"No truck or trade with the Yankees."

Mr. MACLEAN (York): That is a different question. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in favour of co-operation in regard to the devlopment of the waterways of the St. Lawrence. Is my hon. friend in favour of the proposition? That is the question before the people of Canada.

Mr. BUREAU: I am not preaching the gospel. Let the hon. member give his own opinion.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am giving mine. Will the hon. member kindly give his?

Mr. BUREAU: When the time comes, I will.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am quite sure my hon. friend will come to see this proposition in the same way that I see it, and he will see that his province and his great city of Montreal—

Mr. BUREAU: It is not mine.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): —and I am not mentioning that city in any special way—will share in the development of Canada which will be brought about by the development of this waterway proposition to a greater extent than by any other proposition I have heard discussed in this House since I have been a member of it.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St. Henri): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) is considering the proposition from one particular point of view. He is endeavouring to convince only one side of the House, and he turns always towards our good friends the Progressives. I had hoped, before he finished his argument, he would turn and appeal again to the whole House of Commons.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): If I turned in that direction, I did not do so for the purpose my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MERCIER: My hon. friend is perfectly right in doing that. I know that he tries to convince only one side of the House that he is afraid of; but those hon. members have already decided to vote in accordance with their own interests, and as regards the solution of the railway question, they will be satisfied without any St. Lawrence waterway.

As regards the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), everyone may have his own opinion. I know from his constituency, the hon. member for Welland lives on the shores near the great Welland canal, and he is well aware that, if this proposed scheme were carried into effect, he would see transatlantic steamers passing the fine city of Toronto, going through the Welland canal, to ports on the upper lakes, Erie, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. Everybody in that part of the country would like to see those steamers go further, even to the ports of Detroit, Port Huron, Chicago, Fort William and Port Arthur. It is the duty of the representatives of Ontario to advocate whatever is for the welfare of their province; they are entitled to vindicate their right and to do the best they can for their province. Everyone is entitled to work for his province and to make the best use of the opportunities he finds on the floor of this House to secure the passage of certain measures. We have the same aim in Quebec; but in doing all these things, we have only one thing in sight, namely the welfare of the whole of Canada. I hope I do not hurt the feelings of my good friend the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), who moved the resolution before the House, when I tell him that this is a dream, a lovely dream. Conditions in Canada at the present time, if we disregard the financial situation which is pretty bad, are not worse and are, perhaps, better than those of any other country in the world. Our railways are practically in a stagnant condition, but, if we give them a fair trial, better days may come for them. Our trade is suffering somewhat on account of the aftermath of the war; but to bring back prosperity to trade and commerce, and to our factories, you do not need to develop the St. Lawrence waterway. You do not need to tamper with nature's creations and demolish the natural gifts which Providence has bestowed upon each province. Let us take them as we find them and make what use we can of them without encroaching, one province upon another. Let each province strive to obtain from its natural resources all the wealth that lies hidden therein; but do not let us interfere with the rights of others. I was somewhat surprised at the views expressed by my learned friend from South York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Not learned.

Mr. BUREAU: My hon. friend has much learning.

Mr. MERCIER: And by the time this session is over I predict that he will be still more learned. The hon. member is

always talking about the hydro electric question and he seems to take to himself all the credit for whatever has been done in this direction. I was going to say, as the Minister of Customs (Mr. Bureau) remarked a moment ago, that in 1911 the Conservative members from Toronto—perhaps not the same gentlemen who actually represent that city in the House of Commons to-day, at any rate, members of the same political persuasion, the same policy, and animated with the same spirit—were not so very eulogistic of the United States and its enterprises. We know very well what those gentlemen in 1911 said of the Liberal party; they told us that we were going across the boundary too frequently, that we had too much to do with the Yankee, and other things to the same effect. Then, as now, they waved the flag. To-day the situation is somewhat changed, however, and if the present tendency of some members continues, we shall likely see in the future the United States flag flying over the channel between Montreal and lake Superior.

On motion of Mr. Mercier the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Tuesday, May 2, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

HON. MANNING DOHERTY

CATTLE EMBARGO

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I desire to lay on the Table a return to an Order of the House dated 3rd April, 1922, for a copy of all correspondence passed during the year 1921 between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Prime Minister of Ontario relating to the activities of Hon. Manning Doherty in England on the subject of the cattle embargo. My right hon. friend yesterday made special mention of this report. I think it is perhaps due to him that I should give the explanation as to why the return was not brought down immediately. I will therefore read a memorandum which has been handed to me by the Under Secretary of State for External Affairs:

I send herewith the return ordered by the House of Commons on the motion of Mr. White for correspondence relating to the activities of the Hon. Manning Doherty in England. There is no correspondence on this subject in this department other than that contained in certain papers which the private secretary of the late Prime Minister left here about the time of the change of Government. I was not sure whether these papers were sent here for safekeeping, or to be accounted official and placed on the files of the department. I wrote two letters to the late Prime Minister's secretary asking this question, to neither of which I have received any answer beyond a verbal message, whereas I asked for a written reply. Inasmuch, however, as Mr. Meighen is now pressing for these papers I assume there is no objection, in so far as he is concerned, to bringing them down. The papers have been ready since the 13th April.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I presume that by "secretary" he means the former secretary who is not now under my charge.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would point out to my right hon. friend that he left all these papers in charge of this secretary. They were not left in charge of the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They were, as far as I was concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate) for the relief of Ethel Turner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate) for the relief of Walter Michie Anderson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fredenburg.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate) for the relief of Sheriff Elwin Robinson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate) for the relief of Rhoda Renfrew McFarlane Brown.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 68, to Incorporate the Frontier University.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

EXEMPTION FROM PILOTAGE DUES

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend Section 477 of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by adding the provisions that ships of war and hospital ships belonging to such foreign nation or nations as may be specified by the Governor in Council; and ships registered in Canada engaged exclusively in fishing; shall be exempt from the payment of pilotage dues.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of this resolution and has given his assent to it.

Motion agreed to.

HOUSE OF COMMONS STAFF

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

Resolved, that the organization of the staff of the House of Commons adopted on the second day of June, 1920, be amended by striking out the words "Assistant Curator of Reading Room" in paragraph (e) under the heading "Miscellaneous Branch," and substituting therefor the words "Two Assistant Curators of Reading Room"; and that the organization of the Department of the Sergeant-at-Arms, adopted on the same day, be amended by striking out the figure and words "7 Parliamentary Messengers" and substituting therefor the figure and words "6 Parliamentary Messengers."

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House do tomorrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a proposed resolution to provide for certain advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General has been informed of this resolution and has given his assent to it.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—DEFENCE FORCES

On the motion of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister) for Committee of Supply:

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): Before the House goes into Supply, I would like to address a few remarks on the work of the Militia of Canada, and of preparedness on the part of this country. Many arguments have been advanced in this House as to shew why this country should dispense with defence forces, and it is my intention to deal with a few of these arguments, and to attempt to give this House some information which I have been privileged to gain by having seen certain things, so that we may be in a better position to deal with questions relating to the military forces of Canada when they come before us. The main arguments advanced against this country maintaining defence forces are: First, that there is no one proposing to attack us; second, that we have plenty of men trained now; third, that the people are sick of war; and, fourth, that disputes in the future will be settled by conference rather than by arms.

With regard to the first question viz.: who is about to attack us, I would remind hon. members of the pre-war assurances which were given by the Prime Minister of England to the House of Commons of England and to the people of the British Empire, that war with Germany was not only not impending, but was out of the question. I would also remind hon. members of the futility of making prophecies about war, and would recall the examples we have before us of the past hundred years— the example of war with United States in 1812; our own civil wars, the American civil war; and the fact that we are to-day faced with greater armies than the world has ever before been faced with—armies which are to-day mobilized by Russia, France and many other countries.

As to the second argument which has been advanced—that we have plenty of trained men now: The only inference, Mr. Speaker, that one can gather from that argument is that those advancing it propose that those men who took part in the late war should be called upon again to defend the country should there be a war. I was particularly struck by a question which the hon. member from East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn) put to the hon. gentleman for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert), the other evening when he asked whether it was the intention of that member that these men should again be called upon. The reply was "I had as many friends in kahki as the hon. gentleman who asked the question had." I do not think that many hon. members wish to take credit to themselves for what their friends did in the late war, but there has been altogether too much talk about the number of trained men that we have to-day. We have many trained men, it is true; but they will be useful in this country only in teaching the coming generation the lessons gathered during the late war. I do not expect that there will be war in our time, or war, at any rate, that these men will be called upon to take part in; but they should be called upon now to complete the duty that they attempted to perform overseas, by passing on the lessons which they learned.

Then, there is the third argument—that the people are sick of war. The people who are really sick of war to-day are the people who served, the people who gave their sons, who gave their all during the war; but the people who talk most to-day

about being sick of war are those who are sick of their shame at not having done their duty in the past. Let me read the remarks of General William T. Sherman in this connection:

> I confess without shame that I am tired and sick of war. Its glory is all moonshine. Even success, the most brilliant, is over dead and mangled bodies, the anguish and lamentations of distant families, appealing to me for missing sons, husbands and fathers. It is only those who have not heard a shot, nor the shrieks and groans of the wounded, friend or foe, who cry aloud for more blood, more vengeance, more desolation.

It is safe to say that those sentiments are the sentiments of every soldier; but despite those sentiments, I feel convinced that the great body of returned soldiers are still prepared to sacrifice themselves, should the honour of this country require them to do so in the future.

Then, we hear this argument advanced: We look forward to the day when disputes will be settled by conference and not by arms. I agree, and I think all hon. members will agree, that we look forward to that day; but statesmen of all ages have recognized that the way to prevent war is to be reasonably prepared for war. What, for instance, would be the position of Mr. Lloyd George in the conferences which are taking place in Europe to-day if he were not backed by the force which is represented by the British army and navy? Would any one suggest that he would be listened to if he had demobilized the British army and navy? Had he done so, no respect whatever would be paid to the remarks or arguments which might be advanced by him in those conferences. We have Sir Henry Wilson's classification, based upon that principle recognized by statesmen, of armies into three classes: First, those armies which are strong enough to prevent war; second, those armies which are too weak to prevent war, but which are strong enough to win war; and third, those armies which can only lose a war. Into which class does Canada fall? Canada has no army; Canada does not fall into any of these categories. But hon. members will say: What about Canada's part in the late war? True, Canada did magnificently in the late war; but it was fully three years after the war had commenced that Canada was prepared for war; that she was prepared to strike as an independent country should be if it is going to be able to stand as an independent nation, and apparently hon. members desire that Canada should stand as an independent nation.

[Mr. Clark.]

I should like to bring to the attention of the House a comparison between the achievements of the forces of Canada and the forces of that great republic to the south of us during the last hundred days of the war, for the purpose, not of reflecting upon that great republic, but of showing what can be accomplished by a country with a trained army and what is accomplished by a country which is not fully prepared. The United States, unfortunately for them, were three years behind Canada in entering the war, and the result was that they were not able to make the showing per capita that the Canadians were able to make. I should like to give a few figures of the numbers engaged, the casualties, and the success achieved during that period. For instance, during that time the Americans had 650,000 troops engaged; the Canadians, 105,000. The Americans were engaged during 47 days of operations; the Canadians, 100 days. The battle casualties of the Americans were 100,000; of the Canadians, 45,830. The prisoners taken by the Americans were 16,000; by the Canadians, 31,537. Guns captured by the Americans numbered 468; by the Canadians, 623. Machine guns captured by the Americans numbered 2,864; by the Canadians, 2,842. Trench mortars captured by the Americans numbered 177; by the Canadians, 336. Territory freed by the Americans covered 610 square miles; by the Canadians, 336 square miles. Villages freed by the Americans numbered 150; by the Canadians, 228. German divisions met and defeated by the Americans numbered 46; by the Canadians, 47. Casualties per German division defeated by the Americans numbered 2,170; by the Canadians, 975. The maximum advance by the Americans was 34 miles; by the Canadians, 86 miles. These favourable results were made possible only by the fact that the Canadians had benefited by the experience of training and hard fighting during the previous years. My point is this: Is there any one here who will take the responsibility of denying the youth of our country an opportunity of learning the lessons learned by the men who took part in that war? Is there any one who would take the responsibility of unnecessarily exposing the youth of succeeding generations to useless slaughter when by taking full advantage of the lessons learned we could prepare them to take their part in any operations which may become necessary in the future?

We hear much talk about Canada being an independent nation. The Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) the other evening asked whether we were going to go back one hundred and fifty years and become Crown colonists to be looked after by Great Britain and not by ourselves. We hear a great deal of talk about Canada's responsibility as a nation. We hear it vehemently stated that we are an independent nation, independent of Great Britain and of all other countries. I suggest that we should not deceive ourselves. We have no army in this country; we have no forces which can be counted upon even to defend ourselves. We are sponging to-day, as we have in the past, upon the Mother Country, both for defence and for possible offence. We are absolutely dependent upon Great Britain for our protection both on land and sea.

We in this country are not preparing for war. The proposal has never been made by the Minister of Militia or by any member of this House that we should prepare for war. If we were to prepare for war it would require for a period of years a vote of at least fifteen times the amount which it is proposed to make for annual training. We could not actively prepare for war on a vote of less than $150,000,000 per annum over a period of years. That was conclusively proven during the late war by the operations in which the Canadians took part. The ex-service men in this country resent the suggestion that by training and passing on these lessons we are preparing for war. They resent still further making a political football of the issue of national defence in Canada. We have had in this House the sorry spectacle of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) opposing in the past estimates for the purposes of the militia, and this year bringing down similar estimates as a part of Government policy. We have heard him protesting against Canada having a reserve of ammunition for her guns, Attempts have been made during the past six months to make political capital out of the bringing into this country of a few shells which already belonged to Canada, and which would have been wasted if we had not taken them. Those shells, Mr. Speaker, which we have wasted so much time in talking about, could be fired in one hour by the artillery of Canada to-day. Yet the Prime Minister has spent twenty or thirty hours in talking about those shells. With regard to their cost, even if we had been called on to pay for them, the amount required would not exceed the amount which was required to supply our guns for one day during the last hundred days of the war. I venture to say that the forces which are lining themselves up to-day to oppose training consist of those who are uninformed, and in that class I have no hesitation in placing the Prime Minister himself. Secondly, I would include those who would profit by disruption in this country and by the disintegration of constitutional government in Canada.

It has been suggested that a break in the training of our militia for a period of one year or more would do no harm.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I submit that the hon. member is not in order in discussing on a motion to go into Committee of Supply the question of annual training, which has already been referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK: I do not propose to discuss the question of annual training. I think the hon. member is mistaken. Possibly I did refer to annual training, but I intended to refer to it only in its broad aspect and in connection with the militia as a whole.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think every one is familiar with the old rule of the House of Commons, that a motion to go into Supply is the occasion for any hon. member to present his grievances. "No Supply without redress of grievances," is the old standing rule of British parliamentary government, and when a motion is made: That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Supply,—any member can rise and discuss any grievances which he may have. I will read to the House the comments made on this point by Bourinot, based, I may say, on May, the highest authority on parliamentary procedure:

> The order of the day for the House to go into committee of supply having been read, the Speaker will put the question "That I do now leave the chair."

That is the question now before the House. He goes on:

> The same question is always put whenever the house is to go into committee of supply, in order to afford an opportunity to members to propose amendments. On this point it is observed by an eminent authority that the ancient constitutional doctrine that the redress of grievances is to be considered before the granting of supplies, is now represented by the practice of permitting every description of amendment to be moved on the question for the Speaker leaving the chair, before going into committee of supply or ways and means.

Further on he says:

> The ordinary rules of debate are applicable on this occasion; for instance, a matter already decided by the House, or of which notice has been given, or which stands upon the orders of the day, cannot be discussed; nor can any subject or matter of detail which should be discussed in committee, be debated on these occasions; nor can debate or amendment be permitted relating to grants already agreed to, or to resolutions which will be proposed in the committee, or in the committee of ways and means, or to items in the estimates.

In the present instance I do not find the point of order is well taken, because the hon. member is speaking on the necessity of maintaining our militia on its present footing, and his remarks are of a general character. If he were speaking of the estimates of the Militia Department which were under discussion last week, he would be clearly out of order; but so far I think he is in order, and such is my ruling.

Mr. CLARK: I was dealing with the assertion that a break in the training will do no harm. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that such a break, even of one year, will do an irreparable injury to the militia. We have to-day a large class of returned officers and non-commissioned officers who, under great pressure, have been persuaded to stay with the militia, to teach our youth the lessons learned and so pass on to them their own first-hand knowledge acquired at the front. Many of these officers and non-commissioned officers have already quit the militia in utter disgust because they are not receiving that encouragement which they might reasonably expect to receive; and although others are remaining, they are becoming discouraged by the apathy with which they are faced. Those men feel that while they performed a certain duty in fighting for their country, there is still the all-important duty for them to perform of passing on the knowledge gained at the front. That is why they are prepared to remain with the militia at their own expense and at great personal sacrifice.

There is also this danger, that should a man drop out of active training for even a short time, he rapidly loses touch and would soon be classed among those soldiers who in the late war were known as "dug-outs". I do not use that term disparagingly, because it applied to a very large class of retired ex-officers who promptly came forward at the outbreak of war and gave their services to their country. But if our men do not continue their training they soon get out of touch with the latest methods of offence and defence and their usefulness is to that extent impaired.

I need not enlarge upon the patriotic effect that a little training will have upon our youth, or upon the improvement in their physical well-being. I think we can compare the individual with the nation, because after all our nation is only a combination of individuals. We may very well take the example of the boy at school. How much prouder we are of a boy who is brought up to defend himself and to be proud of his physical well-being—of the boy who is not "too proud to fight," to use an expression we have heard a good deal in the last few years.

The proposals which had been before this House in the past are merely to enable us to maintain and train a nucleus of instructors so that if we are called upon to take our part in any future war we will have the few men necessary to instruct the large body of recruits that will constitute our army. The fact that this country is spending less per capita on its military training than any other country in the world, including all the British Dominions, is surely proof that we are not preparing for war. Certainly there is no class in this country less imbued with the idea that we should prepare for war than that class which at present compose our militia and ex-service men generally throughout the country.

How are our militia units maintained? It is generally supposed, I imagine, that our officers, non-commissioned officers and men are being paid by the country for their militia services. In the past they have received, it is true, a small grant for their training, but the money which has been granted has been returned to the units so that they may efficiently "carry on" with their training. The farmers of this country have benefited by that grant, because from it are purchased the supplies used in the military camps.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I close these remarks—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: I know it is distasteful to some hon. members to hear our national defence discussed. I know also that there are many members here who probably disapprove of Canada's participation in the late war. But I felt it my duty to give hon. members—at least, those on the Liberal side—an opportunity of considering this matter, because I understand that a caucus will be held tomorrow when they will decide

whether they are going to scrap the militia or not, and before they do so I thought I should at least place the matter before them as squarely as I could, even although they do not appear to be prepared to listen to my arguments. At any rate, I feel that I have done my part. But I should like to congratulate the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) upon the manly stand he took on this subject when the estimates of his department were being discussed. I should like also to express my sympathy with the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) and other members of his party who do not see the benefits and advantages of a limited defence force, because I quite appreciate that they have been taught in the past, and have apparently grown to believe, that in principle any expenditure on the militia is wrong. Their own leader sought to teach them that. Therefore is it any wonder that to-day, even though their own party now brings down as Government policy certain estimates, those hon. members are not convinced by such a sudden change of front, and bring forward the amendments that were proposed last week? I would like to see the Liberal party consider this question from the point of view of the national honour of this country. It is a national question; and I hope that if they do meet in caucus before the estimates again come up for discussion, they will seriously reflect before accepting any compromise proposed by men so ill-informed on the subject as the member who moved the amendment to the item which we were discussing the other evening. I believe that the militia estimates which the Government have brought down have been pared to the bone; and if any criticism can be offered in regard to the manner in which the Government has dealt with them, it is that they have been too niggardly rather than too extravagant in their proposals.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, I will not discuss questions which will more appropriately be dealt with in Committee of the Whole. But I want to say in defence of the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), that he won distinction in the war, he won the right to take any position he likes on this question. And I have every respect for his opinion. So far from being misinformed, he is a man who is fully informed. We may disagree on details, but I want to point out that the member for Quebec South is in a position, through years of service on his own part and on the part of other members of his family, to speak on military matters.

As to the caucus, I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Clark) cannot get in, and if he did, he might not stay long. However, the Liberal party, notwithstanding anything that has been said on the estimates is here as a unit to do what it thinks is in the interests of this country, and it will emerge from all the criticism with credit to itself and to the men in it, no matter what their individual views may be. I do not want to say a cross word to my hon. friend, but if he wants to go back to the time when people were taking peculiar positions, I would refer him to the year 1911, when he was standing side by side with the men who did not want to do anything for the British Empire.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—salaries, $5,620,000.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment): Mr. Chairman, it will be observed that there is a reduction of $505,000 as compared with the amount appropriated last year. On page 24 of the Estimates it will be noted that last year $625,000 was voted for salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners. During the year the activities of the Board of Pension Commissioners were, to a very large degree, merged with those of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and this year for the same service only $71,000 is asked for, being a reduction of $554,000. Adding to this the $505,000, therefore, the reduction in appropriation for salaries this year is over $1,000,000.

4 p.m.

Mr. MANION: How much of the $625,000 was spent last year?

Mr. BELAND: In round figures, $500,000. After careful consideration of the whole matter and consultation with the officials of the department, we have come to the conclusion that a further reduction may be effected so far as provision for salaries is concerned. Therefore, I would move, that the item of salaries be reduced by $195,000. It is the opinion of the officials, and of myself, after surveying the field, that we will be able to meet all our obligations even after this reduction is made.

Mr. MANION: I commend my hon. friend for cutting down all the expenses

that he can, but I would ask him if the reduction is not entirely due to the fact that the work of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is lessening owing to the condition which prevails—that is that most, or a great many, of the men have been attended to medically, and from a vocational standpoint, and that there has been lessening in other branches of the work? I would like to have my hon. friend's opinion upon that point.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is partly right in that there is a great contraction in the activities of the department. That applies especially to the vocational training. My hon. friend was not in the House the other day when this question was under consideration, otherwise he would have heard the statement I made as to the reduction in the number of men who are actually being trained. I think the reduction is from some four or five thousand last year to six hundred this year. A great reduction in the expenditure has also been effected through the amalgamation of the staff of the Board of Pension Commissioners with the staff of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was that effected?

Mr. BELAND: It was effected during the course of last year. The staff, I think, was merged in the month of July.

Mr. MANION: I would like to ask my hon. friend another question. He said the cutting down of the expenditure was partly due to the natural reduction of the staff owing to the work being completed. I thought it was wholly due to that fact. If not would my hon. friend explain to the committee what the other part of the reduction, in addition to the natural reduction because of the lessening of the work, is due to?

Mr. BELAND: I explained to my hon. friend that there was a reduction due to the fact that some of the activities of the department were lessened, also that a reduction was effected owing to the amalgamation of two important staffs.

Mr. MANION: I quite understand, but the point I was trying to make was exactly what the minister has pointed out—that the reduction is due to the natural lessening of the work that is going on in the department. What I wanted to make clear was that there was no real cutting down in these expenditures due to any special economies. The reason I want to make that point clear is, not in order to establish that my hon. friend has not made any special reductions, but because I do not believe this is a department that can particularly stand reductions, except where the lessening of the work permits of that being done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume the cost per capita will be greater now than it formerly was on account of fewer men being taken care of?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that the cost has not materially increased—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not materially increased?

Mr. BELAND:—and that high salaried officials are being let out, although not in as large number as the lower salaried officials.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume they were let out last year, too?

Mr. BELAND: No doubt there was a reduction last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does not the minister think the time is approaching when it would be safe and proper to amalgamate the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment with some of the other departments of government—perhaps in somewhat the same manner as was done in the case of the departments of naval service and militia? When the department was created during the war, it was understood by everybody that it was a department for purely war purposes and would not continue indefinitely. The work at the time of the creation of the department was enormous, but I suppose that in 1917, 1918 and 1919 that work had reached the peak. I do not know what the estimates for those years were but I observe that the amount for the year 1920-21 was $40,000,000. For 1921-22 it had come down to $19,307,000; and for this year the estimate has again come down to $15,-148,000. From these figures one can see that the work of the department is contracting, and rapidly contracting, each year. Now, will the minister consider the question of wiping out the department, or, at all events, amalgamating it with some other department of government? The time cannot be far distant when the work of this department will be finished, just as the work of the Soldier Settlement Board will be finished. The work of the Pension Commission, I suppose, will go on for many

years to come; but the number under vocational training has gone down from 4,000 last year to, in round numbers, 600 this year. Next year I would think that work would be completed. Perhaps the minister could give the committee some information as to what, in his opinion, would be the approximate time when this department might cease to exist? It is an extra department of the Government and was only created for the purposes of the war. Some day the purposes of the department will be finished. As the expenditure this year is down to $15,000,000 I would think the time is not very far distant.

Mr. BELAND: I cannot state even approximately when the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment should disappear in some other branch of the ministry. Undoubtedly that day will come; the activities of the department have decreased in a large measure. But my hon. friend will note that those activities have decreased mainly in those branches of the work for which a certain period had been set after which no applications could be received—as for example in the case of vocational training. In that case, 1st February, 1920, was the date fixed after which no application could be received, unless it was from a man who had been on the strength of the department in one of our institutions. As far as the patients are concerned, it is almost impossible to give anything like an exact idea as to when this activity will come to an end. The number of patients now being treated by the department is almost as large as it was a year ago, there is a difference only of about 400 out of 5,000 to 6,000, and the probability is that the decrease in the number of patients on our hands in the future will be very small indeed. A number are developing into chronic cases. Eventually the country will have to provide for them in some institutions other than regular hospitals. Among those chronic cases I might mention the mental cases, which ultimately will have to be dealt with perhaps in a different manner from the way they are being dealt with at the present time. Personally I would have no objection to merging this department in some other department, but I do not believe the time has yet come, in the interests of the returned men, to adopt such a course.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am much obliged for the information. I quite see that, in regard to the mental cases, and the hospital cases, the work that is being performed by the department will have to continue for a number of years. But that does not necessarily involve the maintenance of the department; the work could be carried on in connection with some other department. I assume that, perhaps, the majority of the cases in the hospital at the present time are in the nature of chronic cases. It will be the duty of Canada to look after these patients, probably, throughout their lives, and some department of the Government will have to function in the matter, and that applies to the majority of the mental cases. But it must be remembered that the Department of Militia has a hospital system of its own and is accustomed to looking after military patients, and I think it is worth while considering whether we are not now approaching the time when all the work done by this department might be handed over to the Department of Militia and carried on there without the additional expense of maintaining two departments. I will refer to the items in the present estimates on page 59. I do not know what the first item "Capital, $75,000" refers to. The second item, "Care of patients and medical examination of pensioners $4,000,000," will probably have to continue for some time, but it can be administered by another department with a great saving of expense. The next item, "Vocational expense," is decreasing to such an extent that next year, I should imagine, it will be wiped out altogether. The next item, "Salaries," I am glad to know, is coming down. I assume that that includes salaries in connection with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment hospitals that must come down very rapidly for a great many years yet to come. Then we have the item "Pay and allowances $3,500,000"; that is pay and allowances of the men who are actually in the hospitals according to their ranks. That could all be done by the Militia Department quite as conveniently as by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, with a single expenditure where a double expenditure is involved at the present time, with both departments paying these salaries. Then we have "Vocational loans $75,000." I assume that will vanish by next session. We have "Interest on war service gratuity," a very small item, which, I imagine, will vanish. Then, "Unemployment relief," is not in the nature of a fixed charge; on that score something may have to be granted for some years to come, but another department could handle that with a saving in expense. The next

item is "Operating expenses and working capital $700,000." I am not sure to what that item applies, but I notice there is a substantial reduction in it. It is more than cut in two, showing that it is rapidly diminishing, and will some day, I hope, reach the vanishing point. In the whole list there is no work, I submit, which could not be performed by the Militia Department, which has hospitals accustomed to the care of patients. Their pay staff is organized for the purpose, the main items could all be taken care of, and the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, which was only temporarily adopted in this country, would soon come to the vanishing point and a large overhead would be saved to the country. I know the minister is quite reasonable in his view of the matter and will not prolong the existence of the department a day more than is necessary. I would like to impress upon him the desirability of bringing it to an end as soon as possible, because the whole department as now constituted can, I believe, be well administered by another department and the expense of one department be saved to the country.

Mr. ROSS: (Kingston): I wish to say a few words in regard to the salaries. I will only refer to one branch. There is a reduction here of $500,000 in salaries, but I am sorry to see that that is taken off one very important class, namely the nursing class. The bonus has been taken off the nurses this month and last month. There has also been taken off the nurses $40 a month for board, and on that $40 a month the nurses are paying income tax. I would ask the minister to consider their case. If the bonus is taken off, then I think the Government might, at least, remit the income tax on that $40.

Mr. BELAND: There is no change in this regard. The nurses are being paid to-day in the same way as last year or the year before. I am informed that a certain amount was always kept from their salaries for board, and my hon. friend has, perhaps, in mind the fact that the bonus was not paid last month. I think that is the case with every civil servant, because this question does not appear to have been settled definitely by the Government. Should the Government decide to grant the bonus for this year, of course the bonus for last month will be paid as previously.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Would the hon. minister consider the question of the income tax to which I referred?

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. BELAND: I am afraid my hon. friend will have to direct his remarks to my colleague the Minister of Finance.

Mr. CALDWELL: I was not in the Chamber when item 291, "Salaries, $5,620,000", was under discussion. Does that include salaries in the different branches throughout Canada? I understand this does not include the salaries at head office.

Mr. BELAND: This covers all salaries except those under civil government, for which a sum of over $30,000 has already been voted.

Mr. CALDWELL: How many are there on the staff in Montreal under pay who come under this item?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend knows that the country is divided into so many units. There is a unit known as the Quebec unit, with headquarters in the city of Montreal. That, apparently, is what my hon. friend refers to?

Mr. CALDWELL: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: At Montreal, we had, for the province of Quebec, on 31 December, 1921, a staff of 518. That would include, of course, Ste. Anne Hospital, Ste. Agathe Sanatorium, and the inspectors at headquarters, Montreal. Does my hon. friend desire to know the number of medical doctors in attendance?

Mr. CALDWELL: In addition to the 518, there would be some medical doctors?

Mr. BELAND: No, this comprises all.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the average number of patients cared for by that staff of 518?

Mr. BELAND: In that unit, we have Ste. Anne Hospital, with a total of 474 patients; Ste. Agathe Sanatorium, with a total of 117 patients; and I think, in Quebec, we have also a few patients in one of the hospitals. We have besides that, in some of the institutions of Montreal, a certain number of patients.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister does not know the total for the whole province?

Mr. BELAND: I do not believe I have under my hand the exact number for the whole province. Of course, there is a large number of outside patients besides those who come into our clinics.

Mr. CALDWELL: The facts brought out would indicate that there is, on an average,

practically one man on the staff for every patient that is treated.

Mr. BELAND: If you take the whole unit, my hon. friend is right.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the minister not think this is an indication of overmanning of the staff? What would the average salary of the 518 people be? The reason I am asking this question is that my information is that the department is very much overmanned, and that there should be a great reduction of staff. The minister's answers to my questions would indicate that.

Mr. BELAND: The average salary of the men in our employ throughout the country is about $1,200. In the particular unit to which my hon. friend has referred, the Quebec unit, we have, of course, a large number of doctors in the service. It will be of interest, perhaps, for hon. members to know that not only are patients being treated in our hospitals and clinics, but we have to make examinations throughout the province for the Pension Board. That work requires quite a large number of physicians. I have in my hand a list of the men who are employed in that unit and, for that matter, of those who are employed in every unit in the country, with their salaries. My hon. friend will realize that the doctors would naturally receive a fairly large salary, though not running, on an average, much over $3,000,—perhaps, less than that. The same staff also looks after vocational training and the different activities of the department where medical services are required.

Mr. CALDWELL: Are the medical men all on salary, or does the department have different local doctors who do some of this examination work?

Mr. BELAND: We have for reasons of economy, also local doctors, whom we call doctors in the field, who, make examinations of pensioners or of men who seek treatment. We have, for instance, in the Quebec unit with headquarters at Montreal, 30 men in the field. In the unit of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, with headquarters at Halifax, we have 99 men in the field. In the unit of Kingston, we have 43 men in the field; in the unit of Toronto, 68 men; in the unit of London, Ontario, 31 men; in the unit of Winnipeg, 57 men; in the unit of Regina, 14 men; in the unit of Calgary, 42 men; in the unit of Vancouver, 72 men; a total of 456 doctors in the field.

Mr. CALDWELL: On salary?

Mr. BELAND: They are not paid regular salaries; they are paid by a fee for each case.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do the doctors who are paid fees come under this appropriation?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Will the minister give the number on the staff under pay in the different units, and the number of patients?

Mr. MARTELL: Will the minister at the same time give the number on the staff at Toronto, and the number of patients?

Mr. BELAND: The figures which I give now represent the staff in each unit for all possible activities connected with the department, comprising treatment, inspection, examination in the field, orthopedic and surgical appliances' branch, unemployment relief, and training:

	Staff
Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island unit	395

Mr. CALDWELL: That is all in the Halifax office?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Quebec unit, headquarters at Montreal	518
Eastern Ontario unit, headquarters at Ottawa	338
Central Ontario Unit, headquarters at Toronto	1,159
Western Ontario unit, headquarters at London	369
Manitoba unit, headquarters at Winnipeg.	186
Saskatchewan unit, headquarters at Regina	74
Alberta unit, headquarters at Calgary	375
British Columbia unit, headquarters at Vancouver	374

Besides that, we have the overseas office, located in London, with a staff of twenty.

Mr. CALDWELL: You have no staff at St. John, N.B., at all?

Mr. BELAND: We have no unit, but we have a medical and hospital staff.

Mr. CALDWELL: How many? I do not want to seem to delay the committee, but, due to some information I have received, I want to get the facts for the Pension Committee, and I want to get them from a reliable source.

Mr. BELAND: We have at Lancaster hospital, 97 patients, with 6 doctors on full time, 2 doctors on part time, 8 nurses, 3 orderlies, and 4 technicians, making a total treatment staff of 23. We have no dentist there. We have also the general and ad-

ministrative service composed of cleaners, engineers, and so on, connected with the hospital.

Mr. CALDWELL: You have a travelling medical board in New Brunswick, have you not? Or do they come under the Halifax office?

Mr. BELAND: I think we have a travelling board in New Brunswick for the examination of pensioners and men seeking treatment.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would the minister give us the number of patients that come under treatment in these different units?

Mr. BELAND: The total number in hospitals is 5,930.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the number of patients in each division or under each unit?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend, of course, is aware that a certain number of hospitals are administered by this department, indeed, are practically owned by the department. I will give the names of the hospitals in each unit and the number of patients in each.

In Unit "A", Quebec, we have in one hospital 474, and in the other 117 patients: Unit "B", in the maritime provinces: Camp Hill hospital, 309 patients; Jordan Memorial, 36; Lancaster hospital, 97. Unit "C", Ottawa district: Sydenham hospital, Kingston, 238 patients; Mowat Memorial Sanatorium, 82. Unit 'D", Toronto: Euclid Hall, which is for incurable tubercular cases, 26 patients; Christie Street hospital, 548 patients; and Brant House, 264. Unit "F", London, Ontario: Erie hospital, 7 patients; Westminster hospital, 408. Unit "G", Winnipeg, Manitoba: 69 patients, in Deer Lodge hospital. Unit "I", with headquarters in Calgary, Strathcona hospital, 168 patients; Sunnyside, 38; Colonel Belcher hospital, 117; and Central Alberta, 67. Unit "J", Vancouver: Shaughnessy hospital, 223 patients. The total number of patients of 3,288.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think you missed the Regina unit.

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that we have no hospital in Regina, but we have a sanitarium in Saskatchewan, at Fort Qu'Appelle, with 77 patients. I do not know whether by hon. friend wants a list of the tubercular cases in each sanitarium.

[Mr. Béland.]

Mr. CALDWELL: Would that be in addition to the figures read?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do they come under the treatment of the staffs as enumerated here?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: I would like the number of patients in each unit, if possible.

Mr. BELAND: Tubercular cases at Kentville, Nova Scotia, 144; St. John county hospital at East St. John, 15; Mountain hospital, Hamilton, 110; Muskoka Cottage, Gravenhurst, 18; Calydor sanatorium, Gravenhurst, 11; Queen Alexandra, London, Ont., 182; in Manitoba, at Ninette sanatorium, 72; King Edward sanatorium, Winnipeg, 2; Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, 77; Tranquille, B.C., 107.

Mr. CALDWELL: What about Calgary?

Mr. BELAND: We have besides, a number of hospitals with which we have definite arrangements for accommodation.

Mr. CALDWELL: Those patients would not come under the care of your staff who are on salary? They are paid out of a different vote, are they not?

Mr. BELAND: No, they all come under this item.

Mr. CALDWELL: Under the item for salaries?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL: That is, out-patients you are caring for at private or public hospitals not under the direct supervision of the department. Do you have officials there under salary?

Mr. BELAND: All salaries come under this item—all the attendants.

Mr. MARTELL: What are the terms of the arrangement between the department and the provincial government of Nova Scotia with regard to soldiers who are being treated in the provincial sanitarium at Kentville?

Mr. BELAND: We pay to the provincial government the cost of treatment, which is assessed evry six months.

Mr. MARTELL: How does that compare with the department's own cost, say, in Toronto? I understand there are about

1,100 attendants in Toronto looking after about 700 patients.

Mr. BELAND: The average amount paid to the provincial authorities for treatment in the Kentville sanitarium is $3.36 per day, and the average expense throughout Canada for the same service is $3.32.

Mr. BROWN: In regard to the auditing and accounting branch of the department, how many are engaged in that work at Montreal, and what amount of money do they handle?

Mr. BELAND: I am afraid I cannot supply my hon. friend with that information. All the money that is being paid out at headquarters in Montreal is paid, of course, through the auditing branch. As to the exact amount which goes to the unit in Montreal or anywhere else, I have not the information under my hand at the moment.

Mr. BROWN: Certain information has been given to me indicating that the system of accounting and auditing is rather expensive in proportion to the amount of money involved. For instance, I am informed that 23 accountants and 8 auditors handle only $194,207 in Montreal, and apparently the same condition runs all through the system. Has not the minister any figures in regard to this?

Mr. BELAND: I do not wish to dispute the figure quoted by my hon. friend, and of course if it is correct the staff would indeed be too large; but I am informed that a much larger amount is being paid out at Montreal.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Would the arrangement which obtains in Nova Scotia apply to all the provincial sanitaria. For instance, the sanitarium at Fort Qu'Appelle is maintained jointly by the provincial government of Saskatchewan and by public subscription.

Mr. BELAND: In connection with all the sanitaria as to which we have definite arrangements we pay the cost of treatment to the provincial authorities.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Is the cost per patient uniform in the various provinces?

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that it varies somewhat, but not very much.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): What is the rate per patient at the Fort Qu'Appelle sanitarium?

Mr. BELAND: I think I have that information here.

Mr. SHAW: While the information is being looked up would the minister inform me if I understood him correctly some time ago in giving the number of officials of his department in the Alberta unit as totalling 375 to look after 390 patients?

Mr. BELAND; Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Surely the minister does not mean he has that number of doctors, orderlies and others attending that number of patients? The hospitals I am acquainted with are not overstaffed, the average being eight or ten doctors and ten or twelve nurses. Contrast this number of nurses with the twenty-four nurses in the Kingston general hospital. The number of officials in each unit does not represent those connected with the treatment of patients only. What should be given is the number of doctors, nurses, orderlies, cooks and so on, connected with the hospital. For example, there is no such condition of affairs as 1,100 officials attending 700 patients in Toronto.

Mr. BELAND: Of course, the committee will realize that it does not require 375 doctors to look after 390 patients; but the whole staff numbers 375. As my hon. friend has stated, only a small number of this total would represent doctors and nurses. But the number of patients to be looked after does not represent all the activities of the staff. One must bear in mind that the examination of pensioners has to be attended to all over the province, and also the examination and treatment of all outside patients who come to the clinics periodically; in addition examinations have to be made on the order of the medical director of applicants for admission to the hospitals.

The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) asked me what was the cost per patient per day in the sanitarium in Alberta.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The sanitarium at Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan.

Mr. BELAND: The last cost was $3 per day per patient.

Mr. MANION: When speaking of the members of the staff, does the minister include members of the medical profession in other cities who work part time? In my own city there is one medical man who does the work for the department on part time; would he be included on the staff

and would his work be covered by these figures?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The minister has said that the rate per patient in Nova Scotia is $3.36 and in Saskatchewan $3. What is the reason for the difference?

Mr. BELAND: It is a matter of agreement and assessment between the
5 p.m. authorities of the hospital and the department. The department usually accepts the statements of the different institutions in this regard.

Amendment agreed to, and item as amended agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—vocational loans, $75,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is meant by a vocational loan?

Mr. BELAND: It is a loan up to $500 for equipment for men who have been vocationally trained and wish to enter into certain occupations.

Mr. MANION: I notice that $150,000 was the vote last year, and in 1920-21 the appropriation was $2,000,000. Of the $150,000 of last year, how much was actually paid out by way of vocational loans?

Mr. BELAND: The total was $64,118.

Mr. HANSON: What is the experience of the department in respect to the repayment of these loans?

Mr. BELAND: The loan is made against promissory notes repayable in annual instalments over a period of five years. Out of a total of 1,635 loans, 107 have been repaid.

Mr. CALDWELL: Have a good percentage of yearly payments been met?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, about all, I think.

Mr. CALDWELL: The fact that so many are still unpaid is no indication of default; it simply means that certain payments are not yet due?

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Returned soldiers who are fishermen in my constituency are desirous of obtaining loans for the purpose of carrying on their fishing operations. Has any consideration been given to that subject?

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. BELAND: This matter was discussed last year and the year before by the parliamentary committee, and I have no doubt it will engage their attention this year also. So far, no recommendation has been made for the granting of such loans.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I hope that this matter will be taken up seriously and something done. These fishermen work under conditions of great hardship and risk, and they are just as much entitled as farmers to any assistance that may be given.

Mr. MANION: No doubt there are many good arguments in favour of the suggestion my hon. friend makes, but if those arguments are good as applying to fishermen they are good also as applying to other classes of the community, and I presume that is where the difficulty comes in. I know that was the difficulty mentioned in the report of the committee last year. Do I understand the minister to say that the matter will come before the committee again this year?

Mr. BELAND: That is my impression.

Mr. CALDWELL: I have received letters from returned men who enlisted under age and who did not know about the provisions with respect to applications for vocational training until it was too late. Is there any provision in the act for such cases?

Mr. BELAND: There is no provision, I am sorry to say.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am glad to hear the minister say he is sorry. I assume he will bring the matter before the committee and have the time extended in order that these men may have a chance.

Mr. BELAND: I hope my hon. friend himself will do that.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—interest on war service gratuity, $18,500.

Mr. MANION: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. BELAND: Last year the appropriation was $4,000 short, and this year the vote is larger by that amount, plus $500 to provide for increased interest.

Mr. CALDWELL: Will the minister explain what is meant by interest on war service gratuities? Are they gratuities

which the soldiers did not avail themselves of and on which the Government is paying in the interest to them?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. These men were transferred from the Militia Department to the strength of Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment,—for treatment, for instance.

Mr. CALDWELL: They have not yet drawn their gratuity?

Mr. BELAND: No; as long as they are not discharged from our care they are on the strength, and their gratuity is not paid to them.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): These sums will ultimately have to be paid to the men?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. The rate of interest was formerly 4½ per cent; I am informed that it is now 5 per cent.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—unemployment relief, $500,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: How much of the $600,000 voted last year was expended?

Mr. BELAND: All but $19,000.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Was that money expended in the cities generally, or in the agricultural districts?

Mr. BELAND: In both.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Largely the cities?

Mr. BELAND: Naturally.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Can the minister give us the proportions?

Mr. BELAND: I am afraid I have not that information.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—Operating expenses and working capital, $700,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think we should have some explanation as to why we require $700,000 for capital expenditure now, and why that item is incorporated with operating expenses. Expenditure on capital account and operating expenses are not usually placed in one lump sum.

Mr. BELAND: The word "capital" there is perhaps misleading; it is working capital.

Mr. CALDWELL: Then it would be operating expenses?

Mr. BELAND: Well, we have a large number of hospitals and this amount is to provide for general administrative services and expenses, such for instance as: telephones, telegrams, postage, transportation of staff, travelling expenses of staff, stationery, automobiles and insurance on same, mechanical transport expenses, advertising, legal costs, operating costs and contingent expenses, provision for financing treatment and examination of Imperial and Allied ex-soldiers or pensioners in Canada, treatment and re-examination of Imperial pensioners in the United States, and provision for the making of advances to officers of the department subject to recovery. Amounts expended on account of the treatment and examination of Imperial and other Allied ex-soldiers and pensioners are subject, of course, to periodical recovery from the governments concerned.

Mr. MANION: I would like to offer a suggestion. Last year when the estimates came down they contained very much more detail than appears in this year's estimates. I do not know why the details have been omitted. For example, take the item we are now dealing with, "Operating expenses and working capital, $700,000." Last year certain details were given in connection with this item, and I believe it would facilitate the passing of all these items if the same procedure were carried out. Last year the item set out "Operating expenses and working capital, cost of administration, stores, printing, stationery, transportation and travelling expenses," and then a number of other details were given occupying in all perhaps three-quarters of an inch. Last year the statement of the details for all the items occupied a little over half a page whereas this year they take up only about an inch and a half. I would suggest to the minister, and to other ministers as well, that if a few more details were given in connection with such estimates as these they would be useful to the House and would facilitate the passing of the estimates. To ask for the passing of fifteen or twenty million dollars of estimates and give details occupying a little over an inch of space is to unduly curtail necessary information that should be given. I would therefore offer the suggestion to the minister that it might be well to revert to the system of last year in regard to giving the details of such estimates as these.

Mr. BELAND: I have no doubt my hon. friend is right in this regard. He has made a very good suggestion, and person-

ally I would benefit by adopting it. I intend, therefore, next year to carry out the suggestion.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend may not be there next year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Order.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it the policy of the department to continue the hospitals that are owned and operated by the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, or will these institutions be discontinued and the patients treated at private hospitals or hospitals that are publicly owned?

Mr. BELAND: It is the intention of the department to dispose of some of these institutions as soon as possible. That is as soon as arrangements can be definitely made for the treatment of patients in some other institutions, which would conduce to greater economy.

Mr. HANSON: I would like to ask the minister if the department has given any consideration to the establishment of soldiers' homes for the care of indigent ex-service men? I am satisfied the care of these men will have to be taken up sooner or later by this Parliament—sooner, I fear, than later—and it seems to me that not only should the matter engage the attention of this department, or some other department of the government, but that a definite policy should be laid down in respect to it—the treatment of these veterans should not be left to local charitable persons. I happen to know of a case in my own county where a man is in a state of incurable illness. I regret to say that he is a returned soldier. He has been examined by medical boards, and they say his present disabilities were not the direct result of war services, consequently they have declined to take care of him and he is now being cared for by friends. Whether the official statement is well-founded, I cannot say, but the man went overseas and has no means of support—he will have to go into an almshouse or some other institution, and I regret to say that in the province of New Brunswick there is no institution in which he can be placed. His case may be one of many, and it does seem to me that some policy should be adopted and something done to take care of cases of this kind.

Mr. BELAND: This is a matter which should indeed engage the careful attention of the present administration, or of any government. As my hon. friend has said this country will, sooner or later, have to provide homes for ex-soldiers who have become invalids. It is a problem that we should cheerfully face with the object of reaching a solution that will be creditable to the country and advantageous to the men who fought overseas.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How many hospitals, if any, have been closed up during the past year?

Mr. BELAND: The following hospitals have been closed during the year 1921:

Fredericton Hospital, Fredericton, N.B., bed capacity 125.

Sir Sandford Fleming Hospital, Ottawa, Ont., bed capacity 74.

Davisville Hospital, Toronto, Ont., bed capacity 450.

"The Hut", Hamilton, Ont., bed capacity 20.

Earl Grey Hospital, Regina, Sask., bed capacity 81.

Craig Darroch, Victoria B.C., bed capacity 110.

Esquimalt, Victoria, B.C. bed capacity 136.

Item agreed to.

Employers' Liability Compensation, $175,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Explain.

Mr. BELAND: Of the vote of $100,000 a very small amount was spent, because the provisions came into existence only in January of this year. The amount that is being asked for is estimated to be sufficient to meet the necessities of the situation in providing security for the employers who employ men disabled to the extent of 20 per cent or over. Hon. gentlemen will realize that employers will be somewhat reluctant to employ disabled men, and it is in order to make up the deficiency in pay given these men and the pay given the fit men that this vote is proposed. The parliamentary committee of last year made a special recommendation to this effect, and it was carried out by an order in council About $175,000 would cover the exigencies of the situation.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Cases have been brought to my attention in my constituency of men who went overseas and were killed, but, before being killed, were insured and informed their parents that they had taken out insurance policies on their lives. The parents claim insurance, but have nothing to show in what companies they were insured, and they think that the officers in command should be able to ascertain the name of the insurance companies. I understand the system of insurance was very general among those men coming from Quebec.

Mr. BELAND: We have no information as to that. These men were insured in ordinary insurance companies before they enlisted.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): No, after their enlistment, while they were at the front.

Mr. BELAND: The department is in possession of no information in regard to this matter. The officials, I have no doubt, are always disposed to seek any information that may be of use in this regard, but my hon. friend will realize that it is not one of the activities of the department. It might very well come within the province of the Great War Veterans' Association or some other veterans' association, or within the province of the Militia Department. This item does not deal with soldiers' insurance.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Application was made by these people to the department, to require from those in command of the battalion information as to how this insurance was brought about and what companies it was in. This insurance was effected by the men who were in command of battalions at the front. These men wer actually in the trenches when they were insured. They were killed and their parents do not know the names of their companies. Part of their pay went to pay for the insurance, and now the parents have written to the department to ascertain by what means these companies can be compelled to make good. The claims are very fair ones.

Mr. BELAND: The cases referred to by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) are certainly sad cases. He might refer such cases to the Militia Department. The officials there would be in a better position to procure the proper information in this regard than any one else.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—European war and active militia, $33,000,000.

Mr. BELAND: The House will be interested to know the exact number of pensions that are being paid. It will be realized that pensions are paid in respect of death and in respect of disablement. The number of pensions issued monthly in respect to disablement is 47,327; in respect to death, 19,490, a total of 66,817 pensioners in Canada. That does not include, of course, the dependents of either the disabled or the soldiers who have fallen. The last time these estimates were before the House it was my privilege to explain that pensioners with a disability ranging between 5 and 14 per cent have the option of taking a lump sum or of receiving their pension monthly. A large number of pensioners have availed themselves of this provision and have decided to accept a final payment. The number of pensioners who have done so is 22,351 and the total amount paid in lump sums to these pensioners is $9,210,-312. Besides that disabilities of a very minor nature, not over 5 per cent, are settled by the Board of Pension Commissioners regardless of the wishes of the men, and this amount is called a gratuity. Gratuities have been paid in lieu of pensions to 17,000 men, with a disability ranging between one inclusive and five exclusive, and the expenditure on this account has been $821,000. The total expenditure on pensions to date is $113,589,414.50. It will be noticed by the committee that an increase of $2,041,640,- appears in this appropriation. The amount which was voted last year was $30,958,359; but that amount did not meet the requirements of the year, because a large amount had to be paid for commutation,—the payment of the lump sum to which I have just referred,—and when the supplementary estimates for the year ended 31 March last are before the House an amount of $4,000,-000 will have to be provided for that object. Therefore, in reality, there is not an increase in this item. The Board of Pension Commissioners who, as members of the committee know, are alone responsible for the awarding of pensions, expect that, with $33,000,000, they will be in a position to meet the obligations for pensions for the year just commenced.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada, $71,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister has given us the total amount of pensions paid to date. Is it possible to give the total amount paid to date in the administration of pensions by the Board of Pension Commissioners.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What is the explanation of the large decrease in this item,—$554,000?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend was, perhaps, not in his seat when I first gave this explanation. It comes from the fact that the staff of the Board of Pension Commis-

sioners was transferred to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment during the course of last year.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What are the names of the commissioners?

Mr. BELAND: Col. Thompson is Chairman of the Board. The commissioners are Dr. Davis and Dr. McQuay.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Has the minister given any consideration to the idea of having the province of Quebec represented on the commission?

Mr. BELAND: I have.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What is the result of his consideration?

Mr. BELAND: My cogitations have not yet come to an end. As regards the question of the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell), I will give him the information to-morrow.

Mr. SPENCER: What are the salaries of the Pension Commissioners?

Mr. BELAND: The chairman receives $7,000 a year, and the two other commissioners, $6,000. Those salaries are fixed by statute—the Pensions Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the minister any complaint or any comment to make as regards the efficiency of the board and its staff?

Mr. BELAND: The Board of Pension Commissioners is a tribunal and, in the short space of time that I have been at the head of the department, I have been unable to study very deeply the work of the board during the time it has been in operation. I have full confidence in Col. Thompson and the two other gentlemen who are associated with him; I think they are honest and impartial in their decisions. In the awarding of pensions they rely mainly upon the reports, mostly medical, which are submitted to them. The task is not an easy one; it is difficult. It may happen that, throughout the country, a certain number of pensioners receive pensions to which they are not entitled. On the other hand, it may happen that the number of men applying for pensions have been deprived of or refused such pensions or turned down when they should have been awarded pensions. The question is one of information on the part of the commissioners, and also one of appreciation on the part of the medical doctors who are in charge of the different examinations. Medicine is not an exact science; doctors disagree in their appreciation of the same case. Some doctor may think the ailment of one particular ex-service man is to be traced to his war service, whilst another doctor will think it cannot be traced. The whole question of the awarding of pensions is summed up in this phrase—a pension is awarded to a disabled ex-service man when his disability can be attributed to his war service. The pension commissioners have to govern themselves by this principle. To say that I have not received any complaints would be not to state the facts correctly. I have certainly received a large number of complaints from men who thought they were entitled to receive a pension and who were refused the same. In reply to the remarks of my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), I am not in a position to say if, in every case, justice has been done entirely; I am absolutely satisfied that the three commissioners have acted conscientiously in the discharge of their duties, but they are fallible like every human being.

Mr. MANION: I agree with practically everything the minister has said in regard to this matter. May I offer a suggestion regarding pensioners or those who think they should be pensioned? I believe my suggestion will probably meet with his approval, and I think it will meet with the approval of most hon. members. When men wish for another board, they should more easily obtain it than is, perhaps, the case at the present time. In other words a man, let us say, has had his pension discontinued or he has not received a pension when he thinks he should receive one, and he sometimes finds it rather difficult to obtain another board. That is, some medical board has passed upon his case and decided that he has no right to a pension. but the man is firmly convinced that he has a right to a pension. He may or may not be right; probably he is wrong, for I believe that when the board decides against the applicants, in the majority of cases the applicants are wrong. If there is any doubt on the question and certainly if there is doubt enough to enable the man to obtain from another doctor, perhaps a civilian, a letter to the effect that he thinks perhaps the man's conditon is due to war service—he should be able easily to obtain another medical board and have his case reviewed. I should like to impress on the minister what has been impressed on me many times in my capacity as a private

member of Parliament—I was not long enough minister to have it impressed upon me in that capacity—and as a medical man, and that is that these secondary boards, and boards later than secondary, should be obtained fairly easily when a man feels very strongly that he should receive a pension, or that his pension should not be cut down.

Mr. BELAND: This question is now engaging the attention of the parliamentary committee, and I have no doubt a recommendation on that point will be made to Parliament at a later date.

Mr. MANION: I thank my hon. friend for that information. I did not know that the matter was being considered by the committee. I understand that the pension commissioners also handle Imperial pensions. Is there any extra pay to the commissioners for that work? Or under what conditons is it done?

Mr. BELAND: The department administers the Imperial pensions, and is paid three per cent of the amount paid out in pensions. That amount is turned over to the Receiver General.

Mr. MANION: No extra salary is paid to the pension commissioners for their work in connection with Imperial pensions?

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister has said that a large part of the staff of the pension commissioners has been taken over by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Does the Pension Board retain any medical men on its staff, and if so, how many?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, eleven or twelve officers.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is that all the staff the board has?

Mr. BELAND: They have a clerical staff of 21 I think.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does this $71,000 pay the salaries of these 11 medical men and the whole staff of the board?

Mr. BELAND: With the exception of the commissioners; I shall presently ask for a vote for the commissioners' salaries.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the minister think the board can carry on as effectively with the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment practically controlling the whole staff, with the exception of a few medical men, as it did formerly? I have found it something of a problem even to get a man's file from the Pension Board.

Mr. BELAND: The merging of the two staffs thoroughly would take a few months of course. It may be that my hon. friend has experienced some difficulty in regard to files in the past, but this difficulty is being straightened out rapidly, and I believe there will be greater efficiency in the future than in the past, when the work was done by two different staffs.

Mr. CALDWELL: Do the commissioners themselves think the present arrangement is a good one?

Mr. BELAND: I am not informed to the contrary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume the minister is aware that these three commissioners are all returned soldiers, that two of them are doctors with previous public service as well, and that the chairman is a lawyer of very brilliant and very severe and trying war service himself.

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): In putting the question I put a moment ago with regard to representation of the province of Quebec on the board, I want it to be understood that I did not want to detract in any way from the merits of the commissioners; but as this is a bilingual country and there is a large number of people dealing with the board of French origin and using the French language, I think we should keep up the time-honoured custom of giving representation on these important tribunals to the minority of the Canadian population. It was for that reason I called the attention of the minister to the fact that the province of Quebec had at the present time no representation on this board, and not for the purpose of criticizing in any way the conduct of the present commissioners.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Surely my hon. friend would not ignore the minister at the head of the department.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I understand that the board is entirely independent of the minister.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree generally, indeed cordially, with what the hon. member for Bonaventure says. I was of the impression—I may be wrong—that at one time there was a French Canadian on the board. There have been several resigna-

tions from the board because the duties were such that the commissioners entrusted with them felt the remuneration was not sufficient, and new ones were appointed. It is not always the easiest matter to get an appropriate man for a post of this sort. The feeling among the returned men is such that the appointee has virtually to be a returned man. Then he has to be a man with the experience—medical better than any other, except for the chairmanship—and also of some measure of business experience; and besides he must be willing to act. He must be a man of such standing as to command authority in his position. It is not always the easiest matter to get a man of that sort ready to take office. I remember, there was one—I shall not give his name, I do not think I should be asked to—who was pressed for appointment to this post. So far as political allegiance was concerned, everything that could be said was in his favour, but it was felt that the qualifications were not there. There was no other reason in the world why there was not a French Canadian appointee on this board. I agree with the hon. member for Bonaventure that if it can be done it is better, even though it is not essential as respects either English or French, that there should be representation of both races on important boards.

Item agreed to.

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—unemployment relief—further amount required to give effect to provisions of Orders in Council, P.C. 1615, dated the 13th of May, 1921, and P.C. 75, dated the 16th of January, 1922: and to provide for salaries and other expenses of administering the provisions of said Orders in Council (Governor General's Warrant, January 16, 1922), $1,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister state what machinery is employed for the distribution of this relief; when it operated; and the amounts distributed, geographically among the provinces, as fully as he can?

Mr. BELAND: The information will cover operations for the last year. I have not exact details of the relief administered for the period extending from the first of January this year.

Unit A, Montreal, 1,742 men; relief granted, $178,000

Unit B, Maritime provinces, 485 men; relief granted, $43,000.

Unit C, Ottawa, 790 men; relief granted, $68,000.

Unit D, Toronto & Hamilton, 4,031 men; relief granted, $429,000.

Unit F. London, 596 men; relief granted, $38,000.

Unit G, Winnipeg, 727 men; relief granted, $71,000.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Unit H, Regina, 344 men; relief granted, $31,000.

Unit I, Calgary, 858 men; relief granted, $82,000.

Unit J. British Columbia, 1,712 men; relief granted, $184,000.

Unit K, New Brunswick, 605 men; relief granted, $58,000.

That is for the period from January 1 to May 28, 1921. There is another period from May 29 to December 31, 1921, and the figures run about the same. The consolidation of those figures shows that the number of men who received relief were classified as follows:

January 1, to May 28, 1921, 3,907 single men, 7,799 married men, 184 widowers.

May 29, to December 31, 1921, 1,392 single men, 2,796 married men, 93 widowers.

The total number of men receiving relief last year was 16,171. I am not in a position to furnish information of the number of men receiving relief at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister adds those who got relief in the last period to those who got relief in the first period to arrive at his total of 16,000 men?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Would not they be the same persons?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MANION: The minister gave the number of men receiving relief in the last half of the year. What was the amount in money?

Mr. BELAND: From May 29 to December 31, 1921, $325,729; whilst for the former period from January 1 to May 28, 1921, the amount is $1,184,000.

Mr. MANION: That amounts to about a million and a half. I have not a copy of the Supplementary Estimates, but I think the amount is $1,500,000?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MANION: In the items we passed a little while ago there is a figure for unemployment relief amounting to $500,000, which, with this sum of $1,500,000, totals $2,000,000. Those two amounts are taken in together, I presume?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The $500,000 was voted for general relief and had no relation to Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?

Mr. BELAND: Quite likely.

Mr. BELAND: The million and a half we are asking for is for the last quarter from 1st January to 31st March, 1922.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A million and a quarter?

Mr. BELAND: A million and a half.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the three months?

Mr. BELAND: My right hon. friend will notice that last year from January 1 to May 28 the amount granted for relief was $1,184,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The figures run in my mind like this, and perhaps the minister will tell me if they are tolerably correct. Last year for disabled soldier relief the total was about one million and a half, and for our contribution to general relief about half a million. Then, of course, there would be the amount from the 1st January to 31st March; but I am referring to the calendar year. Does the minister say that for disabled soldier relief for the first three months of this year the expenditure has run to a million and a half?

Mr. BELAND: I am not sure that I can supply the exact information, it being difficult to differentiate between the calendar year and the fiscal year. The figures I have here would give for 1922 a total of $1,184,000, plus $325,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, that is about right. It would look as if these three months were the worst we have ever had.

Mr. BELAND: The last three months?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes; a million and a half for three months is a very large figure.

Mr. BELAND: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is unexpectedly large to me.

Mr. BELAND: I am informed that we did not have enough money to run through December, and the amount of one million and a half was to cover from 1st December of last year, while the one million and a half which is now voted is not at present all spent, though the fiscal year has started.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We were in hopes a year ago that we would be able to discontinue relief—if not wholly, very largely. If the Government intend to pursue the course they have pursued—namely, the course we pursued—it would be their duty to present an estimate to the House rather than follow the course of getting the money by Governor General's warrant and a subsequent estimate.

Mr. BELAND: It is difficult to foresee the conditions of next year. We hope that next winter will not be so hard as the one just passed. I may inform my right hon. friend that an item of $500,000 was voted this afternoon for the ensuing year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the Government continues the fractional divisions as to general relief, namely, paying one-half itself and putting one-sixth on the municipality of the excess cost of works, I am not very optimistic that they will meet with a less expenditure this year.

Item agreed to.

Pensions—European war and active militia—further amount required, $4,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister give us an explanation of this item, including in his information figures as to the amount voted and the amount actually spent, so as to account for this extra estimate, and, as well, what was met with that was unforeseen? The late government put in the estimate of what the Pension Commissioners felt was going to be sufficient, in the light of their experience. What turned up in the nature of unforeseen expenditure that ran so far ahead of what the Pension Commissioners deemed they would require?

Mr. BELAND: Perhaps my right hon. friend was not in the chamber when I explained this vote. The total annual liability for pensions last year was $30,480,351. A large number of pensioners had the option of commuting their pension when their disability ranged between 5 and 14 per cent, and it is to cover such commutations that this amount is required.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is really money paid in commutation of pensions, so it will mean that much less in the future?

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

At six o'clock the House resumed and then took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY

House again in committee on Bill No. 6, respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie)—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Neill has given notice of his intention to move:

To amend the bill by striking out the word "two" in line 8 and inserting the word "one" in lieu thereof, and by striking out the word "five" in line 15 and inserting the word "three" in lieu thereof;

To amend clause 1 by striking out all the words after the word "railway" in line 17.

To add a new clause to be known as,—

3. The securities issued by the company shall not exceed fifty thousand dollars per mile of the railway authorized by this Act and may be issued only in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed.

Mr. STEVENS: I could not follow you, Mr. Chairman, in the bill when you were reading the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendments are not in the bill. They appear in a notice given by Mr. Neill which is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. NEILL: I do not wish these amendments to be taken as one. If the first one passes I do not wish to bring in the other two. I only wish the first one to be discussed at present.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved by Mr. Neill that the first amendment be considered by the committee.

Mr. NEILL: This amendment is the same as the one I introduced a few nights ago—at least the effect of it will be the same. I am not bringing it forward in any spirit of obstruction. I simply believe that what transpired the other evening justifies me in again introducing this amendment to-night. Some hon. members who voted on the last occasion did not fully grasp the situation; others perhaps were absent. I feel, under the circumstances, that it is legitimate for me to introduce this amendment again. I will not waste the time of the committee by going over the arguments I used on the former occasion, but there are one or two points to which I wish to draw attention. If any hon. member will turn up Hansard and read the arguments in support of the bill passing without amendment advanced on that occasion, I believe he will be compelled to admit that there was very little solid reason given why my amendment should not pass. If hon. members will look at the speeches for and against the bill in its present form which were made the other night, they will find that there certainly was not a very strong argument advanced in favour of the measure. The amendment I ask is that the company shall begin operations within one year of the passing of this legislation. You will observe, Mr. Chairman, that the bill as drafted does not bring this railway under the Railway Act of Canada as regards the commencement of construction. Under that act the commencement of construction involves spending fifteen per cent of the money authorized for the building of the road within a particular period. By a special clause in the present bill however, the company take themselves out of the operation of the Railway Act of Canada and therefore that section is not operative with respect to them. The effect of it is this: While they ask for two years in which to begin and five years in which to finish, the bill really gives them five years to begin, because "beginning" under the present bill means a most perfunctory operation. A few men with shovels could, in half a day, perform the perfunctory attempt at commencement which could be constructed as a commencement within the meaning of the bill. Consequently while the company ask for two years in which to begin, they are really asking for five years provided the line is completed within that time. I therefore ask that that illusive period be reduced to one year in which the company shall at least make a pretence of beginning operations. I wish to read a letter and it is only a short communication, that I have received in connection with this bill. It is one of a number of letters that I have received but I will not burden the House by reading them all. I shall just read this communication because it is a typical one:

At the last meeting of the local branch of the United Farmers of British Columbia I was authorized to write to you to ask you to use your influence in every possible way, in the coming session of Parliament, to prevent the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company from getting the extension of time they are asking for. We feel very strongly here that the railway company ought to put this extension through for three reasons: Frst, it would provide a considerable amount of work for men and teams; Second, it would open up a considerable amount of country where there is much good land available for agriculture and which would be cultivated if transportation were provided at a reasonable rate; Third, if would cut down the cost of freight. At present it costs about 70 cents per hundred to haul freight from Victoria to Courtenay 145 miles, and it costs 20 cents per hundred to haul it from Courtenay to Merville by motor truck a distance of 8 miles. This disparity in cost presses very hard on the farmer. We firmly believe that this system of railway companies getting their charters extended from year to year is a most pernicious one. They ought either to build or relinquish the charter; unless there

is some really legitimate reason why the railway should not be built at the time.

Trusting you will give this your earnest consideration.

The communication is signed by the secretary of the association which I may mention is mostly composed of returned soldiers. I could read resolutions from boards of trade, and other organizations, but the letter I have cited is a typical illustration of the feeling in that district. It may be true, as alleged the other night, that if this railway is not built by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company it will not be built at all. That may or may not be true but at least we can give somebody else an opportunity. The other day when we western members were enjoying the hospitality of the city of Quebec—a hospitality that was given, I may say, with the grace and kindliness so characteristic of the French-Canadian people—we were shown, amongst other places the Montmorency falls, and it was a pretty sight. But I could not help thinking while we were gazing at it that the Campbell river falls along the route of this railway would produce five times the amount of electrical power. Whilst the latter falls are not so high as the Montmorency falls they have a far larger volume of water and if, as it is rumoured, there are negotiations pending for harnessing these falls, it would be a mere flea bite for that company—because they could incorporate with four or five millions—to build this jerk-water road to connect with the Canadian Pacific railway—It would pay them to build it to bring up supplies for this work. And whilst it is not an absolute fact at present we are not likely to obtain the building of the road by any other company while there is the assurance that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will have a blanket charter over it for all time. I have no hostility towards the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this matter nor have the people whom I represent. I will say this, however: I will withdraw all opposition to this bill going through as it is framed if the hon. member in charge of the measure will postpone any further action upon it to-night and give me a written undertaking by that company that they will really build this railway within the time limits asked by themselves. That is all we ask.

If we had this assurance, and if there were anything like a reasonable probability or possibility that this road would be built, I would cheerfully concede the extra year to begin, and the extra year to finish that road, but I am perfectly certain that that assurance will not be forthcoming. Can hon. members of this House believe that I should stand here and oppose a charter of this kind, if there were any possibility of the road being built under it. What would my constituents think of such an act? Would I not be deluged, and would the House not be deluged, with telegrams and letters urging that I should consent to it? But the reason that these things are not forthcoming is that everything suggests that there is no probability of the line being built. I mentioned the other night the absence of the provision allowing for the issue of bonds for the road. That is an indication that they are not sincere in this matter to-night, and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that if this House passes this measure to-night, or this session—because it will not pass to-night—these people will be coming here two years hence asking for a further extension. It is not a revolutionary thing or an epoch-making thing. It is a simple amendment to give these people an opportunity to do what they declared on paper they wanted to do—to build this railway within a reasonable time.

Mr. TOLMIE: It must be pointed out that this is only a reasonable request made by the railway company. It is quite a common thing for railway companies to do, particularly under the conditions which prevail now and have prevailed for a number of years. I do not think the railway company can be criticized for having delayed the building of the road, particularly when one is familiar with conditions in that part of Canada, and the difficulty in obtaining the material required for railway construction. This road goes through a section of country that is very rough, with very large trees, and in many cases it will require as high as one case to a case and a half of powder to blow out a single stump. It is only reasonable that the railway company should be given every opportunity to build this road at as reasonable a cost as possible. Many of the roads built in that section of British Columbia have not paid from the very beginning, on account of the tremendous outlay, the slow settlement, and the heavily timbered nature of the country. The primary reason for building the road, as I understand it, is to bring out the timber from that section of Vancouver island, and it is only after that timber is removed

and the land has been stumped, or partially stumped, that it will be ready for production, so that the delay in building the road will not be a very great inconvenience to the settlers in the very beginning. As to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway giving up this charter, and it being immediately taken up by some other railway company, I think that is very improbable indeed, because the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway is the only railway in that section of Vancouver island, and if this road is to connect up and do any business, it must certainly connect up with the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway at Courtenay. As far as giving a guarantee that this railway is going to be built is concerned, I am not in a position to do anything of the kind. I have not consulted the representatives of the railway with reference to this matter. This is a big company, well-known in Canada, doing business here, it has done a great deal to open up the West, and I think we can take its word just as well as we would that of any other business organization. Under these conditions, Mr. Chairman, I think the committee should not hesitate to grant the very reasonable request of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN: Much as I would like to agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), who has, in this House, spoken a good word for the province of Quebec, I am obliged to dissent from the opinion he expressed in reference to the extension of this charter, which I believe is being sought for very good reasons. The hon. gentleman has stated that not many good reasons were advanced in favour of the bill a few weeks ago when the bill was before the House. But there are many good reasons, and some of the members on this side of the House, who were not present at the committee meeting, have not had time to go fully into the facts of the case concerning this application. I do not see the harm in extending for two years more a charter to a company which everybody knows is aided by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That railway company has built up this country and is one of the greatest railways in the world. We must consider also that there is no possibility, practically, of any other railway coming into competition with this railway or desiring to get a charter for the construction of this road. There is also another factor. The hon. member for Comox has mentioned the possibility of immigrants, or other people from foreign lands, coming into this country, who might have to go away, because there were no possible facilities to enable them to go into the district of the Island of Vancouver which this railway is supposed to traverse. I might point out that I do not think there are very many immigrants coming from European countries who would go out very far on the Island of Vancouver, or even in the province of British Columbia. Most of these people settle in the central provinces of western Canada, and I think these people would suffer no great injury if a good company, like the one which has this charter at present, should have an extension granted for another two years. I do not hold in this House any brief for the company which is asking for a renewal of its charter. When a company comes here supported by reliable people, and tells this House openly and frankly that, on account of certain conditions which have existed in this country for the last two years, they have not been able to proceed with construction, an extension of a charter for two years has never been refused. My hon. friend has spoken of 15 per cent of a certain amount which had to be expended in a certain time. I think that provision which may have been contained in other charters of other railways, and provided for in the Railway Act, is made to prevent abuses by small companies, and people who might have charters which they wished to deal with, but not in the case of such a responsible company as the one we are dealing with. We know that it has the backing of the great institution to which I have just referred. That provision perhaps should only be invoked in the case of the Central Railway of Canada or other railways which have existed only for a few years, where the people, who are at the head of them, are only after charters to try to bargain and make money with them. When we understand the reasons advanced in the Railway Committee on this occasion on behalf of the granting of this charter and also those propounded last week by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Vien), I do not see what reason this committee would have for refusing to grant an extension of this charter for two years more nor what harm there would be in granting that extension. We know this company intends to do this work when conditions improve somewhat. I am informed that

the construction of this part of the railway in that particular district of Vancouver Island forms part of a construction plan of a big organization; and while I do not know, it might be possible that it is not able, as my hon. friend has just pointed out, to commence immediately the construction of this part of the railway. When a company like that asks this Government and this House for an extension for two years and states that, within that period, it will probably be able to commence operations, I think we should believe the truth of its assertions and grant its request. Many members on both sides of the House, and especially on this side, are, I am sure, in favour of granting this request, and I think it would be a good move on the part of members of the Progressive party if they would support this bill and not support the amendment that the time for commencing operations be cut down to one year, as requested by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). I have not seen many such amendments agreed to in the last few years that I have been in the House. The Railway Committee has always taken into consideration the reasons advanced by these railway companies for renewals of their charters, and it has always granted what is fair and just. Therefore, I do not think we should make an exception in the case of this railway, but that we should give it the same terms as have been granted to many other railway companies.

The committee divided on the motion (Mr. Neill).

To amend the said bill by striking out the word "two" in line 8 and inserting the word "one" in lieu thereof.

Yeas, 70; nays, 70.

The CHAIRMAN: I vote against the amendment. I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is on the motion of Mr. Neill:

To amend the said bill by striking out the word "five" in line fifteen and inserting the word "three" in lieu thereof.

Mr. NEILL: I intended those two amendments and the insertions to go together. It is all one amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The question has been put on one.

Mr. NEILL: Owing to the feeling shown in this committee, and owing to the fact that some more hon. members have come in since the vote has been taken, I think they should have some time to consider the question. I, therefore, move that you do now leave the Chair.

Motion negatived: Yeas, 65; nays, 84.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment to strike out the word "five" in line 15 and insert the word "three" in lieu thereof, carry? I declare the amendment lost.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is now on the third amendment, to amend clause 1 by striking out all the words after "railway" in the 17th line of the said bill.

Mr. NEILL: We have not yet taken a vote on the second amendment. You divided the first amendment into two, Mr. Chairman. I have no objection to your doing that, but I think we might very profitably discuss until nine o'clock the amendment to strike out the word "five" in line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the word "three".

The CHAIRMAN: That amendment has been declared lost.

Mr. NEILL: We have not taken a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN: A vote was not asked for. The question is now on the third amendment, to amend clause 1 by striking out all the words after "railway" in line 17 of the said bill.

Mr. NEILL: I have been accused from time to time of speaking too fast. I have determined to cure myself of that fault. The subject before us to-night is one of the most momentous that might well engage our attention. It originates as you are aware, Mr. Chairman, with Bill No. 6. The official title of that bill is "Bill No. 6, An Act respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company." I see it is marked down here for its first reading on the 21st day of March, 1922, and that it has the signature of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie), who endorsed it, presumably, on its first introduction. The hon. member for Victoria, I might mention is not a resident of the district through which this railway runs, and therefore it is natural to suppose that he is but imperfectly acquainted with the situation of this railway in that district. It therefore becomes necessary for a humble representative of that district to go somewhat fully into the details of the situation. I address myself more particularly to the first clause of the act, but in order that the committee

may get a correct grasp of the situation, I will read the preamble as well.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. NEILL: I resent the levity with which some hon. gentlemen are treating this serious and important subject. As the thread of my argument has been somewhat disturbed by the interruptions, I had perhaps better begin again. The preamble reads as follows:

> Whereas the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company has by its petition prayed that it be enacted as hereinafter set forth, and it is expedient to grant the prayer of the said petition: Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

Then clause 1 of the bill follows:

> The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company," may within two years after the passing of this act commence to construct the line of railway which it was authorized to construct by section two of chapter seventy-seven of the statutes of 1920, extending from a point at or near its present terminus at Courtenay, thence in a general easterly and northeasterly direction to a point at or near Duncan's Bay on the east coast of Vancouver Island, and may within five years after the passing of this act complete the said line of railway; and if within the said periods respectively, the said line is not commenced, or is not completed and put in operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the Company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line as shall then remain uncompleted.

I wish to point out a decided discrepancy between the language used in this bill and in the original act to which it refers. You will observe that this bill says that starting from Courtenay the line will proceed "in a general easterly and north-easterly direction." If we refer to the act of 1920, which is chapter 77 of George V., second session of 1920—

Mr. McMASTER: Would the hon. member permit a question? Would the hon. member be able to speak a little louder so that we would have the full benefit of his argument on this side of the House?

Mr. GAUVREAU: And of his wit.

Mr. NEILL: I am perfectly willing to yield the point, but I wish to warn my hon. friend of this. In my younger and unregenerate days I once used to drive a team of oxen and any one who has had anything to do with driving oxen will agree with me that it can only be done by a man with a very loud voice and an absolute command of profanity. I much fear that the force of habit is so strong on me that if I do raise my voice to the pitch required to make myself heard, I shall inevitably slip back into the old habit. If the hon. gentleman is ready to take that risk, I am quite willing to raise my voice. I understand that the hon. member imperfectly heard my opening remarks, so I am afraid I shall once more be compelled to go over the same ground again. Perhaps, however, it would be better to go through with the thread to begin with, and then I can rehearse my opening remarks afterwards, if I get through in time.

Section 2 of the act of 1920, which was assented to on the 11th of May of that year, provides that the company may construct and operate a line of railway from a point at or near its present terminus at Courtenay—the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) is not paying attention to my remarks. Mr. Chairman, I am here to drive my points home if I have to repeat them a thousand times. You will observe that section 2 of the act of 1920 provides that this company,

> —may lay out, construct, maintain and operate a line of railway from a point at or near its present terminus at Courtenay, thence in a general northerly and northeasterly direction—

You will notice that the original act says "in a general northerly and northeasterly direction," but the bill before us says "in a general easterly and northeasterly direction." Why, if this route is followed, the railway will have to be built in the gulf of Georgia, because that is the easterly direction from the point here named. We have seen many changes in the last three or four years, among them great political changes, but I do not think the direction of the cardinal points has shifted so much as is indicated in these two acts. I should like to know from the hon. member who is sponsor for this bill if he can tell me why the act in its original form describes the railway as running in a northerly direction, while the present bill has it going in an easterly direction. If the hon. member would like to make an explanation I am sure we would all be very happy to hear it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question.

Mr. NEILL: I am sorry the hon. member will not oblige us on such a vital point. I know that a distinction of that kind is well calculated to sway the opinions of this House.

I think I have now indicated in a general way, Mr. Chairman, what is the purport of this bill. I think I should take a point of order on this subject, for the bill purports to be an amendment to this act;

but it is not in ordinary fact an amendment. It has been contended, I was informed the other day by one well in a position to know, that the original act with the powers contained in section 3 is still in existence, and that this bill is an amendment to it. But I would submit to hon. members who are lawyers that that is neither good law nor good parliamentary practice. This act will cease on the 11th day of May of this year, and I cannot see how this present bill can in any sense be considered—shall I say?—as concomitant or a part of it, unless it specifically says that section so-and-so shall be amended.

To illustrate the point I wish to make. If this amending bill purported to amend section 3 of the original act by striking out the date and putting in another date two years hence, that would be perfectly proper and correct and in accordance with parliamentary practice; but when it simply says, as it does here, that it has power to build the railway mentioned in section 2 of the original act, then I submit it cannot be held to be an amending bill, and consequently the original act will disappear on the 11th day of May, 1922. What then becomes of this section in the act dealing with the bonding privileges of the company? Section 4 of the act provides:

> The securities issued by the company shall not exceed $50,000 per mile of the railway authorized by this act, and may be issued only in proportion to the length of railway constructed or under contract to be constructed.

Now, Sir, that section has disappeared in the so-called amending bill. Where then is the authority to be found to obtain money to build this railway? Is it not driven home to you, Mr. Chairman, and every member here that that has been omitted because the promoters know they will not need the money? In other words, they do not intend to build the railway, and they will be coming here two years, four years, ten years hence, and then it will be time enough to put in the bonding clauses. It has been contended, as I said, that the bonding clause in the original act governs this bill; but it cannot do so, for the reasons I have pointed out, that the act is not amended specifically, this bill only alludes to it in an indirect manner, so that—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is dealing now with the last amendment, whereas what he should discuss is the amendment after the word "railway" in line 17, as to the time for construction and completion of the railway.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I accept your direction, and I shall be very pleased to address myself more particularly to the amendment. In my haste to get the discussion over I was going on to the third amendment, but I will now devote myself more particularly to the amending of clause 1 by striking out all the words after "railway" in line 17. That, Sir, I am sorry to say, compels me to refer to section 3 of the Railway Act again, Chap. 68 of the Statutes of Canada of the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen. Perhaps I ought to read the act from the beginning.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. NEILL: Well, it is somewhat extended and I will not inflict it on hon. members. The heading of section 3 is "Construing of special acts." Subsection (a) reads as follows:

> Except as in this act otherwise provided, (a) this act shall be construed as incorporate with the special act.

I need not explain the meaning of that to hon. members. Subsection (b) provides:

> Where the provisions of this act and of any special act passed by the Parliament of Canada relate to the same subject matter, the provisions of the special Act shall, in so far as is necessary to give effect to such special Act, be taken to override the provisions of this Act.

If hon. members do not understand that language it is not my fault; it is due to the peculiar legal phraseology employed. Put in plain English, it means that when a company comes to this House and brings a special railway act, it is supposed in its general lines to conform to the Railway Act of Canada, and what this special act does not specifically mention the general covers. But in this particular case they had inserted the words which I propose to strike out by that amendment. In that way the promoters are trying to take this bill out of the jurisdiction of the Railway Act, because the words that I propose to strike out read as follows:

> —and if within the said periods respectively the said line is not commenced, or is not completed and put in operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line as shall then remain uncompleted.

To the ordinary layman, Mr. Chairman, those words would not appear to take this bill out of the jurisdiction of the Railway Act; but these provisions are always so astutely and so subtly phrased that they

do not always mean what on the surface they appear to mean. I have my eye on it too, Mr. Chairman, and we will be a unit when it comes to nine o'clock! But, as I say, the insertion of these words, which to all appearances have nothing to do with the Railway Act, take the bill out of the jurisdiction of that act. Therefore I want to cut these words out, and then the bill would come under another section of the Railway Act, which I propose to read with your consent, Sir.

This is the same Railway Act that I alluded to before, Chap. 68 of the Statutes of Canada of the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and nineteen, in two volumes—this is the first volume. Section 161 dealing with the powers of construction of railroads and the limitation of time for construction provides:

> If the construction of the railway is not commenced and 15 per cent of the amount of the capital stock is not expended thereon in survey, purchase of right of way, and actual construction work, or in the case of a branch or extension of the railway, if 15 per cent of the bond issue authorized therefor is not expended thereon in actual construction work within two years after the passing of the act authorizing the construction of such railway, branch or extension, as the case may be, or where the Parliament of Canada grants an extension of time for commencing such contruction within the time so granted, or if the railway, or branch or extension, as the case may be, is not completed and put in operation within five years from the passing of such act, or where the Parliament of Canada grants an extension of time for completion within the time so granted, then the powers granted by such Act or by this Act shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway, or branch or extension, as the case may, as then remains uncompleted.

The common sense interpretation of that section is that the Railway Act of Canada specifies that a railway shall within two years commence construction and by construction is meant spending 15 per cent of the amount authorized of the bond issue for the building of that road or branch to be extended. Incidentally, I would like to ask, how does this railway company expect to arrive at this 15 per cent when they have not taken any authority to issue bonds? One can come to no other conclusion than that the bill is intended only as a stop-gap. My object in moving this amendment is to make the company come under the operation of the Railway Act of Canada, by striking out the words I have alluded to in clause 1 and putting nothing in their place. The company would then become obliged, under section 161, to spend 15 per cent of the capital cost of the railway in commencing operations within any period decided upon. So that while the House has decided, by the vote of the Chair—I should think the case almost unique in Canada—that this company shall have two years within which to commence operations, under the bill as introduced they have practically five years, because they do not really need to do anything definite in the way of commencing. A man can go out before breakfast with a shovel and do enough work to call it "commencing construction." I knew of a company which started construction in that way: they fulfilled the contract by stealing a couple of rails from a coal mine siding and laying them out along the route. That gave them three years more in which to carry on. It is to prevent something of that kind that my amendment is formulated. If this amendment passes, and the company, by the action of the committee to-night—I trust it may be only for to-night, for I presume there will be other opportunities of bringing the question up; as hon. gentlemen grow older, it is customary for them to grow wiser. We saw how the vote went last week; give us a little time and we will sweep this amendment through the House, probably by a unanimous vote. But I have got off the thread of my remarks.

Mr. VIEN: I rise to a point of order. Rule 18, paragraph 2, provides that a member who talks for the purpose of gaining time may be ruled out of order. The hon. member clearly intimated his intention of talking the matter out until the clock should strike nine. Moreover, his arguments for the last ten minutes have been a tedious repetition, which brings them under the wording of Rule 18.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I presume that is debatable.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand that the hon. member wishes to speak to the point of order.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member (Mr. Vien) has referred, I think, to rule 18. To what book of rules does he refer? Is it Bourinot? There is a great divergence of authorities as to points of order. There is May, and there is Bourinot, and there are several others which I do not recall at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that this rule is definitely indicated. It is rule 18, clause 2.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, here it is:

Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech.

I submit that I have not deviated from the amendment under discussion. I may have said in a jocular way that the discussion would end at nine o'clock, but is that not so? Is not that the rule of the House? I submit that my remarks were relevant to the amendment at the very moment when the hon. member for Lotbiniere interrupted me. Is it not desirable that this railway company should be brought under the operation of the Railway Act, thus preventing it from going out and doing the so-called commencement work in an afternoon with a shovel—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. NEILL: I am speaking to the point of order. I also have rights in this House, Sir. I call your attention to rule 19, which says that no member shall use offensive words against any other member of the House.

The CHAIRMAN: While it may be said that the hon. member is, perhaps, at the point of divergence from relevancy to the matter under discussion, I think I should give it as my opinion that the point of order is not, under the circumstances, well taken.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your decision. While you may be a little shaky on an even vote, you are all right in your rulings. It is very embarrassing to be interrupted in this way by hon. members; it quite destroys the thread of my argument. I think I have made my case good; clearly it is desirable to pass this amendment so that my constituents will have at least the satisfaction of knowing that this company will pay out 15 per cent of the construction costs during the period decided upon. That is a substantial concession, but it is a reasonable one.

9 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I draw attention to the fact that the hour for private bills has expired. Shall the committee have leave to sit again?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

SUPPLY

The House again in committee of supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

PENSIONS

Pensions—European war and active militia, further amount required, $4,000,000.

Mr. MANION: When the Committee took recess at six o'clock I was about to ask the minister one question in regard to this item. He mentioned a sum of $4,000,000 as being for the commutation of pensions, and he spoke of this as lessening the expense of this year. But I notice that in addition to that sum there is also asked for this year $33,000,000 which makes a total of $37,000,000 as compared with $30,000,000 in the regular estimates of last year. Will the minister explain why there is an increase of expenditure if the amount paid for commutations effected a decrease? That is what I do not understand.

Mr. BELAND: Perhaps my hon. friend did not thoroughly understand the explanation given. The $4,000,000 which are now being asked for, are not for the current year 1922-23 but for the year that is just ended.

Mr. MANION: Then $4,000,000 is in addition to the $30,000,000 of last year.

Mr. BELAND: Yes.

Item agreed to.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

Department of Trade and Commerce—Bounty on linen yarn spun in Canada from Canadian flax, including expenses of supervision; under Orders-in-Council of September 3, 1918, and June 30, 1920, $26,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: We would like to have a little information in regard to this item? Will the minister tell us exactly what this expenditure involves?

Hon. J. A. ROBB (Minister of Trade and Commerce): This is the last year of these grants towards the cultivation of flax and the manufacture of linen yarns in Canada. The act under which assistance was granted was to run for three years, and this is the last year we make payments under the system adopted by the supervisors. The amount paid last year was about four thousand odd dollars but we have not received all the returns from the mills. We are asking for the same amount that was established last year.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I think this item should be held over until we get a little

more information. The details given to us by the minister are not very complete.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend desires any further information I am quite prepared to give it to him. He will notice there is no change in this vote. So far there is only one company receiving bounty, the Dominion Linens Limited of Guelph and the expenditure has been as follows: In 1920-21 on 139,796 pounds, bounty was paid of $5,096.11. The cost of supervision was $150.40. This bounty, as I have already told my hon. friend, was authorized under the War Measures Act to run for three years from April 1, 1919, and later was changed by Order-in-Council to run for three years from April 1st, 1920, so that it will expire in 1923.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Are we to understand that this is a re-appropriation?

Mr. ROBB: The appropriation has to be voted each year, and in accordance with parliamentary procedure if the money is not earned within the year ending March 31st, it lapses and returns to the Treasury, but it must be voted each year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps I can explain this item because I know something about it. It so happened that in the summer of 1918 it was impossible in Canada to get linen yarns. It was also impossible in Canada to get those classes of material into which linen yarns are manufactured. The question, I think, arose in the first instance through want of cloth for aeroplanes. An embargo was placed by Great Britain on Irish flax or linen yarns coming to this or any other country. The stock here had run out, also the stock in the United States. The threads that are used by shoemakers and harnessmakers was also exhausted, likewise fishing twines, and a serious question arose as to how these could be obtained; they were not manufactured in Canada at that time. The flax industry was being encouraged to some extent and there was a good deal of hope that it would develop into a large industry. The government of that day accordingly passed under the authority of the War Measures Act, an appropriation to the extent of $25,000 a year as a maximum to be paid in bounty on the production in Canada of linen yarns. No factory was ready to start that work, no factory in America was equipped for the purpose. A factory had been started in Philadelphia but it had not been able to compete with the Irish, or Belgian linens, or with the linens from Japan. But the machinery was available there, and was subsequently purchased and brought to Canada. The bounty is paid at so much per pound.

[Mr. Campbell.]

Mr. ROBB: Three cents.

Mr. GUTHRIE: With reference to linen yarn manufactured in Canada, only a small portion of the bounty has been earned. The factory in Guelph is the only one that has gone to the extent of actually manufacturing these linen yarns. I understand the amount earned last year was only five or six thousand dollars. It may be that that is not a full year's accounting, and that more will have to be paid, but the maximum as to amount was $25,000 per year, the limit of time was three years, and this is the last year.

Mr. JACOBS: May I ask the hon. gentleman, who seems to be acting as substitute for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, how much has been paid on account of this bounty?

Mr. ROBB: Less than $10,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give us some information as to the possibility of this becoming a paying industry in Canada or if the money is to be merely thrown away.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend must remember that the bounty was given for the purpose of starting the industry. Our information is that this mill is running. The amount paid varies according to the quality of the thread. It provides for a bounty of 3 cents a pound to be paid on linen yarn not coarser than 12 lea, or finer than 20 lea, and 6 cents per pound for yarn 20 lea and finer but coarser than 40 lea, and 9 cents a pound for yarn 40 lea and finer. The amount appropriated under the original act was not to exceed $75,000 in all, and not to exceed $25,000 per year. My hon. friend will observe that, in placing this in the estimates, we are simply carrying out the Order in Council of 1920, and if the money is not earned there is nothing to pay.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I do not like to press it very much further, but, in view of the fact that this amount of money is not ordinarily required, I do not see the necessity for voting it. Could the hon. minister not cut it down to the actual amount required?

Mr. ROBB: No, we cannot cut it down one cent, because Parliament three years ago advertised to industries that $25,000 a year was available for three years. You

would not ask us to repudiate an act of Parliament. This is the last year. There is only one way of correcting it, and that is to repeal the act.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics (including census 1921), $415,000.

Mr. HANSON: I think we should have from the minister some rather detailed statement as to how far advanced these statistics are, and when they will be ready for the country.

Mr. ROBB: This information is handed out to the press, when completed. The information with respect to the provinces has been handed out, but we have not yet fully completed all the details for the different counties, cities, towns and townships. The staff is working at it continuously and we hope before long to be able to hand out a complete statement.

Mr. MILLAR: Will the minister tell us why, when the census was being taken, those who are born in Canada and have lived all their lives in Canada, cannot be registered as Canadians?

Mr. ROBB: I have read that inquiry frequently in the newspapers. My predecessor, was responsible for starting machinery to take the last census, and I imagine he followed the procedure of previous years, but I am forced to believe that the omission to which publicity was given in the last census will not occur again when we take the census of 1931.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Can the minister not give us more information as to when the census is to be brought down? I am surprised to learn that the details are not ready. The final results are ready, and the final results, one would think could only be made up from the mass of details which the census department already has. What is the reason for the delay in knowing what the census is in the smaller group, when we have the information for the larger group?

Mr. ROBB: I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that there are volumes of figures to be compiled and checked, and, incidentally, I may take the House into my confidence, and say that we have discovered some irregularities in the census. For instance, we discovered in some of the western towns that the census had been padded, and whole blocks had been put in which did not exist. Four enumerators were brought before the court and fined. We had complaints from some of the eastern cities that there were omissions in the census. It is important that all these should be checked up carefully before the final report is handed out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When do you expect it to be handed out?

Mr. ROBB: I have urged the department to work as fast as possible and get it out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has taken the House into his confidence, and I am going to be similarly frank with my hon. friend. Some people think the Government are not at all in a hurry to redistribute.

Mr. ROBB: I heard that of the last government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is thought to be a common fault with governments, and that the present Government are not at all anxious, at any rate, to provide for proper representation at the present minute.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Why not?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I leave that to my hon. friend to answer. I do not know why. Redistribution is very much overdue, and my hon. friend will tell us, of course, that we should have looked after it some months ago, although he says it cannot be looked after now. But a very easy way of preventing redistribution would simply be to delay bringing down the details of the census.

Mr. ROBB: We have no desire to do that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am delighted to receive that assurance. Can the minister tell us the cost of the census as against the other ordinary administration costs of the department?

Mr. JACOBS: I see, in the estimates for 1921-22, an item of $1,860,000 for expenses in connection with the taking of the census. This year, the amount is $415,000. Could the minister give us some idea as to the actual cost of taking the census of 1921?

Mr. ROBB: That is a similar question to the one asked by the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). Up to December 31, last, we had paid out on account of the Statistics Bureau including

census, $1,626,540.07. Of this amount, there was expended $97,194.58 for the bureau, and $1,529,345.49 for the census.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not receive from the minister any approximate date when he thought the census returns would be available for the House. The returns which, he understands, we are most anxious to have are, of course, those which would guide the House in the preparation of a redistribution bill. I think the House will agree that that is one of the most important things which we have ahead of us, and a matter which should not be delayed any longer than is absolutely necessary. The figures are all in the bureau at this time. The census was commenced last June, eleven months ago, and, under ordinary conditions, it should have been completed by this time—yes, before this time. The census returns are indispensable in the preparation of a proper redistribution bill, and until we get them, we cannot move in the matter. I was a little surprised, at an earlier date in the session, to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) announce that the Government did not intend to proceed with redistribution at this session. I do not know that this affects Ontario so very much; from what I see in the newspapers, it may be that Ontario may lose one or two seats. That is not the point; the point is that the people are entitled to proper representation, no matter whether they live in Ontario or the West; and the minister, by putting on a few additional clerks, could bring down the necessary information to this House within a very few days. The question I asked the minister was: Are we to have this information or are we not? Those who live in parts of Canada where the representation is going to be very much affected, I should think, would join in the demand for early figures in regard to the census. I should be very glad if my hon. friend would give us to-night an approximate idea when he expects to lay before the House sufficient details of the census to enable the House to deal with a redistribution bill. The item which we are discussing now is the census item, and I think we should get that information before the item is passed.

Mr. ROBB: I think I can go so far as to assure my hon. friend that, barring unforseen events, the census will be completed and brought down in plenty of time to prepare a redistribution bill before there is a general election.

[Mr. Robb.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is the purest kind of evasion. I think the minister must see that himself. There could not be a general election held in this country without a redistribution bill, unless we are going to administer a very severe wrench to our constitution. We must have the census figures. What is the reason for the delay? The statement of the minister to-night will not account for the delay. The employment of a few additional clerks would give us those figures next week, and I think, before the committee passes this item, it should get from the minister a definite promise that we are going to have those figures. It is all right to say that we shall have them before there is a general election. This Government is not in that altogether happy position that it can exactly say when we should or should not have a general election. All the more reason why we should have the census figures to enable us to have a proper redistribution bill.

Mr. ROBB: To-morrow morning I will give instructions to the bureau to spur up a little, if it is possible to put on more help, and bring down the complete census.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman say that the chief of the census staff is of opinion that they have not sufficient information now to warrant the introduction of a bill?

Mr. ROBB: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is he not the authority?

Mr. ROBB: I did not say so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say he is.

Mr. ROBB: Say what?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Chief of the Statistics Branch. Will the hon. gentleman say that he is of opinion that the returns are not sufficient to warrant our going on with redistribution?

Mr. ROBB: I have not offered any opinion in that regard. The question was asked when the census would be completed and brought down. I replied that some irregularities had been discovered in the census and that instructions had been issued not to give out complete returns to the printers, until the returns were all checked up and we could hand out a census that would be fairly satisfactory. The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Meighen) was absent when I intimated to the House that we had discovered certain irregularities in western Canada; that four men had

been fined for padding the lists, and that we have a grist of complaints from eastern Canada, from some cities, that names have been omitted. I am sure my hon. friends will agree with me that it is important that we should check up these returns and satisfy the people that the census handed out is a fair census. That work is being done as rapidly as possible. If my hon. friends desire that we should put on more help, I will ask the chief census enumerator to put on more help, if possible, and to spur up the work. We have no desire to delay completion of the census.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Small complaints as to persons being left out are one thing; I know nothing about that; but I saw some time ago census returns published as to several provinces, and I have read the address of the chief statistician. From that address no one could come to any conclusion save this, that the census is now and has been for some time quite sufficiently advanced for all the purposes of redistribution.

Mr. JACOBS: Is the right hon. gentleman aware of the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) announced to the House the other day that there would be no redistribution this year? I think the Prime Minister this year is master of the situation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be a question. I was not discussing that. I was merely saying that, as regards the census returns, there is no excuse for lack of redistribution this session.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think the minister should let this item stand over until he gives us some more definite information as to when those figures will be available, and what is holding up the completion of the work. For the last two or three months, we have expected that those figures would be available. Some of my hon. friends around me seem to think this is not of a great deal of consequence for the province of Ontario. There is this to remark, that the part of Canada to which it is of real consequence, is apparently very quiescent and very acquiescent as regards the Government's action in not bringing down the figures. I should have thought, if people in any part of the Dominion of Canada showed urgency in regard to this matter, it would be hon. members from western provinces; and if they are prepared to acquiesce in the delay and to postpone any possibility of redistribution this session, I do not know that people from Ontario are so very much concerned about the matter. But the wonderful silence on the part of all hon. members from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in regard to this question is certainly most impressive.

Mr. HOEY: It is encouraging, almost inspiring indeed, to learn that my hon. friends to my right have become converted to the necessity for redistribution. I want to say that silence is no indication of acquiescence. There is on the Order Paper to-day, I understand, a resolution by a member of this group calling the attention of this House to the desirability of enacting a measure of redistribution this session, if possible. I want to associate myself very heartily with the earlier statement made by my hon. friend from South Wellington, that it is very desirable we should have the actual facts concerning the recent census at the earliest possible date with the object of passing a redistribution bill.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I would also like to point out a reason for urgency in this matter. I come from the county of York, a riding that is partly urban and partly rural. In the last election the total number of voters on the list of South York was 49,700. That constituency is entitled to at least three seats. While the city of Toronto and the county of York have ten members in this House, they are really entitled according to population, so far as we know the figures, to twenty members. We ought to have twenty. It is now proposed to introduce the principle of proportional representation in electing representatives to this House. The city of Toronto would like to know how long it is going to be without a fair representation in this House, and whether the principle of proportional representation is to govern at the next election. If so, it will effect an absolute revolution in the city of Toronto and the county of York, and that being the case, we are entitled to know the actual census figures at the earliest possible moment. I believe the figures could be easily prepared and given to the public; I do not think it is necessary to take so much time over it. We cannot have the information too soon, especially in view of so much talk about another election being held any day in this country. We want to have these figures so that we can study them and devise some means of bringing about an equality between the representation of the cities and of the rural portions. While Ontario would not have any more seats, surely the cities by reason of their growth in population are

entitled to greater representation than they now have. As a matter of fact, the city of Toronto and the county of York include about one-fourth of the population of Ontario, and if one man's vote is as good as another man's, we ought to have one-fourth of Ontario's representation in this House, whereas we have a good deal less than one-eighth.

Mr. MANION: With reference to the Bureau of Statistics, I should like to ask the minister what progress has been made in unifying the work of gathering statistics for all departments of the Government. At present, if one wants statistics dealing with a certain branch of the Government, it is sometimes very difficult to get them without hunting up a certain branch, or a certain section of that branch, or a certain department, or something of that sort, and being referred from one to the other. On one occasion last year I was referred from one branch to another seven or eight times before I succeeded in getting certain figures I required in regard to minerals. That is very annoying. There should be one central place where we could get statistics relating to any department and any branch of the Government, and I should like to know what advancement has been made in the working out of such a central system.

Mr. ROBB: That work is being gradually co-ordinated. I myself have had occasion to find fault with the duplication of information that is asked for throughout the country. In so far as it is possible, this duplication is being eliminated and the work centralized in the bureau of which Mr. Coats has charge.

Mr. MANION: The object ultimately is that Mr. Coats' office will be able to give statistics relating to any branch of the government?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is there, if anything, that is not in the statistics office now?

Mr. ROBB: The Department of Labour have a statistical branch, as well as the Mines Department and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no statistical branch in the Department of the Interior. There is a Natural Resources branch, which gathers information of course, but that is not statistics, and such figures as it does gather go immediately to the statistics office. If there is a branch gathering statistics in the Department of Labour, it would occur to me there is no need of it, as the work should all be done in the Statistics branch.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps my hon. friend is right. I know that the figures that are gathered in the Interior Department are sent to Mr. Coats' office. I remember some months ago a man wanted to be transferred from that work in the Interior Department to Mr. Coats' branch.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know that every requisition of the hon. gentleman's department to the Interior with regard to the transfer of statistics was met by the Interior Department. There was no reservation.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): How many enumerators were employed on the last census, and what proportion of them were soldiers?

Mr. ROBB: There were 11,414 enumerators. We have no record as to the number of returned soldiers employed, but a number of returned soldiers were engaged on this work.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): In my riding in every case where the work of taking the census could be given to returned men, that was done. The majority of the work was done by returned men and done fairly well.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): The British North America Act has very wisely provided that the representation of this House should be based on the representation of the province of Quebec. As a commissioner of the city of Montreal for some years, I am familiar with conditions existing in that city, and I cannot approve too strongly the stand taken by the minister to make doubly certain that the census figures, for the island of Montreal more especially, are authentic and accurate. It is a well known fact to those who read the Montreal papers that when the preliminary census figures were given out, several newspapers in Montreal, La Presse, La Patrie, the Montreal Star, as well as the Chambre de Commerce and others, protested against the figures and alleged that the census that had been taken within the city limits was inaccurate and incomplete. Petitions were signed and circulated calling on the Government to verify the figures, so I hope the minister before a final announcement is made, if he has not already taken the necessary steps to verify

these charges, will do so, so that when we get the census report for the province of Quebec and of the island of Montreal we shall know that it is absolutely accurate and complete. The figures for the city of Montreal, properly speaking, are misleading because they only give the population within the municipal limits. The outlying towns, Westmount, Outremont, and so on, are left out of the complete figures for Montreal as they are generally given.

Generally speaking, I think it is the duty of the minister and of the Government to make doubly sure that these charges have been fully investigated so that the figures finally given out may be absolutely satisfactory. This is a matter in which not only the province of Quebec, but every province in the Dominion is interested. If the members from Ontario and the West are anxious to have a change in the representation of this House, they must be certain that the basis on which the work is done is absolutely accurate, and that the figures that are finally given are the correct figures which the country should have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it not a fact that the checking up has all been done as respects Montreal? There is no doubt now as to the figures?

Mr. ROBB: The checking up as respects Montreal has been fairly well completed. It is only right to say that in many cases we discovered the complaints were scarcely justified. There were many irregularities, but they were not of as grave a character as was at first thought and reported through the press. For the further information of my hon. friend, I have here the last report of the Commissioner of the Census up to the 20th of April. He intimates that the returns were being handed out as finally revised, but that in the case of the province of Quebec there was more than the ordinary amount of revision found necessary, and he would like to spend a few days longer on the final revision. I imagine the returns will be completed in a very few days.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does he indicate how much revision still remains to be done?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: On the 20th of April he intimated that the final work would be done in a very few days. That is twelve days ago. Does not the minister think this vote might well stand over until he has those final returns?

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend insists upon it I do not object, but I can assure him that we will speed up the work tomorrow. We are just as anxious as he is to have it completed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Have all the enumerators and other census officers been paid in full?

Mr. ROBB: So far as I know all those whose reports have been passed upon and approved have been paid; but only a few days ago some cases were brought to my attention where enumerators—one in the eastern part of Quebec—had failed to send in final returns. Until we get those final returns we are not going to make payment. In those cases we have had to send men especially down to look into the returns.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I feel that I should—although I do not hope to change any opinion as a result—say a few words with regard to a remark that fell from the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Hoey), as regards those on this side of the House only lately favouring redistribution. The fact is, as was stated in the House last session—although I do not suppose the statement got very wide circulation where such circulation was not profitable—that I made every attempt to have the census so advanced that we could introduce a redistribution bill last session. I conferred with the Chief of the Statistics Branch, who informed me that owing to a change in the law made about ten years ago the census was taken on the first of June instead of three months earlier, as had previously been the case. I canvassed with him the possibility of advancing the date again to the first of March and rushing the census so that redistribution could be introduced during the session. Upon investigation the Chief of the Statistics branch reported to me that it would be impossible so to do, that even by advancing the census three months not more than one month at the very outside would be gained, owing to the difficulty of getting work done at that unfavourable period of the year, the roads and weather conditions being what they would be, and that consequently it would not be possible to be through with the work earlier than September; but that taking the census at the time fixed by law, namely, the first of June, it would in his judgment be possible to have the return ready in October. I had a letter from him to that effect.

During a discussion last session I stated that in my judgment we would not be justified in dissolving Parliament at that time in response to demands from hon. gentlemen, then in the opposition. One reason I gave was that it was very important to have redistribution before dissolution, and I stated that I was most anxious to have it.

It developed in the fall, at a further conference with the Chief Statistician of the Census branch, that it would be the month of December before the census returns were ready, such had been the slow progress made as a result of many unforeseen difficulties that had been encountered, and that there would be no possibility of securing census returns sufficient to warrant going on with a redistribution bill until at least the month of December, that that month would be late enough and by that time the census returns would be available. That meant redistribution could not be put through at any special session, and that if it was to be attended to before dissolution we would have to have a regular session. Under the circumstances I feel that a regular session would not be justified even for the purpose of redistribution. Those are the facts.

It now transpires that it would not have been possible even in December. I feared that might be the case, because I knew that already completion of the census returns was two months beyond the time that had been fixed first in the spring, and if that should be the case we would be in a very unfortunate position indeed. Consequently I felt it my duty not to wait for redistribution. But for hon. gentlemen to try to lead the House to believe that there was any aversion on my part to redistribution, or that the importance of it was not appreciated, is entirely to mislead the House, although not done intentionally.

Now, I do think that we undoubtedly have information enough—I cannot think it can be otherwise having read the addresses and the information given by the Chief Statistician—I say that we undoubtedly have information enough to warrant the introduction of a redistribution bill at the earliest possible date.

Mr. ROBB: This session?

Mr. MEIGHEN: At this session.

Mr. LEWIS: Is it the intention to gradually include all statistical clerks from the various departments of the Government under this one head, because I notice on page 104 under the details of civil government that there are 91 statistical clerks employed at a salary of $85,055? Is that in addition to the amount of half a million dollars under this head?

Mr. ROBB: Page 104 refers to civil employees.

Mr. LEWIS: But are the salaries included in this Dominion Bureau under this item?

Mr. ROBB: No, that money represents the salaries that we have voted under civil government estimates.

Mr. LEWIS: But this item we have now, No. 360?

Mr. ROBB: No, this is for the salaries of enumerators and others who took the census.

Mr. JACOBS: Is it not a fact that these census enumerators were appointed by the Government without the assistance of the Civil Service Commission, and that in these appointments we have had patronage exercised in its most evil form?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not hear any answer. An answer might possibly embarrass the Government, if it ever hopes to be in office for another census. I would suggest to the hon. member that he inquire as to the possibility of appointments under the Civil Service Commission for temporary work of this nature, requiring very often re-appointment to the same office for a very few days in succession. The hon. member knows that as well as anyone else. All I hope for from this Government is that they maintain the Civil Service Act in the form in which it is to-day—indeed, that is somewhat beyond my hopes. If they succeed in doing that, then there will at least be less cause for complaint than there has been in the past. If, however, the hon. member feels like introducing a motion now, as a government supporter, for the appointment under the Civil Service Commission of officials doing enumerating temporarily once in ten years, it will be an evidence of loyalty to that act that I do not expect from hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. JACOBS: What I complain about particularly is that of the thousands who were appointed everyone seems to have been a supporter of the past government.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): The minister has said that the delay was caused through one or two of the eastern constituencies not being yet fully reported. In

my own constituency some of the enumerators complain that they are still unpaid. Of course, these men were not appointed by me; I was not even consulted. But they are complaining to this day, and I would like to know how the matter stands.

Mr. ROBB: It is exactly in my hon. friend's consituency that the trouble arises. The Chief Commissioner in Bonaventure has been dilatory in sending in returns, particularly those relating to the accounts of the persons who worked under him. It was necessary to send a man down there.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Before the resolution carries it seems to me that we ought to have something definite from the ministerial benches as to the attitude they take. Does redistrubtion depend, in the opinion of the minister, upon the completion of that part of the work which has not yet been reported? Or does the minister agree with the leader of the Opposition when he says that there is already enough information available on which to base a redistribution bill? If we are to be told that because of a little trouble in this or that constituency there is to be no redistribution, we want to know it now. On the other hand, if the attitude of the Government is that the census enumeration has advanced to such a point that there is no reason why a redistribution bill should not now be brought down—very good; I have no objection to the item passing. But if that information is not forthcoming, then this item should be held up until we find out exactly what position the work is in; and this is the only opportunity of ascertaining that.

Mr. ROBB: May I remind my hon friend, in the first place, of the statement of the leader of the Opposition that it is very hard to determine exactly when this work will be completed? The leader of the Opposition has just told us that in the case of the last census he was disappointed on three different occasions and found its completion delayed. In 1911 we took a census in this country, and we did not have a redistribution bill until the session of 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Did the hon. gentleman say 1914?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: 1913.

Mr. BELAND: No; I have a clear recollection that the redistribution bill was passed in June, 1914.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The act is chapter 51 of the statutes of 1914; it was assented to in June, 1914. I had the honour of being on that committee. The committee was appointed immediately after the House assembled in January, and its labours were not completed until June. To readjust the boundaries of constituencies all over the Dominion where county boundaries do not exist and where the population has increased in urban centres; to provide for the fair adjustment of boundaries in the cities, is no easy task. Hon. gentlemen who have had to do with work of this kind will realize that a redistribution, in order to be successful, would occupy the attention of Parliament for three or four months.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is all the more reason why we should not further delay this matter; we should get at it at the earliest possible moment. Now, there was this difference between the situation in 1911 and that in 1922. In 1911 the Conservative party had a large majority in the House; there was no chance in those days of anything giving way. But that is not the case with this Government; from what we have seen during this session there are all kinds of chances in the present circumstances. But the Minister of Trade and Commerce has made up his mind—I have no doubt that he has his leader's authority for it—that there will be no redistribution bill this session and that, therefore, there is no need for haste; he can jog along with these figures and bring them down at the end of the session or the beginning of next session. He can see, if he opens his eyes, that there is no very serious demand from the Progressive party for a redistribution bill this session—that is, if we may judge from their attitude in the House to-night.

10 p.m.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know what the figures are, and I am not saying they were not delayed in the past. But I do think the committee has a right to know now exactly how this matter stands; we should not be put off with vague statements as to troubles here or troubles there. We want to know whether there is enough information in the hands of the Government to enable the House to consider this question. It is an easy thing for the minister to get that information, and I am afraid he will have to get it.

Mr. ROBB: I will be prepared to give my hon. friend such information as I have,

but I will not guarantee the figures are complete. As the leader of the Opposition said a few moments ago, this matter is entirely in the hands of the Chief Statistician. Surely my hon. friend does not ask me to hand out reports the correctness of which he himself cannot be assured.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not asking that at all. But the minister only a moment ago mentioned correspondence he had received from the census commissioner, indicating that the reports might be finished in a few days. All I ask is that we have the information down to date.

Mr. ROBB: As soon as it is finished, I will give it to my hon. friend.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No; I want the hon. gentleman to find out now how it stands and when the final report can be made.

Mr. COOTE: Before the resolution is declared carried I want to refer briefly to the remarks made by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). I think his remarks were entirely out of place. I am a new member in this House and know very little of the mode of procedure, but it seemed to me that the hon. member was a little out of order: I understood we were passing estimates and not discussing the matter of redistribution. For my part, I feel that we should have redistribution and that we should have it at this session. I understand that an opportunity will be afforded later to discuss that matter and if there is, I will place myself on record then. But I cannot allow the remarks which have been made by the hon. member for South Wellington to pass without letting him know where I stand.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Coote) says that he is a new member, and that explains why he would give any great attention to the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Now if we are to take the opinion of the leader of the Opposition seriously we would not be losing all this time on the present item because he told the committee that we had enough information, or at any rate that the minister would have enough, to justify proceeding with the redistribution bill. As my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote) said, we are discussing this estimate and not the subject of redistribution. Therefore I would say to you Mr. Chairman, that we had better deal with the present item and not venture upon a discussion of redistribution at the present time. When we come to the matter of redistribution the curiosity of my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I am sure, will be set at rest, to our satisfaction at any rate. In connection with this matter I am sure the minister has every right to take the stand that he has taken. As has been pointed out my hon. friends to the right appointed these officials. The present minister did not have anything to do with the matter and had no chance to appoint competent officials; consequently he has had to put up with the work of men appointed by the late government. The work, in many districts, has been poorly done—that is evident—and we will have to wait until we get satisfactory information. This the minister has promised in good time.

Mr. MANION: When we listen so often to hon. members to our left calling us down for delaying the business of the House it makes us feel a little bit fatigued to say the least. To-night we had to sit here for one whole hour listening to the tiresome repetition of arguments intended to kill a certain bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): My hon. friend does not want to make a misstatement. The hon. member who occupies the floor in reference to the bill referred to is not connected with the Progressive party.

Mr. MANION: I am quite agreeable that my hon. friend should disown—

Mr. NEILL: And he was not out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANION: My hon. friend from Comox-Alberni, (Mr. Neill) knows something about being out of order because he was out of order for a solid hour this evening. I was remarking for my hon. friend (Mr. Johnston) that although he might not claim the hon. member for Comox-Alberni, at the same time hon. members to my left voted solidly in favour of killing the bill in question. Therefore, when we are looking for a little information on a subject like this it is not open to my hon. friend from Last Mountain to address lectures to us in view of such actions on the part of hon. members sitting around him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: None of us who sat in the House with the hon. member for Last Mountain and witnessed his unfailing fidelity to the Liberal party, irrespective wholly of where he sits, are surprised now when, in any difficulty, we see him coming through the fog and the mist with the lifeboat to whatever minister may be in trouble. If the minister will say that the expression of belief that I gave is right—that in so far as the census returns are concerned there is no reason on that score for the delay of redistribution—then the subject of redistribution enters no further into the discussion on this item. This item bears on redistribution only to the extent that it involves the question as to whether we are far enough on now to go ahead or not. Now, I took the responsibility of expressing the opinion—from what I had read, from what I had seen issued from the census office—that we are. If the minister will say that is right then, so far as I am concerned, there is no objection at all to the item passing; but I would not like to have the item pass without any information as to the extent the census has advanced and then, when the resolution of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) comes up, have it met by hon. gentlemen opposite with the assertion "Oh we are not far enough on with the census." Let us know before this item passes if we are far enough on so far as the census is concerned. Then, well and good—there ends the relationship of redistribution to this item.

Mr. ROBB: For the information of my hon. friend I repeat the statement I received from the Dominion Statistician on the 20th April. Indeed, I had better read the whole of the letter and then the leader of the Opposition will know as much about the subject as I do:

> As the data for any particular group of census districts, cities, towns, etc., became available they have been given to the press, during the past fall and winter, in the form of mimeographed sheets for simultaneous publication. In each case the figures were given as preliminary only. In this way, the results for the several provinces, by electoral districts, and for the leading cities and towns of Canada, were given out between September 1921 and March 1922. Altogether nineteen statements of this kind were issued.
>
> As the returns for each province become available in finally revised form they are being issued in printed leaflets. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island have already appeared in this form, and similar bulletins for Manitoba, and British Columbia are in the press. Those for Saskatchewan and Ontario will follow next week—

That is the week following. I am not sure that I have received them yet or not.

> —whilst Quebec will appear last.
>
> In the case of Quebec more than the ordinary amount of revision has been found necessary, and unless there is urgent demand for the results we would like to spend a few days longer on the final totals.
>
> R. H. COATS,
> Dominion Statistician.

I think that is a reasonable request.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute the accuracy of the statement but it does not say whether or not the census is far enough advanced. If that is all the information the minister has, and he does not know whether or not the census is far enough advanced, there is no reason why he should not know by Thursday—no reason at all. He can go to his chief statistician and come to this House and say "yes" or "no" in reply to the question. Now would it not be well to have that information definitely before we go further?

Mr. ROBB: The estimates of the Trade and Commerce Department will not all be passed to-night and when the estimates of the department are up again I may have that information for him. But my right hon. friend was Prime Minister. He himself thought at one time to have a revision. He was disappointed and he fixed another date. Again he was disappointed and another date was fixed on. For the third time he was disappointed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Just twice.

Mr. ROBB: I will give my hon. friend a promise to bring down the information when we go into committee again. In the meantime I suggest we make some progress.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Before leaving this subject I call attention to this one fact: Before the last census was undertaken the then Minister of Trade and Commerce through the chief statistician wrote to every member of the House to ascertain whether he had recommendations to make as to the manner in which the census should be taken in his constituency. I made certain recommendations for my constituency, and inquired whether I would have anything to say as to the appointment of the census officers and enumerators. I was told "No", and the result of it is that not being consulted I did not nominate anybody. To this day a number of these men remain

unpaid, and the department has to send men down to the constituency in order to clear up the situation. Now I believe in the popular representatives having something to say with respect to these matters, particularly as regards their own constituencies. If I had been consulted as regards the county of Bonaventure, bearing in mind the experience that I have had on two other occasions, I certainly would have given advice that would have saved all this trouble, and the same remark applies to many other members. Unfortunately, the appointments were made on the basis of party patronage and to please friends of the Government. The result is that these appointments are unsatisfactory and the whole thing has been botched.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member reminds the committee of some trouble in the past in the county of Bonaventure. I was member for the constituency of Portage la Prairie when the census of 1911 was taken but I assure the hon. member that I was not consulted as to who was appointed to take the census, and the woes and troubles of my hon. friend are as nothing to those I enjoyed because of a much less efficient census, much less expedition, much less satisfaction, and far greater delay.

Item agreed to.

Gold and Silver Marking Act, Administration of, $6,000.

Mr. ROBB: That is to enable the inspector to do more travelling and look over the work more completely. It has been a bit neglected this year owing to war activities.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He is not going to Florida.

Mr. ROBB: Oh I do not think so.

Item agreed to.

Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research (salaries and expenses including printing and stationery and the collection and distribution of information, and for studentships, fellowships, social problems and forestry study), $120,000.

Mr. STEVENS: This is a very important matter. In fact, I wish it were a great deal more extended than provided for in the resolution. Is there any intention of bringing in a bill similar to the one passed last session for the establishment of a standards bureau? I think this work carried on by the Advisory Council has proved beyond all question the desirability of the establishment of such a standards bureau in Ottawa. I have received personally—and I am sure the minister has received—many requests from industrial concerns asking for the extension of this splendid work. Has the minister that matter under contemplation, or is it simply intended to allow the work to go on as at present? I am not criticizing the work, but I do not think it is going far enough, or really accomplishing what it might, if the provision were made which was made in the bill passed last year by this House and thrown out by the Senate.

Mr. ROBB: For the present year it is the intention of the department and the Government to continue the work carried on last year and to give it all the encouragement possible along these lines, but it is not the intention of the Government to bring in any additional vote this session. Between now and next session a careful study will be made of the work, and I am not committing myself to what will be done, but we will be prepared to make a statement next session.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the minister received any important correspondence in regard to the matter, urging the establishment of the bureau?

Mr. ROBB: We have received requests from many boards of trade throughout Canada, from some of the colleges and from many organized bodies. It seems to be approved by the people of Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: Would the Government not consider that the exhaustive study of this question by the parliamentary committee during the session of 1919 or 1920, and the decisions of that committee and of the House last session, would warrant them in introducing the bill without further investigation? Does the hon. minister not think that the House seems to have been fully advised of the need? The Upper House perhaps might be enlightened as well. As far as the ranks of the Government are concerned, there should be sufficient information on hand, without further study on the part of the minister or his colleagues.

Mr. ROBB: The hon. gentleman must not forget that there is a new House of Commons here, and that there is a financial side to this issue. We desire this year, as far as possible, to economize, and, for that reason, we are not going to bring in any further recommendation to the House.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. minister might give me the consolation of saying that he would see that the evidence taken before

the committee is supplied to the new members of the House, because I am sure they will peruse it with interest and profit.

Mr. ROBB: If it is available it will be distributed.

Item agreed to.

International Customs Tariffs Bureau, $2,462.

Mr. CAMPBELL: Will the minister explain what is involved in this?

Mr. ROBB: A number of nations are interested in this International Customs Tariff Bureau, and last year the Government of Belgium, through their Consul General at Ottawa, reported to the Government at Ottawa the marked increase in the expenses now connected with the bureau, and recommended that Canada, as well as the other countries, be requested to increase its quota three times.

Mr. CAMPBELL: What are the functions of this bureau?

Mr. ROBB: To compile international tariffs, gather information and distribute it to the nations.

Item agreed to.

Trade Commissioners and Commercial Agents—salaries and contingencies thereof and miscellaneous expenditures in the development and extension of Canadian trade, $280,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Really, I think this is perhaps the most important item, although not the largest, in the estimates of the hon. minister. The hour is so late that one hesitates to make any observation at all.

Mr. ROBB: Would the hon. member like it to stand?

Mr. STEVENS. I do not wish to delay the estimates, but, perhaps, if the minister would let it stand, we could go on with something less important.

Mr. ROBB: The item will stand.

Item stands.

Gas and electricity inspection, $176,330.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps the minister will explain this increase in view of decreasing costs.

Mr. ROBB: The increase is attributable to statutory salary increases to the staff.

Mr. STEVENS: Does civil government not take care of most of the salaries in the department?

Mr. ROBB: No, we have the men outside.

Mr. STEVENS: This is for the inspectors?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, inspectors throughout the country.

Mr. STEVENS: In other words, this item will cover the salaries of outside inspectors, their travelling expenses, and such like?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: And the increase is made up of increases in salaries to those inspectors?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Government imposes charges for this inspection, does it not?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: A considerable revenue is derived in that way?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, there is a surplus in regard to this work. It more than carries itself.

Item agreed to.

Printing of Parliamentary and departmental publications, including cost of translation, $200,000.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a large increase which I should like the minister to explain. Would he also state to whom this money is paid? That is, is it simply paid to the Printing Bureau; or how much of it, if any, is paid outside of the Printing Bureau? Does this include the publications of the statistical bureau; and if it does, is there a corresponding decrease in other departments owing to the consolidation of the statistical branches?

Mr. ROBB: As to the consolidation feature of the matter, I am not prepared to answer the question offhand, but this amount is all paid to our own Printing Bureau. As my hon. friend will remember, prior to last year this work was done by the different departments, and when it was transferred to this department of printing, a guess was made as to how much it was going to cost and we guessed wrong. Therefore, we have to put in a sufficient amount to cover the expenses this year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much was spent last year?

Mr. ROBB: I regret I have not that information with me.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): The minister has stated that formerly this printing was done in various departments. Will he tell us if he has effected economies by consolidating the printing under one department?

Mr. ROBB: That was the idea of the consolidation. We shall be able to measure that when the returns are all completed.

Mr. STEVENS: In the absence of a little defence for the previous government by the minister, I cannot allow my hon. friend (Mr. Johnson), with his usual subtlety, to get away with the suggestion carefully concealed or partially veiled in his question. This consolidation was commenced long ago by the late government, and it was fairly well accomplished, with the object of effecting these economies. I asked the minister if he could show us that other departments were not duplicating some of these charges which, apparently and undoubtedly, have been charged to this department. He said that he had not the information with him. I do not think it would be fair to leave the committee with the opinion that the late government did not effect this economy. I do not wish to harp on the matter, but my hon. friend was just a little too clever in the way he put his question.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I have another question to ask in connection with this item, and I should like to assure the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) that he gave me credit for something that was not in my mind. I had rather thought this estimate of more importance than the reputation of any party. The question I would like to ask is: To what extent is there a demand for these government publications? I speak from observation covering a number of years, and it seems to me that, in past years, no matter what party happened to be in power, some sections of the country were flooded at times with publications that were not needed. I believe they have a value; but they have a value only if they go into the hands of those who will read them. Are they asked for, or does the department distribute them more or less indiscriminately?

Mr. ROBB: They are asked for, and the mailing list is revised periodically. Post cards are sent out asking those who have received these reports if they desire them continued. If no reply comes, the names of those who do not reply are eventually taken off the list, and the list is revised from time to time.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson), has brought up a question of some importance. I suppose, as a member of Parliament, a man receives a fairly liberal supply of these publications. I think I can speak for the average member of this House when I say that fully one-half of the publications, which are issued by the government and sent to the individual member, are of no practical use at all. We do not look at them; we do not open them; we consign them to the waste-paper basket a minute or two after we receive them. I am sorry to say that my experience has been that many business houses which receive these reports do the same thing. The mailing list could be very greatly curtailed. Five or six years ago the quantity of unnecessary printing that was done in this country was a positive scandal, and we undertook to see what could be done to remedy that difficulty. Not only was the number of publications greatly reduced, but the mailing list was greatly reduced. I believe the minister would perform a very valuable service if he would look into the question of a further reduction of the mailing-list and also a further reduction in the number of publications. In my own case, and I think it is the case with every member of this House and every member of the local legislatures in this Dominion, more than half what is sent might well be dispensed with and that money saved. If the minister will give that matter his consideration I think he will do a valuable service.

Mr. ROBB: I will give my hon. friend that assurance so far as my own department is concerned. I cannot be responsible for other departments.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Béland the House adjourned at 10.35 p.m.

Wednesday, May 3, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

M. J. HANEY—CONTRACTS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What contracts, if any, had M. J. Haney, of Toronto, or the Company of which he was President, with the Government of Canada, during the years 1898 and 1899, or about that time, for the construction of the Crow's Nest Pass?
2. Were tenders called for this work?
3. What was he paid for such contracts?
4. What amount, if any, was he paid on account of extras from these contracts?
5. What other contract work, if any, did he do for the Government of Canada during the years from 1896 to 1911, and what was the total sum received during these years by the said Haney?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. None.

2, 3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Railways and Canals Department—In 1900, Michael J. Haney had a contract for the construction of the Hillsborough bridge at Charlottetown, P.E.I., for which he was paid the sum of $1,231,125.29. A number of other contracts were undertaken during the period in question by the firm with which Mr. Haney was connected. It is, however, impossible to say what was received by Mr. Haney himself in connection with said contracts.

Public Works Department—Port Stanley, Ont., harbour, $207,650; Port Burwell, Ont., harbour, $8,880.55; Depot Harbour, Ont., wharf, $219,303.17.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the Government received a copy of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of British Columbia on December 1, 1921, (which sets out that at a conference between the federal Government and the Government of British Columbia, the federal Government accepted responsibility for the initiation and administration of legislation relating to Mother's Pensions, Old age Pensions and other problems relating to the Improvement of Social Conditions?
2. If so, what were the terms of such agreement as aforesaid?
3. Will legislation be introduced this session to give effect to it and to establish Old Age Pensions in Canada?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. A copy of a resolution of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, passed on December 2 last, was received by the federal government on December 12. This resolution refers to a conference which was alleged to have been held between representatives of the Dominion government and provincial governments at Ottawa in 1919. It is stated that consideration was given on this occasion to the responsibilities of the Dominion and provincial administrations with regard to the initiation and administration of legislation relative to mothers' pensions, old age pensions, and other problems relating to the improvement of social conditions, and that it was the understanding of the representatives of British Columbia at this meeting that the Dominion government accepted full responsibility for the enactment of legislation dealing with old age pensions. The resolution of the Legislative Assembly endorsed the principle of old age pensions and directed the attention of the federal authorities to the desirabiltiy of legislation being enacted.

A resolution was adopted unanimously at the National Industrial Conference, which was held in 1919, of Dominion and provincial representatives with representative employers and labour men in favour of the appointment of a board or boards to inquire into the subjects of state insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity and old age. The text of this resolution appears in the published report of the National Industrial Conference. The published report, however, contains no reference to any separate conference between the Dominion and provincial ministers on the subjects referred to in the resolution of the Legislative Assembly of British Columbia, and there is nothing on record in the Privy Council office on the subject. Presumably, therefore, any discussions which may have occurred between the federal and provincial ministers on these matters were of an informal nature.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Does the Aluminum Company of America, Massena Springs, New York, pay a licence for the electric power which it takes from Cedar Rapids, Quebec?
2. If so, what is the date and amount of said licence?
3. If not, why is said company exempted from Federal Law 6-7 Edward VII, Chapter 16?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Only companies exporting power from Canada come under the provisions of the act.

RATES ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

Mr. COOTE:

How much did railways, owned by the Government of Canada, pay in connection with the press advertising campaign on rates, conducted by the Canadian Railway Association, during the last two years?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM: $31,328.92.

STENOGRAPHERS AND MESSENGERS

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Is it true that the stenographers and messengers of the House of Commons are receiving the same rate of pay?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to adjust salaries in proportion to the importance of the duties performed?
3. If so, when?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Some newly appointed stenographers who are single receive the same salary as old messengers who are married and have long been in the service.
2. and 3. Under consideration.

FIRST CANADIAN CONTINGENT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many men composed the first Canadian Contingent that went overseas in the Great War?
2. Approximately, how many had previous training in the Militia of Canada, and how many had not?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. 30,808. (This does not include the Newfoundland regiment, the Lincoln regiment, nor the Royal Canadian regiment, which went to Bermuda.)
2. Approximately ninety-two per cent of the first contingent received previous military training. The exact number is not available until the Hollerith system is completed.

CANADIAN EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What was the total amount of Canadian trade for the fiscal year 1876-77, and the total amount of exports and imports during the same period?
2. What was the total amount of Canadian trade for the fiscal year 1921-22, and the total amount of exports and imports during the same year.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Fiscal year 1876-77—

Total imports entered for consumption	$94,126,394
Total exports, Canadian produce	68,030,546
Total exports, foreign produce	7,111,108
Total Canadian Trade	$169,268,048

2. Fiscal year 1921-22—

Total imports entered for consumption	$ 747,762,984
Total exports, Canadian produce	740,240,680
Total exports, foreign produce	13,686,329
Total Canadian Trade	$1,501,689,993

[Mr. Graham.]

TRENT CANAL IMPROVEMENT

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What sums of money were expended for the construction and improvement of the Trent canal, by the federal Government, since the beginning of its construction?
2. What sums of money were expended for the same purpose each year, from 1911 to 1922 respectively?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. $20,702,514.80, of which $18,849,361.11 was on construction account and $1,853,153.69 for improvements.
2. Year ending March 31st—

1911	$ 1,744,942 25
1912	1,820,590 32
1913	1,204,105 73
1914	1,177,596 67
1915	1,058,566 35
1916	1,027,519 03
1917	624,441 78
1918	613,980 85
1919	412,507 25
1920	1,077,251 36
1921	690,197 13
1922	673,261 15
Total	$12,124,959 87

Of the total, $10,889,863.51 was on construction account and $1,235,096.36 for improvements.

WELLAND CANAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What has been the total sum expended by the federal Government for the construction and improvements of the Welland canal, since the beginning of said construction?
2. What sums of money were expended for the same purpose during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921, respectively?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1.

Present Welland Canal	$29,399,405 93
Welland Ship Canal (under construction	30,787,977 90
Total	$60,187,383 83

2. Year ending March 31st—

1913	$ 305,571 34
1914	1,071,733 68
1915	4,147,533 84
1916	4,978,030 64
1917	3,532,546 21
1918	1,262,136 94
1919	1,868,239 01
1920	3,631,289 81
1921	5,192,629 41
1922	5,593,580 97
Total	$31,583,291 85

Of this sum $203,005.60 was on construction account present Welland canal, and $719,509.50 on improvement account. The balance, $30,660,776.75 was on construction of Welland ship canal.

POTLATCH INSTITUTION

Mr. LADNER:

1. Has the Indian Department asked for a report from the Anthropological Society on the Indian Institution, commonly known as the Potlatch?
2. Were certain Indians of British Columbia referred by the Indian Department to the Anthropological Society to present their case in favour of the said Potlatch Institution?
3. Has the report from the said society been made.
4. If so, is it favourable to the Potlatch Institution, and does it favour or recommend any amendment to the Indian Act whereby the Indians might still carry on certain of their Potlatch practices?
5. Have there been over fifty convictions of Indians during the past six months, in British Columbia, for taking part in potlatches? If not, how many were there?
6. Are there at the present time twenty-three Indians serving jail terms for having taken part in potlatches?
7. Is there in the Indian Department a petition presented by certain British Columbia Indians, asking for a commission to investigate the Potlatch Institution?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. The Indian Department asked the Anthropological Division of the Department of Mines for a report on the Potlatch.
2. No.
3. Yes, from the Anthropological Division.
4. The report makes no recommendation in the matter.
5. There have been fifty convictions.
6. No; four are serving sentence, the parole of three of whom is under consideration by the Department of Justice.
7. Yes

RAILWAY COMMISSION—CHIEF TRAFFIC OFFICER

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Who is the Chief Traffic Officer of the Railway Commission at Ottawa?
2. When was he appointed.
3. What is his salary?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. On account of the death of the board's chief traffic officer, Mr. James Hardwell, the position is at present vacant.

2 and 3. See answer to No. 1.

VICTORIA BRIDGE—TOLLS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

What revenue has been derived from the collection of tolls on the Victoria bridge between Montreal and St. Lambert, during the year 1921, excepting the tolls paid by the Grand Trunk Railway?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: $117,446.65.

ISLE PERROT BRIDGE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the bridge over the canal at Isle Perrot an interprovincial bridge? If not, why is a vote of $50,000 included in the estimates of 1922-23 for such an enterprise?
2. Is the above amount of $50,000 the only disbursement that the Dominion Government has undertaken to pay for the said bridge construction?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. The bridge in question is on the interprovincial highway in course of construction between Ontario and Quebec, and which crosses the canal lock at St. Ann's, which obliges the Department of Railways and Canals to bear a portion of the cost. The Quebec government has agreed to contribute $600,000, and the Department of Railways and Canals, $150,000; the latter on the following conditions:—

1. That the design and construction of the proposed bridge, and more particularly of the bascule span, be subject to the approval of the chief engineer.
2. That upon completion the operation and maintenance of the bascule span be assumed by the department.
3. That not less than one-quarter of the tolls collected shall be remitted to the department.

2. No; it is the first instalment towards the $150,000 agreed upon.

TRAFFIC IN NARCOTICS

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT moved:

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence and reports exchanged directly between the Health Department of Canada and J. A. Foisy, Dominion Drug and Chemical Company, and the North Eastern Drug Chemical, Limited, of Montreal, regarding narcotics reports in the years 1919-20-21, and principally reports made by the Mounted Police.

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health): I suggest that my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) drop this motion, because it is not considered advisable, in the public interest, that these reports by the mounted police, having reference to the traffic in narcotic drugs, should be made public. In the meantime, if the hon. gentleman wants any information in regard to this matter, he may come to the department and it will be available to him.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Dropped.

PROTECTION TO WORKMEN—OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary, Montreal) (Translation) moved the following proposed resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the fact that an act already exists for the protection of workmen against accidents while engaged in their work, it is desirable that same protection be afforded to all workmen contracting sickness while performing, or due to performance of their work or trade, inasmuch as the federal Government is concerned.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there exists in Canada and in almost every civilized country laws which are so framed as to safeguard the workman against accidents resulting while fulfilling his duties in the various occupations, such as: in house building, mills, factories, ship-yards, ship-building, loading and unloading of vessels, public stores, mines, quarries and in all establishments where explosives are manufactured; in all places where machinery driven by any kind of motor is utilized; these laws entitle the victims or their representatives to an indemnity the nature and importance of which are determined, I believe that in the case of a person disabled or where death is caused by diseases said to be occupational, this person should derive some benefit if not from the Insurance Act against accidents at least from similar legislation. This legislation would apply not to all diseases in general, but to special diseases pertaining to certain industries which are responsible sometimes for the death of those who are so employed. They are also the cause of frequent unemployment the character of which is well known and are thus well termed occupational diseases. At the opening of the Congress for Labour legislation on accidents held at Berne, Switzerland, in 1891, Mr. Numa Droz thus expressed himself: "It is evident that the question of accidents is intimately interwoven with other labour questions. The one dealing with accidents to workmen, if we justly include, within its scope, occupational diseases forms as it were the centre and heart of labour legislation."

In the meantime, the views of Mr. Numa Droz have been embodied in the laws of Switzerland and occupational diseases are included in the liabilities to which industries are subject; this gives rise to claims whether mere unemployment or death be the outcome, and compensation is adequately determined in each case. The word accident is very broad in its acceptation; very much so, when it stands as an equivalent for disability; wounds resulting from or in connection with the work of the labourer. An accident may be defined: the act by which the human body or parts thereof are affected or destroyed under the influence of unforeseen events. The human body or any part of it, through the medium of some morbid agent may be the cause of disability or of death, whether instantaneous or otherwise.

However, in all cases the employer should be held responsible towards the victim of the accident. Any morbid cause, whatever may be the name given to this agent, let it be called belt, pulley, dynamo, elevator, phosphorous, copper, lead, quicksilver, etc., the name is nothing—any morbid cause which produces disability or death at any period, by impairing or destroying the human body, in my opinion, should give rise to damages whether it is followed by ordinary unemployment, or death be the consequence. Take for instance a labourer who receives a wound or fractures one of his limbs while working, if as a consequence tetanus or mortification sets in and causes death, certainly the employer is held responsible. Let the end come after five days or months, that does not prevent the claim to be well founded, because one part or a number of parts of the human body have been impaired and then destroyed, within a certain time, creating disability or death through a morbid process which is brought on by the wound at first, and then followed by complications throughout the whole system.

Let us now consider certain cases of occupational diseases, the existence of which is well known. Persons who are employed in the manufacture of chemical matches or in pyrotechnical works—and they are numerous—are subject, owing to the nature of the work, to different accidents. Sometimes the matter which enters into the preparation of matches ignites and explodes and is often the cause of burns; in such cases there can be no doubt that the manufacturer, as proprietor, is to be held responsible. Accompanying the dangers in the nature of accidents, which may result from certain manipulations, to workmen engaged in the manufacture of chemical matches, there exists another more serious danger. It is a disease which has been called by the workmen themselves phosphorous poisoning and which science designates as "necrosis." It consists in the mortification of the facial and jaw bones

leading to disability and very often causing death. This disease is not general amongst the workmen; it affects but a few, and that is precisely why we may say that these persons have been victims of an accident which pertains to the special danger of the occupation followed, the work they are called upon to perform. This disease is the result of the phosphorous fumes which escape from ordinary phosphorous—the only one to which these accidents are attributed, as the case is not so with amorphous phosphorous or other substances. The use of the ordinary phosphorous in match factories was prohibited by the French government in 1889, thanks to the efforts of Dr. David and Mr. Truillot, because it was proved that the use of this process developed necrosis. Later, not having been able to enforce this decree, all possible precautions were taken to minimize this danger, the nature of the disease being well defined as occupational, owing to the substance that the workman is obliged to handle and the fumes which he inhales.

Upon the advice of Dr. Brouardel and the public health committee, the legislation had to be amended so as to oblige match manufacturers to have their employees examined every month instead of every six months. It is evident that this precaution of compelling the workmen to undergo a strict monthly inspection, in order to find out whether, during this short interval, they have not contracted a disease which is not generally contracted elsewhere, is proof that this disease is more especially an occupational one. Therefore, it would only be fair as well as necessary, to give the workman who is constantly exposed to this danger which he cannot escape, the benefit of the legislation which is his protection in case of an accident when he is at work. After having examined the workman, the medical attendant of the factory, according to his diagnosis of the case, either prescribes a rest, or giving up of the work, should he deem it necessary. The first prescription is usually the extraction of the teeth, a surgical operation required by the disease. But, that to which I shall particularly call your attention, and that which is of the greatest concern to me, is the fact that the workman is compelled to cease all work, and that this unemployment in which he, himself, has nothing to say, is enforced upon him by the medical attendant. This unemployment system had been in practice in France, until Mr. Fauré and several of his colleagues obtained that the workman who is thus condemned to inactivity should, during the time of unemployment, be treated as if he had been the victim of an accident, while at work, and draw full pay at the match factory.

In 1888, Mr. Felix Faure, admitted the necessity of protecting workmen from these so-called occupational diseases, in reply to Mr. Gabriel Raspail's proposal for such a measure. He told him that his request was quite fair, but that this legislation concerned the health department more than the labour department. Now that we have here, in Ottawa, a health department as well as a labour department, could they not emulate Switzerland and France in this matter of occupational diseases? Although these occupational diseases pertain to health, I think they should be dealt with by the Labour department. As in the case of accidents while on duty, it is a question of indemnifying the workman as much as possible for the injuries caused either by the machinery he uses, or by the material he handles.

The glass industry, where the workman exercises his trade at a temperature frequently of 400 degrees, which suggested the nick name of "fire food," unquestionably breeds an occupational disease. How many times is not the worker, under such an intense fire, overwhelmed by a cerebral congestion that brings on death or apoplexy, leaving paralysis in its wake? What a number of unfortunates come to our offices covered with cutaneous eruptions, as a result of alterations which take place in the blood through inhaling the fumes of illum inating gas which abounds in those work shops? How many of us have met such persons suffering from enormous distension of the cheeks, often more than an inch beyond the lower jaw-bone, caused by the continuous strain of glass-blowing which makes them say that they have "broken cheeks"—and the same may be said of their lungs. Since statistics show that 26 to 100 of such workmen suffer from cataracts, when forty years old, owing to the intense heat they constantly endure, and since it is known that in those industries, designedly to save coal, steam is forced over the fires, thus subjecting the workman to gaseous and sulphuric emanations that poison them; and that being so, is it possible to deny the occupational character of such diseases?

One of the most widely spread industries in all countries, and one which is the most disastrous because of the occupational dis-

ease it develops, is the textile industry. A staff of employees is imprisoned in buildings the ventilation of which is absolutely deficient; the atmosphere, in the carding and combing rooms, is filled with cotton or flax dust which the men and women breathe constantly, filling their lungs with this insalubrious dust. This industry requires a humid atmosphere frequently overheated to 35 degrees as in woollen factories. Workers of either sex labour the whole day in an atmosphere laden with steam; they wear damp clothing; their feet are constantly wet: they are obliged to leave the factory in all kinds of weather, be it autumn or winter, at meal time, and when the day's work is over, so that, in a country like ours they are exposed to the most dangerous chills. The class of people who work in these factories is very poor because they receive only famine wages which is not sufficient to provide them with proper shelter, clothing and food; and therefore, the inroads of tuberculosis are far-reaching amongst these people.

If we look into the statistical data concerning textile industries it will be seen that 25 per cent of the people working in those factories fall a prey to tuberculosis.

Among rubber workers, how many cases are there of individuals inhaling carbon sulphide the effects of which upon the brain are such that it may bring on temporary and sometimes permanent insanity, always causing a marked deterioration of the nervous system! In the process of vulcanization, chloride of sulphur injures the respiratory organs, sometimes causing asphyxiation, with the most serious after effects.

It will be sufficient to remember the pitiful experience of our soldiers, the victims of asphyxiating gases on the battlefields, to have a notion of its effects upon the body of a mechanic working in a shop where rubber is vulcanized.

Grinders, 'arm-tool or metal-polishers, using emery, grit or silicate grind-stones, glass-cutters, inhale copper dusts which, combining with the acids in the human body, generate copper sulphate, a very active poison. Emery or silicate dusts emitted by the wheels settle in the lungs of these workingmen and destroy the lung substance to such an extent that a member of the French Assembly, Dr. Armand Després once stated upon the floor of the House that a young man entering those workshops when fifteen years old was carried away by consumption at the age of thirty, and that statistical data revealed that eight out of ten were in that predicament.

I could cite many more instances which go to prove that there are occupational diseases which cause disability and even death; those I have already given are sufficient, I think, to support my contention. The law of nature is there to forbid any attempt against the lives of our fellow-men, be it for gain or other reasons, by imposing such conditions of existence or labour as I have mentioned. Money considerations do not entitle us to render a fellow-creature blind or to poison him, so as to accumulate wealth at the expense of his health.

Why should we not be as solicitous for an employee as the owner is for his horse which is hurt or falls sick while at work. Is it not true that in addition to his personal attendance, he gives his horse medicine and a more copious feeding and calls a veterinary surgeon? How different with man! When a working man who has but his day's wages for a living is a prey to sickness as a result of labour conditions, his employer deserts him; his salary is cut off; he gets neither a physician nor medicine and is very often driven to poverty, even if he does not lose his employment. And when sickness is due to the character of his work, should we not be at liberty to say that this man is entitled to some consideration for himself and his family? In my opinion this is an anomaly and it is the duty of every representative of an industrial constituency to try and suppress such an anomaly, lest later on his parliamentary record be invoked against him and he be charged with selfishness and indifference to the welfare of his constituents.

What a contrast, if we think it over, between this apparent indifference and those national outbursts of sentiment and philanthropy over infant mortality—which I deplore myself. Far-seeing citizens, including women, are sounding the alarm year in and year out; the subject is commented upon from the pulpit and this national calamity is deplored; the medical profession furnishes its quota of apostles; the dispensaries are increasing in number as are literary writings, associations and good advices from lecturers and sacrifices intended to check this scourge. All that, I admit, is worthy of such a cause; but after all, such admirable zeal is displayed only in order to face unfortunate consequences, it has to be acknowledged, arising from numerous causes the chief of which

are atavism, heredity, want and poverty. Let us begin by safeguarding the maid who toils in our workshops and may be a mother tomorrow; let us protect the man while at his work, especially the father of a family to enable him to bring home regularly, comfort and the necessaries of life, instead of giving to the community young women who are a prey to anaemia, sickness and exhaustion through working in spinning mills, laundries and rubber factories, and instead of marrying them to men intoxicated, poisoned, who bring to their families insufficient wages on account of frequent unemployment. And then the problem of infant mortality will be solved.

What! the laws would not have a single enactment acknowledging the claims of a working man who would come to you and say: I entered the workshop in perfect health; I was not a prey to any ailment and I had not a trace of the disease which afflicts me to-day and which, out of fifty or sixty patients, according to the testimony of medical men, claims twenty and more victims. When a working man will come to you and say: I entered this factory and after four or five years, I began to feel the effects of the disease which has reduced me to unemployment," or when the children in turn will reproach you: "You are responsible for our father's premature death; medical science recognizes and statistics testify that the nature of his work was the cause of his death"; when they will claim damages, will it not be difficult to ignore that this workman was the victim of a truly occupational disease?

I do not quite see the difference between the risks that a workman may incur in a factory, owing to the material he handles exploding or otherwise by poisoning resulting from the same material either by the fumes emitted and inhaled or through any other process of absorption which in a short while may cause disability or death.

What was the object of bringing down a Compensation Act on accidents? The legislator desired to come to the rescue of the workman, he wished to protect him against his own negligence, and carelessness. He did not take into account if the employer had used poor judgment or was guilty of negligence; he required but one condition for the enforcing of the law. He established the principle, and I think no exception should be made, that where there existed a danger pertaining to the nature of the work itself, thereby occasioning such conditions where accidents take place and which generally are followed by disability to carry on the work, it was the owner of this industry who should compensate him for the damage caused.

Starting from that established principle which is well recognized in Canada, we must consequently place occupational diseases on the same footing as accidents. We are indebted to the workingmen who fall victims of an explosion either in a mine or a factory. The same indebtedness is due, based on the same principle, to the workingmen who have been victims, in a chemical factory or other, of an occupational disease which has rendered them unfit to work and which sometimes may cause death.

I believe that the two casse are absolutely identical and that it is time to cry out with Waldeck Rosseau, the father of labour syndicates in France: "Forward, let us advance, run if necessary, but at least let us make some headway."

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I confess that I have not been able to follow all that my hon. friend has said in support of his motion; but in so far as it is his desire to have the federal government consider the welfare of its employees in matters both of sickness and of accident, I am in entire sympathy with the purpose that he has in view. I think, however, the motion, as it is worded, goes, beyond this, in that it refers to existing legislation, which is provincial, not federal legislation; and while I should not like to raise the question of the propriety of this House discussing provincial legislation, it is well, I think, to point out the possible bearing of this circumstance before my hon. friend presses his motion to a division. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in view of the fact that a law already exists for the protection of workmen against accidents while engaged in their work, it is desirable that same protection be afforded to all workmen contracting sickness.

Workmen's Compensation Acts, as the House well knows, are acts enacted by provincial legislatures, and no doubt provincial legislatures will also consider the question of extending social insurance to include insurance against sickness as well as compensation for accident. But I do not think this House could properly pass upon what the provinces should do in this matter. The resolution, however, is clearly ambiguous. The last clause of all—"inasmuch as the federal government is concerned"—

would seem to indicate that what my hon. friend has in mind is solely the employees of the federal government. As I have already said, as regards the employees of the Government, we may very properly consider whether they should not be protected in the performance of their duties against sickness just as well as against accident, and to that extent, I am wholly in sympathy with my hon. friend's motion. But so far as it involves any expression of opinion as to what should be done by provincial legislatures, I do not think this House should consider the question further. I think my hon. friend's purpose has been well served by the able speech he has made upon the resolution, and by having presented arguments which we can all read when we have an opportunity of perusing the report of the debate.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member (Mr. Deslauriers) wishes to withdraw his motion?

Mr. DESLAURIERS: Yes.

Motion withdrawn.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY EMPLOYEES—PENSION RIGHTS AND STATUS

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, immediate steps should be taken by the Government to restore the pension rights and status of all employees and ex-employees of the Grand Trunk railway who were deprived thereof owing to participation in a strike on the system in the year 1910, to the end that all such may secure their just rights pursuant to the terms and true intent of the settlement made between the parties.

He said: In my absence on April 10, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), referring to this resolution, said:

There is no need for this resolution inasmuch as the Government has already taken steps in the direction proposed. The Government has been negotiating with a view of seeing that a long standing injustice should be remedied without further delay: If it is not possible to effect by negotiation what we hope and believe will be attained by negotiation, then the Government will bring in the necessary legislation to see that the injustice that was done to employees of the Grand Trunk railway involved in the strike of 1910, in virtue of the terms and conditions of its settlement not having been complied with, is duly remedied.

I read with great interest and satisfaction the remarks of the Prime Minister, and in view of what he said on that occasion I certainly have no desire at the present time to press this motion. I should be glad, however, if my hon. friend could see his way clear to give me an opportunity later on in the session, if perchance negotiations fail, or if no legislation is brought forward, to deal with the subject matter of this motion. I am very much in earnest about it, and I realize that the Government are as well. Apparently we are in accord in our views, and if the Prime Minister would be kind enough to promise me this consideration I should appreciate it very much and, on the strength of such an assurance, I would move the adjournment of the debate on the motion.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Not only am I very much pleased to meet my hon friend's wishes, but should negotiations fail and should it be necessary for the Government to consider introducing legislation, I will assist the hon. member in carrying his resolution.

Mr. BOYS: I am entirely satisfied with the Prime Minister's statement and I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SINKING OF THE CON REIN

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the Petition of the Eastern LaHave Transportation Company, Limited, and others, to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and of all communications and replies from the United States Government relative to the said petition and to the facts disclosed therein.

He said: The purpose of this motion is to call the attention of the House to a matter which, although primarily of local importance, is nevertheless of national interest as illustrating an anomalous situation that prevails in this country to-day. Last year, on the 29th of August, a vessel belonging to the Port of LaHave, in the province of Nova Scotia, was sunk near Block island in the state of Rhode Island, by an American submarine. The circumstances surrounding the collision were investigated by the United States marine authorities, and in a report which was submitted by that body it was found that Lieutenant John H. Hames, of the United States navy, commanding officer of the United States submarine K-4, was responsible for the collision between that submarine and the three-masted schooner Con Rein. I am instructed that under the conditions that exist in the United States it was not and is not possible for the owners of the ves-

sel to assert in the law courts, directly as against the United States government, a claim for damages which accrued to them as a result of the sinking of the vessel. Consequently they have petitioned the hon. the Prime Minister as Secretary of State for External Affairs to request the United States government to provide compensation for the loss which they sustained. That petition has come in the ordinary course and, I have no doubt, has been presented to the United States government. I am not aware of the result.

Now, the facts of this matter are so clear that there does not seem to be any doubt about the liability for the collision, and I would ask the Government to use every effort to urge upon the United States government the immediate settlement of the claim. But this affair illustrates the anomalous position of Canada with reference to matters in which Canadian citizens in the United States are interested. In order that any action might be taken in this matter, it is the duty of the Government of Canada to approach the United States government through the British Ambassador at Washington. It does seem to me that there ought to be a more direct method by which the Canadian people could have their interests protected in the American republic than through the diplomatic means now at our disposal through the British Embassy. I am aware that in previous sessions of this Parliament, when I had not the honour to be present, the question of representation at Washington was discussed, and I understand that it was announced as the policy of the late government to appoint a representative at Washington. So far no one has been appointed to such a position. I would submit to this House that many important matters that are continually arising as between the United States and Canada, adjacent as they are to one another, in which the interests of Canadian citizens are involved, require special care and attention; and it is in the interests of this country that a Canadian representative should be appointed to be resident at Washington. Looking over the proceedings of the last Imperial Conference, I gathered that the position of the British government in regard to the matter was that they had no objection to the appointment of such an official, working, of course, in conjunction with and under the British Ambassador. When one comes to think of the tremendous effect on this country of the numerous tariff changes which are made from time to time, and the legislation of every character passed by the United States Congress, and of the thousand and one other ways which one on a few moments' reflection can call to mind, in which action on the part of the United States government is of considerable interest to the people of Canada, one is forced to the conclusion that we should have a Canadian representative at Washington.

This case illustrates the peculiarly anomalous position in which a Canadian citizen is placed. A vessel has been sunk through the negligence of a United States naval officer, but the owners cannot proceed directly against the government of the United States in the courts of that country, and when they seek the services of our Secretary of State for External Affairs they find that instead of dealing directly with the United States Government, our Secretary of State must approach that government through the British Embassy. Naturally the British Embassy is occupied with very many problems affecting the two countries, and with the delay which is always characteristic of the interchange of communications between governments, a matter such as this is very likely to be pigeon-holed; whereas if we had a Canadian representative in Washington he could take it up immediately with the appropriate department of State there and secure a speedy settlement. All over Canada there must be cases arising in which our citizens are likely to be injuriously affected in the United States, and I submit—although I have not included this proposal in my resolution—that the House might well consider whether we should not hasten the appointment of a Canadian representative at Washington. The injustice which the owners of this vessel have suffered through the inevitable delay in securing a settlement of their claims, and the peculiar position of the whole matter. illustrate to my mind very clearly the necessity of the appointment which I have indicated.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, some fifteen years ago I had the honour of accompanying a deputation from Ottawa to attend a gathering at Washington of the North American Lumbermans' Association. We had the honour of being received by the then President of the United States, the late Theodore Roosevelt, and I remember he told us that the intercourse between Canada and the United States was becoming so important that the old roundabout system of dealing between the two countries through

the Colonial Office was entirely inadequate, and that it demanded that Canada should have nothing less than a representative resident at Washington. The president repeated that statement to several persons in our deputation, and we thanked him for the compliment he was paying to Canada's growing importance. I was of his opinion at that time and I still entertain it. I have had the advantage of hearing the question discussed in this House on many occasions, and it is a wonder to me and to all others who have given it any attention to see, when we go to Washington, insignificant little republics represented there by resident ministers or consul-generals, while this important country, with its many dealings with the United States, is without direct representation. I heartily concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and I hope one of the achievements of the government will be to have a permanent representative appointed to Washington so that our relations with our great neighbours will be further advanced as rapidly as possible.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, I should like to endorse the request of the hon. member for Pictou that action be taken by the Canadian Government in order to get a settlement of the case to which he refers. Although the amount involved is not very large as amounts go to-day, when we are thinking and spending in millions, perhaps the officials of the Government do not realize what the loss means to the people who are directly interested. The company spoken of is doing business in my own county, and is known as the East La Have Transportation Company, Limited. This company owned a vessel named the Con Rein, engaged in the coasting trade between ports in Nova Scotia and New York and other United States ports. At the time the accident happened, last August, the vessel delivered in the port of New York a cargo of lumber and took on board a return cargo of anthracite coal for Charlottetown, P.E.I. On the way down the sound she was rammed by a United States submarine. At the investigation, in which three qualified United States naval officers took part and held court it was conclusively proved that the officers of the submarine were at fault. Not only did the owners lose their ship, which was worth $70,000, but the owner of the cargo was also a loser, and the crew lost all their personal effects.

[Mr. Marcil.]

The owners of the vessel brought the case to the attention of the Canadian Government through their solicitors, and I understand the Department of External Affairs has taken action. But, as large bodies move slowly, not only in Canada but in the United States, I would impress upon the Government the necessity of endeavouring as early as possible to get the United States government to take early action towards a settlement of the owners' claims, and I am sure that after hearing the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou the Government will do their utmost to this end.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Government will be only too pleased to follow up this matter immediately along the lines suggested by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). There is no reason why the motion should not carry.

With regard to the larger question of the direct representation of Canada at Washington, this is receiving the consideration of the Government at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL DEEP SEA RACING

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, in order to encourage the shipbuilding and fishing industry, it is advisable that every possible assistance be given to the promotion and maintenance of international deep sea racing between Canadian deep sea fishing vessels and deep sea fishing vessels of other nations.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are two questions which I wish to discuss on this resolution—the encouragement that should be given to our shipbuilding industry; and the encouragement that should be given to our fishing industry.

It is a well-known fact, Sir, that shipbuilding has been engaged in since the earliest times of which we have any records. The first vessel that sailed the stormy sea was Noah's ark—and that was a great many years ago. But as you know, Sir, Noah was given inside information of a great flood that was to come, and he was told also to prepare for it and be ready, with his wife and his family, to go into the ark for shelter. That boat, though not, perhaps, as modern a vessel as those we have at the present day, fulfilled the purpose for which it was intended, and, after a number of days passed on the stormy sea, came to rest on mount Ararat.

Mr. McMASTER: Were they fishing?

Mr. DUFF: No, they were not fishing. You will also remember, Sir, from a reading of the history of Greece and Carthagena, that vessels were built in those days not only to sail the seas and carry the products of one nation to the other, but to engage in the fishing industry. Coming down to more modern times, in the sea yarns written by Kingsley, Stevenson and others, we read of the events which took place, especially in the Old Country and the United States, in connection with the building of ships in those days. Before steam came into use, when vessels were entirely propelled by sails, each country vied with the other in an effort to produce ships which would make voyages in the least possible time. We remember that ships sailed from England, went around Cape Horn and the Cape of Good Hope ,and proceeded to India, Australia and New Zealand, or ports on the Pacific coast. They carried goods manufactured in Great Britain, and brought back from India the spices of that land; from China, the teas which were raised there, and from Australia, wool and other products. These stories are very interesting, especially to those who take an interest in the sea. Not only did these ships carry valuable cargoes, but there was vigorous competition between them, prizes being sometimes offered by the owners of vessels to the captains as an inducement to make the shortest possible voyage. There was competition between ships owned by English merchants, and ships owned by Americans. I could go on for a long time, but I do not wish to occupy the attention of the House at too great length in emphasizing the interest taken in the ship-building business in those days, in order that the products of the land might be carried on the different oceans to far-away countries.

My object this afternoon is to endeavour to show the connection between the building of ships to carry the products of land and sea to foreign countries and a matter of international interest which I think the House should consider. In 1854 a New York pilot boat known as the America was taken across to England to participate in a race in which everybody in the Old Country was interested. In a contest off the Isle of Wight, at which Queen Victoria was present, the America defeated the English clipper which sailed against her, and what was known as the International Cup was brought from the Old Country to America. Since that time several attempts have been made to wrest that cup from the American people and take it back to the British Isles. A number of ships were built for that purpose; Lord Dunraven, who was a great yachtsman in the Old Country, for several years competed in this race off New York Harbour, but in all cases the American boat was the better or the faster one, and the cup has ever since remained in the possession of the New York Yacht Club. Sir Thomas Lipton also came across, first with his Shamrock I., and competed against the Vigilant, I think it was. In subsequent years, with the Shamrock II. and Shamrock III., he endeavoured without success to wrest that cup from the American yacht club. In my opinion, this competition of sailing vessels is something which should be encouraged by the people of Canada.

Some four years ago, as the result of a suggestion which I made in a speech at the annual gathering of the Nova Scotia fishermen that a fishing race should be held, some gentlemen in the city of Halifax and others who became interested decided to hold what is known as the fishermen's races. Accordingly, in 1920, off the harbour of Halifax, seven or eight fishing schooners, vessels of 100 tons which had been built for fishing purposes and had actually been engaged in that great industry, took part in a race which was the delight of those who witnessed it. The winner was the Delawana, and some Americans who were present from Gloucester and Boston, and who were interested in the fishing industry and in racing, suggested that there be a contest between the Delawana and a fishing schooner named the Esperanto. I do not need to go into the details of this contest; every man and woman in Canada read of the race which took place off Halifax harbour. One of the Halifax papers donated a challenge cup, known as the International cup, to the winner of this race. The American schooner proved the faster of the two, and she took the cup to the city of Gloucester. Last year the fishing captains and business men of Nova Scotia, with the view of getting the cup back, built several vessels to compete in the race which took place last fall. Several new fishing schooners were built—and I may say that one of the conditions of the race is that vessels taking part in it must have been engaged in fishing during the summer preceding the race. An impetus was thus given to shipbuilding in Nova Scotia as a result of the race in 1920. It will be remembered also that last fall the American fishing schooner Elsie com-

peted with the schooner Bluenose, built in my own town, for this international cup; and I am pleased to be able to say that the Bluenose, built by one of our enterprising shipbuilding firms, Messrs. Smith and Ruland, won the race on both days, with the result that the cup came back to Nova Scotia. According to an arrangement arrived at by an international committee composed of men from Nova Scotia, Boston and Gloucester, this year the cup must be defended by a Nova Scotia fishing vessel in Massachusetts Bay. In other words, we have to take our ship over to Massachusetts Bay rather than compete for the cup in home waters. You will have noticed that we have built in Nova Scotia two new schooners to enter the elimination races, with the view of seeing whether they are better than the Bluenose, and that American business men and fishing captains have during the last several months built two vessels to compete in this race. We feel that this is not a local matter; we feel that it is not even a provincial matter, but that it is of interest to the whole people of Canada, because the men who go over to Gloucester will go there as Canadians. Last year when the ship Elsie came down from Gloucester, she did not come alone, but was accompanied by an American naval vessel bringing representatives from many parts of the United States. The President, for instance, sent his own representative; the state of Massachusetts also sent a representative, as did also the city of Boston; the city of Gloucester sent their mayor. When we go this year, I ask the federal government to send their representative, I will also ask the Nova Scotia government to send their representative. So this is not a matter of purely local interest, but one of international interest. It is of interest not only to the province, not only to the whole of this country, but also to the people of the United States as well.

My object in bringing this matter to the attention of the House is this. In view of the fact that this is an international matter, a few people in the province of Nova Scotia, looking at it entirely from a racing and business standpoint, should not be expected to bear the whole cost of this venture. When the race was held in home waters, the cost was not so great and a few gentlemen in Nova Scotia, as I have said, were willing to put up the expenses, but taking part in this race in Massachusetts Bay will mean an extra expense, and while the owners of the Canadian ship are willing to risk losing their vessel in the race or en route, and also incur the depreciation that is bound to take place in the vessel, whilst she is in the race, they feel that as the country as a whole is interested in this matter, it should contribute something towards the cost. With this race being held year after year, more vessels will be built in the province of Nova Scotia, and more ships will sail on the seas carrying the products of Nova Scotia and of Canada to all parts of the world. It will also be of benefit to the fishing industry, which, in my humble opinion, has not had the encouragement in the past which it should have received. If the Government takes an interest in this matter and grants a small sum of money, I believe that not only will the shipbuilding industry be encouraged and more vessels be built to go on the high seas and the Grand Banks of Newfoundland to bring into the ports of Nova Scotia the products of the sea, but that the fishing industry also will be materially improved. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, why this encouragement should be given. The deep sea fishing fleet of Nova Scotia, and after all, that really means the deep sea fishing fleet of Canada, is a great asset to this country, and the Government would make no mistake in encouraging these hardy toilers of the sea, who go down to the sea in ships and risk their lives day after day on the ocean. It is a beautiful sight,—and if you saw it, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you would agree with me—to see about one hundred and twenty-five schooners, of about one hundred tons, hoisting their flags and making ready for the fishing grounds. They do not hoist the flag every day for the wind to blow it to tatters. The flag to the fishermen of Nova Scotia and their wives and sweethearts is an emblem and a symbol. It is a sacred matter. The fishermen of Nova Scotia do not believe in flapping the flag, they only fly the flag on special occasions. When these vessels are ready for sea their captains go to the custom house and clear for the deep, and the flag is hoisted to the masthead. It is a symbol that the vessel is ready to sail on an adventurous voyage, and that the crew are about to take risks that perhaps no other men in the world have to take in their daily occupation. The men down there do not cheapen the flag by raising it every day. They reserve it for this one special occasion when they clear for the Banks, when it is used as a symbol and an emblem that they are sailing out on the deep waters, to be away perhaps for two or

three months. Again, when the vessels return and are seen in the offing, perhaps three or four miles away, we go on the hill-tops with our binoculars and see the flag flying at the masthead, and we go down and raise our own flag to show, first that the men on board have safely returned, and secondly to signal that their families have been well while they were away. That is what we fly the flag for. It is a beautiful sight, I say, to see these ships with their flags flying, going out to sea and returning to port.

These men deserve some consideration from this Government. If we can vote $1,000 for Alpine climbers, as we are doing, and for other services not so deserving, I think this Government, in order to encourage the building of ships and the development of the fishing industry in this country might very well make a small grant for this purpose. It is a matter that is of interest to the whole people of Canada. I remember last year when the race was on, we were having inquiries from all over the country as to how it was going, and the telegraph offices kept open all night so that news of the race could be flashed every three minutes. I therefore think that Parliament should have no hesitation in voting the small sum of $5,000 for this very worthy object.

Shipbuilding and the fishing industry is no new thing in Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia all revere the memory of Hon. Joseph Howe, one of the greatest statesmen Canada has ever produced. We remember that when he was in this Parliament he gave expression to the opinion that in forty years from that date we would have at least 500,000 men engaged in the fishing industry in Nova Scotia. These hopes, however, have not been realized, and it seems to me this Liberal Government should endeavour as far as possible to realize the hopes of the great people of Nova Scotia. What did Joseph Howe say about these men? I think perhaps it is worthy of being put on the pages of Hansard:

Though my craft may be small, she is snug and she's trim,
And her crew are accustomed to battle the wave,
They are cheerful of heart, and athletic of limb,
And follow the business their bold fathers gave.
Through the storm and the sleet of the winter we sail,
While the rich and the feeble on couches repose;
There is health in our toil, and a charm in the gale,
And our courage still rises the harder it blows.
Every harbor from Sable to Canso's a home,
Every depth from the Banks to St. Lawrence we've tried,
And we care not though round Labrador we may roam,
Or sweep on the strength of old Fundy's fierce tide.
Now wealth from the waves we draw forth with our lines.
And now with a cargo of produce we're stow'd,
Or having a full freight of coal from the mines,
We slowly sail on with our cumbersome load.
Then who would exchange the rough life that we lead,
Joint owners at sea, and free sons of the soil,
At the bidding of others to labour and bleed
With but little of pleasure to sweeten our toil.
We build our own shallops—

That is what we do in Nova Scotia. It is a joint venture. Nearly every fisherman on board one of these fishing vessels, which cost perhaps $35,000, is an owner in the venture.

We build our own shallops, we rear our own crew,
And life has for us sweet endearment in store,
For though luxury's fetters our souls never knew,
Bright eyes bid us welcome when peril is o'er.

I think that is a most beautiful sentiment. I think it covers the whole ground, and that there is no necessity for me to argue further. I might, however, say that the shipbuilding industry in Nova Scotia needs some encouragement. All during the war we built every vessel it was possible for us to build, at the call of our country, but conditions have changed. Freights are now low, and if some encouragement is not given the shipbuilding industry in Nova Scotia, I am afraid there will not be many vessels built in the next few years. Therefore, not only to encourage the shipbuilding industry, but the fishing industry as well, so that we shall have more fishing vessels going down to the sea and bringing back its products for the whole people of this country, I think this Government would be very well advised to accept my motion and include in the supplementary estimates a small grant of $5,000 for this purpose.

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): I am sure every member of this House feels grateful to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) for the information he has given us. His remarks certainly appealed to my sporting and national spirit, when I realized that the Nova Scotia fishermen were holding their own against the Americans and other foreign competitors in the race. I must admit his eloquent words appealed to my

poetic feeling. If, as my hon. friend says, the encouragement of the Government would help the fishing and shipbuilding industry in that province, certainly some assistance should be given. I do not know whether the enthusiastic expression of my hon. friend "every possible assistance" can be accepted. It is rather wide. I have not given the matter sufficient consideration to commit the Government to any expenditure at the present time, but I promise my hon. friend that I shall give this matter full consideration, and I ask the House to allow me to move the adjournment of the debate so that I may later on convey to my hon. friend the decision of the Government on the question.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

House again in Committee on Bill No. 16—Mr. Woodsworth— to amend the Immigration Act, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): At the time of the second reading of this bill, the Government expressed the view that, perhaps, it had better be considered by a special committee. I understand, having made inquiries from different groups in the House, that some exception has been taken by one of the groups to having the bill go to a special committee, and it was thought more desirable to have it discussed in Committee of the Whole. The Government has no objection to proceeding with the bill in Committee of the Whole, in order to see what progress we will make, and I am inclined to think, from the intricate nature of the bill, that it would be an advantage all round to carry out the original suggestion and send it to a special committee.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: The suggestion of the Prime Minister that the bill should be considered by a smaller committee is quite satisfactory to me, if it meets with the approval of the House. I recognize the difficulty of dealing in a general committee with the complicated question involved. I do not know just what the order of procedure is at this point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The order is to proceed in Committee of the Whole and see how we get along.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: In order that we may intelligently discuss the first subsection, it will be necessary to give very briefly an outline as to what is proposed by this bill. The matter was not discussed on the second reading because it was thought that the bill would go to a smaller committee. The effect of the existing amendment to the Immigration Act is really to deprive a very large section of our people of the right to trial by jury—a very serious consideration. It is unnecessary for me to review the history of the claims put forth by the British people, from the time of the Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights, to the right of trial by jury. That great document—the Magna Charta—was effective in restricting the arbitrary power of kings and ministers, but we have to-day, in this legislation which has been placed on the statute book, a reversion, if I may call it so, to the condition of affairs which prevailed before the time of the Magna Charta. There are three acts which are very intimately connected. The first, is the amendment to the Immigration Act, with an amendment to the amendment, the second is the Naturalization Act, and the third is the amendment to the Criminal Code which was introduced at the same time. Those three acts dovetail into one another and have the effect of taking away the right of trial by jury from a very considerable section of the people of Canada. This act is designed primarily, not, as one might imagine from its being an Immigration Act, to keep out undesirable immigrants, but rather to deal with people who are already in Canada. I submit that, if we are going to deal with undesirable people in Canada, or people who have committed crimes in Canada, the provision with regard to that ought not to be brought in, in connection with an immigration law. Let me repeat. This act is not designed to keep people out of this country, but rather to deal with people who are already here. It may be said; roughly, that there are four classes of people in Canada: First, the native-born, either of English or French or other origin; second, immigrants from the United States, who are technically foreigners, but whom we very largely regard as belonging to the same class of people as we are; third, those whom we commonly class as foreigners, who speak some other language than English as their mother tongue, people who come, very largely, from various countries of Europe; and fourth, British-born people, people who belong to the same stock as we do, but who have been born in England, Scotland, Ireland or other British countries. To-day, as a Canadian-born Britisher, I should like

to appeal to my fellow Canadian-born Britishers, whether English or French, to relieve the British-born of the disabilities under which they are placed in Canada because of their birth in Great Britain. That is the situation as it exists to-day.

Let me deal now with the various sections of the bill. The first one has to do with domicile, and this can be understood only as we remember that the idea is to get rid of certain undesirable classes. These classes are enumerated in later sections of the act; the first provision makes it impossible for anyone, later classed as an undesirable, to obtain domicile in Canada. These people can come into this country and they may live here for a certain period of time; but if they are declared to be undesirable, it is as if they were not living here; their residence here gives them no claim whatever, no right to trial in the courts of this country. They may have been living quite a harmless life; they may have no criminal record against them, either in the Old Country or in this country; but if they are declared to be undesirable, the fact that they have been living here actually ceases to have any value.

Mr. JACOBS: They are declared to be undesirable by the immigration authorities, I understand, not by a court of justice.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Quite so. That is the point. This is entirely under the Immigration Act, and my plea is that, before anybody, who has been living in this country for any length of time, is declared undesirable, his case should be presented to a regular court and decided by that court, and not by the Immigration Department or any other department. That is why I seek to have this particular section altered. Section 2 of the act provides:

> Provided further that no person who belongs to the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section 41 of this act shall be capable of acquiring Canadian domicile.

Then again, subsection (ii) in part reads:

> Canadian domicile is lost, for the purposes of this act,. . . . by any person belonging to the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of section 41 of this act.

Then again subsection (iii) in part reads:

> When any citizen of Canada who is a British subject by naturalisation, or any British subject not born in Canada having Canadian domicile, shall have resided for one year outside of Canada, he shall be presumed to have lost Canadian domicile.

That is, if a man, who has been living in this country for a considerable number of years, should, for instance, return to Great Britain for a year to visit his people and then come back to Canada, he would cease to have Canadian domicile and cease to have any right to trial in this country.

Mr. JACOBS: Although a British subject?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Let us be clear on that point. Although a British subject, he would cease to have any rights whatever before the courts of this country. That is the point with regard to the first clause of the Bill. If I may, I would like to run briefly over the other clauses, as they are closely inter-related. I pass on to the second clause repealing paragraphs (n), (o) and (p) of subsection 6 of section—there is a typographical error there; that should be section 3 instead of section 2. The amendment to the act adds a number of classes to those who had previously been regarded as undesirable. The objectionable feature is contained in these words:

> Persons . . . . (n) who disbelieve in or are opposed to organised Government. . . . (o) persons who are members of or affiliated with any organisation entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organised Government.

And:

> (p) Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies and who were or may be interned on or after the eleventh day of November, one thousand nine hundred and eighteen, in any part of His Majesty's Dominions or by any of His Majesty's allies.

I think it is quite obvious to any one that I am not here to advocate, in any way whatever, disbelief in organized government. But I do say that this question of belief or disbelief in organized government and the decision whether people do or do not believe in this, should not be left to an Immigration Department. That is the point. The question should be left to the courts. This matter ought to be kept very clearly before us as we proceed. I can quite understand how many people may misunderstand the position which I am trying to put forward, because, on the face of the matter, one would say: "Is that not reasonable? Should we not try to exclude people who disbelieve in organized government?" I would be quite willing to say: "Yes." But if people come into this country and are resident in this country, it ought not to be within the power of any individual in the Immigration Department

or any other department to say: "You are here and since you disbelieve in organized government, you must be sent out of the country without any trial on the matter whatever." Worse than that, this paragraph (p) works a gross injustice to a large number of our fellow citizens who are technically classed as alien enemies. A good many people whom I know in the West, who came from those provinces in Austria, which lie along the border line between Austria and Russia and which were overridden first by one army and then by the other, when the war broke out, were within the bounds of Austria, and hence came to be classed as alien enemies. I protest, incidentally, this was a great injustice to them. As one of those men said to me one day: "We were enemies of Austria long before Great Britain was an enemy of Austria; we came out to this country to get away from Austria." Yet the fact that they had been born in Austria classed them as alien enemies. We find this section dealing with these people who are in this country, many of whom have been living exemplary lives, the very class of people whom perhaps we most need as immigrants to go on the land. The clause reads:

> Enemy aliens or persons who have been alien enemies and who were or may be interned on or after November 11, 1918.

So that this is directed against a particular group and works a hardship in their case. I shall now consider section 41, and I would impress upon the committee that if this bill of mine is passed it does not mean that the old section 41 will be done away with; but the objectionable clauses which were introduced two years ago will be abandoned and section 41 will remain as it was before that time. Section 41, dealing with the undesirable classes, says, in part, that any person who:

> —shall, by word or act, create or attempt to create riot or public disorder in Canada, or shall by common repute belong to or be suspected of belonging to any secret society or organization which extorts money from or in any way attempts to control any resident of Canada. . . . or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government; such person, for the purposes of this act, shall be considered as belonging to the prohibited or undesirable classes and shall be liable to deportation.

There you have the same trouble entering in. The whole question as to whether or not a man is undesirable, or whether or not he belongs to organizations that are supposed to teach doctrines that are not in harmony with the welfare of the country, is left to the Department of Immigration to decide. I would suggest that we should be in keeping with the very best British practice if we condemned men only when they committed some overt act and not for merely thinking this or the other thing. In Japan, I believe, there is now a law against dangerous thoughts, and we seem to be approaching very near to the autocratic imperialism of Japan when we undertake to decide whether or not a man harbours dangerous ideas. It has been taken for granted in British countries that a man may believe whatever he likes so long as he does not in any way interfere with his fellow-citizens or imperil the country. And that is sound ground to take. In section 16, I take exception particularly to the following:

> Any person suspected of an offence under this section may forthwith be arrested and detained without a warrant by any officer for examination and deportation.

That, it seems to me, is going further than we can imagine possible in any British statute. It is bad enough to arrest, without warrant, any man who is really guilty, but in this case even if a man is only suspected of doing something he may be summarily arrested without warrant, and without trial deported, though he might happen to be a British subject. That is an intolerable situation. Section 17, which is amended in harmony with the other, provides:

> Whenever any person other than a Canadian citizen or a person having Canadian domicile—

has done so and so. That is where it touches the British-born. If a man is foreign-born I presume he may have some sort of protection at the hands of a foreign consul; but if a man is British-born he has no domicile, and has not even a chance for naturalization. That comes in in another act. Provision is made in the Naturalization Act that a man, even if naturalized, may be de-naturalized at will. I have not introduced any bill with regard to that act, but, as amended in 1919, it fits into this nicely. Most of us had not realized that in order for a Britisher to obtain rights before the courts in this country, he had to be naturalized. But that is the case. It will be seen, therefore, that this catches a man in any case if he is considered undesirable. The British-born man has no domicile, and if he is naturalized he may be de-naturalized. Then

we come further to the amendment to the amendment. It was considered, a few days after this amendment to the Immigration Act had been passed, that it was not strong enough and did not quite meet the needs of the time, and so still more stringent regulations were introduced. Section 41, as again amended, contains an extra clause with regard to undesirables:

> Any one who without lawful authority assumes any powers of government in Canada or in any part thereof—

—may be declared an undesirable. That is to say, any man belonging to an organization that undertakes a certain kind of work which may be considered by somebody as work that ought to be done by the Government, may be declared an undesirable and without any impartial authority to try the case he may be summarily deported. Further on there is this clause:

> Provided that this section shall not apply to any person who is a British subject either by reason of birth in Canada or by reason of naturalization in Canada.

There is where the difficulty comes in again with regard to naturalization. Most of our English immigrants coming to this country took it for granted that they had certain rights in the country and would receive full protection from the law. They did not consider it necessary to become naturalized, and this clause therefore places them in a far more difficult and helpless position than in the case with persons born in Germany, Austria, or Russia.

Mr. McMASTER: Do I understand from my hon. friend that a man born in Scotland and coming out here has to become naturalized?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, before he can obtain protection from this act; otherwise he is liable to deportation.

Mr. JACOBS: I think the hon. member is quite wrong. If a man was born in Scotland he is a British subject and does not require to be naturalized at all.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, otherwise he may be deported.

Mr. JACOBS: Yes, back to Scotland.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is my point; he has no chance. This proviso relates to any person who is a British subject either by reason of birth in Canada or by reason of naturalization in this country. But since a Scotsman is a subject of Canada neither by birth in Canada nor by reason of naturalization here, he may be deported under the provisions of this act.

Mr. JACOBS: That is to say, his British citizenship by reason of birth in Scotland will not avail him in Canada under this act.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That is it. Subsection 2 says:

> Proof that any person who belongs to or was within the description of any of the prohibited or undesirable classes within the meaning of this section at any time since the fourth day of May, 1910, shall for all purposes of this act be deemed to establish prima facie that he still belongs to such prohibited or undesirable class or classes.

We have here introduced a retroactive clause—if it can be shown that prior to the 4th May, 1910, a person belonged to any of these undesirable classes, it should be at least prima facie evidence that he still belongs to them. I am no lawyer, but I have always thought that one of the fundamental principles of British law was that a man is to be considered innocent until he is proven guilty. Here it is provided that if he belongs to a certain class prima facie he is guilty. He is required to establish his own innocence of the "crime"—in this case of whether or not he belongs to any of these undesirable classes to which he belonged some years previously.

I do not think it is necessary at this time for me to say anything further with regard to the unfair and anti-British character of this legislation. I have perhaps emphasized the fact that it applies to Britishers. I should like to go a little bit further than that, because I think I have enough of the spirit of the Britisher in my own being to believe that everyone ought to have a fair chance in this country. I do not think the British-born want any greater privileges than any other body; I do not think that any of us who happen to be Canadian-born want any special privileges; and the idea in introducing this legislation is that we should give a fair chance to every man, Canadian-born and non-Canadian born, and that if he is doing anything in any sense detrimental to the best interests of the community he shall be regularly tried in open court, and if found guilty, deported, if you will—but given a fair trial first.

That, Mr. Chairman, as briefly as I can put it, is the contention embodied in this bill. I do not see how we could get at these subsections without having gone

into that general question. I would read the first clause again:

1. Subsection one of section two of chapter twenty-five of the statutes of 1919, being "An Act to amend The Immigration Act," is amended by repealing all such subsection from the proviso in subparagraph (*i*) to the end of the said subsection.

Section agreed to.

Mr. JACOBS: I am heartily in sympathy with this measure and for the information of the hon. member (Mr. Woodsworth) who has just resumed his seat I might say that, with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and several other hon. members, I opposed the law which it is now sought to repeal when it was first placed upon the statute books two years ago, at a time when this House seemed to be suffering from "jumpiness" and "nerves" induced by the long war. We had the idea that we could handle this question of undesirable immigrants very much better by permitting the immigration authorities, rather than our courts of justice, to pass upon their cases. I saw nothing at that time, nor have I seen anything since, which would cause me to alter my opinion that the proper forum for dealing with these cases is the court of justice in the district where the suspected party may be found.

I have some hesitation, Mr. Chairman, in speaking of immigration measures, for the reason that I happen to be the only member of a certain race in this House, and when I support a measure of this kind a portion of the press declare the following day that the measure is wanted only by a certain class of undesirable Jews whose views are put forward in the House by the member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs.) So I fear I am rendering a disservice to the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg (Mr Woodsworth) by backing up his measure; my support may do him more harm than good. I have been suffering for some time from attacks of this kind from certain elements in the community, particularly in the city of Montreal.

Now, I should like to cite to the committee something which appeared in the Star of Montreal yesterday, which I think will convey to them some idea of how foreign immigrants are looked upon in certain quarters. The article is entitled:

Civic Body to discuss influx of foreigners with resultant crime

Sixty per cent of serious crimes here committed by Foreigners, Official Declares—Would restrict flow into country.

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

Then the article proceeds:

The flow of foreigners into Canada, with a consequent increase in the number of serious crimes, will be discussed by a special committee of the City Council this afternoon. Ald. Trepanier will preside.

The name "Trepanier" is rather significant; it suggests the necessity of the operation of trepanning.

Correspondence will be read from the Union of Canadian Municipalities and from the Merchants' Association of Montreal, dealing with the subject, and pointing out the danger of an unrestricted flow of foreigners into the bigger cities.

A letter from J. Fitzgerald, manager of the Merchants' Association, states it is entirely too easy for criminal characters to come into Canada, and entirely too difficult to have them removed after they get into the country.

"I believe that eighty per cent—

This is what Mr. Fitzgerald believes:

I believe that eighty per cent of the serious crimes in Montreal are committed by people who have come into the city only a few months previous to the commission of the crime," says Mr. Fitzgerald.

I suppose he wishes to imply that as they remain longer in the country their desire to commit crimes becomes less,—that they are filled with a desire to commit crimes only for the first few months after they arrive. The article continues:

"The police, when they discover that bad characters are here, seem to have every difficulty in having them sent out of the country."

Then there is this significant paragraph:

The secretary-treasurer of the Union of Canadian Municipalities, A. D. Shibley, of Montreal,—

Whoever he is; I never heard of him.

—writing to Ald. Trepanier—

You will notice, correspondence is going on between Trepanier and Shibley which is designed to affect public opinion in the district.

A. D. Shibley, of Montreal, writing to Ald. Trepanier to offer co-operation in the movement to restrict foreign immigration, declared that from police head-quarters he had found that last year sixty per cent of the serious crimes, such as murder and robbery with violence, were committed by foreigners, whereas, in proportion to their numbers, fifteen per cent should be their percentage.

He allows them the right to commit crime, but only to the extent of fifteen per cent.

There was also a financial loss by burning of buildings and stocks of merchandise which it was known was attributable to foreigners, but in most cases it was impossible to prove it, and this cost the city millions every year.

That is the kind of propaganda which is being indulged in by certain elements in the community.

A bill similar to this was introduced on two occasions by hon. members in this House in the last Parliament. The first bill, I believe, was sponsored by Hon. Mr. Calder, at that time Minister of Immigration and Colonization. After the war was over the government of which he was a member felt that there was no further necessity for any such drastic legislation. Mr. Calder's bill took away from the Department of Immigration the right to decide questions as to the desirability or undesirability of certain immigrants. The bill passed this House without opposition, but when it went to the Senate it met an untimely end. Later a bill of the same nature was introduced by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), but it also met the same fate when it reached the Senate. So I want to warn my good friend from Winnipeg that the passage of this bill may be met by some opposition when it reaches—I was going to say, that irresponsible Chamber, but I do not know that I will——that Chamber which is not responsible to the people. I assure him that if his bill passes this House and is defeated in the other Chamber I will support him from year to year until it becomes law, because I think it is a step in the right direction. It is something which is in consonance with British tradition and British practice, and it should pass this Chamber, unanimously.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) was the correct one in regard to the measure now before the committee, and I was glad to note that the promoter of the bill (Mr. Woodsworth) was willing to adopt that suggestion. This bill is a short one, but it involves a study of thirty or forty intricate sections and subsections of three or four distinct Acts of Parliament, and it would be idle for a committee of this size, with the time at our disposal, to give proper consideration to the important questions raised by the bill. I did not know the matter was coming on this afternoon, but I have hastily glanced over the various enactments—

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to ask the hon. member how long it took his government to pass this act in the first place? He suggests that the matter involves a good deal of investigation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: In the first place, the matter received long consideration before it reached the House, and it was considered at great length in the House during the session in which it was passed. In my opinion there are not more than four or five members of the committee who understand this proposal, and I think I would be in the majority, of those who do not. I doubt if any one but the promoter himself does understand it. If such a measure as this is to be placed on our statute book, by all means let us understand it; let us have proper consideration of the various clauses. The suggestion of the Prime Minister was that the matter should go to a small committee to be fully considered in all its aspects and reported to this House. The Committee of the Whole can never fully examine the various clauses that are affected. My hon. friend who last spoke (Mr. Jacobs), in his own jocular way, endeavoured, I think, rather to minimize the importance of the question of the class of immigration that should be permitted to come into Canada. But it is a very large and very important question for this Dominion and one which should not be lightly dealt with. It is just possible that the present law is in some respects too drastic. I, for one, realize that it was placed on the statute book at a critical time in the history of the country. That critical period has more or less passed away, and it is quite possible that the law should be modified. But I have not in the time at my disposal been able to grasp fully the meaning or import of the proposal, nor have I been able to come to any conclusion as to what other legislation will be affected if the bill is passed and put into operation. For that reason, I think the promoter of the bill would do well to suggest that the committee rise and report progress, on the understanding that the bill be referred to a special committee with power to inquire into the matter and report fully to the House at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I look upon this question as a judicial one. I am familiar with the conditions existing in Montreal, and I know that no part of the country has received more foreigners during the last ten years or so than that city. We are all interested in protecting the standing of Canada and seeing that justice is meted out to members of all classes and all creeds coming into this country. But, like the member for South Wellington (Mr.

Guthrie), I am unable to give an intelligent decision on the action taken by the member for North Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth), and I would strongly support the idea of having the matter referred to a small committee of competent men so that the matter can be examined and inquired into. During the last few years the charge has been repeatedly made in the press of Montreal —I do not know whether or not it is well founded—that a large number of the crimes committed in the city have been committed by recent arrivals in this country. It is a case of protection of the people, not only of Montreal, but of the whole of Canada, and the Government would be well advised to give this matter mature consideration through a small committee of competent men. I support that idea and hope the Government will give effect to it.

Mr. JACOBS: All that has been asked, as I understand it, by this bill is that the law be made the same as it was previous to 1919.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Nobody here knows what that was.

Mr. CRERAR: I find myself in much the same position as the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). In attempting hastily to get the full import of this bill that is before the committee I found it necessary to examine many sections of the amended Immigration Act, and it is quite impossible, in the short time at one's disposal, to get an intelligent view of the whole matter. When the bill was before the House on a former occasion—I think on its second reading—the suggestion was made that it would be referred to a special committee. I was certainly under the impression that that procedure was to be followed, and I cannnot understand at the moment, having come into the chamber after the consideration of the bill was commenced, how it has reached its present stage. To my mind, the measure should be referred to a committee, and it should be done at once. I am free to say that I am in general accord with the principle of the bill. The amendments to the act, particularly those drastic amendments which were passed in 1919 giving power to the officials of the Department of Immigration, to deport people without any fair trial, are not in accord with British practice and should not remain on our statute book. The question, however, is a large one. The bill seeks to repeal a good many sections of the act, and I think it could well be referred to a special committee for report. I would offer the further observation that the committee should be appointed at the earliest possible day and should make its report to the House as soon as it can, so that we may consider the matter and deal with it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad that apparently we have reached unanimity on this matter. It is quite true, as my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) has said, that when the bill was before the House on a former occasion I indicated that from the point of view of the Government it should be referred to a special committee, and that the Government would take steps to ascertain the names of the members who should compose that committee. When the Whips undertook to get the names of the committee, I was informed that the leader of the Opposition objected to having the matter discussed by a special committee at all. I was unable to understand what objection there could be to that course because it seemed to me it would be impossible to have the bill satisfactorily dealt with in any other way, and I spoke to the leader of the Opposition personally about it, so as to make quite sure that that was his view. He expressed to me the opinion, quite emphatically, that he thought the bill ought to be threshed out here in Committee of the Whole instead of being referred to a special committee. As I said this afternoon, I did not like to proceed by way of special committee if there was any real objection to that course on the part of any group in the House. I think we have had sufficient discussion this afternoon to convince everyone that it would be impossible to have this bill properly dealt with in Committee on the Whole, and I therefore now move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I move that Bill No. 16, to amend the Immigration Act, be referred to a special committee the members of which are to be appointed at a later date, with power to report from time to time.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On the Order for the House to again go into committee on Bill No. 17, to amend the Criminal Code, Mr. Woodsworth:

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As this bill is related, I think, in some particulars to the

one we have just referred to a special committee, I think it would be better to have it referred to the same committee. I therefore move that Bill No. 17 be referred to the committee to which Bill No. 16 was referred, and that this Order be discharged.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: That procedure is quite satisfactory to me. I think it is much preferable that the matter should be threshed out in a special committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is just this distinction between the present bill to amend the Criminal Code, and the one with which the House has just dealt. The present proposal is a very simple one, dealing practically with a single subject of the Criminal Code and involving the amendment of only one act of Parliament and one or two sections of that act. It relates to the crime known to our law under the name of sedition also to criminal conspiracies, I think. That is a matter, I think, that might fairly be dealt with by the Committee of the Whole House. However, I am not opposed to sending the bill to a special committee. I was unaware that my leader had taken a position in regard to this matter. I had never consulted him about it, but I am satisfied that if he had been here this afternoon and had heard the discussion so far as it has proceeded, he would have come to the conclusion that a special committee was proper in that instance. In the present case, speaking for myself, I am not opposed to this bill going to a special committee, although it contains a much simpler proposal than that involved in the amendment to the Immigration Act.

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) Bill No. 45, to amend the Bankruptcy Act, was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—1919, c. 36, s. 3 amended:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Explain.

Mr. JACOBS: I may say that a bill similar to this was introduced last year by me, but it failed to receive the support of the Government, which makes it necessary for me to trouble this Parliament with a like measure. This bill provides that it shall be an added ground for the making of a petition in bankruptcy if the debtor gives notice to any of his creditors that he has suspended or is about to suspend payment of any of his debts, and secondly, if he ceases to meet his liabilities generally as they become due.

Inasmuch as this bill deals with a somewhat technical matter known practically to the legal profession only, I would suggest that it be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee for further study, so that we might have an opportunity of hearing from various delegations and others who are interested in the measure.

Mr MACKENZIE KING: I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I move that Bill 45 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Just for the purpose of making myself clear on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, is it in order after a bill has been committed to the Committee of the Whole House to take it from that committee and send it to a select standing committee? If it is desired to refer a bill to a select standing committee, should not the motion be made immediately after the second reading, and before the bill has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House? I am raising the point of order simply that I may be enlightened.

Mr. SPEAKER: A case of this kind does not often happen, but Bourinot provides a precedent for it. At page 527, fifth edition of Bourinot I find the following:

> In case the committee of the whole has reported progress—

As in this case.

> —a motion may be made immediately before fixing the committee for a future date that the bill be referred to a select standing or other committee.

This is a case in point.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Mr. Jacobs, Bill No. 46, to amend the Railway Act was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

On motion of Mr. Kennedy (West Edmonton) Bill 54 to amend the Criminal Code was read the second time.

Mr. KENNEDY (West Edmonton) moved, that the House go into committee on the bill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I ask that the bill be allowed to stand until the next sitting of the House. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) mentioned this matter to me, and, I think he wanted to be present when the discussion took place. If the promoter has no objection, I ask that the bill stand until the next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

FINANCIAL CREDIT

On the order for resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of Mr. Irvine:

That, in the opinion of this House a representative Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to investigate the basis, the function and the control of financial credit, and the relation of credit to the industrial problems.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): This order will stand until the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is present.

Order stands.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER WATERWAY

The House resumed from May 1, consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Church.

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Canada should give early and favourable consideration to the report of the International Joint Commission on the St. Lawrence River Waterway, and request the Government of the United States to join with Canada in making an international agreement for carrying out the work so recommended.

Mr. PAUL MERCIER (Westmount-St. Henri): When the debate on this matter was adjourned a few days ago, I was thinking that we would have to be careful in dealing with this project in Canada. When the people on the other side of the line come forward with a project of this nature they generally have a motive of interest. In fact everybody in this life acts from a motive of interest, and when I see the people living in the districts of the Great Lakes advocating this enterprise and many members endorsing it I am but little surprised.

Within the last few weeks we have seen in the newspapers that representatives of the United States' Senate favour this measure. Senator King, from Utah, and Mr. Ten Eyck, Member of Congress, for Buffalo have said: We may have a piece

of land down the St. Lawrence valley, and we may buy another piece of land along the Great Lakes, to carry on our international project in Canada, but when the scheme is supported by these people who are interested so much it seems to me perhaps it is not a beneficial thing for our country.

The United States is surely the country which will derive the most benefit from this enterprise. Of course on our side certain districts of this country will benefit if the project is carried on, from the construction, but they will especially benefit from the development of that waterway. It will certainly be a great benefit to all the harbours and wharves situated along the Great Lakes, and will be a benefit to the ports of Detroit, Port Huron and Chicago, and even of Fort William. Steamers will carry in their holds gold and merchandise.

The people on the other side of the line who propose this project are entitled to do so. They have a right to advocate the policy best calculated to satisfy their ambitions, but I am convinced that the measure will be against the interests of Canada as a whole. For the past two months an educational campaign has been carried on in favour of the project. The United States, in order to obtain an advantage in the matter of transportation, have had the International Joint Commission report printed and distributed. The United States Senate passed a measure adopting that report and they sent it to Canada to try to obtain the approval of the representatives of this country in the House of Commons.

Is it advisable for a country like ours, which can develop itself within its own boundaries, to endeavour to associate with the people of the United States, to give them the advantage of knowing everything about our system of navigation, of importation, about all the secrets of the St. Lawrence river, its weak points, if there are any, and many other matters which affect the safety of our country and which should be kept secret. If we open our country to their steamships, within twenty-five years Canada will be their own because if a joint board is appointed that will have control of this new channel, we may be quite sure that influences of all kinds will be brought to bear upon that board to our disadvantage.

In my opinion—and my hon. friends opposite are not obliged to make the confession—this project will be very advantageous to them and perhaps to them only in the present situation and for perhaps

twenty-five years to come. But when they consider their prosperity, they should not be too ambitious. The province of Ontario at the present time is a rich province; it is getting along well and making all the progress it may desire. It is one of the oldest provinces of Confederation and it has surely attained the aims which it has had since Confederation.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Will the hon. gentleman deny us seaports?

Mr. MERCIER: I do not wish to deny Ontario seaports, but the ports which it has now are developing well and in the near future it may have the advantage of all the other ports that may exist in Canada. But if the people of that province want for themselves a channel that will bring to them the fullest measure of prosperity at the expense of the maritime provinces and the western provinces, I think they want a little too much under the circumstances, especially when such a project would mean burdening the whole people of Canada with an expenditure of nearly $300,000,000. This project cannot be seriously considered under present conditions because our finances are not in such a state as to warrant the investment of such a large amount of money in bringing such an enormous scheme to a successful conclusion. On account of the need for economy in public expenditure, many public works throughout the country have been stopped. Many provinces require some money for drydocks and public services. The Esquimalt drydock is still unfinished and a large amount of money is needed to complete it. In different parts of Canada, there are wharves that are in need of repair, and there are channels to be dug so that they may be deep enough for the steamers that have to pass through them.

If we want to develop our country by providing further water transportation facilities, there is the Georgian Bay canal, which has been mooted for many years back. It would be a useful development for Canada, and it would shorten the route by 300 miles, if it is given preference to the St. Lawrence waterway. By the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, the people not only of Ontario, but of the whole of Canada, will benefit; and in northern Ontario better progress will be made, because the settlers of to-day and of to-morrow will have better transportation facilities in that district than exist at present.

On looking at the report, which has been laid on the Table of this House, and copies of which have been sent to every member by direction of the Prime Minister, I see that many questions were asked, but the answers that have been given to those questions should have been given more plainly, because, upon those answers, depends the question whether the project of the St. Lawrence waterway is a good thing or not as regards Canada. The question is not so much whether it is right to spend a great deal of money on a project, as whether, when you invest money, under our present financial conditions, good results will be obtained. At pages 183 and 184 of the report, it may be seen that the answers, which were given to the questions put before the commission so as to inform the two governments of the United States and Canada, are not very clear. Question 6, which, to my mind, is a vital question as regards Canada's interests, reads:

> What method of control is recommended for the operation of the improved waterway to secure its most beneficial use?

The answer reads:

> The commission recommends (a) that such navigation works as do not lie wholly within one country or are not capable of economic and efficient operation withni one country as complete and independent units, be operated under the direction of the International Board as set forth in recommendation No. 7; (b) that all navigation works other than those particularly mentioned in (a) be operated by the country in which they are located with the right of inspection by the International Board as set forth in recommendation No. 8; (c) that power works' be operated by the country in which they are located as set forth in recommendation No. 9.

The "power works" are indeed, Mr. Speaker, the corner stone of the whole St. Lawrence waterways scheme. No specific method of control is mentioned. That answer is an example of the answers given in the report. We have no definite answers to any of the most important questions concerning this project. There are no facts available, and what little information we have been given is as vague as the passing clouds. Let me read question No. 9 and the answer thereto:

> What traffic, both incoming and outgoing, in kind and quantity, is likely to be carried upon the proposed route both at its inception and in the future, consideration to be given not only to present conditions, but to probable changes therein resulting from the development of industrial activities due to availability of large quantities of hydraulic power?
>
> Answer. To this question also it is impossible to give a specific answer, in the absence of definite information as to all the factors that will enter into the problem.

I agree with that statement, because the commissioners cannot possibly foretell what is likely to happen in the future. The answer continued:

> The commission has brought together authoritative information as to the existing traffic between the tributary area and overseas points as well as between the same area and coastwise points on this continent, and has reached the general conclusion that sufficient traffic will seek the new water route, etc.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a "general conclusion" is hardly a substantial enough basis to act upon in an undertaking of such tremendous importance as this, and I am not surprised that the commission cannot say definitely what amount of traffic there would be. Before embarking upon an enterprise involving, as this work certainly would, an enormous expenditure of money and is, in my humble opinion, a national risk, there should be submitted to the governments, both of the United States and of Canada, something more definite and concrete than the generalities that have been put forward. There should be absolutely reliable information on which dependable calculations can be made. Indisputable authority based on the carefully considered findings of civil engineering experts should be available. In 1918 the St. Lawrence Power Company, an American corporation, constructed a dam at Massena in the state of New York and the undertaking was opposed by the government of our country. The work was carried out, nevertheless, because the International Joint Commission considered that it was necessary as a war measure; and this House may rest assured that the St. Lawrence will stand to lose a considerable degree of power by the construction of that dam, to the advantage of our neighbours.

As I said the other night, let us be content to develop what resources Providence has given to each province, and let us work together for the welfare of the country as a whole, each province being satisfied with its own and not interfering with others. We have the resources in Canada and it only remains for us to develop them for us to become a prosperous nation. But, I repeat, do not let us try to grab from one another what is not ours. In 1911 Sir Wilfrid Laurier was questioned regarding the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. He said that the work was one of national character and would be carried through for the benefit and welfare of the whole Dominion. He said, "If I could do it to-morrow, I would carry out that work." And Mr. Pugsley, who was then Minister of Public Works, brought down an estimate of $3,000,000 to start survey work in connection with the Georgian Bay canal. This project was generally supported at that time, and members representing Ontario and the city of Toronto urged the government to carry it through. To-day, however, they have evidently abandoned that scheme and want another one which would involve the country in untold debt, without any definite assurance of success. I think that the Government would do well to consider this matter very seriously indeed before taking any action at all.

Mr. BALDWIN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. McCONICA: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: I caught the eye of the hon. member for Charlevoix-Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) first.

Mr. CASGRAIN: As it is near six o'clock, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McCONICA: I had hoped to say a word regarding this resolution, and for that reason—

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion is not debatable.

Motion agreed to and the debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will take up the resolution respecting freight rates, and if we conclude the discussion thereon we shall resume with estimates, taking up those of the Secretary of State and Public Works.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, May 4, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

STANDING COMMITTEES

CHANGES IN MEMBERSHIP

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I move:

> That the name of Mr. Marler be substituted for that of Mr. Martell on the Select Standing

Committee on Mines and Minerals, and the name of Mr. Martell be substituted for that of Mr. Marler on the Select Standing Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 70, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The object of this bill is to afford proper protection of our salmon and lobster fisheries. Both these fisheries are conducted beyond, as well as within, territorial waters. Heretofore our regulations, which have applied to both, have never been challenged. But we have been informed that they may be challenged in some part of the country, especially in British Columbia; and the Department of Justice is of opinion that the regulations should be implemented by legislation.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILL—FIRST READING

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz.—Mr. McQuarrie.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE:

1. Under what conditions and regulations are Japanese immigrants admitted into Canada?
2. In what way are the rights of Canadians in Japan limited as to ownership of land, franchise, mercantile pursuits, fishing, shipping (coastwise and foreign), mining, agriculture, and other pursuits such as are engaged in by Japanese in Canada?
3. What is the number of Japanese immigrants that have entered Canada yearly in each of the ten years ending March 31, 1922?
4. How many Japanese have left Canada for Japan, each year, during the same period?
5. How many Japanese have returned to Canada from Japan each year during the same period?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be able to give an answer to this question to-morrow.

Question stands.

GATINEAU POINT—ROCKLIFFE FERRY PRIVILEGES

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Has the Government called for tenders this year in connection with ferry privileges between Gatineau Point and Rockliffe?
2. If so, what are the names of those who submitted tenders and what was the amount in each case?
3. Who was the privilege accorded to and what was the reason governing the award of same?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay): In explanation of the delay in answering this question, I may say that tenders have been called for and received for this service, but a license has not yet been issued.

INCOME TAX STATISTICS

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. How much revenue did the income tax produce in the last fiscal year?
2. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of $2,000 per year, last year?
3. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $2,000 and less than $3,000?
4. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $3,000 and less than $4,000?
5. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $4,000 and less than $5,000?
6. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $5,000 and less than $10,000?
7. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $10,000 and less than $20,000?
8. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $20,000.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. $78,684,354.80.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6.—No information.

7 and 8. Compilation of statistics for the last fiscal year (31st March, 1922) has not been completed.

Note:—For statistical purposes the classification of taxpayers according to income classes is as follows:

(1)	$ 1,000	to	$ 6,000*
(2)	2,000	"	6,000†
(3)	6,000	"	10,000
(4)	10,000	"	20,000
(5)	20,000	"	30,000
(6)	30,000	"	50,000
(7)	50,000	"	75,000
(8)	75,000	"	100,000
(9)	100,000	"	200,000
(10)	200,000	"	400,000
(11)	400,000	"	600,000
(12)	600,000	"	800,000
(13)	800,000	"	1,000,000
(14)	Over $1,000,000.		

*Exemption $1,000.

†Exemption $2,000.

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. How much revenue did the income tax produce in the Province of Manitoba in the last fiscal year?
2. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of $2,000, per year, last year?
3. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $2,000 and less than $3,000?
4. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $3,000 and less than $4,000?
5. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $4,000 and less than $5,000?
6. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $5,000 and less than $10,000?
7. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $10,000 and less than $20,000?
8. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $20,000.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. $6,014,254.39.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6.—No information.

7 and 8. Compilation of statistics for the last fiscal year (31st March, 1922) has not been completed.

Mr. WOODSWORTH:

1. How much revenue did the income tax produce in the city of Winnipeg in the last fiscal year?
2. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of $2,000, per year, last year?
3. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $2,000 and less than $3,000?
4. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $3,000 and less than $4,000?
5. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $4,000 and less than $5,000?
6. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $5,000 and less than $10,000?
7. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $10,000 and less than $20,000?
8. What amount was paid by persons having incomes of over $20,000.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No information available, as statistics have not been compiled according to municipalities.

ROUMANIAN AND GREEK CREDITS

Mr. JACOBS:

1. Have the Governments of Roumania and Greece paid any interest to the Canadian Government on the loans made in 1919?
2. If not, has the Government taken any steps looking to the payment of such interest, and (b) how much is now owing for interest?
3. How much is now owing by the Governments of Roumania and Greece on account of principal of the indebtedness incurred through the credits advanced these countries?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. As to Roumania, no; as to Greece, yes.

2. Yes; (b) by Roumania to March 31, 1922, $2,606,652.20; by Greece, to December 31, 1921, $196, 424.19.

3. By Roumania, $20,449,104.49; by Greece, $7,520,473.17.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

INCOME WAR TAX ACT—CHARTERED BANKS

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton):

What is the total amount paid by the Chartered Banks in Canada under the corporation clause of the Income War Tax Act?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

Income Tax, $786,653.17; Special War Revenue Act (on note circulation), $4,278,-420.87; total, $5,065,074.04.

The amount paid under the provisions of Part I of The Special War Revenue Act, 1915, shall be considered as a deduction of tax payable under Income War Tax Act, 1917.

C. G. S. CHAMPLAIN

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Have notes given by the Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company, Limited, and endorsed by Messrs. Thomas Harling and Clark Brothers, in payment for the Canadian Government Steamship Champlain, been redeemed?
2. If not, what amounts are still outstanding?
3. What action does the Government contemplate taking against the Company or the endorsers of the notes to recover payment?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1 and 2. The steamer Champlain was sold to the Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company for $61,050. A cash payment of $13,102.50 was made and notes for 3, 6, 9 and 12 months dated May 1, 1920, accepted for the balance. One of these notes for $12,000 was paid on maturity. The notes for 6, 9 and 12 months for $12,-000, $12,000 and $11,997.50 respectively have not been redeemed.

3. The Department of Justice has taken action to recover amount of notes from the endorsers.

RETAIL DRUGGISTS—ALCOHOL PURCHASES

Mr. STEWART (Leeds):

1. Has the Government or the Finance Ministers received a request from the Canadian Pharmaceutical Association for an amendment of the existing law with respect to the purchase of alcohol by retail druggists, for the manufacture of medicinal, pharmaceutical and other preparations?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to comply with such request, either in whole or in part, and amend the regulations, and to provide, subject to proper safeguards, restrictions and regulations, for the purchase by retail druggists of alcohol for such purposes, at approximately the same rate of excise duty as that payable by the large manufacturer?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Yes.

2. An Act of Parliament would be required to make such a change. Announcements respecting legislation dealing with taxation are made in the Budget Speech.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. What amount was expended by the Dominion Government on the harbour of St. John, New Brunswick, during the years 1911 to 1921, inclusive?

2. What were the respective amounts expended on the said harbour during each of the said years?

3. What was the nature of the work performed during above years on the said harbour?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. and 2.

Fiscal year	Capital		Income	
	Voted	Expended	Voted	Expended
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1911-12	950,000 00	579,059 21	27,500 00	24,412 93
1912-13	1,100,000 00	1,100,155 02	25,000 00	24,930 84
1913-14	3,100,000 00	2,668,626 97	71,000 00	17,774 10
1914-15	3,000,000 00	2,999,950 20	150,000 00	2,731 06
1915-16	1,500,000 00	1,132,533 45	150,000 00	982 99
1916-17	1,000,000 00	997,308 25	100,000 00	730 00
1917-18	1,000,000 00	446,905 13	301,400 00	3,066 89
1918-19	500,000 00	266,725 95	.....	.....
1919-20	1,000,000 00	997,720 57	.....	.....
1920-21	1,250,000 00	1,249,735 80	.....	.....
Total	14,400,000 00	12,438,720 55	824,900 00	74,268 81

Total amount voted—$15,224,900.00. Expended $12,512,989.36.

3. Work consisted in the construction of new wharves and the improvement of wharves on the west side of St. John harbour, and repairs to old breakwaters, also the construction of a new breakwater and the dredging of a channel from the main channel up to the basin in front of the dry dock now under construction in Courtenay bay under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, also the dredging of the main harbour and slips and berths therein.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—GRAIN LEAKAGES

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. What was the cost to the Canadian National railways of leakages of grain, from cars, between points of shipment and the head of the lakes, during the past railway year?

2. What was the cost to the said railways of new grain doors, and repairs to grain doors upon grain cars, during the same season?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY: The information in answer to this question will have to come from Winnipeg, and it will probably be about ten days before I can give the information to the House.

Question stands.

IMPROVED FISHING METHODS

Hon. Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Does the Government intend to take any action on the application of W. A. Wick and others, asking for the introduction of improved methods in the fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence and Gaspesian coasts?

2. If so, what action?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

While preparations were in progress for such action, in view of the arrangement that was made with the provincial authorities, for the administration of the fisheries on that portion of the coast, it was decided to discontinue them, and the provincial authorities were so informed.

EXCESS OVERAGES

Mr. SALES:

1. What terminal elevator companies have paid moneys to the Government by reason of excess overages?

2. What terminal elevator companies owing money on excess overages have not yet paid?

3. What are the names of these companies and the amounts owing by them for the year 1919-20 and the year 1920-21?

4. Why have the companies referred to in question 2 not paid?

5. Has the right of the Government been definitely challenged in regard to enforcement of payments?

6. If so, what is the policy of the Government in respect to the challenge, and also in respect to companies who have not challenged the authority of the government but who have paid the moneys?

Hon. Mr. ROBB:

1. For the 1920 weigh-up, the following terminal elevator companies paid moneys to the Government by reason of excess overages:—Empire Elevator Co., United Grain Growers, Fort William Elevator Co., Grand Trunk Pacific Terminal Elevator Co., Port Arthur Elevator Co., Thunder

Bay Elevator Co., Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co.

2. For the 1920 weigh-up the Eastern Terminal Elevator Co. has not yet paid.

For the 1921 weigh-up the following companies have not yet paid: Canadian Pacific Railway Co., Consolidated Elevator Co., Western Terminal Elevator Co., United Grain Growers, Grand Trunk Pacific Terminal Elevator Co., Northwestern Elevator Co.

3. 1919-20—

Eastern Terminal Elevator Co.	$49,027.07
1920-21—	
Canadian Pacific Railway Co...	29,184.17
Consolidated Elevator Co... ..	3,432.73
Western Terminal Elevator Co.	47,907.42
United Grain Growers	41,971.05
G. T. P. Terminal Elevator Co.	5,697.45
Northwestern Elevator Co.	2,331.24

4. Because the right of the Government to these overages has been contested.

5. Yes.

6. The matter is at present under the consideration of the Department of Justice.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What has been the cost of the trips to Europe of the ministers of the Canadian Government during the war period and since?

2. What has been the cost for each minister who attended any of the after war conferences held at Paris, Geneva or elsewhere in Europe?

3. How much, if any, has each one of such ministers returned to the Treasury of the amounts allowed for such trips over and above their actual expenses?

4. What are the names of such Ministers and the respective amounts allowed to each, as well as the amounts returned by each?

CROWSNEST PASS AGREEMENT

PROPOSED INQUIRY INTO EFFECT UPON RAILWAY RATES

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved:

That notwithstanding that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee be appointed to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs, it having been disclosed by recent conferences held between the Government and the chief executives of the various railways with respect to the reduction of freight rates that the representatives of the railways deem it inadvisable immediately to reduce rates on basic commodities because of the expiration, on July 6th, 1922, of the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement;

That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry to the said committee with particular regard to the effect of the rates established by the Crowsnest pass agreement upon Canadian National railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally;

And that the said committee shall have power to send for persons, papers and records, including the minutes and evidence taken before the Committees of this House in previous Sessions, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

He said: The resolution just read states the reasons why it is considered at the present time in the public interest to appoint the committee proposed. When this Government assumed office there was, as there is to-day, a general feeling throughout the country that freight rates were unduly high and that they not only interfered with, but were oppressive to, the trade and commerce of the country. The Government were anxious there should be an immediate and substantial reduction in the rates, and while this could be effected in part by allowing the Crownest pass agreement to become once more operative in July next, it was felt that the matter was of such far-reaching importance that the Government would not be justified in permitting this to take place without having a committee of the House appointed to inquire into the effect which such a revival of the agreement might have, and to make such recommendations as, in the public interest, that committee might deem advisable. As intimated in the speech I delivered to the House on the railway situation a short time ago, the Government, soon after its assumption of office, had a conference with the heads of the Canadian National Railways, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, with a view to securing, if possible, a voluntary reduction in rates on those products known as basic commodities. The matter was thoroughly investigated and as a result of the conference, the executive of the railways felt that, in view of the fact that the Crowsnest pass agreement would expire on July 6, it was not advisable at the present time, however desirable it might be, that any immediate reduction should be made. As hon. members know, the Crowsnest pass agreement is an undertaking entered into in 1897 by the Government of that day with the Canadian Pacific Railway whereby, in consideration of a subsidy, freight rates on certain commodities were limited. That agreement stood until 1918, when the United States Government, through its Labour Board, increased the wages of the railway employees in that country. The employees on the Canadian

lines thereupon made application for a similar increase in their wages. The Order in Council which made the McAdoo award effective on government owned lines and recommended its adoption on privately owned railways authorized the Board of Railway Commissioners to prepare a schedule of rates which would grant increases in freight rates in Canada similar to the increases that had already been granted in American territory. The Board of Railway Commissioners prepared such a schedule of rates which was given effect by Order in Council of July 27, 1918, under the War Measures Act, authorizing the board to set aside the Crowsnest pass agreement or any other rate-limiting agreement. This Order in Council remained effective until the revision of the Railway Act was under consideration in 1919, when, by subsection 5 of section 325, authority was granted the Railway Commissioners to set aside the Crowsnest pass agreement for a period of three years from the passing of the act. That period of suspension expires on July 6, 1922. The Consolidated Railway Act came before Parliament for revision, having first been dealt with by the Senate, and was referred to a select committee of the House, and it was that committee that finally incorporated in the bill subsection 5 of section 325 to which I have just referred. The bill was passed and returned as amended to the Senate. The Senate objected to this section in its original form, and a conference was held between the managers of the two Houses. Sir Robert Borden afterwards intimated that it would be satisfactory to the Senate if acceptable to the House that a limitation be made in subsection 5; and the limit was then fixed in that subsection at a period of three years from the passing of the act in 1919.

To-day the railway companies have come to us and represented that they are in exactly the same position in which they were in 1918. They are faced with the still increased costs of labour and materials and they declare that if the Crowsnest pass agreement goes into effect on July 6 it will mean a loss of millions of dollars, adding to the already very heavy deficit of the Canadian National Railways, and materially affecting the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway. On the other hand, there are those who contend that the reduction in freight rates would stimulate business and bring about increased activity, which would result in greater earnings for the railways. Furthermore, they add, there is the possibility that in a very short time there will be a further decrease in wages in the United States, which would in all probability apply in Canada as well, and that the railways would not suffer the loss they claim would ensue. But there is another reason why the matter should be considered by a special committee. The Board of Railway Commissioners, in the last adjustment made in September, 1920, through its chairman, Mr. Carvell, gave this judgment:

> As our jurisdiction for granting increases on certain lines of railway in Western Canada depends entirely upon the amendment to section 325 of the Railway Act, 1919, which expires on the 6th day of July 1922, the rates hereby established cannot continue beyond that date unless Parliament in its wisdom sees fit to extend the provisions of that section. Therefore, the rates herein provided for shall not extend beyond the first day of July, 1922.

The Railway Board have themselves put the matter up to Parliament. So far as the Crowsnest pass agreement is concerned, they have no jurisdiction because it is a matter of statute; and I may say that it is not the intention of the Government, nor is it the desire, to interfere in any way with the functions or the duties of the Board of Railway Commissioners. The Board of Railway Commissioners are the proper authorities to fix rates. In so far as the Government is concerned, this committee is to deal specifically with the Crowsnest pass agreement, not with the general question of rates. It may be necessary, in order to deal intelligently with this matter, to get information with reference to rates, in their application to this agreement and the committee will determine this under the powers conferred upon it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I have only to say that this is a matter of great importance to this country from every standpoint, agricultural, business and railway, and the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement or its continuation should have the very careful consideration of every hon. member. The Government is anxious to have this committee obtain the fullest possible information that can be gathered in connection with this matter so that it may recommend to Parliament what will be in the interests of all the people of this country.

At a later stage of the proceedings I shall move the nomination of the members of the committee.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the subject involved in the resolution has not only commanded the attention of the Parliaments of Canada for years, but since Confederation has been one of the main problems confronting the country. The construction, control and general supervision of our railway systems has, in the very nature of things, been one of the great difficulties that our people have had to overcome.

Canada is a vast country, and when she essayed the task of confederating all of British North America, she did so at a time when her population was sparse, and when consequently the burden of transportation was heavy relative to the number of taxpayers to sustain it. Therefore, in the very fact of our geography, in the very fact of our sparse population, lie the roots of the great transportation problem with which we have wrestled through these fifty years; and that we should now be faced with that problem virtually only in the form of a question of rate reduction is a matter of some congratulation.

I think the people have wanted neither in courage, nor intelligence, nor practical business capacity in the manner in which they have addressed themselves to this question, faced all its difficulties, and surmounted them one by one; and in my humble judgment, though we have made mistakes, and one major mistake, we have surmounted those difficulties so successfully that we find ourselves to-day with the greater number of them behind us.

That there should be at this time a demand for a reduction of railway rates is natural. We have had that demand before us with growing insistence for months past. In the period of the war, for reasons very indirectly referred to by the minister (Mr. Kennedy), increases of rates were not only necessary, they were so manifestly inevitable that there was no difference of opinion as to bringing them about. After the war ended, the problem instead of being an easier one, really assumed dimensions greater still. Later on we met with the first movement towards reduction of rates, a slight reduction taking effect on the first of January, 1921, to the extent of five per cent, under an order of the Board of Railway Commissioners. On first December, 1921, a ten per cent reduction was made. These reductions were ordered conformably with the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement to which the hon. gentleman refers. Since that time the Railway Commission has made no further reductions.

I refer to these matters now—I shall refer to them at greater length perhaps before I close—only to put in proper perspective the situation as we meet it to-day.

I say it is only natural that the people at this time should urgently seek for a further reduction in railway rates. One of the vital, indeed, one of the indispensable conditions of confederation is low railway rates. We undertook at Confederation to construct a nation on this portion of the North American continent. We then had but three or four millions of people, if we had that number; our territory was four thousand miles in width, and our fathers foresaw that if we were to make a nation we must not only bind that territory with transportation routes, but we must make the conditions of transportation over those routes such that trade would actually flow over them and the bonds of commerce unite the provinces, thereby making progress as a unit possible, and the prosperity of the people a living truth.

We met the same difficulty in relation to our trade question. Historically we have solved that problem along certain lines, and whether rightly or wrongly—in my judgment, of course, I think rightly—the people have solved it every time it came before them in a consistent form with a desire to so direct our trade as also to bind our provinces in trade relations that would be healthful and secure.

Virtually the same question that confronted us in trade matters confronts us in transportation matters. It has always been deemed essential that our rates of transportation, even at considerable cost to the national treasury, should be such that our trade to the utmost extent should flow east and west—that we really should have a commercial entity which is a fundamental requisite of our continuing as a national entity. Consequently this Dominion has by no means been parsimonious in its treatment of railway companies. On the contrary, we have sought by generous treatment of railway transportation companies to make railway construction possible. We have sought as well by like treatment, even at the expense of the whole nation, to make possible low transportation rates. Canada has borne those burdens as a nation since its inception, in order that the rates of transportation might be such that what might be described geographically as the natural routes of trade would not fatally

interfere with, at least would not predominate in competition with, what was essential to the primary continuance of Confederation—our east-and-west routes of trade.

Therefore we have at all times sought this goal, and never did our people seek it more ardently, never did they seek it more devotedly and insistently, than they do at the present time. At all costs our railway rates must be cut down. I do not say on whom the burden shall wholly fall—it may have to rest on certain classes, probably in part on the whole Dominion; I am not discussing that at all—but the rates of transportation in this country must come down because the present rates are inconsistent with that flow of trade which is an indispensable necessity to the continuance of our country as a real commercial entity.

I do not think there is any great difference of opinion on that score. There is a difference of opinion as to the order and the method in which it shall be done. The railways take one view, and the majority of the people, I think, take another. There must be a disposition to be fair on both sides, but one thing is imperative, and the sooner all come to the conclusion the better: we must have not only lower, but very substantially lower, freight rates in this country generally, and that in a very short time.

Now, what is the history of the treatment of this question? For years it was dealt with in this Parliament. Railways are not a commercial proposition in that independent sense that most others of our industries are. Railways, in the evolution of trade, have become more or less—first less, then more, and now almost wholly—natural monopolies. They must have monopolistic rights of a character; they must have rights of eminent domain. Consequently there grew up in time the doctrine that there must be a review of rates and charges made by companies engaged in railway transportation on the part of the public—that is, on the part of Parliament—differing entirely from that which Parliament would think wise to exercise in relation to ordinary business. That responsibility Parliament itself sought for a long time to discharge, but subsequently it became the function of a committee of the Privy Council. Subsequently, in the year 1903, it was vested by this House in what became known as the Railway Commission of Canada. That Railway Commission was appointed; it was established for the purpose of exercising with respect to all transportation companies that very supervision and review in relation to railway rates, in relation to the distribution of facilities, in relation to the charges to be made for one facility and the other,—in relation, indeed, to all matters that affected the public. It was established, I say, for the purpose of exercising that review in a manner fair to the public on the one hand and fair to the railways on the other. That legislation was concurred in by all parties in this House. From that time there has been vested in the commission this function, and the major part of it has been that control of the rates for which primarily it was created.

Now, I am not here to discuss at this moment at all the discharge of its duties by the Railway Commission. On the whole, it has undoubtedly been a splendid institution and has rendered great service to Canada. What, however, is the history of the immediate question dealt with or presumed to be dealt with by this resolution?

In 1897, before the creation of the Railway Commission, an agreement was entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the government of Canada whereby, in lieu of certain cash subventions connected with the constitution of the Crowsnest Pass Railway, amounting, I understand, to approximately $4,000,000, the railway company on its part undertook indefinitely to grant certain commodity rates, chiefly on grain passing from western Canada through Fort William eastward, but also on live stock passing from provinces east through Fort William westward. In addition, a somewhat arbitrary selection was made of commodities moving westward from the eastern provinces into the prairies, and certain fixed rates were agreed to be adopted by the company as respects those commodities. The railway company lived up to its obligations as respects that agreement continuously until the year 1918. The living up to its obligations on the part of the Canadian Pacific entailed not only the extension of the application of the agreement to its own largely enhanced mileage both west and east, but entailed as well, in order to get business, the application of the same rates on the same or approximately the same commodities, by other competing companies. As a consequence, those rates became virtually universal.

In 1918, the year at which the incidence of the war and all its dangers were at their worst, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States made an order in respect of railway wages known as the McAdoo award. There were many subsequent orders on the part of the Chicago board, and all of these had the result of very materially—indeed, drastically—elevating the whole level of railway wages in that country. Our railways are, to an extent, international—that is, to the extent that many of them cross the boundary. They are international also in this respect: the organizations of employees that man our roads are of an international character. The situation that confronted the governmen, then, was this: These increased wages having taken effect in the United States, there naturally arose a demand—indeed, the demand was inevitable—that they similarly take effect on the Canadian portions of the roads and throughout our country. And beyond question—though we need not go back and put ourselves in the same position just now—beyond question, we would have been confronted at that crucial time with a very serious tie-up—yes, paralysis, if not the destruction of our entire transportation work—had not the demand been met. The railways found themselves in the position that they could not meet the demand, largely because of the general level of the rates, but as well because of the rates in force under the Crowsnest pass agreement. The general level could not equitably be raised unless the impediment of that agreement were removed. Consequently, the government of that time—and hon. members will remember the constitution of the government then—in deference to the imperious demand that the war situation imposed upon us in this country, determined that its duty was courageously to face the situation, to remove the impediment and at all costs bring about conditions under which transportation would move in Canada as it had to move if the war on our part was to be conducted. So that under the powers vested in us by Parliament, certain railway rates recommended to the government unanimously by the Railway Commission of that time were established by Order in Council, P.C. 1863 of the 27th of July, 1918. These rates, let me repeat, were the rates that in the judgment of the Railway Commission were essential if the objects sought were to be gained, namely, the moving of our commerce. They were established, and that they might be, the Crowsnest pass agreement was for the time being suspended. In 1919, as hon. gentlemen well know, though the war was over in the sense that the armistice had for some months been signed, the conditions that the war brought about were more marked, more accentuated, more acute, than they had been even the year before. That, indeed, was in part due to further increases of wages made by the Chicago Railway Board, which had precisely the same effect as respects Canadian wages as the McAdoo award of the previous year. The situation was met that year by the introduction to Parliament—indeed, the same had been done in I think, the two preceding years; one, anyway—of a general revision of the Railway Act of this country. The Government came to Parliament with a revision of that act. In the year 1919 the government of the day came first to the Senate—in an effort to distribute more equally the labours of Parliament—and laid before it the Government's proposals as to the revision of that act. Initially there was not included in it any reference whatever to the Crowsnest pass agreement. That bill came to and passed the House of Commons, but during its progress in this assembly the Government, after conferences with the Railway Commission, introduced subsection 5 of section 325 which in effect gave the Railway Commission free and untrammelled control of rates irrespective wholly of any special agreements that might have been entered into, and irrespective among other things, of the Crowsnest pass agreement itself. That was one of the amendments made in the Commons to the bill that came from the Senate, made at the instance of the Government. It was one among forty-three or forty-four amendments made, all of which amendments afterwards passed the Senate save four. Included in these four was this subsection 5 of section 325. In that form with the four clauses rejected the bill came back to the House of Commons. Managers were appointed for the two Houses, in accordance with our constitution. Those managers considered these four rejected amendments, and they adopted, after debate, subsection 5 of section 325. They suggested certain amendments to the other three, and in that form the managers reported to their respective bodies. Notwithstanding that subsection 5 of section 325 was accepted by the managers for the Senate, in the House of Commons certain objection was then taken to it, chiefly on the part of the present hon. member for New Westminster (Mr.

McQuarrie), who then sat for that constituency. After debate the Prime Minister of the day suggested that it might be well, because he expected, as all of us did, that conditions would change in a short time, to limit the operation of the suspension to a fixed time, and finally he himself introduced in the Commons an amendment to the clause by which the operation of the suspension was limited to three years and was made to expire on the 7th day of July, 1922.

The bill passed the Commons, was accepted by the Senate, and became the law of the country.

While this suspension was in operation the Railway Commission found themselves able on the 1st of January, 1921, to make some reduction, very small, and to make a subsequent reduction on the first of December of the same year. In the summer of 1921, also, a large reduction was made on live stock rates. Previous to that, there had in the year 1920 been a very substantial increase made by the Railway Commission, an increase of forty per cent in eastern Canada, and an increase of thirty-five per cent in western Canada—these, however, accompanied by most important exceptions applicable to coal, applicable to milk, applicable to stone, gravel and other materials, which had the effect of modifying very considerably the forty per cent and the thirty-five per cent increases respectively.

There was an appeal taken from this decision on the part of many bodies, provincial governments and others, to the Governor in Council against the judgment of the Railway Commission. It may be interpolated here that in the original statute, continued ever since, though control was vested in this judicial tribunal, the Railway Commission, of rates and other matters of railway supervision, there was reserved to the government of the day a review in appeal over what the Railway Commission might do, that review being virtually untrammelled so far as the words of the act were concerned. Historically, such review has not been exercised save to the extent of referring the judgment back where it might appear there had been certain considerations of fact not brought to the attention of the Railway Commission in its consideration of the case, or wrong principles affecting public policy adopted. I think that as a matter of record there has been only one change, that all the other interferences consisted merely of references back.

In the fall of 1920, upon appeal, the government of the day, after hearing counsel for all parties and after fully considering the entire question, referred back the order of the Railway Board because in its belief there had been certain principles followed by the board which were not sound principles in point of public policy. One principle to which exception was taken was this: The Railway Board in its judgment had affirmed that in determining what railway rates should be, how far they should go in the way of fixing rates, regard should under the circumstances be had to the financial requirements of the Canadian National system. The government of the day felt that having regard to the basic purposes for which the various units of that system were constructed, the factors in determining the construction being in part colonization, in part political, at all events not wholly commercial, it was not a sound principle to follow for the Railway Commission to say they must be governed in their decision as to what were fair and equitable rates by the financial requirements of the Canadian National Railway system. Therefore, there was a reference back, in order that that principle might be reviewed and that a decision might be arrived at without regard at all to the needs of the Canadian National. There was a reference back on other matters bearing on the alleged discrimination between the rates prevailing in western Canada and in eastern Canada. On the reference back the Railway Commission following the instructions, if you call them that, of the government, following the government's definition of what it believed to be true public policy on these matters, affirmed its decision previously arrived at, affirmed the rates therein set out.

It should, of course, be noted that in the original decision the board provided for monthly returns from all the companies, the three principal companies as it named them, and stated that upon those returns, if it appeared possible any month to effect reductions greater than those provided for in the decision itself, those reductions would be made. Anyway, the board affirmed its previous judgment, and since that time there have been made the two reductions of last year, but no more.

I should have said in the reference back made by the government of the decision of the commission in the fall of 1920, the government requested the Railway Board to make a general review of the whole railway rate position, with a view to

seeing what reductions could be made from time to time of a general character, but with a view especially to the elimination of all complaints, if possible, as to discrimination. The board addressed itself to the task imposed upon it by the government, and has been since the fall of 1920 mainly employed in investigations throughout the length and breadth of our country in order to put itself in a position to decide definitely this most complicated, and difficult problem. But the board has stated, as read by the Minister of Railways, that it finds itself now confronted with the very same obstacles that, on the reverse journey, it confronted in the year 1918. In determining now upon reductions, just as then in determining upon increases, it finds its hands tied by the revival on the 6th of July of this year of the old Crowsnest pass agreement, and it virtually says to this Parliament: We cannot decide what we ought to do in the way of reductions of the multiplied tariffs that are before us; we cannot decide the question until we know what is going to become of the Crowsnest pass agreement on the 6th day of July next. And they rightly affirm: We have not the power to say "yes" or "no" as to that revival—that is a matter for Parliament, and for Parliament alone. Consequently the Railway Commission are on sound ground in saying: The burden, in so far as it is on us, is suspended until Parliament acts with respect to the Crowsnest pass agreement. Hence it cannot be argued, I think, with any show of success that there is default at the present time on the part of the Railway Commission. That appears to be the judgment of the Government itself, as evidenced in the address to the Minister of Railways. I could not help but reflect as he was speaking on the probable difficulty that he had in bringing his Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to that opinion. I could not help but reflect indeed on some of his own speeches delivered in less responsible days; yes on some of the speeches of his leader (Mr. Mackenzie King), but particularly on those defiant and rebellious utterances of the Minister of Agriculture when he laid the whole indictment of our high railway rates at the door of the Railway Commission, and particularly at the door of its chairman, and when he pronounced himself bound on a crusade to Ottawa to dethrone that iniquitous chief.

That brings us to the position as it meets Parliament now. The Government of the day faced with the responsibility—just as we were faced with it in 1918 and in 1919—comes down with this resolution. I remarked in opening that we had historically in this country, though the obstacles were great, though the mountains were high, met them courageously and surmounted them in the main successfully—met them with intelligence, met them with practical business grasp. May I ask what is the spirit and the method with which the Government meets this situation now? It comes to Parliament and asks for a special committee of hon. members. To analyze this resolution, it asks for a special committee to inquire into transportation costs. That is the purpose of the resolution if it means what it says. There is nothing else that the committee is asked to do, save to inquire into the question of transportation costs. In the second paragraph, the resolution instructs the committee to listen to evidence on transportation rates, bearing particularly on the effect of the revival of the old Crowsnest pass agreement. Now the minister says this is a resolution asking Parliament to select a committee to consider the wisdom of the revival of the old Crowsnest pass agreement. It is not. If it was, my attitude to it would be just the same as it is now, but it is not that at all. It is for a committee to go into the whole question of transportation rates and to listen to evidence on the question of the revival of the old Crowsnest pass agreement. Very well let us take it to mean what the Minister of Railways says. Undoubtedly, in order to decide on the Crowsnest pass agreement revival, regard must be had to the general question of transportation rates. Intelligence—yes indeed, complete intelligence — must be exercised in relation to the question of general transportation rates. Of

4 p.m.

that there is no doubt at all. This committee is going to be a commission, if the Government has its way, to review the whole question of transportation rates and to listen to evidence with a view, I presume, to reporting on the question as to whether it ought to revive the old Crowsnest pass agreement. The resolution recites that this is to be done notwithstanding the fact that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commission. Well, I can see that that is a very good reason why there should not be a committee appointed to duplicate the functions of the Railway Commission. That is a very good reason recited by the Government for not

doing what it proposes; but the reason, the only reason, recited by the Government for doing what it proposes has very little more relationship to the conclusion than if it had recited that we have had a late and unsatisfactory spring. Why appoint a committee to go into the whole question of transportation rates? The reason, the minister says, is that the railway companies tell him that they are not favourable to a voluntary reduction because they do not know whether it is intended to revive the Crowsnest pass agreement. Well that would be some reason for the Government telling Parliament what it ought to do, and if the Government did not feel that it was in a position to tell Parliament what it thought it ought to do, it would be reason for the Government getting the necessary information by the best means in its power. Now what date is this? This is the 4th day of May, 1922. This suspension expires on the 6th day of July, 1922—almost two months from to-day. We are half-way through the time between the opening of this session and the expiration of this suspension. What is this committee to accomplish in the meantime? This committee is to accomplish what the best experts this country could secure found themselves unable to accomplish, not in weeks or months, but in years. In 1895 the question of railway rates was reviewed by a body under instructions of this Parliament. Many months were so occupied and really no result was obtained. The effort was renewed. In this connection I commend hon. members to an address delivered by Professor MacGibbon, of the University of Alberta, on or about the 19th day of January of this year on this subject—a most illuminating and carefully thought out address. I quote as follows:

> The first investigation into railway rate levels in the Canadian northwest occurred about 1895. Since that date rate grievances have been a fairly constant subject of discussion. A second investigation was begun in 1899, continued until 1902 and eventuated in the creation of the board of railway commissioners in 1903. In turn the board of railway commissioners has found a large part of its occupation in adjudicating upon rate disputes in western Canada.

The Commissioners, previous to 1903, deliberated for three years on this question. Finally they came to Parliament and said: It is so complicated, it is so big, that we commend to Parliament the creation of a judicial body that will take it under its permanent and constant charge and review. That was the conclusion after the last investigation. Since the Railway Commission was created, the great body of its time—as hon. members know, who read the reports of its activities—has been employed through its experts, travelling as it does through the length and breadth of Canada, in studying this question of transportation costs, in determining the application of its principles to the multiplied problems that come before it—because if there is one question that is complicated, if there is one question that is almost endless, if there is one question as to which experts, and only experts, can apply their minds in even a reasonable time to the solution of with any success, it is this question of the rate structure of our railways. What are equitable transportation costs are affected by fifty, yes a hundred, different considerations. The considerations that affect them at one point have no effect at all at another. Different considerations apply. The considerations that affect them as respects one road do not affect them as respects another road. The considerations that affect them as respects one commodity do not affect them as respects another. The considerations that affect them at one time do not affect them at another time at all. All sorts of outside influences and pressures, factors that cannot be eliminated, come from time to time. Why, after the Board, a board that, right from its inception, had devoted its time to this problem, was asked, in the fall of 1920, to make again a systematic, concentrated study of the question in order to determine, just as soon as possible, when reductions might be effected, that board has taken until now and is only now able to act, and then only, after we decide what we want done about the Crowsnest pass agreement. In an address delivered by the vice-chairman of that board just a few weeks ago in the city of Montreal, he elaborated at some length on the many-sidedness of this great question; and amongst his assertions was this, that there had been submitted to the board last year alone no fewer than 75,000 different tariffs of rates by the various railway companies of this country. I am informed that there are to-day no fewer than 250,000 different tariffs of rates in actual effect. Such is something of the nature of the question; and the Government comes to Parliament and says: "We have to decide whether we will continue the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement or whether we will not, and we are going to ask a committee of Parliament to delve into the whole railway rate question, especially in

its bearing on this question, and to give us its recommendation in time to take effect before the 6th day of July." nay, more, in time to take effect much sooner. After the Government comes to Parliament with its judgment and submits it to Parliament, then some time must intervene. The Government's judgment may be: Yes; the Government's judgment may be: No; the Government's judgment, may be: Yes, conditionally; the Government's judgment may be: No, conditionally, and the multiplicity of conditions it might be hard, at this time, to conjecture, conditions that might be possible and right. Whatever the Government's decision may be, one of those two, one of those dozen, the rates that must be formulated, in accordance with the decision of the Government, will be of a different character in the case of one from that of another. All those tariffs of rates must be formulated after the Government decides, after Parliament decides. They must be submitted to the Railway Commission; and the Railway Commission may feel it should hear evidence, indeed, it may feel bound to hear evidence pro and con as to those rates in the light of the decision that the Government arrives at. Consequently, a reasonable time undoubtedly must intervene between the determination of this problem on the part of Parliament and the 6th day of July when the suspension expires. Wher is that reasonable time? I submit that all this subsequent deliberation will take at least some days or weeks, and we have only about eight weeks left. Yet the appointment of this committee is asked on the 4th day of May, and it is asked to come to such intelligent decision, after review of the whole question of transportation costs, as to be able adequately in the course of three, four or five weeks to advise the Government in this regard.

You ask me what should be done? It seems to me that the course of the Government was quite clear. The late government went into this matter with the body that should have the information in its hands. The late government consulted that commission which Parliament created in order that it might have this information in its hands. We consulted that commission in 1918 and, again, in 1920. We acted on the recommendations of that commission. We got the facts from them in order to enable us to say to Parliament, what, in our judgment, ought to be done, and we came to Parliament and, by the voice of a member of the government, we submitted to Parliament the judgment of the government and asked that Parliament review that judgment in the regular constitutional way. I submit that that course is the course that ought to be pursued to-day; yes, it is the course that should have been pursued earlier in the session if the Government we have now had been able to decide anything at all. We should have known what the judgment of the Government was long before this period of the session, in order that a well deliberated decision might be reached in regard to this question and all concerned adjust themselves accordingly.

On what ground does the Government seek to evade its responsibility? What is there about the matter that justifies the Government in seeking to evade its responsibility? It is true that on occasion special committees are the proper course. If a new question presents itself as respects which new facts may be divulged, new angles of approach may be disclosed, and as respects which there is no constitutional tribunal competent to advise the Government, then there may be a case for a special committee. Special committees have frequently been appointed under those circumstances. But this is an old subject, not a new question in any sense, a question that has been before us for years and, moreover, a question, in respect of which, as to the facts that we ought to have at hand, to enable the Government to decide, there is a body sitting, prepared to advise, having gathered information thereon during seventeen years of its existence. Why, then, not go to that body? Why seek to evade responsibility for action by asking a new body, wholly unequipped, wholly inexperienced, in a course of time even ludicrously inadequate, to come to a decision to advise the Government? Let the Government go to the Railway Commission and ask them what will be the effect, on the general question of a reduction of rates, of the expiration of the suspension. Let the Government ask the commission what will be the effect on trade throughout the country if the expiration of the suspension is allowed and the old agreement revives. Let them ask the commission what, in their judgment, will be the effect on organized and every other industry if the old agreement does not revive and if the suspension is made permanent. Let them ask the commission what will be the effect on the earning power of roads, on surpluses, on railway

credits. Let them inquire what, if either of these courses is followed, will be these effects in the judgment of the commission that has studied this subject for years. That can easily be done; the commission is in a position to advise the Government. It is the duty of the commission, and it is, doubtless, ready to advise the Government. Let the Government take that course which it should have taken long ago, and come to this House and say: "This is our proposal, our best judgment; to this House we submit that judgment, and we ask for approval of the policy of the Government." Is that not the manly, the courageous course? Is that not the course consistent with responsible government—responsible government about which we heard so wearisomely, so inconsistently all through these later years? That is the course I recommend to the administration. Let the administration take that course and it will give earnest of something that the people of this country are waiting very wearily for the administration to show; it will show courage, resolve and capacity to deal with the practical task of governing this country. Does the administration expect, by the passing of this resolution, that a committee of this House can accomplish in two months, nay, in far less than two months, anything comparable with what the Railway Commission has already accomplished and can advise the Government upon at the present time? Does it expect that? It expects nothing of the sort.

Now, I do not like to indulge in expectations, but I should like to give what seems to me the real purpose of the Government. Whether it is a deliberate purpose or not, I submit that the passing of this resolution is going to have the effect of stalling the whole question. It is going in a few short weeks, to land the Government in a cul-de-sac, and the Government may find itself obliged to come to Parliament and say: "Oh, the committee is still at work; we find that is an enormous question. We find that this is a question the most intricate and complicated that a body of men ever addressed itself to, and the committee is not yet through. We dare not in these circumstances take the responsibility of letting the suspension lapse, and so we come to Parliament and, aside from the merits of the question, as to which we have no opinion at all, we ask that under these special and stringent conditions Parliament agree with us to a continuation of the suspension." That is what I expect. I hope that my words of warning now will have the effect of deflecting the Government from that course. But if they have not that in mind, for the life of me I do not know any proper public object they have in view.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask a question on that point? Does my right hon. friend himself support the further suspension of the operation of the agreement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: "My right hon. friend" will come to his decision when it is his constitutional obligation to do so. When I was in office, yes, and when the hon. member (Mr. Crerar) was a colleague of mine in the year 1918, he and I in conjunction with our other colleagues took our courage in our hands and came to Parliament with our decision. We made our decision in 1918; we had to make it in the vital interests of the country; and we came to Parliament in 1919 and took responsibility for that decision. We treated Parliament in 1919 precisely as, I submit, it is the duty of the Government to treat this House. We could with more reason than now applies have adopted these evasive tactics, but we did not do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when any facts are adduced to show the conscienceless character of the methods they pursued to obtain power, have adopted a uniform reply. Of all things that they have done, there is one respect in which they have been consistent. When they are charged with dereliction of duty and with misleading the public, when they are charged in a wholesale way with swallowing the convictions and professions of a lifetime, they always answer: "Oh, we won the election. We are here and you are there."

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the constant and solitary answer of the Government, and hon. gentlemen opposite, unable to agree with me in serious argument, at all events are at one with me in my statement of their defence. In their desperation it is really the only answer they can give; so to my friends opposite a generous pardon is extended now. But I answer them in their own words on this question. Yes; you are there and we are here; and I submit to you the suggestion that you come before Parliament with a policy and thus demean yourselves in a manner becoming men who have courted and are entrusted with power.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): If my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) could conclude his ar-

guments on any of these questions without making a political attack, it strikes me that his contributions to the debates would have a greater impression on the House. Now, this is a matter which should have no political significance at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: I see that hon. members cannot imagine anything being discussed in Parliament except from a party standpoint. Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that while the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) who has had an experience of many years, and who admittedly has read the information gathered by the Board of Railway Commissioners for over twenty years, has not yet been able to make up his own mind,—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say I had read it all.

Mr. GRAHAM: Then, I stand corrected. My right hon. friend says he has not read it. I understood from his argument that the information on which the old government had acted carried down to the year 1920-21. I had the impression that it was information received from the Board of Railway Commissioners, as gathered during the past twenty years, upon which the late government had acted. Well, it is rather worse to make a decision without having adequate information than it is to arrive at a conclusion after being seized of that information. However, that is just by the way. I want to point out to my right hon. friend that there is a difference between this Government and the late government, and I am glad of the fact. Under the War Measures Act the late government took advantage of its powers, to do everything itself. This Government proposes to let Parliament have something to say in regard to matters in which the whole people are interested.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is the whole thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was in 1919 that the question was dealt with.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Order in Council was passed in 1918, and my hon. friends submitted the matter to Parliament in 1919. But I will not waste the time of the House dealing with these questions; I desire to discuss the matter seriously.

The railway situation in Canada is one that requires not the political but the most serious business attention of every member of the House. We have had differences of opinion, and I could take up the time of this House for hours discussing these differences; but I take the ground that the people of this country are not so much interested now in what either party has done in the past, as in what Parliament at the present time is going to do. We cannot live in the past if we are to make progress. Conditions in this country have changed; the war has altered the viewpoint of many people on many things. We find ourselves to-day confronted with a condition, and not a theory; and it needs practical suggestions and not a rehash of old political arguments if we are to solve the problems before us. If hon. gentlemen, who perhaps have not carefully read the agreement of 1897, will permit me, I shall place on Hansard the gist of that agreement so far as freight rates are concerned. I will not read the whole of it. The Crowsnest pass agreement makes this concession with regard to freight rates:

(d) That a reduction shall be made in the general rates and tolls of the Company as now charged, or as contained in its present freight tariff, whichever rates are now the lowest, for carloads or otherwise, upon the classes of merchandise hereinafter mentioned, westbound, from and including Fort William and all points east of Fort William on the Company's railway to all points west of Fort William on the Company's main line, or on any line of railway throughout Canada owned or leased by or operated on account of the company, whether the shipment is by all rail line or by lake and rail, such reduction to be to the extent of the following percentages respectively, namely:—

Upon all green and fresh fruits, 33⅓ per cent;
Coal oil, 20 per cent;
Cordage and binder twine, 10 per cent;
Agricultural implements of all kinds, set up or in parts, 10 per cent;
Iron, including bar, band, Canada plates, galvanized, sheet, pipe, pipe-fittings, nails, spikes and horse shoes, 10 per cent;
All kinds of wire, 10 per cent;
Window glass, 10 per cent;
Paper for building and roofing purposes, 10 per cent;
Roofing felt, box and packing, 10 per cent;
Paints of all kinds and oils, 10 per cent;
Live stock, 10 per cent;
Wooden ware, 10 per cent;
Household furniture, 10 per cent;

And that no higher rates than such reduced rates or tolls shall be hereafter charged by the company upon any such merchandise carried by the company between the points aforesaid; such reductions to take effect on or before the first of January, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight;

(e) That there shall be a reduction in the company's present rates and tolls on grain and flour from all points on its main line, branches, or connections, west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur and all points east, of three cents per one hundred pounds, to take effect in the following manner:—One and one-half cent per one hundred pounds on or before the first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, and an additional one and one-half cent per one hundred pounds on

or before the first day of September, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-nine; and that no higher rates than such reduced rates or tolls shall be charged after the dates mentioned on such merchandise from the points aforesaid.

It is no wonder that it was a serious step for any government to relieve the railway from those rates, but as a matter of fact conditions were such at that time that I would not criticize the then government for doing almost anything in reason in order to carry out our part in that great war effort. But now the time has come when, according to the order in council, Parliament is called upon to decide a policy.

Let me point out to my right hon. friend that his remarks about the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners have no bearing whatever on the reference of this question to a committee. The Board of Railway Commissioners as a matter of fact—and I had a good deal to do with the powers given to that board—are in just the position my right hon. friend stated. But he was rather endeavouring to mystify hon. members in dilating on its duties and powers. No one suggests for a moment that this Parliament should deprive the Board of Railway Commissioners of any of its statutory powers. But this question to be decided now is not a question of rates per se as my legal friends would say, it is a question of policy on the part of this Parliament.

Notwithstanding the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners, my right hon. friend says that that Board cannot exercise these powers until it knows fully under what conditions they are to be exercised. If the Crowsnest pass agreement is to be reverted to, then the Board of Railway Commissioners will have no power to go behind that agreement; they will be confined to the rates named therein so far as that agreement is concerned. But if Parliament in its wisdom decides to defer for a further period the restoration of this agreement, then the Board of Railway Commissioners could give their decision as to what these rates ought to be.

This is not a new question; it was up many times during the period I had the honour to be at the head of the Railway Department. At its inception the Board of Railway Commissioners was clothed with certain powers, which were enlarged from time to time, until to-day the jurisdiction of the Board is far wider than that of any similar commission in the world; but, of course, as I said before, the statute embodying the Crowsnest pass agreement is outside the scope of the board's jurisdiction.

At one period after this agreement was made the question of rates came up. It was argued on many sides that at that time, conditions having changed, and the Board of Railway Commissioners having been appointed to deal with rates, some arrangement ought to be made by which the agreement would be abrogated. The government of that day, believing that a contract made under the circumstances was binding, could not see how the agreement could be displaced.

We are not discussing the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners, we are discussing what should be the policy of Parliament with reference to the Crowsnest pass agreement, and to my mind a decision cannot be properly arrived at until we are seized of all the facts. I leave it to the fairness of both sides of the House to say whether I am not right in stating that at the present moment we are not in the position we were in when that agreement was made; we are not even in the position we occupied five years ago. We are here representing people who have a dual capacity, they being both taxpayers and part owners of a great national system of railways, and therefore interested in what is to become of those railways. In years gone by they had no such interest except to a very limited extent, that is, in the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway, comprising less than two thousand miles altogether; whereas our National Railway system to day is twenty-two thousand miles in extent. These same people also have interests as consumers and producers. The management of our National Railway system—the railway system of the people—tell us that if we revert to the Crowsnest pass agreement it will very materially injure their property. We are here representing them as directors of the people's property on the one hand; on the other hand, the producers and consumers say: We are being very materially hurt now by the existing transportation conditions. The railway companies come to us and make representations privately that they believe that they can convince a committee of the House that conditons are such as to warrant some amelioration of the position the railways would be in—their railways and our railways—if this agreement was allowed to come into force again.

Now, this House, as a House, Mr. Speaker, has no power or method of hear-

ing every side of this story except through a committee. We cannot sit here and listen to arguments by the railway companies and by our own railways; but a committee of the House could hear those arguments and then report to Parliament what the situation is, when the Government would be able to give a decision. My right hon. friend is altogether mistaken in thinking there is any idea on the part of the Government of evading responsibility. But a government that believes in fairness is of the opinion that this matter should not be decided until all parties are heard. That is British fair play, and that is what the committee is suggested for.

To recapitulate, Mr. Speaker, here is the situation so far as the Government is concerned. Unless some legislation takes place the statute embodying the Crowsnest pass agreement will come into force again on July 6; such legislation will not be passed unless good cause is shown; and the opportunity for presenting that cause can only be had through a committee. That is the only fair way, in fact it is the only way by which we can arrive at a just decision. The Government, I repeat, has no desire to escape its responsibilities, but it does believe in fairness to our own railways as well as to others, and it believes also that the only way in which the various views of the parties interested can be presented to this House is through a committee. Then, upon receiving the report of that committee, Parliament and the Government will decide what course ought to be taken.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the motion under discussion is not expressed nearly so clearly in the motion itself as in the words that have fallen from my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Kennedy) this afternoon, and later from my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham).

Reduced to its essential meaning, the motion resolves itself into nothing more and nothing less than this, that a committee of this House shall be selected to consider whether or not the Crowsnest pass agreement, respecting railway freight rates in this country and which has been under suspension for almost four years, shall be allowed once more to come into effect, be suspended for a further period, or be indefinitely set aside. That is the purpose of the resolution, and it is from that angle that I propose to discuss it.

I listened with a great deal of interest,

[Mr. Graham.]

as I always do, to the speech made by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) who leads the hon. members to my right. He gave a very interesting historical review of railway conditions in this country during the past twenty-five years. He chided the Government—possibly with some little reason—upon not having a policy on this question, but he sat down without giving any intimation whatever to this House or to the country where he himself stands with regard to this important matter. My right hon. friend is an adept at side-stepping in political debates, and he certainly outshone himself this afternoon, because no one by any stretch of the imagination, could tell from his remarks what his position is on this question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the Government will say, and if my hon. friend will say, that my stating what ought to be done is necessary to enable them to decide, I do not think I would object to saying so.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, that throws a little more illumination on the position of my right hon. friend, but certainly not a great deal. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation in stating to the House my position on this motion. It resolves itself, as I said a moment ago, into the question whether or not we shall give consideration to a further suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement and its effect on railway rates in this country. I have, after careful consideration, come to the conclusion that that agreement should not further be suspended, and taking that position, Mr. Speaker, I cannot consistently support a motion to refer to a committee of this House the question whether or not it shall be further suspended. I think it is quite a proper thing for this or any government to seek the views of the House, through a special committee, on questions of public importance. We have followed that procedure in respect to the Pensions Committee. It might be argued with as much force, I think, by my right hon. friend or by any other hon. member that it is the duty and the function of the Government to bring down a fixed policy in respect to the question of pensions, and not send it to a pensions committee. I cite that merely as an illustration. I do not occupy common ground with my right hon. friend when he chides the Government for its refusal to reach a decision upon this matter. I base my opposition to the motion on a different ground altogether—on the ground that this agreement should not further be

suspended, but that it should again come into operation so far as its effect upon railway rates in this country is concerned. I propose—and I shall be as brief as possible—to give the House the reasons why I have reached that conclusion.

There is no doubt, I am sure, in the minds of any hon. member of this House—or, indeed, in the mind of any person in this country—as to the great need of cheap transportation costs, in relation to both freight and passengers. The vast distances of the country; the sparseness of the population; the necessity of binding the different sections of this country together—and that can be done only by a full and complete understanding of each other's needs—these constitute the strongest reasons why we should have the lowest possible transportation rates consistent with sound business necessities. Indeed, the Intercolonial railway was built at the expense of the people of Canada for the specific purpose of linking the Maritime provinces down by the sea with the other provinces further west, in order that better and cheaper facilities for travel should be afforded to people visiting the one section of the country or the other, and in order as well that there might be lower transportation costs in freights. These were the chief considerations that led to the construction of the Intercolonial railway. When the Canadian Pacific railway project was launched, it was for precisely the same reason: that the great West and the great province of British Columbia might be linked up with the eastern part of Canada. Later we had the Canadian Northern; we had the National Transcontinental; we had the Grand Trunk Pacific—and for what reason? The whole argument in support of these projects was to furnish competition in the matter of railway freight rates and to bring down transportation costs as respects both freight and passengers.

If we look over the railway history of this country we find—and my authority for this is the Drayton-Acworth report, prepared in part by my hon. friend the late Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton)—that the total assistance given by public bodies in this country to railways in Canada up to the end of 1916, in cash, in values of lands, and in bond guarantees, reached the tremendous figure of $968,000,000. Now, why was that done? Mainly, if not altogether, for the purpose of ensuring cheap transportation costs, of reducing rates on freight and passenger traffic. And I say that that whole purpose was bound up with the laudable object of linking up the different sections of this country, as indeed they must be linked up if Canada is ever to attain national eminence.

We come now to a consideration of this Crowsnest pass agreement, which, after all, is the real bone of contention in the motion at present before the House. The leader of the Opposition has sketched the history of this agreement—indeed, the Minister of Railways did the same—and I want in passing to make a brief reference to it. This agreement was made by the Parliament of Canada in 1897 or 1898—I forget which, at the moment—with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that it was a specific agreement made between the people of Canada, acting through their Parliament, and a great transportation system. Under its terms the government of Canada subsidized the Crowsnest Pass railway, a subsidiary line of the Canadian Pacific, to the extent of $11,000 a mile, totalling, as my right hon. friend stated, something over $4,000,000. In return, the Canadian Pacific agreed to certain maximum rates on a considerable list of commodities passing from eastern Canada to western Canada and also affecting a few commodities, chiefly grain, passing from western Canada to points in the East. That agreement continued in effect, as has been pointed out, until 1918.

I was in complete accord with the position that was taken by the government of the day at that time in respect to this matter. I was then a member of the Government, and I know that there was no other course open to the government and to Parliament at that time than to abrogate temporarily the effect of this agreement in respect to rates. The reason for that has been stated here this afternoon. We were living under war conditions; the cost of living had mounted; railway wages had to be advanced; the cost of coal and of materials had advanced at a very rapid rate. Consequently, under those conditions, it was necessary that our Canadian railways should be placed in a position where they could efficiently carry on during the war. As far as I know, while there was some criticism raised to the action by Parliament, on the whole it commended itself to the judgment of the people of Canada.

The agreement was first set aside by Order in Council. Later, in 1919, an amendment was made to the Consolidated

Railway Act, then passing through Parliament, suspending the operation of that agreement for a further period of three years. I say of that amendment also, although I had left the government before it was introduced, it was necessary at that time. But the heavy burden of freight rates did not oppress the people of Canada at that time in the way they do to-day. Why? It is true that freight rates had gone up, but the prices that the farmers were receiving for their products had also gone up. Take the prices they were receiving for their grain, for their live-stock, for their dairy products; take the prices the lumbermen were getting for their lumber, and the prices the flour millers were getting for their flour; these had all advanced greatly, and when you take into consideration the prices that were then received for these commodities, the freights as they were fixed at that date were not unduly oppressive. But if they were not onerous then, the rates are certainly onerous now. In my humble judgment there is no one thing to-day that more directly affects the business prosperity of Canada than the excessive freight rates which obtain at the present time. I have stated that before, and I think my statement is supported by the sound business sense of the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I have seen resolutions passed by boards of trade, I have seen representations made by provincial governments, I have seen representations made by other bodies, all looking towards a reduction of freight rates and urging in the strongest possible language the need there is for a substantial reduction in transportation costs in this country.

If this motion carries, we admit at once that the question of the Crowsnest pass agreement is open to debate, and as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to place myself in that position. The agreement was made in 1897 for what purpose? The railway company secured a valuable cash subsidy from the Parliament of Canada, and these rates were fixed, and for what purpose? They were fixed not only to benefit western Canada; they were fixed as much to benefit eastern Canada. The railways wanted financial assistance and the government gave it. To assist the factories of eastern Canada, to assist the development of business in this Dominion, these rates were fixed in return, so that commodities might more easily pass from eastern Canada to the great prairies of the West, which were then opening up in all their vast extent. The arrangement, I submit, was beneficial to western Canada, and it was necessary also for the prosperity of eastern Canada. We have had in Canada for the last forty years a system of protection so far as our fiscal policy is concerned. The net result of that policy of protection has been to drive business east and west to a greater extent than would otherwise have been the case, and if you are going to compel the farmers of western Canada, the labouring people, the business men, the merchants, the professional men and every one else in western Canada, to buy their goods from eastern Canada, the matter of transportation costs from the East to the West must be taken into consideration. Consequently, if it were essential that we should have as low freight rates as possible at that time, I say it is just as essential that we should have them now.

As far as the commodities of western Canada are concerned, it is equally essential that these reductions take place. I speak from personal knowledge, Mr. Speaker, when I make this statement: as a result of the increase in freights on lumber, for instance, that took place in 1918, lumber mills, not one or two, but many along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway in northern British Columbia closed their doors and they have not operated since, and the one reason for that is that the increase in freight costs on lumber made it impossible for the lumber manufacturers to sell their products in the markets they had hitherto served. The same is true in respect to the shipment of fish from the Pacific coast to the prairie. In the prairie regions we are dependent for our deep sea fish mainly on the Pacific ocean. Consequently, the very fact of the increase in freight rates affects also the shipment of that commodity.

I will give the House an even more pressing case than those I have mentioned, and that is the effect that these increased freight charges have had on the shipment of grain from the prairies. The provincial treasurer of Saskatchewan, speaking on this question in the Saskatchewan legislature a few months ago, when that legislature unanimously passed a resolution asking that the Crowsnest pass agreement come back into effect, made the statement that he knew of cases, not isolated ones, but hundreds of cases, where farmers had not threshed their grain because the price they would get for it when it reached the market at

Fort William or Port Arthur would not be sufficient to pay the freight charges after threshing costs had been paid. I have heard, I believe reliably of cases, not isolated ones by any means, where railway agents are insisting on farmers prepaying their freight on grain going to Fort William because they are not going to take any chances of the grain not realizing sufficient when it reaches Fort William to pay the transportation costs. I draw the attention of the House to that fact and I say that this country cannot prosper under those conditions.

What effect has that on eastern Canada?—you ask me. The best market that the factories of eastern Canada have today are the prairie provinces of this Dominion, as every member of this House knows. The great industry of western Canada is the industry of agriculture. That is a truism which needs no argument. If on the one hand these main producers of wealth in western Canada are to be handicapped by the excessive costs of getting their products to market, and if, on the other hand, the merchants, the manufacturers, and business generally is to be handicapped by the high cost of freight going to western Canada, how can we expect the country to prosper? How under those conditions can you expect your factories to open, how can you expect to relieve unemployment in eastern Canada, how can you expect to bring about a general revival of business in this country? It cannot be done. I say that on that ground also, it is of the first importance that the rates on freight particularly should come down in this country.

There is another argument; my hon. friend the Minister of Railways made allusion to it to-day. It is to my mind an argument that carries a very great deal of force. You can raise freight rates in this country to a point where you will absolutely destroy business. It is true, also, that you can bring them down to a point where you will destroy the profit of the transportation companies, thereby bringing about inefficiency in transportation. Somewhere between these two points must be found the medium, the basis upon which rates will be fixed. It is absolutely essential, if business is to be revived in this country that freight rates come down. I submit, sir, that when we maintain freight rates at the existing levels of today we are killing the goose that lays the golden egg as far as furnishing business to the railways is concerned, and it is a short-sighted policy that should not receive the approval of this House.

It has been argued—I have not heard the argument here but I have seen it presented outside, and I wish to make an allusion to it—that if a reduction in freight rates takes place it will have a serious effect on the earnings of our Canadian railways —that it will have a serious effect on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that it will have a very serious effect on the National Railways. I wish to examine that argument very briefly. When the question of freight rates was before the Railway Commission a few years ago—and indeed, I believe throughout the whole history of the last few years in the consideration given to this matter by the Railway Commission —the needs of the National Railways were never taken as the basis upon which the rates would be fixed. The basis upon which the Railway Commission fixed rates was the needs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was recognized that it would be impossible for the Railway Commission to fix rates such as would be required to enable the National Railways to pay. Consequently the National Railways, as a factor in the fixing of rates, were left out of the equation, and I think I am quite right in stating that the rates were fixed primarily upon the needs of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Now, it is argued in some quarters that it is necessary to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway prosperous in order that the credit of Canada may be maintained; that it is necessary that the Canadian Pacific Railway be furnished with rate fixtures to enable it to earn sufficient surplus to pay the dividends on its stock. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that argument is not a sound argument. The credit of Canada, the national financial position of Canada, is not fixed by the balance sheet of the Canadian Pacific Railway; nor is it fixed by the balance sheet of any other corporation. Upon what does national credit rest? It rests on the general prosperity of the country, and it rests equally on the security the country gives in the way of law and order — the security it gives to foreign capital when it invests here, the security that is absolutely essential if prosperity is to be maintained. These are the factors which establish the national credit and not the balance sheets of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or the balance sheets of any other business concern in this country. We have sometimes made a very great mistake in our attitude

of mind toward that question. I have nothing against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; I want to see it prosper. It has prospered splendidly in Canada, and there is no Canadian but is proud of the record the Canadian Pacific Railway has made; but if we are to argue that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be maintained in the position where it can earn the dividends on its investment irrespective of everything else, then I say we are not on a sound basis in the consideration of the matter.

Let me point out another consideration: If we assume for the moment that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would be unable to pay its dividends for the year, would that be a very serious matter from the point of view of the national interest? There is scarcely a single railway in the United States that has not, at some period or other in its career, gone through the hands of a receiver. Has that affected the national credit of the United States? Why, until within comparatively recent years the United States was a great borrower of foreign capital—borrowing in Great Britain, borrowing in France, in Holland, in the countries of Europe that were prepared to lend capital for development purposes in North America; and the experience of the United States railways in this respect had no effect whatever in fixing the national credit of the republic. Another fact too that should not be overlooked is that Canada has done very well by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think it is improper, or unfair, in any sense to bring that argument up at the present time.

5 p.m.

Quoting again from the Drayton-Acworth report we find, according to that report, that the total assistance given by the public of Canada to the Canadian Pacific Railway reached the handsome total of $228,000,000 since that road was brought into existence. But the Canadian Pacific Railway also enjoyed other advantages in the carrying on of its work in Canada. Under the agreement by which it was chartered by the Canadian Parliament it was given exemption from taxation not only on its works, that is on its railway works, but also on the immense land grants it received from the federal government by way of assistance at the time the project was undertaken. At that time I think it was generally understood by Parliament, at any rate it was the general opinion of the country, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was given exemptions from taxation on its lands for a period of twenty years. But it was later held by the courts that that period did not begin from the date the land grants were given but from the time the lands were selected. What is the result? The Canadian Pacific Railway Company hold their millions of acres of land in western Canada and have not even yet in many cases, paid any taxes on those lands.

That was the result of the agreement entered into by the Parliament of Canada with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but that agreement imposed serious hardships. In many districts in western Canada it was almost impossible to form school districts because the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway were exempt from taxation, and the burden was so great on the other ratepayers of the district that they were almost unable to carry on their educational work.

Now that agreement, Mr. Speaker, was made with the company when the railway was undertaken, and the people and the Parliament of Canada have scrupulously lived up to every letter of it from that day to this. I submit that now we are getting back again to normal conditions, when the prices of natural products in Canada have gone down in many cases to below the pre-war figures, it is not too much to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to live up to the agreement it made with the Canadian people when this Crowsnest pass railway was built and when, in return for $4,000,000 cash subsidy, it agreed that the rates on commodities,—on a large list of commodities,—would never go beyond a certain point. I submit, Sir, it is not too much to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway Company now to respect the letter of the agreement that was made at that time just as scrupulously, as fully and as faithfully as the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people have observed the agreement they made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company when that great enterprise was undertaken.

There is another fact to be remembered. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not in a difficult position financially. I read, with a great deal of pride as a good Canadian, the balance sheet of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company a few days ago —pride in this sense, that we had a great transportation company that was in such a sound position financially. But I have studied the balance sheet of the company

and I find that it has reserves not in the tens of thousands, not in the hundreds of thousands, not in the millions, but in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I have no fault to find particularly with that but why, Mr. Speaker, are reserves created by any business concern, why are reserves created by a transportation company just the same as an industrial concern? The reserves are created as a provision against a rainy day when the earning power may go down a little. Then these reserves can be drawn upon to make good the deficiency. I submit that should the Crowsnest pass agreement go back into effect, even should it have the effect temporarily—it would not be for more than a year or so at the very outside—of preventing the company from making the earnings that it has made in the past, that its dividends to its shareholders could very well be cared for out of the handsome reserves which have been created during the course of a long period of time.

We now come to a consideration of National Railway matters. I said a moment ago that the needs of the National Railways were never taken into consideration by the commission when rates were being fixed; and it is of course absurd for any person, either here or outside, to consider the proposition to having railway rates fixed on a basis that will enable the National Railways to pay. That cannot be done. I shall have something to say upon that, I hope, when the estimates of the Minister of Railways come up again. This is not the time, nor the place, nor the occasion to discuss that question. I merely submit that rates cannot be fixed on the basis of enabling the Canadian National lines to pay, and, consequently that factor may be omitted from our consideration of the case. The Canadian National lines are largely colonization lines, they pass through new territory, and I should like to say, just in passing, that I have an abundant faith in the future of our Canadian National railways. As I have said before, as I say now and, as I shall take occasion to say again whenever an opportunity arises, they are a good potential asset for this country and they will eventually prove a great asset. I have a good deal of sympathy with the Minister of Railways in the position in which he finds himself in connection with the National railways. I think, judging from the statement that was submitted to the House the other day, he is tackling the proposition energetically, and I hope we shall soon get on common ground as regards all political parties, when we shall treat this national undertaking as a business proposition and free it absolutely, continuously and forever from any consideration of party politics in its administration.

Allusion has been made to the difficulties that will face this committee if it undertakes this work. I can see no prospect that such a committee, undertaking the programme that was laid down by the Minister of Railways this afternoon, and that was supported by the Minister of Militia, can reach any intelligent conclusion in this matter in the time at its disposal. We know all the factors that enter into freight rates, all the circumstances surrounding the question; and simply to say: "We can appoint a committee of this House that will hear evidence on this matter and bring in a decision that will enable us to reach an intelligent conclusion upon it," is altogether beyond the possibilities of the case. When we survey conditions in Canada to-day, we know they are difficult, if, indeed, not desperate. Every one, I am sure, is glad to note that there are signs of revival. To bring about a revival of prosperity in this country, a revival of business, to start the wheels of industry going again, to give encouragement to the people on the farms to produce their stuff, to give employment to labour, one of the first and necessary steps is to bring down transportation costs in this country, and for that reason I am opposed to any further suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement in this case. It is stated that dire results will follow if this scale of rates again comes into effect. I cannot see that such will be the case; but even if it should prove, by actual experience, an undue handicap upon our railways, why could this Parliament not, a year or two years hence, again consider the matter? Let us get back to the old scale of rates; let us see what effect that will have on business conditions in this country; and then, if it proves unduly burdensome to our railways, it is always open to this Parliament to give further consideration to it. But, in the meantime, this agreement should not be further suspended. This Parliament should allow that legislation to lapse; we should come back under the scale of that agreement; and if we do that, we shall be taking perhaps the longest step we can in the immediate future towards restoring sound business conditions in this country.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I should like, in a word, to endorse the position taken by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I feel that the industrial sections of the West will agree with the position taken by the agriculturists. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says that it is necessary that freight rates should be reduced in order to ensure the continuance of Confederation. May I suggest that it is necessary that freight rates should be reduced in order that the economic life of the West may be maintained at all? The West occupies somewhat a different position economically from that of the East. The West has been built up entirely on a basis of the railways. Had we not the great transportation systems to the western plains, those plains would still be uninhabited and uninhabitable. The extent to which people can carry on in the West is absolutely dependent upon their transportation facilities, and only those who have lived in the West can quite appreciate the position in which the West has been placed during the last few years because of high freight rates. We are there as producers, we are there as consumers; and we have to pay both as producers and as consumers. That is true not merely of our agriculture, but of our fishing, our lumbering, our mining and other primary interests, we cannot begin to get these things started so long as freight rates remain as they are to-day. I take it that the railroads were built primarily to serve the people. Immense sums were granted in order that the Canadian Pacific railway should be built to serve the people; but to-day we find that the people cannot afford to use the railways. There are cases where goods are perishing in the fields because the producers cannot afford to ship them to the towns.

I think the hon. member for Marquette has already called attention to the fact that, in the middle West, we cannot get lumber from the west coast simply because of prohibitively high freight rates. It, therefore, becomes absolutely essential that these freight rates should be reduced. I do not know that a great deal of consideration need be given to the exact position of the Canadian Pacific in this regard. We all recognise that that railway has enjoyed a period of great success in the past. We recognise that subsidiary companies have been built up. Why should that railway not take its share, with other industries or with other concerns, at a time when there is more or less depression?

The suggestion to appoint a committee evidently looks to a discussion of the whole question. Supposing that this committee brings in a recommendation that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be still further suspended, where would we be then? I would just like to say that, in my best judgment, the West, at least, simply would not tolerate such a recommendation as that. We could not do so with the tens of thousands of unemployed throughout the West to-day, and with conditions stagnant as they are to-day. We simply must have some relief, and it seems to me that this question ought not to be referred to some committee to talk over for weeks; but rather that since the question is one of principle, the discussion should go on in this House and the principle should be decided here.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, at the risk of repeating a good deal of what has been said this afternoon, I desire to say a few words upon the resolution now before the House for consideration. I agree with the hon. member who leads the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) that the essential and vital question involved in this resolution relates to the Crowsnest pass agreement, which came into effect in 1897. I admit that that is a very important question. It is an important question to hon. gentlemen who sit directly opposite me and who represent constituencies in the prairie provinces. I wish to remind them, however, that it is not entirely a western question; it is as much an eastern question. And, more than that, I say that by a concurrence of events of recent years, and by reason of the economic and financial conditions of the country, it is a national problem and must be viewed in that light; if it is not so considered, we cannot reach a fair and sound conclusion. I admit that potentially a very great principle is involved in this matter, and a very difficult question is before hon. gentlemen of this House to determine. And we must settle it. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) deemed it prudent on his part to submit these matters to a committee, and the issue before us this afternoon is whether or not that request, in all the circumstances, is a fair one, a reasonable one, a practical one, and one which should be conceded by the House. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) did not, I think, give a very fair rendition of the resolution now before us. It may be quite true that

the introductory section of the resolution is expressed in too general terms. The important part of the resolution, however, is the enacting clause, which contains the submission which the minister asks us to put before the committee. Let me read it:

> That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry to the said committee with particular regard to the effect of the rates established by the Crowsnest pass agreement upon Canadian National railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally;

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend referred to the previous part of the resolution as being merely introductory. May I call his attention to the fact that it is not? The previous part of the resolution is an enacting clause. It says that, notwithstanding, and so forth, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee should be appointed to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): And still I adhere to my statement that the language used in the first section is very general. It refers to conferences between the Government and the heads of the railways; it refers to the Crowsnest pass agreement; but it is in the second part of the resolution that we find the enacting clause. Now, having read that clause, I would point out that this resolution does not call for an investigation into railway rates generally. That would be an impossible task to impose on a committee or, indeed, upon Parliament; for few hon. gentlemen in this House, if any, are competent to express an opinion upon the structure of railway rates. We have not had the experience or the training to enable us to do so, and with the exception perhaps of the last Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), hardly any hon. gentleman in this House would venture to give an opinion upon railway rates in detail.

In essence this resolution asks that a committee inquire into the effect of the Crowsnest agreement upon the Canadian National Railways. Thus the matter becomes a national problem. It is not sectional; it affects the whole of the country; it affects every citizen of Canada. And if it increases taxation the question is one upon which all interests must be heard. The leader of the Opposition objects to the creation of a parliamentary committee. He states that the Government should itself initiate a policy and present it to Parliament for consideration. Let me point out that this is a political question. It is not altogether a railway rate question though, that, of course, is involved. The Crowsnest pass agreement is one that was validated by Parliament; it was made effective by an act of Parliament. It was considered by the Parliament of Canada, and if the suspension is to be continued, or if we are to go back to the agreement, surely Parliament has a right to express an opinion upon the subject. In that case, it has a right to secure such evidence and facts as it deems necessary, from any source, and for that purpose a select committee is considered essential.

I would refer to the remarks made by the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). He was disposed, I thought, to consider this question largely from the standpoint of the conditions that prevailed in Canada when the agreement was entered into. He disregarded new factors that have come into the situation. He disregarded the fact that a few years ago we passed through a great war which has seriously affected many things we considered long ago settled, and affected, particularly, the economic interests not only of Canada but, as well, of the whole world. That fact must not be disregarded. Another factor has entered the situation. Since 1897, the people of Canada, through their Government, have become the owners of a vast railway system, and this ownership was not among the conditions that existed when the agreement was made. Let me say here that I am not taking a stand one way or the other in respect of the rate agreement referred to as the Crowsnest pass agreement. I confess frankly that I have never had an opportunity of studying it carefully. Living as I do in eastern Canada, there was no very great reason why I should take as much interest in the matter as would hon. gentlemen who live in the West. I am merely indicating the importance of the issue that is before us in the resolution now under consideration. The average member of Parliament is not, and cannot be, informed as to the facts; and I go further and say that it is quite probable that the country as a whole is not well informed of those facts. Before we undertake to make a decision in this matter, surely it is not an unfair request to ask, at least, that a committee be appointed to secure such facts as are relevant to the issue and as will assist the House in coming to a determination thereon.

Before I refer to some other matters I might consider one or two further re-

marks made by the leader of the Progressive party.

There was a time, possibly, when the Crowsnest pass rate agreement, as I have already stated, was purely a western question—when it affected largely the Canadian Pacific Railway and the people living in the territories served by that railway. It is a bigger question to-day. It does not affect the Canadian Pacific Railway and western interests solely; other railways and other interests are involved. My hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) said that if the revival of this rate agreement caused the Canadian Pacific Railway to pass its dividend, that perhaps would not be against the national interest. Well, of course if that occurred it would be bad for the shareholders. But I fear wider interests are involved. What would it indicate if that railway were unable to earn the dividend upon its stock held by the investing public? Would it not mean that there had been a recession in railway business, which in turn would indicate that there was a decline of activity in the commerce of the country? And if that condition affected the Canadian Pacific Railway disastrously, would it not of necessity affect adversely all other interests in the country? Therefore, I say it is a bigger question than the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway alone.

But I admit for the moment that I am not interested as to whether or not the Crowsnest pass agreement, if again put into effect, would cause such a diminution in the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the company would have to pass its dividends. We need not be concerned at the moment about that phase of the question. A railway never of itself originates or creates traffic. All commodities that are exchanged are produced by some section of our people, and a business transaction represents a sale and purchase on the part of two people; the sale and purchase must be an accomplished fact and must occur before transportation service is requisitioned at all. In other words, a railway only functions after individuals have consummated business and commercial transactions.

I am sure no Canadian is pleased with the fact that the Canadian National Railways during the past year operated at a deficit of considerably over fifty million dollars—a deficit which must be made up by taxation. And to what is it due? It is due, of course, to the fact that the country is not normal in its commercial and industrial processes. Therefore we have this tremendous deficit, which is a severe burden upon the people. I am confident that everyone is interested in having these deficits ended and the railways brought to such a condition that they can at least pay their operating expenses. And the cases are similar. If our railways are prosperous to the extent even of paying only their operating expenses, it means that the country is prosperous to that degree at least; and I wish to protest against the view which I understood my hon. friend from Marquette to impress upon this House, that it was not an important question, viewed from the national standpoint, whether or not our railways earned operating expenses or paid dividends.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is involved in this resolution? The history of the Crowsnest pass agreement has already been given to the House by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham). That agreement was first entered into in 1897, and under it the Canadian Pacific Railway Company undertook the construction of certain railway mileage in British Columbia, primarily for the purpose of developing mining in a certain region of that province; that was the reason given to Parliament at the time. The Canadian Pacific Railway, or other interests, asked the government of the day to pay a subsidy of $11,000 per mile, and they received something like $3,000,000 for the construction of that road and the carrying out of the contract. As a consideration for that assistance, the railway company on their part undertook to fix maximum rates on fifteen commodities, these commodities moving from east of Port Arthur to western points; they also agreed upon maximum rates for wheat and other grain moving from the West to the East as far as Port Arthur. This agreement, I have no doubt, was designed to meet particularly the conditions then prevailing in the West. The agreement continued in force, without variation, until August, 1918, when under the War Measures Act the 25 per cent rate increase was granted and superseded those fixed maximum rates. In 1919, as has already been stated by several hon. members, clause 325 of the Railway Act was passed with a view of legislatively suspending the operation of the agreement. That suspension comes to an end next July, unless this Parliament further continues it.

Now, in order that the Government might be in a position to determine whether the suspension should be continued, or whether

the agreement should be allowed to go into effect again with some variations, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) has asked the House for leave to submit to a committee the whole question, with the purpose I assume—I can imagine no other purpose—of obtaining all the facts relating to this particular matter. I think the issue is important enough to warrant the establishment of this committee for that purpose, and I intend to support the resolution on that ground.

What facts do we need to be seized of? It is stated that if this agreement is allowed to go into effect again next July the Canadian Pacific Railway will operate at a deficit. I do not know whether that is true or not. That has been stated to me by some persons who are not railway experts and know very little of the actual situation, and I would not like to be guided to my conclusions by such statements. Are there many hon. members who really feel they are sufficiently conversant with all the facts involved, to be in a position to pass judgment upon the issue at once? I can hardly understand any hon. gentleman taking that position, unless he has been intimately associated in his life work with the structure of railway rates and operation. If, however, there is such an hon. member he might well be willing to pass judgment upon the whole issue without hearing any further evidence. I say we should be informed, so far as information can be obtained with any degree of exactness, what will be the effect upon, say, the Canadian Pacific Railway if the Crowsnest pass agreement is revived? That is a big factor in the issue, and speaking for myself at least, I should like to have it authoritatively from some person. I do not know how we can get that except through the avenue of a committee. If it comes directly from the railway, its reliability will be at once challenged; if it comes from the Railway Board, the allegation may be made that some members of the board are prejudiced in the matter and that the information given cannot be relied upon. As I have said, this issue has changed very considerably in the last two years. It has changed since section 325 of the act was put into legislative form. It did not require very much courage to pass that section at that time. Nobody objected to it. The condition of western interests then was very different from what it is to-day. The great wheat production of that section of Canada was being officially bought and sold and the question of railway rates was not a very important one, because they were not then, I think, borne by the producer of wheat. At any rate, the sentiment of the country was such that at that time it did not require much courage on the part of the government or of Parliament to suspend the Crowsnest pass agreement, or to enact section 325 of the Railway Act.

We have become recently the owners of a great system of railways, and it is proposed that the country continue that ownership—a tremendous experiment, indeed, which we all hope will result in success. A few years ago in the West the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific were competing for western traffic. With a situation like that prevailing to-day, competition might very well regulate the rates. But that is not the situation to-day. These railways, so far as they have come under Government ownership, have been consolidated—or practically consolidated—I may say for the purposes of my argument, even though I be not literally correct. The Canadian National Railways are operating at a very large annual deficit, to say nothing of failure to pay the interest on the moneys which they owe to the public. Any deficit incurred by reason of the operations of the Canadian National railways must be paid by the people of this country; the people of the west and the people of the east must pay their proportion as well as the people of Central Canada. If we have annual large railway deficits made up by taxation from the pockets of the people, we cannot hope for a revival in business or industry.

Mr. SPENCER: My hon. friend says that the deficits come out of the pockets of the people. Where do the railway rates come from?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The railway rates ultimately come from the consumer, the man who buys the thing that is produced and transported. The more money that is taken from the people to make up railway deficits, the less money they will have to buy the commodities which the country produces. Whatever way you look at this question, you find it is one which affects all the people of Canada, all sections and all interests. If the Crowsnest pass agreement be again put into operation and the result is an addition of from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000 to the deficits of the Canadian National Railway system then that is a very serious national problem to

consider. It is bigger than a western question; it is national, not sectional. We must sit down and review the whole situation as Canadians, regardless of sectional interests.

I have heard it said—not perhaps by very competent people, I admit,—that if the Crowsnest pass agreement comes again into effect the deficits of the Canadian National Railway system will be increased by the amounts I have mentioned. Personally I should like to know whether or not that statement is well founded. My view of the whole issue would be changed if I were satisfied upon that point, and the people whom I represent would, I am sure, be inclined to view it in a different light. But who is going to inform me; who is going to inform hon. gentlemen around me and Parliament as a whole whether or not that statement is well founded? It would be better to have the facts reach Parliament through the avenue of a committee than through the Minister of Railways, for the Canadian National Railway system is still operated by directors who are supposed to be absolutely independent. What objection can there be to having such matters as these made clear to Parliament and to the country? How else can we obtain the facts? What objection can there be to the constitution of a committee to make these things clear prior to our venturing upon the determination of such an important issue?

The leader of the Opposition states that the Government should declare its policy in this respect, announce it to Parliament, and, whatever it be, seek to make it effective by legislation. Well, that is one way of dealing with the question. Sometimes that can be done; sometimes it is not wise or prudent to do that. It was either the leader of the Opposition or the leader of the Progressive party who admitted this afternoon that the facts relating to this issue were intricate and involved. After all, Parliament has responsibilities in respect to this matter: Parliament made this agreement in 1897. Parliament alone can vary it or substitute another for it, and Parliament should not shrink from its obligations in the matter. Indeed, it cannot escape them; it must deliberate upon this issue and in due course exercise its judgment. But, as I have already said more than once, I am not quite clear how Parliament can place itself in that position without having more knowledge of the facts than I think most hon. members have regarding it. Ultimately, I admit, the Government must state its policy upon this question. It cannot escape it. But the Government says it should state its policy after this committee has reported. There is nothing unreasonable about that position. It is in harmony with past practice. It is not out of harmony with sound constitutional parliamentary practice. I fail to see any objection whatever to the request of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) for the creation of this committee.

This committee is not asked in specific terms to report or to make a finding as to whether or not clause 325 should be further suspended. It is not in specific terms asked to make that finding. I do not know whether the Minister of Railways intended that it should. It is simply asked to make inquiry as to what effect the Crowsnest pass agreement shall have upon the Canadian National railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally. It would appear from a careful reading of the resolution that the minister deliberately had in mind the acquisition of facts relevant to this issue through the avenue of a committee and by it to be placed before this House. I do not think it would take the committee a great number of days to have placed before it the facts and the evidence contemplated by this resolution.

Mr. FORKE: Have you ever taken into consideration the fact that the people who are opposing the abrogation of the Crowsnest pass agreement realize that they cannot go on producing and paying the present freight rates? They know their side of the question absolutely. They do not need any investigation or to hear anything that may be said from the other side; it would make no difference to them. They cannot carry on business under these conditions.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not disposed to argue with my hon. friend the effect of the present railway rates upon producers in any section of Canada. I think we are all agreed there should be a reduction of freight rates on the primary commodities. The people in my section of the country feel the effect of the present high freight rates upon primary commodities just as other people do. Many of them tell me they have been unable to carry on their business during the past year or two by reason of these rates. That problem exists in every section of the

country. I hope that there is coming soon a reduction in rates upon heavy primary commodities in this country, upon the product of wheat, for instance, which is of so much interest to my hon. friends directly opposite me. The continuance of clause 325 would not, I hope, mean that we are not going to have a reduction in railway rates. As I said a moment ago, the people of all Canada are all very much interested in a reduction in railway rates. The only reason why railway rates have not been reduced on the Canadian National Railway system, I presume, is because the roads have been operating under a very heavy deficit. If this deficit is going to be increased, how can we look forward to the future with very much hope of a reduction in railway rates? Does not my hon. friend see that this is an important question? We cannot have heavy railway deficits and low freight rates, or something will suffer in this country.

It has been suggested that it would not necessarily affect the nation if the Canadian Pacific railway's operations this present year turned out disastrously and they had a deficit instead of the usual surplus. I am not a shareholder in the Canadian Pacific, and I am not personally much interested in it any more than is any other hon. member of this House, except in wishing that all the big institutions in our country should be fairly prosperous; for if they are not, it reacts upon us all. A deficit in the operations of the Canadian Pacific in Canada would, I think, be an unfortunate thing for all of us. One cannot foresee just what its effect might be. It perhaps might not be so bad as some people think, but I do venture the opinion that if such a thing occurred we would face a condition of affairs full of possible danger to our economic welfare.

Mr. MORRISON: If the railways had been unable to pay any dividends during the last two years, do you think it would have had the disastrous effect on Canadians generally that the present situation has had, where the masses, no matter in what industry they were engaged, have lost money?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Let me say to my hon. friend that whenever any organized commercial activity fails, it immediately affects everybody. My hon. friend would not say that the recent failure of many commercial institutions in this country has not had a bad effect, in the first place, on the community in which the business was carried on, and secondly, on all other sections of the country.

Mr. MORRISON: You are evading the question. I asked you a straight question, and you have not answered it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will my hon. friend put the question again?

Mr. MORRISON: I asked you if you thought it was more disastrous for the railways to fail to pay dividends during the past two years than the present situation, where the masses have failed to earn dividends no matter in what industry they were interested. You apparently consider the railways as of first importance, as compared with the masses of the people.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I doubt, in the first place, if any good would be accomplished by answering my hon. friend's question, because I do not think it is important at all. Of course, it is an unfortunate thing for the country if people produce commodities at a loss, and it is an unfortunate thing if the railways sell their services at a loss. I would not undertake to say which is the worst. They are both bad enough, dear knows. It is not the kind of question one is interested at the moment in discussing. We should rather be concerned in avoiding the causes which bring about these conditions.

I am not speaking on behalf of the railways. All I was attempting to say was this. It is not a desirable thing to take from the pockets of the people of this country by taxation, moneys to pay the operating deficits of the Canadian National Railway System, or to pay the dividends of private enterprises either, but the situation would be surely aggravated if last year's deficits on the Canadian National Railway System were increased. It surely would be aggravated if the same misfortune befell other great railway interests in this country. It would all mean that the people would not only have to pay for necessary transportation but also to bear the burden of increased taxation as well.

The issue involved in this resolution is important to the Canadian National Railway System and to the other railway systems of the country. It is of interest to all classes; it is not a provincial or a sectional issue, it is national in its character and we must look at it in that light. Undoubtedly the taxpayer is interested in the question. If this agreement involves increased taxation, then we as representatives of the people must consider the issue before us in that light; if we do not we are not perform-

ing our duty. There are many intricate and involved facts in connection with the whole question. We should familiarise ourselves with these facts and master them as thoroughly as we can. It would not take very long, in my judgment, to have all the facts placed before a committee, and by the committee sent to Parliament for action. There would be justification for the adoption of this resolution even if the committee confines itself to simply procuring the relevant facts and present no finding—and it is just possible that that would be quite a proper course for the committee to pursue. What objection could there be to that suggestion? Will any hon. member, outside of perhaps one or two gentlemen, state that he is so fully acquainted with the history of this question that he is willing to pass judgment upon the matter at once? If there are a few members who entertain that opinion, surely they will be fair and generous enough to concede to others, who feel that they wish to know more about the subject, the privilege of securing additional information through the avenue of a committee. It is for that reason I propose to support the resolution of the minister.

I say the question is eminently one for a committee. But while I have spoken strongly for the appointment of a committee I do not wish it to be understood that I am committing myself to the principle of suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. I do not feel myself in a position to pass judgment on the matter at the present time and for that reason I support the Minister of Railways in urging that the resolution be accepted by the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I would ask the hon. member if he has taken into consideration the sacredness of a written contract?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I had intended referring to that matter and in answer to my hon. friend's question I would say this: Many written contracts regarded as sacred—as between men, and between companies—have been violated or varied during the past two or three years. That is one of the incidents of the post-war period. Agreements between nations, governments, corporations, and individuals, have been suspended, varied, or abrogated, these last few years. Post-war conditions have changed the course of events, and have forced governments and men to adopt unexpected courses in relation to many affairs and transactions.

At Six o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOHN MORRISON (Weyburn): Mr. Speaker, I wish to state my views but briefly on this question to-night, as the ground has been pretty well covered. I desire to say, at the outset, that I am not antagonistic to our railroads, either privately-owned or publicly-owned. I realize fully how dependent we are upon the prosperity of our railways, and that if Canada is to prosper, our railways must necesarily be prosperous. I feel it is the duty of this House so to adjust conditions in this country that all classes, railway companies, manufacturers, farmers, all employers of labour, and labour, shall have an equitable deal, and my purpose is to present the views of the people whom I represent in this House.

The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stated that the consumer pays the freight. I do not think that is correct in every instance. The freight rate on grain per 100 pounds from Brandon to Fort William is 21 cents. I am quoting central points in the three provinces. From Regina, the rate is 29 cents cents, and from Calgary, 36 cents. If the consumer pays the freight, how is it that the farmers do not receive the same net price? The Brandon farmer receives the Fort William price minus 21 cents; the Regina farmer the Fort William price minus 29 cents, and the Calgary farmer, the Fort William price minus 36 cents. The farmers have to sell their products on the world's market; the world's market fixes the price. Could we set the price, then the consumer would pay the freight rate. Farmers in Manitoba get their farm machinery from the East more cheaply than do farmers in Saskatchewan, while we Saskatchewan farmers get ours a little more cheaply than Alberta farmers do. That shows that we, as consumers, pay the freight rate on machinery. We pay the freight rate both ways, and, therefore, we are very much interested in seeing that there is a more equitable adjustment of the railway rates.

Rates on lumber and, indeed, on all building materials are to day prohibitive. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) drew a gloomy picture of what the state of affairs in Canada would be if railways were not earning dividends, but he assumes that railways can earn dividends only by excessively high rates. I contend that rates have been so high of recent years

that they have actually killed much of the business. We believe that a larger business at a lower rate would be more profitable to the railways and vastly more profitable to Canada as a whole. I know farmers and business men who want to put up buildings, but who are saying: "No, I will not build just now; I think materials will get cheaper as time goes on and railway rates come down." It is very necessary that they should have better buildings; but they are deferring building, because they know their money will go much further when railway rates come down. I am quoting these instances just to show that exceedingly high railway rates are not the most desirable thing for all classes.

I meet quite a few railwaymen, and this phase of the question has been put up to me by them. One man said to me: "I worked only four months last year. I get high pay while I am working, but I can barely live on the high wages I get for working four months a year." If there was more business, these men would be willing to accept a lower wage if they had continuous work; but if a man works only four or six months in a year, he has to get exceedingly high pay for the days he does work. We contend that it would be much better for employees of the railways as well as for the mass of the Canadian people generally if rates were lowered. Last summer I met a gentleman who put up this phase of the question to me. He was travelling from Edmonton east, and he was on the train but one night. He went to get a state-room, and they wanted $33 for one night. He said to the conductor: "Are those rooms all taken?" The conductor replied: "No, not one of them." He said: "Is that usual?" "For the last two weeks," said the conductor, "not one state-room or compartment on this train has been occupied." The man said: "How was it before the increase in rates" The conductor said: "It was a rare thing for one of them to be empty." The man was telling me this as evidence of the fact that railways had raised prices so high as to be prohibitive, and the railways were thus killing their own business.

Now, Sir, the West was partly settled as a result of the protection afforded by the Crowsnest pass agreement, and we contend that there should not be any further delay in bringing the Crowsnest agreement into operation. Nothing else will satisfy the people of the country, who are exceedingly anxious that the agreement shall come into force again on the 6th day of July.

Hon. JOHN A. STEWART (Lanark): This afternoon the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham) and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) stressed the point that the war had worked tremendous changes in Canada. The senior member for Halifax stressed particularly the effect upon economic conditions. If the Minister of Militia had stated to the House that one of the most remarkable changes brought about in Canada since the war was in the policy of government, I think possibly the House would have agreed with him. It has been the past parliamentary practice in Canada, for as long as we have any record, that a government in power takes the responsibility for its action upon important questions; and I think that upon a matter of the importance of that involved in the resolution now before the House, it will be the opinion of hon. members and the view of the people of Canada that the Government should give to Parliament a lead. I followed the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Kennedy), and I listened closely to those of the Minister of Militia, and I believe it is a fair criticism of what they both had to say that there was no indication, in their speeches, as to what the policy of the Government was on the really important matter that is involved in the resolution. I think I might even go further and say that in the remarks that have come from the government benches so far in this discussion, not only has there been no indication as to what the policy of the Government is, but there has been no attempt on the part of those who have spoken even to chart out the probable course of the Government and indicate in what direction they are attempting to move. The onus in this matter is clearly upon the Government. Under Order 308 of the Board of Railway Commissioners, passed on the 15th day of September 1920, the following view is expressed:

> As our jurisdiction for granting increases on certain lines of railway in western Canada depends entirely upon the amendment to section 325 of the Railway Act, 1919, which expires on the 6th day of July, 1922, the rates hereby established cannot continue beyond that date unless Parliament, in its wisdom, sees fit to extend the provisions of that section. Therefore, the rates herein provided for shall not extend beyond the first day of July 1922.

In view of what Order 308 states the onus is clearly on the Government to

determine its policy; the final consideration and decision of the matter by the Railway Commission is blocked. If the Government decides its course the Railway Commission will be able to act on the result of its investigations carried on since 1920 for the purpose of recommending and deciding as to what would be an equitable adjustment of rates, having regard to the general conditions throughout Canada. And if the Government defines its policy and Parliament declares its decision, there would be nothing left that would obstruct the final decision of the matter by the Railway Commission.

Now, what is proposed in the resolution before the House? What is the scope of the inquiry which the Government proposes should be made by the special committee? I read from the resolution:

> That notwithstanding that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee be appointed to make inquiry—

Inquiry into what?

> —into the question of railway transportation costs.

These are the only words in the whole resolution that define and limit the scope of the inquiry that will be held. When this committee meets, supposing this resolution goes through, it will be limited by the four corners of the resolution as to what it shall inquire into and within the four corners of the resolution there is no provision for any investigation by the committee further than to inquire into the question of railway transportation costs. There is not a word in the resolution as to the general question of rates. The committee is to inquire into the question of railway transportation costs,—in what connection? Let us see what the second paragraph says:

> That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views—

Upon what are they to submit their views?

> —to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry.

Well, what is the subject matter of the inquiry? The subject matter of the inquiry is limited absolutely to what is stated in the previous paragraph, and that is an inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs. Once the investigation into the matter of railway transportation costs has been disposed of, the committee will have exhausted the whole authority granted to it under the resolution. There is not a single question in the resolution as to the necessity for the revival of the Crowsnest pass agreement, and if the special committee sought to deal with that matter it would be exceeding its jurisdiction and the authority given by the resolution under which it would act. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) dealt at very great length and in a most interesting way with the effect that the continued suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement would have upon the people who live in the West, particularly in the Prairie provinces; and the Crowsnest pass agreement was pictured as a panacea for all the ills to which the West is heir. I wonder if the member for Marquette has considered the effect a revision of the Crowsnest pass agreement might have for the benefit of the very people for whom it was originally enacted. The first classification in the agreement provides that there shall be a reduction, upon all green and all fresh fruits, of 33⅓ per cent moving from points east of Fort William to certain defined points in the West. I doubt very much whether that would be of any benefit to the people in the middle West to-day.

If I am correctly informed, the movement of fruit to-day is from British Columbia east to the prairie provinces; in 1897 the movement was from the eastern provinces to the west. Under the Crowsnest pass agreement there is absolutely no provision made for fruit that moves from the west to the east, so that this commodity when shipped from British Columbia east would be penalized in favour of fruit grown in the East. Let me also refer my hon. friend for Marquette to the second classification,—coal oil. I wonder how much coal oil moves to-day from Fort William and the east into the West? I would refer him also to the provision that there shall be a reduction of 10 per cent upon the movement of live stock from the east of Fort William to the West; that being the direction of the movement in 1897. I think hon. members who know western conditions will agree with me that the movement of live stock to-day is from the west to the east. Under the Crowsnest pass agreement there is absolutely no provision affecting transportation charges upon live stock moving from the West to the east.

I refer to these classifications for the reason that my hon. friend from Marquette, it seemed to me, left the impression upon

the House that the revival of the Crowsnest pass agreement in its present form would effect the relief which this country needs. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that while the Crowsnest pass agreement should not be scrapped, in the general interests of Canada it should not be revived. The classifications under that agreement were adopted having regard to the requirements of western Canada in 1897. I think the hon. gentleman will admit that in the particulars to which I have referred the West would be better served by a revision of this agreement rather than by its revival in its original form.

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend will permit me, the subjects to which he has alluded are, with the exception of live stock, of comparatively little importance. Grain, lumber and fruit from British Columbia are also of importance.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): My hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) stated this afternoon that as a result of the present conditions the lumber mills in British Columbia were closed, and that the transportation of lumber from that province to eastern Canada was adversely affected by the present rates. Let me refer him to the fact that under the Crowsnest pass agreement there is provision for a comparatively low rate upon lumber moving from points east of Fort William to points west of Fort William; but there is absolutely no rate provided for the transportation of lumber from western Canada to eastern Canada.

Mr. WARNER: Does my hon. friend know that the Railway Commission already has power to fix rates which are not included in the Crowsnest pass agreement?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Yes; and I have absolute faith in the good judgment of the Railway Commission, but I am discussing the provisions of the Crowsnest pass agreement. The only provision governing rates of transportation from points west of Port Arthur to eastern Canada is that contained in subsection (e):

> That there shall be a reduction in the company's present rates and tolls on grain and flour from all points on its main line, branches or connections west of Fort William to Fort William and Port Arthur and all points east of three cents per one hundred pounds.

That is the very limited provision governing the transportation of any commodity from western Canada to the east, and that is why it does seem to me the revival of the Crowsnest pass agreement, by the failure of this Parliament to take action between now and July 6, will not provide for my hon. friend for Marquette and those associated with him that relief which they feel they ought to have.

Mr. SHAW: Might I ask the hon. gentleman if he has considered the significance of clause nine of the agreement itself, when he states that no provision is made for the transfer of goods from the west easterly except on the two articles, grain and flour?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am speaking now of the provision for specific rates. The whole question as to rates upon other commodities goes to the Railway Commission.

Mr. SHAW: Quite right.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): But under the classifications expressly set out I say there is a definite limitation as to the commodities covered by the agreement, and the point I desire to make is that having regard to general conditions not only in western Canada but over the whole Dominion, surely an agreement based upon conditions existing in 1922 would be much more likely to provide the relief and the remedy which the people require in the form of a reduction of freight rates, rather than an agreement based upon conditions as they existed twenty-five years ago.

This Parliament is asked to-day to appoint a special committee, with certain powers as defined in the resolution, and I again submit that the four corners of the resolution limit the subjects that this committee will be empowered to inquire into to the single subject of transportation costs.

We know that the Government have studied this question for some considerable time. We know that the Government has conferred with the chief executives of all the railway companies; we know this because the Government itself says so. The resolution contains this statement:

> That notwithstanding that the regulation of railway rates is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, it is advisable that a Select Special Committee be appointed to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs,—

Now what?

> —it having been disclosed by recent conferences held between the Government and the chief executives of the various railways with respect to the reduction of freight rates that the representatives of the railways deem it inadvisable immediately to reduce rates on basic commodities because of the expiration, on July 6th, 1922, of the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement;

In view of that should not the Government state in detail to the House what the result of those conferences was, rather than content itself with that general statement? Has the Government no faith in the ability of the chief railway executives in Canada to advise it on the question of transportation costs? Does the Government believe that a special committee of this House would in four or five weeks be better qualified to advise it on the question of transportation costs than the chief executives of the railway companies? The Government has under its jurisdiction, managing 22,000 miles of railway lines, two boards, the Canadian National board and the Grand Trunk board. The Government knew four months ago, when they came into power, that the Crowsnest pass agreement would expire on the 6th of July if some action was not taken by Parliament; so it is a fair assumption that since the 29th of December last they have studied this question and obtained the advice of the two boards which control the government railways. There are available also the records of the Department of Railways and Canals and the statistics filed in the Bureau of Statistics, which is connected with the Department of Trade and Commerce. And in addition to all that, the Government has access to the records and the findings of the Railway Commission itself.

As far back as 1920 the Railway Commission was asked to carry on an investigation for the purpose of determining this very question of rates. Since then that investigation has been carried on by the commission with all the organization and facilities at its command, and I am advised that in that connection 250 exhibits have been filed. Since it started to function in 1904, the Railway Commission has been building up records which are invaluable in the consideration of the difficulties in which the Government finds itself. If, therefore, the Government, having called into conference the chief executives of the railway lines in Canada and the operating officers of the lines under government control, were still unable to determine upon a policy, they might very well have called into consultation the Railway Commission itself. The Railway Commission is a very valuable organization composed of experts in the very matters which it is necessary to consider in order to determine what are fair and equitable rates, what are rates that will serve all the people, having regard to present conditions, not to conditions that existed in 1897. I do not think any hon. member will question the necessity for reduced freight rates or the benefit that they would confer upon trade in Canada. These reduced rates ought to become effective, having regard to present conditions in the West and all over Canada. So that I urge, Mr. Speaker, that this is a question upon which the Government should make its decision. I urge, as it has already been urged in this discussion, that the time between now and the 6th of December—the 6th of July—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Possibly, Mr. Speaker, I had in mind that this matter was to go to a committee, and if it does I fancy my first statement might be good. But my point is that the time between now and the 6th of July is wholly inadequate for a proper consideration of these matters. Last year the special committee on transportation sat for over six weeks inquiring into matters not by any means as involved as difficult and as intricate as the questions which it is now sought to refer to a special committee.

If this matter is to go to a special committee, why has there been delay from the 8th of March to the 4th of May? Hon. members opposite have known how difficult and intricate this investigation would be; will they suggest that the business that has been before the House for the last eight weeks has been sufficiently important to interfere in any way with the sittings of a special committee? If it was the deliberate policy of the Government to have a fair investigation of this matter by a special committee of the House, it should have been referred to us in the first week of the session. Had that been done, we could have given to the matter during the past eight weeks that consideration which will be impossible if it goes to a special committee now.

It may be argued that this is a matter arising out of the report to the House of the Minister of Railways. While the matter did come to us in that report, the introduction of it weeks before would in no way have interfered with the report itself. The Government could quite consistently have said in the first week of the session: "Here is a matter that we have considered since the 29th of December. Here is a matter with respect to which we have conferred with the chief executives of the different

railway lines. Here is a matter upon which it is impossible for us to arrive at a conclusion, and we desire that it be investigated by a committee of the House." But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what has occurred. After the session has been in progress for nine weeks, the Government tells the House that it cannot come to any conclusion on this matter. The senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said this afternoon that he did not think a statement to the House on the part of the Government following a conference with the chief executives of the railways and the Railway Commission would be wholly believed by hon. members; that the members of the House would prefer to hear the statement direct from the lips of the officials themselves. But, after all, that is not what the resolution provides for and the senior member for Halifax should have directed the attention of the House to that fact. The resolution does not provide that there shall come before that committee the chief executives of the railways and of the Railway Commission and tell us the results of their investigations and give us the statistics they have gathered, but the resolution itself expressly provides for what is going to happen, and what is going to happen is this:

> That, in the circumstances, it is advisable to afford opportunity to all interested parties to submit their views upon the subject matter of the inquiry to the said committee with particular regard to the effect of the rates established by the Crowsnest pass agreement upon Canadian National railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally;

That second clause of the resolution provides that these four interests shall be represented before the committee. The four interests that are to be represented before the committee, under the resolution itself, mind you, are the Canadian railways, and other lines, interests concerned with agricultural development, and Canadian industry generally. If these interests are to be represented before the committee I wonder what the extent of that representation will be? Take, for instance, the investigation that has been carried on by the Railway Commission. The argument alone before the commission on behalf of those who were represented there, and had the right to be represented there, occupied three weeks. It took three weeks of the time of the Railway Commission to hear the argument, and they sat morning and afternoon. Their sittings were not limited to certain hours, as would be the case with a special committee of this House; they sat every morning and every afternoon, and it took them three weeks to hear the argument, after all the evidence was in. I ask hon. gentlemen what chance there would be between now and the 6th of July to carry on an investigation by a parliamentary committee covering the interests referred to in this resolution.

It would be an easy matter to determine upon the representation of the National Railways. It would be a comparatively easy matter to consider and dispose of the representation of other lines of railways, but I wonder how long—hon. gentlemen to my left will know—it would take to get before the special committee all those who would be interested in the agricultural development of Canada, and all those people would be entitled to be heard because this is an investigation of transportation costs having regard to the agricultural development of Canada. Who is going to determine that, and how is it going to be determined in time to allow this special committee to get down to work within a reasonable time?

Take the last interest that is to be heard before this committee, Canadian industry generally, extending from Halifax to Vancouver. I wonder how that representation will be determined? I wonder how long it would take to have a proper representation of those who would have a right to be heard with regard to Canadian industry generally. Yet these are the matters which in the short space of five or six weeks a special committee of this House is to investigate in the hope that it will get results which it would be impossible for the Government to secure from the Board of Railway Commissioners who have had these matters in hand. If the Government want information in any other direction, it is surely a comparatively easy matter to get it from their own railway executives, from the men who are associated with them in the management and control of 22,000 miles of government roads. Has the Government no faith in its own executives? Has it no faith in the records that are in its own offices as to transportation costs? Will it have more faith more confidence in the findings of a special committee of this House? At best, Mr. Speaker, I urge that such a finding would be a half-baked affair simply because there is no time, no opportunity, to go into these matters, even if such a committee had the ability to do so.

Under the law as it stands to-day the whole question of railway rates is in the hands of the railway commissioners. If

it is the intention of the Government that the Crowsnest pass agreement shall not be revived, surely we have a right to know whether it is the intention of the Government to transfer wholly or in part the power of fixing rates from the Railway Commission to Parliament itself. That such is the intention is a natural deduction from the resolution. The whole question seems to be whether there shall be a further suspension of the provisions of that agreement, or whether, by failure to act in any direction, it shall automatically revive on the 6th of July. What I submit is this, that the House has a right to expect a lead from the Government. The House has a right to know what the Government policy is. The House has a right to expect that if the Government is going to function, it should come into this House upon a matter of such far-reaching importance as that involved in the resolution we are now considering with a clean cut, definite policy and tell the House what it recommends. This agreement was framed, confirmed by act of Parliament, and became law in 1897. It sets out a special list of the commodities which shall receive special treatment under the agreement. I do not fancy that any hon. gentleman has any idea that that list of commodities was based upon transportation costs. The rates fixed by that agreement had no relation to transportation costs as they existed at that time. The list of commodities, according to the debates of the House of that time, was based upon political considerations, based upon the necessities of western Canada at that time as the Government deemed them to be. Surely the original drafting of that agreement was as much a matter for consideration by a committee as the question whether the agreement should now be revived or further suspended.

Let me draw to the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite that in 1897 when that agreement was framed and these commodities listed for special treatment, the Government of the day did not find it necessary to appoint a special committee for the purpose of inquiring into transportation costs or for any other purpose. The Minister of Railways of that day brought into the House a resolution providing for the terms of the agreement. It was introduced as a government measure and the government stood by it. They stood by it and passed it, and that is precisely what this Government should do now.

[Mr. J. A. Stewart.]

I simply repeat that the Opposition claim now that this Government is acting contrary to the whole parliamentary practice of the past. The Government comes before us with a matter which the members of the ministry themselves state to be far-reaching in its effect upon the Canadian National Railway system. It has been stated by other hon. gentlemen that the question is far-reaching with regard to business generally. The senior member for Halifax referred to it with particular regard to its effect upon the dividends of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) dealt with it in the same connection but possibly in an opposite direction. I am not urging any objection to the Crowsnest pass agreement having regard to its effect upon the earning powers either of the National Railways or of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But I do urge that having regard to general conditions in Canada, and to the altered conditions since 1897, there is a real question as to whether the express terms of the Crowsnest pass agreement operate fairly and equitably to all Canadian interests.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the real purpose of the resolution before the House can hardly have been fully appreciated or this debate would not have run on to the length it has; and certainly some of the arguments we have heard would have been rendered wholly unnecessary. The question is not one of whether the Crowsnest pass agreement suspension shall be continued after July 6, as I think my hon. friend from Marquette assumed; nor is it as to whether the Government should have gone to the Railway Commission for information before coming to Parliament as the right hon. leader of the opposition has asserted. The question is the fundamentally important one of whether, on a great national question, the Government should endeavour to become as fully informed, and have Parliament as fully informed, of all essential facts, circumstances and consequences as possible before reaching a final decision. That is the question involved in the resolution—nothing more and nothing less. It is a matter of giving the members of this House the fullest information on one phase of a question which every hon. member who has spoken on the subject of railways in this Parliament has described as the most important problem before the people of Canada at the present

time. Far from the Government not having a policy on this matter, the Government is following what in this House and in the country has all along been the policy of the Liberal party with respect to railway matters—namely, that on this all important question there should be given to Parliament the fullest information possible.

I am not surprised that my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition or indeed my hon. friend for Marquette, should at first blush have expressed themselves as opposed to this resolution, because if I recollect aright at the last session of Parliament when we of the Liberal party, who were then in Opposition, took the position that Parliament should be given the fullest information on matters relating to our Canadian National railways, both these hon. members voted against that resolution. On the 22nd March, 1921, I moved the following amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply:

> Subject to the reservation that in exceptional cases there may be documents of a confidential character which, in the public interest, may properly be withheld from publication, the House declares that it is the undoubted right of Parliament to demand and receive copies of all reports, accounts, correspondence and papers in relation to the management of every department of the public service, including the affairs of the Canadian National Railways, whether operating directly under the control of the department or under corporate form.

That was a declaration of the policy of the Liberal party with respect to matter pertaining to railway problems, namely, that Parliament should have the right to the fullest information on these all-important questions. But I find the names of both the leader of the Opposition and my hon. friend for Marquette recorded in the division list as opposed to that resolution. They are therefore consistent in the attitude they are taking to-day in criticizing the Government for seeking to gain the fullest information possible on this all-important railway matter before coming to a final decision.

Mr. CRERAR: I am sure the Prime Minister will permit me to say that my objection to the motion is not at all based upon the considerations which he has just stated, and I think I made that very plain this afternoon.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not catch the force of my hon. friend's remark.

Mr. CRERAR: Then I shall repeat it. I wish to say to the Prime Minister that my objection to the motion
9 p.m. now before the House was not based upon the considerations which he has just stated, but upon other considerations altogether.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will deal with that in a moment. I think my hon. friend objected this afternoon on the ground that this resolution was deciding the question as to whether the Crowsnest pass agreement suspension should be continued after the 6th July or not. That, I think, was the ground upon which he objected to the resolution this afternoon.

Mr. CRERAR: I am very sorry that I failed to make my meaning clear to my hon. friend. I found no objection to the principle of the Government consulting Parliament on matters of this kind; but the ground upon which I rest my objection at this moment is that this agreement should not be permitted to lapse further, that it should come back into effect; and taking that position I could not very well consistently support a motion to refer it to a committee that would give consideration to the fact as to whether or not it should be restored.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then all I have to say to my hon. friend is this—that we have yet to see whether that agreement will come before Parliament for further consideration by way of amending legistion. That question is not involved in the resolution before the House at the present time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps my hon. friend would not object to my making a similar statement. My objection to the resolution to which the hon member refers was not based on any desire, or expression of desire that Parliament should be refused any information but—similar to that of the hon. member for Marquette —only because we desired that the management of the road should not become a subject of political discussion such as to interfere with its proper business operation, but that in due time Parliament should have all information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not recall that statement by my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will show it to my hon. friend in Hansard.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We can all read Hansard for ourselves. Perhaps both my hon. friends will permit me to refer to one other resolution which was passed last year, in regard to which they took a like position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend says "hear, hear." I hope he will say "hear, hear," after I have read the resolution which he himself moved in this House on the 8th April; and, by the way, may I interpose that the wording is all-important as immediately bearing on the very matter we are discussing, namely, the propriety of having certain questions referred to a select committee of this House before the Government reaches a final decision. On April 8th, 1921, the present leader of the Opposition, then the Prime Minister, moved, seconded by my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton):

> That a Select Standing Committee on National Railways and Shipping be appointed for the present session, and be instructed to inquire into the following questions:—
>
> (1) What information as to operation of Canadian National railways and shipping as conducted by the Board of Directors and Management should, in the public interest, be brought down in Parliament on question, motion for production of Papers, or otherwise.
>
> 2. When, by what method, and under what conditions, if any, should such information be given, regard being had for the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy (including finance), and to the Board of Directors the best possible conditions and efficiency of management.

Mark those words, that this committee, which my right hon. friend wished to have appointed, was to give Parliament information when certain investigations should be made having regard for what?

> For the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy.

That is exactly the reason why the Government is proposing to have this question referred to a special committee now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is such a body now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is because of the necessity of bringing to the attention of Parliament, in regard to this all-important question, all the essential facts in order that the Government itself may have possession of these facts and that hon. members of the House may be in full possession of these facts before a final decision on this question and all that it involves is given.

I have, I think, directed the attention of the House to the fact that that resolution of my right hon. friend was supported both by the present leader of the Opposition and by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar).

Mr. MEIGHEN: How did my hon. friend vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did not draft the resolution.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How did he vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I voted against the resolution, not because of the phrasing of it, which was that of my right hon. friend, not because of this particular clause—

> For the necessity of securing to Parliament and the public all facts requisite for the determination of policy.

—which might have been omitted altogether if it had not been regarded as so important by my right hon. friend, but because the intent and purport of his resolution was to side-track altogether the obtaining of information by Parliament on matters concerning the Canadian National railways. If there is any doubt about the wisdom of the vote, I would ask my right hon. friend what report this committee has made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The report is unanimous and is in the records of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What does it say?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It speaks for itself. If the hon. member so desires, I will get it and read it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It speaks for itself and also for my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And for my hon. friend, because members of his party were on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As I have said before, one can always tell when my right hon. friend is hit by an argument—he jumps immediately to his feet every time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was stating the fact.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Take another jump.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I moved the resolution; I spoke in favour of it; I supported it, asking for a committee on that subject for the reasons that I gave. There was

no body constituted to furnish Parliament or the Government with that information. The question was a new one because of the acquirement of the National Railways. I supported and voted for the resolution for those reasons. In this case, there is a body constituted for this purpose with the information at hand. Why does not the hon. member not go to it? I stand by my position on that resolution. May I ask the Prime Minister—How long does he expect to abide by his decision on that resolution?

Mr. LAPOINTE: That was not worth the jump.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is unduly sensitive. If he can keep his seat until I get through, then he may speak again.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member told me to jump.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What did my right hon. friend suggest as the course which the Government should have taken? He said that we should have gone to the Railway Commission for information. I think I am right in that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yet, what was the burden of his whole say with respect to the Railway Commission? It was that a few years ago the Railway Commission was, in the public mind, regarded as a body which was protecting the interest of the public, but that to-day and of recent years, it had come to be looked upon by the public,—he did not say whether rightly or wrongly—as a body that was supporting, not the public, but the railways. That is the body which my right hon. friend says that we should have gone to for information, and, then brought down to the House our decision on the basis of the information so supplied. What would have been the first charge my right hon. friend would have made if we had come to Parliament and said: "We have certain information from the Railway Commission; we have taken our stand on that ground". He would have said that the Railway Commission was looked upon, throughout this country, as caring more for the interests of the railways rather than those of the public.

May I ask my hon. friends from the West this question? Would their confidence in the Government's position have been greater if the Government had come before the House and stated that a certain policy which it had adopted was based upon information given by the Railway Commission? It was out of deference to western opinion on this very matter of securing reliable information that the Government felt it a special obligation that western members should have the right and power to discover for themselves, by representation on a committee of this House, what was the truth and what was not the truth in regard to the essential facts on a question in which they are so vitally interested. That is the reason why the Government has taken the position it has. I am surprised at the hon. member for Marquette taking the position he did to-day. It is not a position he would usually take; I mean it does not display the measure of caution he generally exercises before he takes a definite stand. He says, in effect, that he does not care what the consequences are of the Crowsnest pass agreement; that it must go into effect, willy-nilly, regardless altogether of how it may affect any other parts of the country. That does not express, I am sure, the real feeling of my hon. friend. I have heard him repeatedly in this House, whilst referring to matters of special interest to one part of the country, advocating that we should take into account the interest of all other parts of Canada. He will agree with me, I am sure, when I say that, if it is going to help to make for national unity to divest discussion in this Parliament of sectional prejudice, if it is going to help to give people in all parts of this Dominion a greater sense of security as regards the desire of Parliament to act in the interest, not of any one part, but of the whole, then that that particular course should be taken. If he has time to reflect further on the matter, he will, I am sure, agree that there is a great deal of force to be attached to that particular consideration.

The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) is fond of saying that the Government has not a policy on this or that. Of course we expect him to say that; but let me make it very clear that, not only is the Government in this matter acting in accordance with the broad policy which it has always taken with respect to matters of great national interest, namely, that there should be the fullest information available before final decisions are reached; but, with respect to the Crowsnest pass agreement and the time of the expiration of its suspension the Government has a

decided, clear and very definite policy. In order that there may be no mistake as to the Government's position on this matter, I have reduced to writing the exact statement of the Government's position towards the expiration of the Crowsnest pass agreement, and I hope my hon. friends opposite, after hearing it, will feel, as I think they ought to feel, that, as regards this particular resolution, there is no reason why it should not have their whole-hearted support. In a word, the Government's policy is this:

> Unless it can be shown that in the public interest there are good and sufficient reasons why, what is termed the Crowsnest pass agreement of 1897, should not again become operative in July next, the existing Statute will not be interfered with.
>
> In other words, the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement will then have expired.

Now, is there any hon. member of this House who will rise to his feet and say that he is not in favour of such a policy as that? If it is shown that it is not in the public interest that a certain step shall be taken, is there any member who will rise in his place and defend such a course? All that the Government is asking is that there shall be an opportunity, not alone to the Government itself, but to the members of Parliament and to the country, to understand all that is involved in the coming into effect of that agreement on July 6th of this year, or in the continued suspension of it after that date? As has been pointed out in the debate this afternoon, the Government, far from seeking to evade responsibility, is fully conscious of the magnitude of its responsibility as representing the public in its three capacities, as consumers, as investors, as taxpayers. The Government cannot afford to decide any question on the ground simply of the way in which, and the degree to which, with respect to one particular aspect it will affect one particular part of the country. The Government has to take into account the Dominion as a whole, and all classes therein, and take the course that seems most in the public interest. If it is shown that it is in the public interest that this agreement shall be permitted to be revived on the 6th day of July, certainly the Government will see that it is revived. But if it is shown that such a course is not in the public interest —and remember that this aspect of the matter before it can be finally determined has to be decided on the floor of Parliament, not to-night but at a later date,— and that the suspension of the agreement should be continued longer, legislation will be necessary. When such legislation comes into the House, then will be the time for hon. gentlemen opposite to cast their votes in making a final decision. Let hon. gentlemen clearly understand that sooner or later the whole matter will come back to them again for consideration, and in the meantime that all they are deciding is whether or not they will allow a committee of Parliament to get all the information it can on a matter of great national importance. To-day, in the minds of my hon. friends opposite, it is a question of railroad rates affecting one part of Canada. I have been through the Canadian West on two or three occasions of late, and I may say frankly that I have been impressed with the absolute necessity for a reduction in freight rates if that part of our Dominion is to develop as it should. Hon. members on this side of the House are in entire sympathy with hon. gentlemen opposite in their desire for a reduction of rates. But that is not the question involved. The Government is anxious to see that, in seeking to do justice by hon. gentlemen opposite, they do not do injustice in another part of the Dominion in a manner which might lose to those hon. gentlemen the support that they may look to on future occasions in other matters in which they are also vitally interested. To-day it is a question of railway rates; to-morrow it may be a question of some trust or combine which hon. gentlemen opposite may think should be investigated. Are they, then, now going to take the stand that they will not permit a committee of Parliament to get all the information it can on any question? My Labour friend (Mr. Woodsworth) who spoke this afternoon argued eloquently the other evening on the desirability for the fullest information in regard to social conditions in the coal mining fields of Nova Scotia. Is he going to ask Parliament to allow an investigation into the matter of the coal miners and their rights, and deny to this Parliament the right of having an investigation into this question of railway rates which affects all classes of the community? That is the point from which I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will view the matter. Realize that all the Government is asking is that there shall be the fullest inquiry into this all-important matter; because, as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Stewart) rightly said to-night, the Government has been negotiating with the railway executives to see if they cannot effect an immediate re-

duction on the basic commodities of the country, and the Government has learned that the railway executives are prepared to make an immediate reduction on those commodities, although to what extent they are prepared to go depends upon the view that is to be taken of this Crowsnest pass agreement. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says that when the Government was raising railway rates in 1918 the Crowsnest pass agreement was the impediment that stood in the way. To-day the position is just reversed. The executives of the railways are prepared to make an immediate reduction on basic commodities, but this agreement stands as an impediment in the way; and until they know definitely what attitude is going to be taken towards the agreement they are not prepared to make the reductions which otherwise they would be inclined to concede.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do I understand from the Prime Minister's remarks that the reason why the reduction has not taken place is because the Government have not decided as to what they will do in regard to the Crowsnest pass agreement?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not quite see the force of my hon. friend's remarks, unless they are intended to imply something which cannot be inferred from what I have stated. The Government, as I have said, has been conferring with the railway executives on this matter. I need not point out to the House that such conferences as the Government has had, through the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), have of necessity been in the nature of informal interviews. The Government have had to accept at their face value the statements which have been made; there has been no opportunity to investigate these statements. That was impossible in informal conference; but that step can be taken before a Select Committee of the House; and if there is right, and justice, and truth, and wisdom in the course which my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) suggests, namely, that the agreement shall come into force, why be afraid of publicity? Why be afraid of an investigation? That is the whole point at issue. It is not a matter of responsible government, as my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) said this afternoon. He declares that the Government should have a policy, should come to Parliament with it, declare it, and drive it through the House. Well, he has his views on responsible government and I have mine. If I am to judge him by his acts of the past, his theory of responsible government is that a Prime Minister and his colleagues should regard themselves as a body of supermen who can come to a decision in secret conclave, bring that decision into Parliament, and by sheer force of their following, regardless of how it may have been obtained, drive that decision through the House, irrespective of the will of the people at large. Now, I desire to say, and to say more particularly to my western friends,—who have been saying a good deal in their public speeches—that in my view of responsible government, the House of Commons, the rights of members of Parliament and the rights of the people should be regarded as all-important, and that the Cabinet should consider itself as a committee of Parliament and not as a body of supermen—I have taken the position that this Government would so regard itself, and that on these controversial questions, so far as it was possible to do so, the Government would seek to ascertain the will and wish of Parliament in a reasonable way and give expression to it in legislation. That is what we are seeking to do at the present time; that is the whole purpose of the present legislation. The whole purpose is to form, out of the different groups that compose Parliament, a committee which shall have full powers of investigation under oath, permit them to summons the different classes and interests concerned, and give to them the right to get all the information they can before this matter is finally decided.

In the last analysis—and with this let me conclude—if it decides to ask for a futher suspension of this Crowsnest pass agreement, the Government will have to come before this House, and persuade the House that that course is in the public interest. There can be no change in the statute as it stands, and the agreement will automatically go into effect on the 6th July, unless prior to that date this Government comes before Parliament and secures from Parliament further legislation.

Now, all we ask at present is, having regard to what is involved, having regard to the fact that we have railway deficits to consider; having regard to the fact that we have British Columbia's interests, the interests of the maritime provinces, of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, as well as the interests of the prairie provinces to consider; having regard to the

fact that we wish in all things to maintain a spirit of unity and goodwill between all classes and all parts of this Dominion—that hon. members let us have this matter fully investigated by a committee, leaving to us full responsibility as to the course to be ultimately pursued, which we are not shirking for one moment, but which we wish to exercise in the light of full information, and in the light of what we believe to be just and right for the people of this Dominion.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): I do not propose to add anything to the merits of the debate on this question, it having been so thoroughly threshed out. I merely wish to allude to some matters of local or provincial importance in connection with it.

In the first instance, I am sorry that I find myself in disagreement with my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), and with his followers, of course, more especially when I have in mind their gallant support of me when I had some little railway troubles of my own. I was heartily in accord, strange to say, with everything that the hon. member for Marquette said this afternoon, and I endorse every word of his remarks, but unfortunately there are matters of provincial or British Columbian character in connection with this subject which compel me to take a different point of view. The interest of my own riding and province must prove superior to the bonds of friendship or of esteem for the honourable gentlemen.

If the Crowsnest pass agreement is abrogated without further amendment, a very gross injustice will be done to British Columbia. It was partly alluded to by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart), and I should like to add something to his remarks. This agreement was embodied in legislation passed in 1898 and, as the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) read out this afternoon, its two vital sections are sections (d) and (e). Section (d) imposed upon the company a reduction of rates from 33⅓ to 10 per cent according to the various articles, some twelve in number, on all traffic westbound from Fort William to points west of Fort William. Fruit is one of the articles covered. But that is only on the rate westbound, so that our British Columbia fruit would suffer a tremendous setback by this additional 33⅓ per cent reduction given to the presumed fruit grower in the East, and a very gross injustice would be perpetrated in that regard. I can give you an example, Mr. Speaker.

Apples originating at Okanagan Landing, which is about the centre of the fruit-growing industry in British Columbia, would pay a freight rate of $1.43 per hundred pounds to Barstow in Alberta, a distance of 405 miles. From Fort William to Hazelton, the same distance, going west the rate would be 84 cents, a difference of 59 cents, or a percentage difference of 71.4 per cent. The reduction on the Fort William rate would be about 55 per cent. Can any hon. member say that it would be a reasonable thing under the present conditions of fruit growing in British Columbia, where we already have a high railway tariff to contend with, that another additional 33⅓ per cent should be added, or that that was ever contemplated in 1898, when fruit growing in British Columbia, for export at least, was entirely unknown.

Take the other side of the question, shipping east. The reduction promised in subsection (d) is on grain and flour from all points west of Fort William to Fort William and all points east. But there is no reduction proposed on wheat and flour coming from the prairie provinces to British Columbia. When the Crowsnest pass agreement act was passed there was no export of wheat or flour from British Columbia, there was no elevator in that province, there was no orient trade, there was no Panama canal; all those things have grown up since. We have a large elevator, we are agitating for another, and one will be put up this summer by private enterprise. All these things are intended to promote the interprovincial export of flour and wheat from the prairies, more particularly from Alberta, to the Pacific coast, and in that way build up an interprovincial trade.

I will quote an instance of the rate in that regard also. The rate from Morley, Alberta, to Vancouver, 601 miles, is 30 cents; while the rate from Virden, Manitoba, to Fort William, 600 miles, is 23½ cents, a difference of 27 per cent. A reduction on the grain rate from Virden to Fort William will reduce that rate by seven cents, which will bring it down to 16½ cents, or a difference as compared with the charge on wheat for the same distance from Morley to Vancouver, of almost 100 per cent. That is a practical illustration of what would happen if this change is made without some consideration of the conditions which have grown up in British

Columbia since this agreement was entered into.

It may be claimed that we have what is called the Mountain rate in British Columbia, and that that affects us adversely. It does affect us adversely already, and naturally we do not need to make it any worse. Moreover, there has been a very strong agitation in British Columbia against the Mountain rate, and the province had a most searching investigation, retaining an expert to appear before the Board of Railway Commissioners, and there is every prospect that that Mountain rate will be somewhat reduced at any rate. But it does not materially enter into the subject of this agreement just now.

I wish, however, to put myself on record squarely and unequivocally as being in favour of a reduction of freight rates to the greatest possible limit. I have no hesitation in making my position plain on that point. I will stand for any reduction almost, however great, in freight rates.

When the hon. member for Marquette was talking of the lumber camps of British Columbia being closed and the fish caught on the Pacific coast not coming east, he was only echoing the remarks I made in the House a few months ago. I gave instances of those camps shutting down on account of the existing high freight rates, and there is no need to make them worse under the Crowsnest pass agreement.

The remedy I suggest is more traffic. Reduce the rates and let the farmers on the prairies have something left over after they have paid for the transportation of their wheat. Let them ship their wheat to British Columbia and bring back the much needed lumber that we are just as anxious to sell as they are to buy, and the increased traffic will make up the deficiency caused by a reduction of freight rates.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Marquette stand in his place and apparently unabashed and unashamed make the statement that he was quite indifferent, in fact, he practically said that he did not care whether the Canadian Pacific Railway paid a dividend next year or not. I gazed at him awestruck, expecting the floor to open up underneath him for such sacrilege, and hoping that the hole would not be big enough to swallow up also us wretched members who sit in the back seats. But he made his remarks with a nonchalance and recklessness that I certainly admire but cannot imitate. It reminded me of the small boy who was told by his brother that he had not said his prayers that night. "No, Bill," he replied, "I didn't say them last night either, and I am not going to say them to-morrow, and if nothing happens to me I am never going to say them any more." I shall watch with an anxious eye during the next few days to see if something bad does not happen to my hon. friend. When I heard him make that statement, hope almost awoke in my breast; I thought perhaps I might yet get my amendment through on the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill. He spoke of the reserve of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I think he mentioned something about trillions. Now, I am not familar with trillions; I count my money only in millions, and beyond that basis of calculation I cannot go. But the hon. gentleman must be mistaken, for it is not forty-eight hours since we in this House heard an ex-member of the late government, the member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) solemnly assure the House that if the Canadian Pacific were required to build that line of railway in British Columbia thirty-six miles long he would deplore their having to do it, because, he said, along that route the stumps were such that it would require a whole box of powder to blow them up. Now, a railway that will be turned aside by a stump or daunted by the necessity for using a box of powder cannot possibly have a reserve amounting to trillions, or anything like it.

There is just one other thing I want to mention, and I hope the Government and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) who represents British Columbia in the Government, will take particular notice of it. As the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has said the Crowsnest pass agreement does not mention rates on lumber, so that if we in British Columbia are to get any redress at all in respect to the lumber situation, it will have to be through compromise or negotiation in connection with the advocacy or otherwise of the Crowsnest pass agreement. I also wish to express the hope that on that committee there will be found a representative from British Columbia and that arrangements will be made to hear expert testimony with regard to rates as affecting the industries of that province.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, I am a representative of the city of Winnipeg, a city which, probably more than any other in Canada, depends for its existence and its prosperity

upon the railroad rates. I am a western man, as my hon. friends opposite are, and I am at one with them in the demand for a reduction of freight rates. I believe, Sir, that our economic regeneration in this country depends primarily upon the bringing about of a considerable reduction in freight rates. I am confident that prosperity will not come to us until such a reduction has been effected.

It struck me this afternoon that the question was purely one of education. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said, the matter must be finally settled by debate upon the floor of this House, and I have never known of a case where the gathering of full information and full data before a decision on any question was reached, worked an injury. With the full determination that, come what may, I will at the proper time, stand for a marked reduction of freight rates, I for one shall be glad to have an opportunity of voting intelligently on this question, on the basis of information received through or from a special committee. On that ground, therefore, I will support the resolution now before the House.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from the eastern part of Canada feel just as keenly as hon. members from any other part of the country the necessity for the revision of freight rates if there is to be a revival of business throughout the land. The rates on the Intercolonial railway are fixed by the directors of the Canadian National Railways without any reference whatever to the Railway Commission presided over by Mr. Carvell, and the resolution which has been proposed by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Kennedy) gives us the first opportunity we have had of ascertaining at first hand exactly what the transportation costs of the railway systems of this country are.

We heard this afternoon of the great amount of labour that was being expended on this matter by experts connected with the Railway Commission. But do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that in accordance with the practice that has always been followed in the past, we can summon these gentlemen before the special committee and there obtain the benefit of their knowledge and experience in connection with these matters? Having done that, we can proceed to discuss these and other questions, and, if necessary, legislate with regard to them.

My hon. friends opposite speak about the onerous freight charges made against the products of the West. But their complaints, well founded as they are, are no more justifiable than those which we make in the maritime provinces. There we have had no Crowsnest pass agreement, but under the solemn pact on the basis of which the maritime provinces entered Confederation, we were to have the benefit of such rates as would promote interprovincial trade. But these have been taken from us, and our trade is consequently disappearing. The conditions of which we complain are quite as serious as those prevailing in any other part of Canada. Are we, then, to be denied an opportunity, through the medium of this special committee, of ascertaining what is the basis of transportation costs?

My right hon. friend who leads the Opposition tells us how boldly he proceeded under the War Measures Act to announce a policy in 1918. But not much boldness was necessary, in view of the powers that were given to him under that act. He proceeded to create in this country a system of wages following the McAdoo award, and then he abrogated the Crowsnest pass agreement and imposed these higher rates. That is what was done in 1918, and that is what was confirmed by the amendment of the Railway Act known as section 325. On every other subject of importance that is presented to us for consideration we proceed through committees in order to ascertain the facts; is it to be said that in respect to this vital subject, upon which we must have information before a decision is reached, we should not have a committee? We are all glad to see the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) in the House after his illness. I may say to him in all kindness, however, that I do not think he has given due consideration to the provisions of this Crowsnest pass agreement. The Minister of Railways earlier in the evening emphasized the condition that prevailed with regard to fruit, and that point was accentuated a few moments ago by the remarks of my hon. friend from British Columbia (Mr. Neill). So also in regard to live stock; so also in regard to coal oil. Apparently it was not clear to some hon. members that the rates on lumber would not be affected in any way by the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement, because in it there is no reference whatever to that commodity.

The interpretation which I place upon this statute is that the rates fixed under the Crowsnest pass agreement would affect only the lines belonging to the Canadian

Pacific Railway Company which were in existence in 1897. It has no reference or application to a single mile of railway built by the Canadian Pacific since that time. I venture to offer that opinion, Mr. Speaker, based on my reading of the statute and on whatever legal experience I may have. If I am correct in my assumption, and assuming we have no committee to investigate the matter and the agreement, being continued, has no application whatever to railways lines built by the Canadian Pacific since 1897, would not that be a peculiar condition of things?

Mr. CRERAR: I think my hon. friend is wrong in the statement that he has made. I cannot at the moment quote my authority, but I am under the impression that the Railway Commission have held in the past that the Crowsnest pass agreement covered all lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of the Great Lakes.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Railway Commission is not a judicial body in legal matters, and its decisions in matters of that kind do not absolutely control, but would be affected by the decisions of the courts of this country.

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend's statement now is correct the Canadian Pacific have the option of challenging the decisions in the courts, but that option they have never exercised.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have made some inquiry and I understand the situation to be this: The Canadian Pacific never raised the point. They permitted these rates to go into effect on the lines which have been constructed since 1897, and they never raised the question legally. I am simply offering my opinion upon this subject as a lawyer of some experience, and I say I cannot find in this statute any provision that these rates were to apply to the lines of railway thereafter to be built, and according to my understanding of the law, for the rates to apply, the statute must contain words to this effect: "these provisions shall apply to lines hereafter to be built". Such words are not to be found in this statute.

Not only that, but the reduction of rates was made in regard to rates then existing. How could these rates apply to lines which were not in existence, so far as traffic was concerned, in 1897? I venture to say that the position of the Government in this matter is exactly the same as they took when the question of the Wheat Board came up at the beginning of the session. I ventured at that time to point out that a favourable decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in regard to the creation of a compulsory Wheat Board was a matter of very grave doubt, and that suggestion, which was not a very new one so far as I was concerned, was confirmed by the law officers of the Crown. Do not hon. gentlemen think it was a very wise policy for this Government to adopt instead of proceeding to formulate a hard-and-fast line of action in regard to handling the wheat crop of the West? Was it not a wise course to submit that question to a special committee of the House where hon. members had the greatest possible opportunity of discussing this very important question? In regard to this vital question of freight rates, ought not an equally wise course to be pursued? If the suggestion I have made to the House to-night that this agreement would not apply to railways built since 1897 should be correct, I submit that hon. gentlemen from the West would not be true to the interests of the people they were sent here to represent if they refused to permit a special committee of this House to investigate just what is the meaning of this Crowsnest pass agreement, and what its effect is to-day. Suppose section 325 of the Railway Act is amended by the Senate—there is no reason why the Senate could not pass a bill cutting out the limiting clause at the end—and that bill comes here to be dealt with. We would want to be in position to deal with it. I want to say, having had a very slight acquaintance with the subject of railway rates, because I once represented a client in a freight rate case, that I know of no other subject so abstruse and complicated and difficult to deal with. I am quite sure, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) said this afternoon, that outside of the wide experience which my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) has had as chairman of the Railway Board, there are very few men in this House competent to deal with so abstruse a subject as the proper adjustment of freight rates in this country. There never was a subject with regard to which there was more necessity for this House to insist upon a special committee being appointed to get the proper information under oath from experts who have given their lives to unravelling freight rate problems, as well as hearing from the responsible executives administering the railways of this country. Animated as we all are by the desire to reduce transportation charges in this country, so that we

may have a business revival in Canada, if this special committee is appointed we shall then be able to approach intelligently a settlement of this question, but if we do not have that committee and this whole subject is left up in the air, the settlement that will be made will be one lacking that clearness of vision and that proper exercise of judgment which this House ought to have in considering a question of such vital importance as this.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York): I confess I was at a little difficulty in my effort to follow the reasoning of my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He did me an honour that I do not think I am at all entitled to when he said that I probably was the only man in the House who could understand the freight tariffs or understand this question at all. Then he pointed out that he had been engaged in a rate case and had found it the most horribly complicated thing he had ever run up against. Then he said that this horribly complicated subject instead of being decided by people whose business it has been to decide such questions should be decided by a body that he had previously said could not decide it. I really could not follow my hon. friend.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I cannot follow my hon. friend now.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I regret it but I really think I am right this time. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the House feels under a deep debt of gratitude to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for writing out a declaration of the policy of his party. Here is another great document to be preserved for all time, and it is one he need never tear to pieces like the others have been torn, because I am sure it will never be able to hurt one way or the other. It commits him of course so definitely to just what he is going to do in connection with the matter under discussion. One of his formulae under which policies are to be interpreted and treated will not apply. It is his formula to the effect that "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." He will not be able to say that in this case because there is no letter. There is nothing in this particular thing at any rate that he need get away from. Then we have another new doctrine and that is that before anything is done by the Government which amounts to anything, it must first be sent to a special committee of this House. I wonder how it would be possible to carry on business in this country if my hon. friend seriously intended to carry out that idea? I am sure he will find a great deal of difficulty in getting the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to subscribe to this new doctrine and to sending on the budget to a special committee of this House before we consider it here. The budget of course gets to a committee finally but it gets there with the imprimatur of the Minister of Finance. He takes his stand upon it just as the Government ought to take its stand upon this question here to-day.

There is one thing that puzzles me about the whole of this debate and that is why this question is raised at all by the Government unless it be of course for the purposes that have already been suggested. How can there be any room for debate upon the question that more information can be got? We have had months and months of evidence being taken. It is all available to the Government. Then we have had three weeks of argument. That too is all available to the Government. What is more, the people of this country paid an awful lot to get that evidence and have that argument made before the commission. I remember that one of the chief complaints made against the Railway Commission in connection with the judgment of 1920 was that the board had not gone west but had stayed in Ottawa, had received the evidence and had come to a conclusion here. The West was very cross about it and so were other districts of the country. Well, since then we have had this investigation and a complete investigation. We have had the board sitting, I think, in eight of the provinces. The people of Canada have incurred an expense in getting experts and lawyers for the purpose of submitting their cases that may run into hundreds of thousands of dollars, and yet notwithstanding this all these people are invited to come back to Ottawa again—to do what? Simply to repeat what they have already said, simply to repeat everything that is now down in black and white, and, which the Minister of Railways must be thoroughly familiar with. And why? In order that this matter may be stalled just so much the longer.

Now we are interested, and very much interested, in the railway rates question; I entirely agree with everything that has been said on that point. But we are interested in the reduction of rates on basic commodities in the whole rather than in any particular part of Canada; and we are interested in a fair treatment of commodities as a whole, and not of commodities

within a small class. I may be wrong but I think there are approximately fifteen different commodities which eastern Canada is interested in having regard to the movement west—I do not think there are more covered by the Crowsnest pass agreement. I do not know exactly why they were selected. Of course the gentlemen that are interested in those few items would be deeply interested in the maintenance of that low rate. Now just to give the House some idea of what it means I hold in my hand a freight classification with hundreds of pages. That affords some idea of the manifold activities of commerce. Why should fifteen articles—or fifteen classes of articles—out of the whole of that mass get a preferential treatment? We have had a lot of trouble—every country has had the same experience—in trying to get something like fairness in connection with railway administration. It is a very difficult thing to accomplish. In the old days you had special agreements here, there and everywhere. The bigger manufacturer, the man who was in the position owing to the volume of his business and the traffic he could offer, was always getting advantages over his less favoured competitors. Not only that but you had the same thing in connection with certain municipalities, districts, and the like; and as far back as 1873—the year that England appointed her railway commission—this Parliament set to work to try and remedy those grievances. Nothing was done; nothing could be done until you had a special rate regulating commission which was not created until 1904.

Now what was the underlying principle of all that legislation? It was that there should not be under discrimination; that is unfair discrimination, not only as between traders, shippers, but also as between different localities and different places; they were all to be treated the same way. When this agreement was put into effect there was no enforcement of that law; but I cannot imagine anything which is much more discriminatory than that very agreement. What is wanted in Canada is a reduction,—just as drastic a reduction as can be made—in freight rates on basic commodities which have to move in mass and to the extent that special privileges and discriminatory rates are given here, in so far as all basic materials not covered by that contract are concerned, you may say goodbye to any reduction of rates.

I do not exactly know what is involved in this particular issue having regard to money. From my recollection I would take it that since I left the railway board there have been increases in western territory amounting to something like thirty-five per cent. I would imagine that the decreases made since would probably leave in the West a net increase over the 1913 standard of twenty per cent.

Mr. CRERAR: A little more than that.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: If that be the case I would be within the mark in saying that this agreement would involve a difference in railway rates of approximately something like $18,000,000; and it is quite clear that if that amount of railway revenues was taken away to-day, with the deficits which we already have, there would not be very much left for us to work on for the purpose of getting overdue reductions on other basic commodities.

Mr. CRERAR: The sum my hon. friend has mentioned would cover all railways and not merely the National lines alone.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is quite right. I think it would cover all railways. As I say, the amount would be approximately correct.

Then, in connection with the point raised by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) as to the manner in which the agreement operates, it is quite true, and I think I was responsible for it, that when that agreement was before me for consideration the attitude I always took was that the board could not think that Parliament intended absolutely widespread discrimination in connection with that contract and we always invited the companies to put in tariffs which applied Crowsnest pass rates to new lines, but I am perfectly free to admit, in view of more recent authority, that there is very grave doubt as to the legality of that position. The contract, after all, was a contract having to do with the company's lines as then owned, leased or operated and projected through the Kootenay district, and the basis of rates was also fixed having regard to the then scale of rates applying on the different lines of railway which were under operation. I would say that the chances are that the agreement would probably be confined by the courts to the situation which was covered by the agreement when the agreement was made. At the time the agreement was made there were some

10 p.m.

7,400 miles of railway in operation by the Canadian Pacific, and I think to-day there are some 14,000 miles.

But the main trouble has nothing to do with that; the main trouble is that we have high freight rates in all parts of Canada, and we think, in connection with basic commodities, any reductions made ought to be so made as to give the whole country some benefit of them. For example, we have tremendously high rates on coal in Ontario, and I am afraid it would never do to allow everything which could be made available for a reduction in rates to go in one particular direction on a comparatively small mileage, unless we are to say that, for all time, we agree on the principle of creating and continuing discrimination. But this all serves merely to emphasize the fact of the necessity of something being done one way or the other, of some action being taken by the Government to-day, of their saying: "yes" or "no". The question was put to the Prime Minister by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), whether the fact was that high rates were being maintained in this country because the Government was not able to make up its mind as to what it was going to do with the Crowsnest pass agreement. I do not think that question was answered, and it certainly was a question rightly put if we have regard to what was said by the Prime Minister. The House has most assuredly been told that the Government has gone into conference with the railway executives and that they have said: "We cannot make, in these basic rates, those reductions which are so much required until we know what you are going to do with the Crowsnest pass agreement." We need to do more than talk about reducing rates and reducing expenses; we need to do something towards bringing about that reduction at the earliest possible moment. Therefore, in view of what the Minister of Railways has said, in view of what the Prime Minister has said, I now beg to move, seconded by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen):

That all the words after the first word "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor.

A general reduction in railway rates so essential to the welfare of Canadian production and trade cannot, as declared by the Government, be made until Parliament decides whether or not the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement which expires on July 6th be renewed; that it is the immediate duty of the Government—already too long deferred—to acquire the necessary information gathered and in their disposal at the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners and to submit its policy, to this house.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. A. B. HUDSON (South Winnipeg): Mr. Speaker, the question before the House, it seems to me, is not altered or advanced by the amendment which my hon. friend (Sir Henry Drayton) has just moved, and I think the whole question has been so fully discussed that it is not necessary for me to enter into any of the various phases of the matter to any great extent. The question, however, of a reduction of freight rates is of such vital importance that I feel I should state my position briefly before this resolution or the amendment is put to a vote. The position which is taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, so far as I can make out, is that hon. members of the official Opposition do not want the Crowsnest pass agreement to come into effect, and hon. members of the Progressive party do want the Crowsnest pass agreement to come into effect.

With much that my hon. friends of the Progressive party have said in regard to this agreement, I agree. If the question before the House at the present moment was whether or not the Crowsnest pass agreement should be restored to its full effect, I would be bound to vote in favour of that position. But the question is not that; the question is whether or not an opportunity should be given to members of this House to make a further inquiry, to inform themselves as to all the facts which have a bearing on the situation, and then, after that, somebody will have to make some substantive move before the question of the Crowsnest pass agreement can come up for discussion. For that reason, for the reason that I believe all members of the House, including myself, should supply themselves with the fullest information that is available before the time for action comes, I propose to support the resolution and to oppose the amendment.

Mr. J. T. SHAW (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker, I trust that, perhaps, I may be pardoned for intervening in this debate, in view of the importance of the matters involved, not only to the West, but to all parts of Canada. There is one gratifying fact, and that is that, apparently, all parts of the House are agreed as to the necessity for an immediate and drastic reduction in freight rates. That is not common only to members of this House; it represents to an almost unanimous degree, the attitude of the people of this country, and to some extent, perhaps, the attitude of even the railway companies themselves. Now, in order to place on Hansard the views of the

provincial government of Saskatchewan, to which reference has already been made in this debate, I would direct the attention of the House to a resolution passed unanimously on the motion of the former provincial treasurer, now premier of that province, on this particular question. The resolution reads:

> Whereas the burden of existing freight rates, especially on the products of agriculture, is so great as to be more than the traffic can bear, and
>
> Whereas in many parts of the province the result of this condition is that grain is standing in the fields unthreshed because, at the present prices, threshing costs and freight charges would absorb the whole of the price realised;
>
> Therefore be it Resolved that in the opinion of this Assembly the Government of Saskatchewan should continue to press its application for the réduction of freight rates now before the Railway Commission of Canada and further—

And I direct the attention of hon. members on all sides to this part of the resolution—

> That in the opinion of this Assembly the Parliament of Canada should under no circumstances re-enact subsection five of section 325 of The Railway Act of Canada which expires in July 1922 and which, if allowed to lapse, will again bring into force the Crowsnest agreement.

Now, in support of that resolution the then provincial treasurer made this statement:

> It may seen an extreme statement to make that at the present time existing freight rates are killing the traffic, but anyone who travels through the province, and particularly the northern part of the province, cannot fail to be impressed by the large number of fields in which stooks of oats are still standing unthreshed for the reason stated in the resolution, namely, that the present price will not bear the threshing costs and the freight charges.

What the present Premier of Saskatchewan says in that regard I am quite sure can be substantiated by many members of this House. Let me also quote the statement of the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, I believe, appeared in the newspapers either this morning or last evening. In that part of his speech dealing with freight rates, he says:

> It is the view of the directors, and it has been their view for some time, that the scaling downwards of freight rates should be begun with reductions on basic commodities, especially in those industries which have felt the general depression most severely. Notwithstanding the willingness of the companies to make sacrifices in their revenues in the hope that a lower scale of rates on basic commodities would give an impetus to business activity, they have been precluded from agreeing on a definite policy because of the approaching expiration on July 7 next of the provisions of the Railway Act allowing the Railway Commission to make rates irrespective of agreements, statutory or other.

Now, I take it from that statement that the Canadian Pacific Railway company will object, as an organization, to the reviving of the Crowsnest pass agreement. In view of the various statements made with regard to the resolution before the House, one perhaps finds himself in some difficulty in determining exactly what is the particular issue. It seems to me, however, regardless of how it may be put, that the question fundamentally is simply this: Are we going to appoint a committee to determine whether or not, after all the facts have been ascertained, the Crowsnest pass agreement shall be further suspended, shall be abrogated, or shall be revived in its present form? Let me say at the outset that I for one at least am in favour of the agreement being revived on July 7th next, and I am perfectly clear on that. I have no objection to an investigation into railway rates as they affect any other commodities not covered by the Crowsnest pass agreement, but as regards that agreement I believe without question that it should come into effect again on July 7th next.

Realising the necessity for a reduction in freight rates, let us for a moment consider the contract which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has with the Government in the agreement described as the Crowsnest pass agreement. It is unnecessary for me to point out that this is not the only contract which the government of Canada has made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and I think that everyone will agree with me when I say that the people of Canada have scrupulously and faithfully carried out every provision of any contract that they ever entered into with that company. They have not asked for the abrogation or the suspension of any of those agreements many of which undoubtedly have borne very heavily on the country, and more especially on the people of western Canada. We have hewed to the line and carried out the terms of each and every contract which our governments have at various times made with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Is it proposed now that this committee shall consider only the Crowsnest pass agreement because the Canadian Pacific Railway asks for the abrogation or the suspension of that agreement? Would it not be just as fair, considering this as a solemn agreement made

in consideration of a cash subsidy of $3,630,000, for the Parliament of Canada to ask the Canadian Pacific Railway company to consider the suspension or the alteration of their charter regarding, for instance, tax exemption? I think that the Canadian Pacific Railway company, when they entered into this solemn and binding contract, must have realised the possibilities of the situation. They may not perhaps have realised them all, but in that regard they must take their chances just as the people of Canada took their chances when they entered into the agreement with the Canadian Pacific railway in the matter of their charter. Would the Canadian Pacific railway, in consideration of the abrogation or suspension of this particular agreement, undertake to return to the people of Canada the sum of $3,630,000 which was given them as a cash subsidy? Do they propose to give us any consideration for the privileges which we have accorded them? So far as I can observe, I presume they will not. The Crowsnest pass agreement of 1897 represents nothing less and nothing more than a charter so far as freight rates are concerned, and I think we should be very careful indeed before we consent to a further suspension or to an abrogation of that agreement. I may say frankly that I, for one, am not prepared to consent to anything of that kind.

Considering the agreement for a moment, I may point out that the bill incorporating the Crowsnest pass agreement itself was introduced by the then Minister of Railways, the Hon. A. G. Blair. Mr. Blair had apparently no misconception as to the value to the people of Canada of this particular provision regarding freight rates. He said:

> The committee will have noted that we have sought to ensure the country a large measure of relief from the rates which have obtained since the Canadian Pacific railway was started. We have imposed conditions upon the company which are very largely restrictive of their present powers. We have embraced in one of the sub-clauses of these resolutions, a considerable list of articles which go into very large consumption among the people of the western provinces and we have secured an agreement on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company that very substantial reductions will be made upon existing rates.

Now, the commodities have already been referred to, a few items at a time, but I think, it will be found upon a close examination that so far as the westbound commodities are concerned they cover fruit, agricultural implements, building materials, household furniture, iron and wire, cordage and binder twine; those are substantially the commodities concerned in the westbound traffic referred to in this agreement. It is true that at that time these particular commodities did constitute the basic commodities of the West. It is also true, despite what the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) has stated, that with one or two possible exceptions—live stock, fruit and one or two other commodities—they still constitute the basic requirements of the western country. Looking at the eastbound traffic, we find two items, grain and flour. Surely no one will suggest that these articles do not still constitute the basic products of the West. But it seems to me that the members of the House in those days when considering these various commodities endeavoured to give favourable rates to eastern manufacturers so far as westbound freight was concerned, and favourable tolls to eastbound products of the western country.

It has been suggested, Mr. Speaker, that this agreement applies to the Canadian Pacific railway only as it then existed. But I would point out to the hon. gentleman responsible for that view that the Railway Commission, which is a judicial body, decided in December, 1917, and its decision has not been questioned, that the Crowsnest pass agreement:—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is the date of the decision?

Mr. SHAW: December 26, 1917. It deals with the 15 per cent increase then granted by the Railway Commission under the chairmanship of Sir Henry Drayton. In deciding the question as to whether or not the agreement applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway as it then existed, the chairman said in the operative part of his judgment:

> I am of opinion that the discrimination should be avoided, and that the effect of the Crowsnest pass agreement must be extended to the system of the company as now operated.

If that interpretation of the law is correct, the situation is simply this, that not only did the agreement apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway of that particular date and to the lines leased and operated by it, but it likewise applies to the Canadian Pacific Railway as it exists to-day.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The question I raised is purely a legal question and not a matter of rates. The quotation from Sir Henry Drayton's judgment does not

purport to decide, as a matter of law, that the Crowsnest pass agreement extended beyond any lines other than those then existing. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me in that.

Mr. SHAW: I do not wish to mislead any one, certainly not the hon. member for Pictou, but it does seem to me that that particular point is perfectly clear in the judgment of the Railway Commission as given by Sir Henry Drayton, and I quote it for what it is worth.

Hon. members may recollect that a case involving a somewhat similar point came before the Privy Council in connection with the application of a gas company in one of our western cities for a declaration that they were entitled to franchise rights in property which had not been included in the area of the municipality at the time the franchise was granted. The Privy Council held that the franchise rights extended beyond the original corporate limits of that particular city at the time, and covered the increased area subsequently taken into the municipality.

Another point referred to was as to whether or not the Crowsnest pass agreemen applied only to the Canadian Pacific Railway and not to other lines of railway —the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific. Of course, in the agreement there is no reference to these two additional railways, they not being then in existence, but in the same judgment from which I have already quoted the chairman of the Railway Commission said:

> It is quite true that neither the Canadian Northern nor the Grand Trunk Pacific are bound by provisions of the Crowsnest pass agreement or act. On the other hand, while it would be open for the Board to permit an increase of 15 per cent in their rates over a very large part of the territory served by one or other of these systems, grain could undoubtedly be hauled to the Canadian Pacific. The result would be that both these companies in order to protect their traffic would reduce their rates at all points where their traffic would suffer from Canadian Pacific competition. The element of unequal rates would be again introduced into the western territory, and I am convinced that this is no better for the railways than it is for the districts.

So the chairman held that the agreement applies not only to the Canadian Pacific Railway, but in addition to the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railways.

Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has to abide by the provisions of the Crowsnest pass agreement, it will undoubtedly suffer considerable loss. The National Railways will substantially have to comply with the same provisions, and consequently they too will suffer considerable loss, the total of all losses being estimated at some $18,000,000. Now, would the Canadian Pacific Railway Company be permitted to raise existing rates on other commodities for the purpose of meeting this deficit? I suggest not, because of course it has got to meet the competition of the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific.

I have every respect for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is a large and businesslike corporation. I have heard it suggested that it is the financial barometer of this country. It is true that during 1921 the company paid its dividend and had a substantial surplus, something like three-quartetrs of a million dollars, but if on last year's operation the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does constitute the financial barometer of this country, then I certainly am very much mistaken, because I fear that very few corporations indeed, unless specially favoured in some particular way, made anything like that showing. Therefore if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is a barometer of the financial condition of this country, it is not a true barometer of that condition during the past year. On that ground alone I have no hesitation in saying that barometers of that character are not going to fool anyone who is endeavouring to truly ascertain the financial credit of this country.

It is also urged against the coming into force of this agreement that the National Railways might suffer. Now, everyone knows that the National Railways, or a great part of them, were speculatively built; as suggested by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) they were colonization roads. I think, however, we have every reason to expect that with the aggressive attitude assumed by the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) in the co-ordination of these two now separate and distinct railway services, a great saving will be effected, and also, I think, a great increase in efficiency.

I suggest also that we at least on this side of the House are hopeful that the Minister of Railways will not be unmindful of the recommendation of the former chairman of the National Railway Board that the very large capitalization of the National Railways should be reduced in order that the earnings might represent a fair return on the capital involved.

Now, my suggestion, Mr. Speaker is this: that the Crowsnest pass agreement, which is simply a charter of our rights respecting freight charges, not only in this part of the country, but in western Canada as well—that the Crowsnest pass agreement should be given a try-out for such period of time as Parliament may decide. If after it has been tried out it is found that the railway companies have suffered unduly or that the efficiency of our transportation systems has been injured, it will then be time enough for Parliament to determine whether the Crowsnest pass agreement should be suspended for a further degree of time, or abrogated altogether. I do think that an opportunity should at least be given for such a trial as I have suggested.

If Parliament decides to have an investigation into transportation costs as asked for in the resolution, I think perhaps that might be desirable, so long as our rights reserved under the Crowsnest pass agreement are protected, and so long as it is definitely understood now that that agreement is to go into effect on the 7th of July, 1922.

I am sure it must be common ground in this House that an immediate reduction of railroad rates would go a long way toward remedying the business paralysis which now prevails everywhere. I think that we, assembled here as the representatives of the people, should be the last to interfere with the going into effect of the Crowsnest pass agreement, that solemn contract between the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that even at this late hour it would be out of place for a member from British Columbia to say just a word on this extremely important question. I must say, as I have said on previous occasions, that hon. members on my left have a tendency to take a more or less sectional view with regard to some great national questions. It may be said that the Government is dilatory in its conduct, but so far as our friends on my left are concerned, they tell the House and the country that they want the Crowsnest pass agreement enforced because it means, primarily, cheaper rates on wheat. But I would ask hon. members to raise their vision from the tops of the wheat growing on the prairies to the tops of the forest growing on the hillsides of British Columbia and remember that when they return to the agreement and thus improve their own position, they deal a far worse blow to the lumber industry in British Columbia than it has ever before received. The rates on wheat would be out of proportion altogether to the rates on lumber, fruits and fish.

We in British Columbia have for years been working under a great handicap. The extremely high freight rates on lumber have closed many of our mills, with resulting unemployment and stagnation of industry, which includes the business of supplying lumber to the farmers who require it on the prairies. If in no other way, I suggest that the farmers of the prairies could profitably use that lumber to cover the immense quantities of agricultural machinery that we see scattered across the plains from the Rocky mountains to Fort William.

The point I rose particularly to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we expect from a party which calls himself Progressive a larger and broader outlook on great national questions of this kind. Hon. gentlemen come here and in many of their speeches emphasize the desirability of foresight and breadth of vision on the part of public men. During the debate on the Address we heard many splendid speeches, idealistic in their character, from my friends to my left. Now, here is an opportunity for my hon. friends to put those principles into practice, but instead of doing that they say to the people of Canada: No matter what happens to the industries of the rest of the country, we are going to have the restoration of that agreement; we are going to have cheap rates on our goods, and that finishes it so far as we are concerned.

But it may be that hon. members to my left are, as a whole, in accord with a general reduction of freight rates. I believe they are, Mr. Speaker, because the people of the country demand such a revision. The heads of the railway corporations have assented to it, and the Government have expressed their own concurrence in that view. Surely the speeches which we have heard from our friends of the Progressive party represent the views of only a portion of them; surely they would not take a course which would have the effect of deciding a great question like this without regard to the needs of the other provinces. British Columbia has laboured under greater difficulties in regard to freight rates

and greater handicaps than any other province, particularly as regards the immense sawmills there, the great salmon canneries and other fishing industries, and the fruit industry. Those who have spoken from the ranks of the Progressive party have not said that when they get the rates reduced on wheat they will, in the national interest, extend their policy so that the various economic factors throughout the whole country, industry, commerce and agriculture, may receive fair and equitable treatment. I think the course proposed is one which is inimical to the best interests of the country.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I desire to make a few remarks, not in relation to my own position on the question, which undoubtedly I made clear to all hon. members of the House when I spoke on the motion itself, but to say something by way of reply to assertions, if I cannot call them arguments, advanced on behalf of the Administration. I submit there has been very much introduced into the debate that has had a tendency to confuse the issue and to divert the minds of hon. members from what we really decide in voting yea or nay on the amendment and on the motion.

In the first place it is not a question of the justice or wisdom of the present scale of rates that is in issue. As the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Shaw) has stated, summing up the purport of the debate, there is only one opinion that has been expressed in the debate on that question. There is only one, I think, that can be expressed. I agree with him that any far-seeing, intelligent railway executive would concur with the purport of the discussion this afternoon, that it is in the interests of all concerned, the railways included, that substantial and, as nearly as may be, immediate reductions be made in the general level of freights in this country. I would not object even to the application of the term drastic. The time comes when big things of this kind must be grappled with, and grappled with resolutely, and hands forced on the question. Otherwise, one waits on the other and the other on the one, and the country waits on both. But that is not the question that is in issue at all.

Nor is the question of whether or not the Crowsnest pass agreement as such should be made permanent in issue. I can understand, however, the attitude of hon. members who say, "Inasmuch as I have already studied out this question, read the evidence, thoroughly informed myself on the question, and am irrevocably opposed to the renewal of the agreement, consequently, I cannot admit a yea vote on this question." I think that is quite consistent. If hon. members are able to firmly decide and turn their backs finally on the evidence, if they have read it all and come to a conclusion, then, of course, they are in a position to say "The matter does not admit of debate. I do not need any policy to be submitted to me. My mind is made up." That position is consistent.

I must say I was not able to comprehend the position of the hon. member for South Winnipeg (Mr. Hudson). He has reached the conclusion evidently of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). Well, if he has, why does he want to delay decision? Is his purpose to try to educate others? If so, let it be done in debate in this House. Why submit to a committee on what in his judgment is not debatable any longer?

Mr. CAHILL: Why was this submitted to a committee when parliamentary legislation was initiated in the first place?

Mr. MEIGHEN: This will be submitted to a committee again. The Government of that day came down with its policy, moved a resolution in this House, stated where it stood. The resolution was moved by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. CAHILL: No, exactly the opposite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly it was. The Minister of Railways came before the House and moved a resolution. He stated that was the best judgment of the Railway Commission, that was the Government's policy, and that policy went to a committee of this House, the same as all Government policies do.

Mr. CAHILL: A special committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, a special committee dealing with the revision of the whole Railway Act, but the Government first came to the House with its policy. If the Government did not move that, who moved it? Does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. CAHILL: It was moved in committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Exactly, in Committee of the Whole, moved by the Government, moved by the Hon. Dr. Reid, who at that time was Minister of Railways, and the hon. member knows it.

Mr. CAHILL: A special committee.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, this was moved by the Government in the House. Does that get into his head?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I have been discourteous to the hon. member.

Mr. McMASTER: Not very polite.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not reflecting at all on the hon. member's head. I am reflecting on his obstinacy. Very well. The Government took its position.

Mr. CAHILL: Why did not the Government take its position on the floor of the House instead of through a committee?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government did.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the difference between one special committee and another?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government submitted the whole revision of the Railway Act to the committee. The Government did not submit this point at all. It was not up at that time. Immediately it came up the Government—

Mr. CAHILL: It was by Order in Council.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Let me finish my sentence. The Government got its information from the Railway Commission, got a memorandum, and on the basis of that submitted to the committee of the whole its opinion upon the question—

Mr. CAHILL: It did not come direct.

Mr. MEIGHEN:—and that will suit me if this Government will do that. Let the Government announce its course, announce it anywhere. Very well. The point my hon. friend sought to divert me from was this, that the question of the extension or non-extension of the suspension is not the question we are discussing, though it is quite true if hon. members have finally and conclusively and irrevocably made up their minds on that in the negative—in the negative, I repeat —then they are consistent on that ground in opposing the resolution. But I oppose the resolution on the grounds I stated before, and once more I submit to the House through you, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the interests of this House and in the interests of the proper conduct of affairs in this country that we take up our position on the grounds I submitted to this House before.

What is the resolution before us? The resolution before us is this, that a special committee of this House go into the whole question of transportation costs and hear especially witnesses on the subject of the wisdom of the extension of the Crowsnest pass suspension. That is a statement of it that I know will suit the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy). That is what we are asked to do. Now why are we asked to do it? What will be gained by doing it? The Prime Minister dilates at great length and in very loud voice on the wisdom of having all possible information. He is a preacher of the doctrine of information, and he says that those are not of his faith who would deny any information to this House.

The Government, he intimates, would be autocratic if it dared to come down to Parliament with its policy until all information had been adduced before a special committee, or some committee, of this House. Why, the government of this country day in and day out for years, all governments, this Government since it came into power has come into Parliament with its policy,—such as it was—invariably the policy it said it would not follow, but nevertheless its policy—without having anything submitted to a committee of this House. There are cases, of course, when the contrary course may be taken, cases such as I sought to explain when I was on my feet before. But to say that anybody who declines to vote for this resolution is against information is to talk what I submit, in all respect, is nonsense. Is the information not available now? If it is, why have the evidence all heard again? May I submit that to hon. members once more? If the evidence has been heard and is on record, if all that cost has been gone to, all the trouble and the time taken, why do it all over again? Let hon. members think of that question. Is it not true that the evidence has been taken, yea, all the evidence, that ten times the evidence has been taken, twenty times the evidence that can by any possibility be submitted to this committee? Is that not true? Is it not true that the Railway Commission has sat almost successively for a year and a half, that it has heard the evidence pro and con, from every angle and from every class and every industry of this Dominion, that it has weighed that evidence, that it has had the exhibits filed and studied, that it has had every-

thing studied from the standpoint this committee has been charged to study it from? Has not that all been done, and is not the evidence so taken at the disposal of every member of this House? Is it not at the disposal of the Government? Why, it has been at their disposal for days, for weeks; and the men who heard it, who had the advantage of seeing the witnesses in front of them and weighing their testimony, those men who have heard similar evidence for seventeen years—at least for the years they have been in office—and their experts for seventeen years, those men stand in front of the Government ready to submit the evidence, ready to give their judgment on that evidence, and submit that judgment to the Government.

Now is not that true? Let me ask again what more do we want in the way of information? Is it solemnly suggested, seriously suggested, that this committee to be appointed by the House is to hear all the classes of evidence of various interests that have already been heard before the Railway Commission? If it is not who are to be eliminated? Who are those who have the right to be heard before the Railway Commission that will not have the right to be heard before this committee? Can any hon. member answer me that? Let me repeat: Is it seriously suggested that a committee of this House to whose membership not one member—or at least not more than one—can possibly be appointed that has ever studied, or given more than a day's consideration to this question—one of the most intricate that ever the mind of man addressed itself to—that such a committee of this House is to settle what the Railway Commission has sat for a year and a half almost continuously to consider, and considered for seventeen years before. Is it suggested that we go again to the expense that the commission has gone to; put the provinces and Canada to the same expense, put the various classes of industry in this country to a like expense; consume a like time, and that the decision of this issue is to wait until the committee brings in its report? If that is not the suggestion, what really is the suggestion? What is the purpose of this committee? What can it do that it can do well? I know of nothing whatsoever.

Now furthermore: When the Railway Commission considered the question that is to be submitted to this committee—without which consideration this committee can never make a report—when the Railway Commision considered the same question in the summer of 1920, the complaint arose from all corners of the Dominion because they had not pursued the usual course of making it easy for people to give testimony and present its case before it—that is to say, the course of going where the evidence was and could be conveniently brought before the commission. That was the main complaint, and bitter the complaints were. The commission cured that complaint. After the re-submission of the issue to them by the governments in the fall of 1920 they went to seven provinces of this Dominion; they went to British Columbia, to Alberta, to Saskatchewan, to Manitoba—they sat in every one of these provinces. They sat also in Ontario, in New Brunswick and in Nova Scotia. They sat in every province except two of this Dominion; they heard the evidence on the ground, and they viewed the problem from the viewpoint of these localities. Can this committee duplicate that performance? Is it suggested that it should duplicate it? If not, how can it come to a conclusion anything like as intelligent as the Railway Commision is in a position to present right to-day?

Consequently I say those that argue that we need to appoint this committee because we require more information are presenting an argument that upon serious, honest reflection I do not think any hon. member of this House can entertain. The information is all down; the information is all sifted; the evidence has been all given; the evidence is all printed. The information has been gathered and sifted before a body competent to gather it and competent to sift it. That information is there, that body is there. That body is there ready with its advice and its conclusion. This Government should go to that body, read the evidence, get the conclusion of that commission, reflect on it, and come to this Parliament and present its policy. Now is not that a good practice? Oh, but the Prime Minister says that we have appointed a committee already to consider the Wheat Board suggestion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I never spoke of the Wheat Board.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think my hon. friend referred to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, I never spoke of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry if I mistook his reference, but I must take the hon. member's word. It would be more appropriate if he had done so than anything else he has said relative to this issue.

An hon. MEMBER: What about the committee appointed by the late government to consider the National Railway operations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true that we did submit that question to a standing committee but does not the House see the difference? Had there been any body considering that question through these years? Had there been any body constituted to study that question and hear evidence upon it? None at all. That was a fit and proper question to submit to a special committee so that evidence could be heard and that evidence sifted; but in this case the evidence has been all heard, the evidence has all been sifted—there has been a special body appointed to do it. There it sits, there it has sat, there it is right ready with its advice. Last session we did refer this question to which allusion has been made to a committee. I moved for the appointment of that committee to consider a wholly new question as respects which there was no body in this Dominion in a position to advise the government of the day. We asked for a committee of this House to investigate this question: How far the daily operations of our National Railway system—how far, and when, those operations could be brought down and fully disclosed to Parliament without hindering the work of the Board of Directors itself. Now even though we did appoint a committee to do this, it was a question as to which the government had no body to resort to, and no evidence had been already compiled, and as respects which information could be adduced that at least had not been adduced before; but even though we did ask for that committee the government already had unmistakably declared its own opinion on the question and had followed that opinion consistently in the House. We did not seek to hide behind any commission—not at all. We were ready to have the whole thing studied and evidence adduced; but we were

11 p.m. not afraid to declare our own belief after the study we had been privileged to give it. So where is my hon. friend when he calls upon this reference able to make anything that has even the appearance of an argument? Nowhere at all. You do not get anywhere in discussing this issue merely by emphasis of sound. Let the Prime Minister say what there is that can be adduced before this committee that has not already been adduced and that any hon. member can read.

Now let me pass from that. On the other hand what is to be lost by the appointment of this committee? That is worth inquiring into. This committee if it sits day and night, and Sundays, will not have but a small fraction of the time required to study the subject that is committed to it by the terms of this resolution. But presuming that it has, it will require it all—it will require weeks. Then I do not think this report will be of much value. But look at the time that is lost, and where is the Government going to be then? Why it will be about the end of the session, and then the Prime Minister will be in that most frightful position that he will lament it himself in tears, as he did many a time in times gone by of bringing down important legislation in the dying days of the session. Would it not be humiliating for the Prime Minister to find himself in a position where he had to perpetrate such an awful mistake as that? Why he has been declaiming against such a course session after session. It should not be done but it is not always possible to avoid it—I know that. In this case we are going to lose weeks. We are going to get into the position where, I submit, the committee will have to say to Parliament, if it speaks its honest mind, that it has not had the opportunity or the time adequately to study this problem, and consequently where the Government will have the excuse, as I fear it, of coming to Parliament and saying "The whole issue is not finished out yet and we present this position to the House of Commons: We cannot get the judgment of this special committee, and it will probably be next session before we can. The special committee, to the extent it has gone, has not anything like traversed the whole ramifications that it must traverse, and consequently, we must ask Parliament for at least a temporary extension of the suspension." When I spoke first, I said that that was the cul-de-sac into which the Gvoernment was going to get. It looks, because I have not heard any reference to the matter, as if that is the cul-de-sac the Government seeks to get into. At all events, nothing but valuable time can be lost; nothing in the world can be gained; great expense can be heaped up, and all for the sake of the administration to avoid taking upon its back the responsi-

bility which it for so many years, courted, but which now it does not seem able to discharge.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wondered, when I heard the amendment read, just what exactly was the intention and purpose in the mind of the hon. member (Sir Henry Drayton) who moved it. It is perfectly apparent now that the intention was to give the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) an opportunity to make a second speech and to go over the same ground he went over at great length this afternoon. Let me say to my right hon. friend that his case must be an extremely weak one, or he would not have taken an hour this afternoon and another hour to-night—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Twenty minutes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:—in a loud as well as at times a modulated voice, to cover the ground which he has found it necessary to cover in support of his case. I think the amendment only gives the House an added reason why it should support the original resolution. The first paragraph of the amendment reads:

> A general reduction in railway rates so essential to the welfare of Canadian production and trade cannot, as declared by the Government, be made until Parliament decides whether or not the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement which expires on July 6th, be renewed.

This clause is to the effect that Parliament must decide whether or not it is advisable for the Crowsnest pass agreement to be renewed. May I ask hon. members of the House—How are they to reach a wise and sound decision on this question unless they have ample opportunity of satisfying their minds as regards all the bearings of the situation? The purpose the Government has had in mind in suggesting this committee, is that every hon. member should have opportunity of getting such information as may be necessary or desirable to enable a decision, that will be in the national interest, to be reached. I contend it is impossible for hon. members, without any knowledge whatever of the arguments pro and con with respect to this agreement, to register in this House an intelligent and fair vote upon the matter.

May I draw attention to the next clause, and see what it implies?

> That it is the immediate duty of the Government—already too long deferred—to acquire the necessary information gathered and in their disposal at the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners and to submit its policy to this House.

Is that not simply repeating what was said by my right hon. friend this afternoon, namely, that the Government should come into this House and suggest a certain course of action in connection with freight rates, based solely on information obtained from the Railway Commission or upon information received in conference, but, as I remarked this afternoon, in purely informal conference without any opportunity whatever of the Government ascertaining, by further inquiry, whether the representations that have been made are, to all intents and purposes, fair and accurate. In a matter of this importance, the Government would not be justified in taking, at their face value, the representations that have been made to them by the railway executives. They have heard only one side from the railway executives. They desire an opportunity of bringing the railway executives before a committee of this House and of enabling every hon. member to question the railway executives and to get true and accurate information in regard to the situation. The Government wants that for its own protection as well as for the protection of the people of this country. If we are going to decide this matter, it being of the magnitude it is, in a way that is unmistakably in the national interest, there should be opportunity for the fullest investigation. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) says: "Take the information you have already at its face value; take it from the railway executives and from no one else excepting the Railway Commission." What did my right hon. friend have to say about the Railway Commission this afternoon? As I pointed out, he said that, in the minds of the people of this country to-day, the Railway Commission is standing for the protection of the railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say that. The hon. gentleman had better look up Hansard. I stated that the duty of the Railway Commission, as it appeared from the outside for a time, owing to the natural conditions, was to stand between the railways and the people for the protection of the people, but owing to conditions brought about by the war, the reverse appeared now to be the case. But I expressed no reflection whatever upon the Railway Commission, and never have I, in any way in this debate, expressed the slightest lack of confidence in the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not imputing to my right hon. friend any lack

of confidence in the Railway Commission. I know he has every confidence in that commission; but I am taking the statement he has just made in saying that the reverse is now the case as regards the attitude the public takes towards the Railway Commission. If his words have any meaning, it is this, that, before the war, the Railway Commission was regarded as protecting the interests of the public where controversies arose between the public and the railways; that since the war, without his indicating whether the impression is just or unjust—I think my right hon. friend would say that the impression was unjust—the impression nevertheless exists, that the Railway Commission to-day is primarily protecting the interest of the railways. Yet he asks us, as a Government, to base our policy on information given by that body and that body only. All the information that the Railway Commission has in its possession will be at the disposal of the Committee which will be asked to investigate this matter. Hon. members of the House will then have the same information as the Government has. Are we taking a retrograde step when we seek to put into the possession of every hon. member the information that we ourselves have? Surely, if there ever was reason for a course of action such as is being taken that reason is present when the question being dealt with is that of railway rates and of the consequences that are involved in proposed changes.

Let me say, in conclusion, that the Government's motive in this, has been to inspire public confidence in whatever action is taken. We are led to believe that certain consequences will follow a failure to continue the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. I am unable to say whether those consequences are well founded, whether the reasoning is sound or not. It may well be that, in the course of a thorough investigation, it will be discovered that there should not be placed on the possible consequences of a failure to continue the suspension of that agreement the emphasis that is being placed upon them in certain quarters at the present time. But what the Government feels is this, that, if certain consequences are likely to follow, the country has a right to know what they are. The people of this country will have to bear the effect of those consequences; the Government are the trustees of the people, trustees for them as taxpayers, as the owners of large railway systems. When hon. gentlemen opposite speak about giving public ownership a fair trial, they ought to be prepared to support whatever will work towards that end. Our contention is: While this agreement applies to the Canadian Pacific, it is well known that the effect of competition will occasion similar rates to be put into effect on the Government roads. We are not saying that that should not be done. All that we say is this. Government ownership is on trial at the present time; hon. gentlemen opposite want to give it a fair trial; we propose to give it a fair trial, and one of the ways in which we propose to do that, is to take the public into our confidence to the fullest extent possible. While it is important that the Government should have the confidence of its own following, and while it is desirable that they should have the confidence of hon. members of this House to as large an extent as possible, it is still more important that they should have the confidence of the people of this country whose trustees they are at the present time. It is looking to that larger confidence that we take the stand we do, when we say that before we plunge the country further into debt as a consequence of railway liabilities one way or the other, before we take any stand in the way of Government policy which may or may not prove injurious to large sections of the country, we intend to have the fullest possible publicity in order that the public may be completely informed in a matter that so vitally affects the public interest.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I take the opportunity for a few moments only of speaking on the amendment. I am not going to do as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has done, and as my hon. friend the leader of the Government (Mr. Mackenzie King) has also done, namely, make two speeches of precisely the same character and on the same material. I am going to oppose the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton), and I am going to oppose it for this reason: My hon. friend from West York argues, and the leader of the Opposition supports the argument, that the Government should consult the Railway Commission and those who possess information in respect of this matter and bring down a policy to Parliament in connection therewith. In respect to the amendment, I take the position I took this afternoon as regards the motion, and that is, that we have sufficient information before us now to enable this House to come to a judgment

as to whether or not the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement should be further continued. We have had discussions before the Railway Commission for months. The public, I think, are pretty well informed as to the evidence that was submitted to that commission. The newspapers have contained very full reports of it, and we have had an opportunity of studying the subject, while members of the House have listened to the arguments upon the matter. I therefore cannot see why it is necessary to give the further consideration to the matter which my hon. friend the Prime Minister suggests; and for the reason which I have just stated I am going to oppose the amendment that has been submitted.

Now, the Prime Minister argues with a great deal of force that he desires to take the public and the House into his full confidence in this matter. I have no objection whatever to that principle. I do not support the view of the leader of the Opposition as enunciated this afternoon, that it is not the part of the Government, when it sees fit, to seek the views of Parliament by means of a special committee on questions of this kind. I do not take that view, although the Prime Minister, I am sure quite inadvertently, ascribed it to me in his earlier speech this evening. But we have the facts before us pretty well on this question. I take the ground that the reference of the matter to a committee will be inconclusive. It will get us nowhere, and consequently, recognizing the need of a reduction in freight rates in this country, and in view of the fact that we have a definite, set agreement in the matter of rates under the Crowsnest pass agreement, I can see no reason why the House should not now be able to make up its mind on the question. There is no doubt whatever, if I interpret rightly the speeches made by members of the Government, that the whole purpose in submitting the question to the committee is to ascertain whether or not this agreement should be further set aside. That is the essential part of the motion we are considering. I do not think it is necessary to consult a committee to determine that question; and holding that view I cannot consistently support the motion to refer the matter to a committee, nor can I support the amendment of my hon. friend from West York, that the Government seek further information that might result in bringing down a proposal to set the agreement further aside.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): I have given as close attention as possible to the resolution and have endeavoured to arrive at the object of the Government in submitting it to the House. I have listened to the two addresses delivered by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), and I recall the fact that in the speech from the Throne reference was made to the matter; and nearly a month ago the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), in dealing with the railway situation, stated that it was to be referred to a committee of the House. Some time before that it was intimated by the Railway Commission that a reduction in transportation rates was to take place. It has since been made known that the reason why no action was taken was because of the uncertainty as to the course the Government would pursue. It is a somewhat remarkable thing that nearly two months of the session have elapsed before we have reached the present stage when this resolution is submitted to the House with a view to appointing a committee to ascertain certain facts which the Prime Minister has just told us the Government have at their disposal and are already satisfied about. A special select committee is to be appointed, named by the Government, to carry out the Government's wishes. The Government will have a majority on that committee and we may rest assured that that majority will carry out the conclusions which they have arrived at. Did not the Prime Minister in his address on the main motion inform the House that, after numerous conferences with the executive of the railways, the executive had concluded to reduce the rates on basic commodities, but had deferred doing so pending the action of the Government with regard to the renewal of the Crowsnest pass agreement? I think the Prime Minister made that clear. Is it possible that the Government are a party to deferring a reduction in railway rates in this country? Is that the object they have in view in holding up the matter for months when every one knows that the business of the country is absolutely paralyzed owing to the excessive rates that are being charged at this time? As the leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) points out, the demand is being made in western Canada that railway charges shall be prepaid for fear that the cargoes will not bear the expense to which they are subjected in the matter of railway rates. During the past few weeks I have experi-

enced the truth of this myself. I ordered a carload of material from a centre about three hundred miles from home and when it was shipped I found that the railway charges amounted to practically $20 more than the cost of the goods. It was very important that this material should be placed on the markets of the country. I may mention that it was a consignment of cedar posts for fencing purposes. They came from a district which had been devastated by fire, and unless the wood was converted into marketable material and placed on the markets it was absolutely useless. Yet people who own such material and have to pay for the labour of making it marketable find that when they place it upon the market it is not equal to the transportation costs over a few hundred miles. That illustrates the condition of business in this country, and people are waiting, and waiting patiently, for a reduction in freight rates.

The Prime Minister has told us that the railway companies are prepared to make a reduction in freight rates, but are waiting to see what the Government will do with regard to renewing the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement. Notwithstanding that, the responsibility is now to be placed upon a committee of this House because apparently the Government have not the courage to declare what they intend to do. Surely these are not the men who last December were so emphatic in telling the country what they were going to do in regard to this and other matters.

As far as the Crowsnest pass agreement is concerned, I do not think it is a very serious matter whether it is renewed or not. I should like to give the matter further consideration before coming to a definite conclusion, but from the information which has been submitted, and from other information in my possession, I am not too sure but what it would be in the national interest that the agreement should not be renewed, and I was a little surprised when the Prime Minister, read a statement which was going to commit him definitely in this matter, so there would be no calling in question his attitude in regard to the renewal of the agreement. What was the first word he uttered? Unless—unless certain things happened the Government would do so and so. That was neither very emphatic nor very clear; it left everything in just the same indefinite position that I am inclined to think the Government desired it should be left in. In fact, I think the Government are not honest with the people in the attitude they are assuming. They should come out and declare their position clearly and unequivocally, as governments are supposed to do in any country enjoying responsible and representative institutions. Let them assume the responsibilities which the people placed upon them last December, and tell the House and the country what they intend to do. This should be quite easy, for the Prime Minister has intimated that the Government have the information and know what they intend to do. But apparently this committee is to be appointed to enable hon. members to secure the information which the Government already possess.

What is to happen? This question is to be submitted to a select special committee, which will report back to this House, and we shall then have to go over the whole matter again and take up just as much time as if we had dealt with it in the first instance. The Railway Commission apparently is to be ignored. We know there were just reasons for suspending the Crowsnest pass agreement during the war. Some slick gentlemen from the United States threatened to tie up our transportation systems, and as a result of their action the McAdoo award was adopted, involving an increase of $40,000,000 in our transportation charges. We could not afford to have our transportation systems tied up, and something had to be done. But conditions are different to-day, and the effects of the war have largely passed away. But the Government now asks the House to help them defer a reduction in the rates which the Prime Minister intimates the companies are already prepared to make if they only knew what the Government intended to do in this regard. Is this not a nice condition of affairs? In face of the stagnation which prevails owing to the impossibility of transporting the materials necessary to build up this country, why do the Government hold back? Are they playing into the hands of the railways to enable these excessive freight rates to be collected month after month from the people?

The Government ought to deal with this matter promptly, instead of resorting to this subterfuge and deferring their decision week after week, until finally, as the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, we will have to deal with it hurriedly in the last days of the session, and it is uncertain what the result will be. For my part, Mr.

Speaker, I object most emphatically to having this matter referred to any select special committee that may be named by the Government to carry out the Government's wishes, because they ought to know, and, from what the Prime Minister has already intimated, I believe they do know, how they intend to deal with it.

The House divided on the amendment (Sir Henry Drayton) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Arthurs,
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Boys,
Charters,
Church,
Dickie,
Drayton (Sir Henry),
Duncan,
Garland (Carleton),
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Hubbs,
Ladner,
MacKelvie,
Maclean (York),
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Ross (Kingston),
Ryckman,
Senn,
Simpson,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Tolmie,
White,
Wilson—35.

NAYS

Messrs.

Archambault
Baldwin,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Béland,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Blackadder,
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Brethen,
Brown,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carmichael,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Clifford,
Coote,
Copp,
Crerar,
d'Anjou,
Davies,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Drummond,
Duff,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Ethier,
Euler,
Evans,
Fafard,
Fansher,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Halbert,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Hunt,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kay,
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Essex),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Knox,
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Leader,
Léger,
Lewis,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Low,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Macphail,
McBride,
McConica,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
McMurray,
McTaggart,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Millar,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Morrison,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
Ross (Simcoe),
St. Père,
Sales,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stein,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork,
Thurston,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Vien,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
Woods,
Woodsworth—167.

PAIRS

The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips is as follows:

Messrs.

Malcolm,
McMurray,
Kay,
Blackadder,
Clifford,
Power,
Jacobs,
Maclean (Halifax),
Low,
Kyte,
Walsh,
Chew,
Forrester,
Fielding,
Hatfield,
German,
Delisle,
Laflamme,
Duncan,
Ryckman,
Wilson,
LeSueur,
Stansell,
Mewburn,
Bristol,
Guthrie,
Stewart (Lanark),
Boys,
Clark,
Manion,
Porter,
Hocken,
Hanson,
McLaren,
Chaplin,
Sheard.

The House divided on the main motion (Mr. Kennedy) which was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Béland,
Boivin,
Boucher,
Bourassa,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Cannon,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Carruthers,
Casgrain,
Chevrier,
Chisholm,
Clifford,
Copp,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis (Joliette),
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fafard,
Fontaine,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Gervais,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Graham,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Humphrey,
Hunt,
Kay,
Kennedy (Essex),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Lavigueur,
Léger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Low,
Macdonald (Pictou),
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
McMurray,
Malcolm,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Marler,
Martell,
Mercier,
Michaud,
Mitchell,
Morin,
Morrissy,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Murdock,
Murphy,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Rinfret,
Robb,
Robinson,
Robitaille,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Stein,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stork,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Vien—109.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Beaubien,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Black (Yukon),
Bowen,
Boys,
Brethen,
Brown,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carmichael,
Charters,
Church,
Coote,
Crerar,
Davies,
Dickie,
Drummond,
Duncan,
Elliott (Waterloo),
Evans,
Fansher,
Findlay,
Forke,
Gardiner,
Garland (Carleton),
Gould,
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Halbert,
Hocken,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hubbs,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
Knox,
Ladner,
Leader,
Lewis,
Lovie,
Lucas,
MacKelvie,
Maclean (York),
Macphail,
McConica,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
McTaggart,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Millar,
Milne,
Morrison,
Reed,
Ross (Kingston),
Ross (Simcoe),
Ryckman,
Sales,
Senn,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Simpson,
Speakman,
Spence,
Spencer,
Stansell,
Steedsman,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lanark),
Stewart (Leeds),
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Thurston,
Tolmie,
Wallace,
Ward,
Warner,
White,
Wilson,
Woods,
Woodsworth—92.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

PAIRS

The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips is as follows:

Messrs.

Malcolm,
McMurray,
Kay,
Blackadder,
Clifford,
Power,
Jacobs,
Maclean (Halifax),
Low,
Kyte,
Walsh,
Chew,
Forrester,
Fielding,
Hatfield,
German,
Delisle,
Laflamme,
Duncan,
Ryckman,
Wilson,
Lesueur,
Stansell,
Mewburn,
Bristol,
Guthrie,
Stewart (Lanark),
Boys,
Clark,
Manion,
Porter,
Drayton,
Hanson,
McLaren,
Chaplin,
Sheard.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 12.17 a.m. Friday.

Friday, May 5, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

VACANCY—KAMOURASKA

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received notification of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of the Electoral Dis-

trict of Kamouraska consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by C. Adolphe Stein, Esquire, the sitting member therefor. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Chief Electoral Officer to make out a new writ for the election of a member to the said Electoral District.

JAPANESE IMMIGRATION

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I should like to be permitted to lay on the table of the House certain information by way of reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) with respect to Japanese immigration. I promised him that it would be brought down to-day.

(The questions and answers are as follows):

Questions:

1. Under what conditions and regulations are Japanese immigrants admitted into Canada?

2. In what way are the rights of Canadians in Japan limited as to ownership of land, franchise, mercantile pursuits, fishing, shipping (coastwise and foreign), mining, agriculture, and other pursuits such as are engaged in by Japanese in Canada?

3. What is the number of Japanese immigrants that have entered Canada yearly in each of the ten years ending March 31, 1922?

4. How many Japanese have left Canada for Japan each year, during the same period?

5. How many Japanese have returned to Canada from Japan each year during the same period?

Answers.

1. Under a confidential Agreement known as the Lemieux Agreement entered into between Canada and Japan in the beginning of 1908. Under this Agreement Japan voluntarily restricts the movement of Japanese to Canada to a comparatively small number each year.

2. In common with other foreigners, Canadians cannot as individuals own land in Japan. They can, however, if they form an association and become "juridical persons" under Japanese law. They further enjoy the rights of perpetual lease in respect of land in certain portions of the former foreign settlements in the open ports; and they may become holders of rights of "superficies" and "emphyteusis".

Foreigners have no franchise rights either in connection with elections to the Diet or to the prefectural, municipal, town, village or district assemblies.

Canadian vessels may not engage in the coasting trade between Japanese ports and Canadians may not become owners of ships flying the Japanese flag, though they may become members of "goshi-kwaisha" (partnership with limited and unlimited liability), "kabushiki-Kwaisha" (joint-stock companies), and "kabushiki-goshi-Kwaisha" (joint-stock partnerships with limited and unlimited liability) owning Japanese ships.

Canadians may not as individuals engage in mining, but a company formed under Japanese law by foreigners and registered as a juridical person may do so.

They may not become shareholders of the Bank of Japan, the Yokohama Specie Bank, the Bank of Korea, the South Manchuria Railway Company, the Oriental Development Company and certain other companies, or of shipping Companies in receipt of a Government subsidy. They may not become members or brokers of the various exchanges in Japan. They may not as individuals become members of Japanese Chambers of Commerce. They may not engage in the emigration business or hold shares in any company so engaged.

Foreign unskilled labourers may not pursue their callings in Japan outside the limits of the former foreign settlements or the "mixed residence" areas without the express permission of the administrative authorities. Labourers for this purpose are defined as being persons engaged in labouring pursuits in connection with farming, fishing, mining, public works, building, manufacturing, transport, hauling (of vehicles), stevedoring and other forms of manual labour, but not persons in domestic service or persons following the calling of cooks and waiters.

3.	Males	Females	Children	Totals
1912-13	252	424	48	724
1913-14	354	447	55	856
1914-15	191	358	43	592
1915-16	148	233	20	401
1916-17	301	310	37	648
1917-18	459	370	54	883
1918-19	584	530	64	1,178
1919-20	280	389	42	711
1920-21	145	338	49	532
1921-22	136	299	31	466
	2,650	3,698	443	6,991

In connection with the above table it may be pointed out that the first column gives the total immigration of males year by year for the period indicated. Of these males the following numbers are shown to belong to the skilled and unskilled labour classes.

1912-13..	181
1913-14..	271
1914-15..	138
1915-16..	96
1916-17..	212
1917-18..	355
1918-19..	444
1919-20..	201
1920-21..	96
1921-22..	95

The difference between the total number of males and the number of males of the skilled and unskilled labour classes is made up of traders, clerks, business and professional men. The difference between the total number of males and the total immigration is made up of wives and children under fourteen years of age joining Japanese regularly domiciled in Canada.

4. Statistics of persons leaving Canada are not collected by the Department of Immigration and Colonization. The only figures available are returns issued monthly by the Japanese Goverment showing Japanese passengers sailing to Canada and returning from Canada. From these returns the following table has been compiled.

Calendar year.	Males	Females	Totals
1912..	446	137	583
1913..	1,030	251	1,281
1914..	974	257	1,231
1915..	745	274	1,019
1916..	631	249	880
1917..	1,121	455	1,576
1918..	1,309	505	1,814
1919..	1,191	554	1,745
1920..	1,533	652	2,185
1921..	1,076	460	1,536
Total. ..	10,056	3,794	13,850

5. This information is not available, as prior to the 1st April, 1922, returning Japanese domiciled in Canada were included with persons of all other races and nationalities returning to Canada on the ground of domicile acquired in this country.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts as follows:

Your Committee recommend that the evidence being taken in connection with Overseas accounts be printed from day to day and that Rule 74 relating thereto be suspended.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. T. L. CHURCH (North Toronto) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 71 to amend the Railway Act, 1919.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CHURCH: The object of the amendment is to restore the special rate that applied prior to the war in regard to tickets purchased on such special occasions as Thanksgiving Day and certain other holidays, and for the purpose of attendance at the fall fairs conventions and sporting events as are held throughout Canada. Before the war, single fares and a fare and a third was charged, instead of the full return fare, to persons attending various functions of this character on certain days and special occasions and conventions of different kinds held in the spring of the year by farmers' and other organizations. In connection with sporting events, such as soccer, lacrosse, football and hockey and other games, there was also a cut rate for week-ends. Now, I admit that during the war it was necessary, in the interest of economy, to curtail these concessions. But now that the war is over the people expect that after the country has spent some $900,000,000 directly and indirectly in aid of the railways of the country they shall be given some privileges in return besides the privilege of being always called upon to pay taxes. The United States have restored the old special rates that obtained for these events prior to the war with the result that there has been a large increase in the earnings of the railways from this class of traffic.

I might read two or three sentences from certain letters I have received in reference to this matter. Mr. J. Lockie Wilson, the Superintendent of the Ontario Department of Agriculture, who has the supervision of some 360 fairs in the province of Ontario, urges the restoration of the old rate in the interests of these fairs which have a distinct educational value and make for the general good of the country. Mr. John G. Kent, the Managing Director of the Canadian National Exhibition Association, writes:

The public are clamouring for a return to pre-war conditions, and we have been urged by letter and personal interview from all parts of the country to bring before the Government the necessity of reducing regular fares for these various occasions.

Mr. P. J. Mulqueen, president of the Royal Canadian Henley and chairman of the Ontario Athletic Commission, also writes urging a restoration of the old special rates to prevent unrest and encourage sport and recreation. And Mr. A. P. Westervelt, Secretary of the Royal Agricultural Winter Fair, urges that steps be taken to restore the old rates. There is—he says—a general and insistent demand in this matter, and I would move that the bill be given its first reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. CHURCH: Mr. Speaker, I would also move that the bill be given its second reading to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Next sitting of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: Unless the House gives its unanimous consent the bill cannot be read the second time to-day.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

GOVERNMENT ORDERS ON MONDAYS AND WEDNESDAYS

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

That on Wednesday the 10th of May and Monday, the 15th of May, and all subsequent Mondays and Wednesdays to the end of the session, Government Notices of Motions and Government Orders shall have precedence over all business except Questions by Members and Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the motion is adopted I would suggest to my hon. friend that, as there are quite a number of important resolutions standing on the Order Paper, the Government might be inclined to consider extending for a few days the time at the disposal of private members. If the resolution carries in its present form the discussion of private members' resolutions will cease with Monday next. There is one resolution coming up on that day dealing with the question of oriental immigration. It will probably take up the whole sitting, and I suggest to the Prime Minister that we might be given the following Wednesday afternoon and the following Monday as well.

Mr. WOODS: Does that mean that there will be a night sitting on Wednesday next?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Government were to meet the wish of my hon. friend (Mr. Crerar) to the extent of allowing Wednesday, May 10, to be retained as private members' day, probably that would enable such resolutions to be taken up as hon. members desire to discuss. I might remind hon. gentlemen that most of the motions on the Order Paper have been called two or three times. I believe they were all called on Monday last as well as on the previous private members' day. If the House is agreeable, I should be glad to amend the motion to read that after Wednesday, the 10th May, and on Monday, the 15th May, and all subsequent Mondays and Wednesdays to the end of the session, Government Notices of Motions and Government Orders shall have precedence.

Right Hon. ARTHUH MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I would be inclined to concur with the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). There are not many of the motions on the Order Paper in which this side of the House is specially interested, but there are some that I think it would be unfortunate if they are not discussed through private members' days being shut off. For instance, there is motion No. 14, in the name of the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), which although it has been down since the 10th of April has never yet been introduced. There is the motion introduced by the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine)—I do not mention it specially except in this sense, that the discussion of it was adjourned at the instance of the Government awaiting the return of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). Then, of course, there is the motion set down by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) which is to be discussed on Monday; and there are other motions that I cannot but think the hon. members interested seriously intended to discuss. Every private members' day has been fully taken up so far except for a short time at the end of some days. I am not attributing the fault to the Government specially that we are not through more of these motions, because they have been called and the members responsible for them have not been ready to proceed; but unless those motions were put down merely to forestall and prevent discussion from another source, it would seem to me there ought to be opportunities for a short discussion of them anyway.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I hope that if the Government endeavours to meet the wishes of my right hon. friend he will not later on say that we are somewhat late with government business. I might point out to him that in the last session of the last parliament, at the end of seven weeks the government took Wednesdays; we have allowed eight weeks to pass already before doing so, and I think we have been generous in that regard. However, the Government has no wish to prevent private members from having ample opportunity to discuss the motions in which they are interested.

Mr. CRERAR: If I might offer another suggestion, Mr. Speaker, it would be that the Government take Wednesday of next week and leave Monday of the week following for private members, which will allow a full day for discussion. If we adopt my hon. friend's suggestion we will have only three hours in the afternoon to devote to these motions.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If the Government give Wednesday and Monday of the following week, that would be going as far as it seems wise to go at this stage. If there are important motions which it would be very desirable to take up, we might make special arrangements for their discussion. I would therefore move that the resolution be amended to read: "That after Wednesday, the 10th May, and Monday, the 15th May," and so on.

Mr. CRERAR: That would give two Mondays and one Wednesday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The following Wednesday and the following Monday—two more days.

Mr. CHURCH: If this motion passes, will the Prime Minister afford an opportunity to wind up the debate on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterways motion standing in my name? As the Government has made no declaration of policy in regard to the subject matter of this motion, I should like to have the discussion concluded and a vote taken on it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That motion has been up three times already. It will probably come up again in the natural order of business.

Motion agreed to.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The motion standing in my name, Mr. Speaker, is incorrect, the date given being March 31st, 1922, whereas it should be March 31st, 1921. If there be no objection, I will amend the motion accordingly and move:

That the report of the Auditor General and the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1921, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

PAIRED MEMBERS INADVERTENTLY VOTING

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): Before the Orders of the Day are called, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of explanation. Last night I placed myself, or was placed, in a position which requires me to give a word of explanation to my fellow-members. I voted when I was paired with the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter). I did that because at that time I did not know I was so paired. Early in the session I asked our Whip to arrange a sessional pair for me. He did so. No doubt he remained under the impression that he had informed me of the fact; however, he had not done so, and that led me into registering a vote last night which I should not have done. It was a purely inadvertent action on my part, and I know that hon. members will forgive me for taking up the time of the House in making this explanation, which I think is due to them, to the Whip, and to myself.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE (Cape Breton South and Richmond): I desire to add a word of explanation to what the hon. member for Brome has said. As soon as my attention was called to the fact that he had voted in violation of the understood pair which he held, I had the pair with the hon. member for West Hastings transferred to the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Forrester), and he did not vote.

I also desire to offer an explanation in behalf of the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Blackadder) and the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Laflamme). These two gentlemen were paired also. The junior member for Halifax voted on the amendment, and as soon as my attention was called to it I communicated with him, so he did not vote on the main motion. The same thing happened with the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska. The junior member for Halifax has not been in the House for some weeks owing to the unfortunate condition of his health. He entered the Chamber at the last moment yesterday evening and I had no opportunity to remind him of his pair. I was unable to substitute another pair in his place because at that time the vote was proceeding along the furthest end of the rear row.

I did not observe these hon. members were voting in violation of their pairs because my attention was absorbed in the business of checking off the vote as it was called; otherwise I would have prevented the unfortunate incident. But by way of extenuation I need only cite the fact that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) also inadvertently voted. It is evident therefore that these errors may be committed even with the best intentions.

Mr. W. A. BOYS (South Simcoe): I do not know whether it is in order for me to add a word or two, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. BOYS: Last night no less than five votes were recorded by hon. gentlemen opposite who were paired. As has been mentioned, one of those votes was put right by the hon. member for South Perth not voting. It is true that the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) voted in error. It was noticed at once, and without hesitation I sent word across to my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) and immediately arranged with an hon. member on this side not to vote, to put the matter right.

Now, I do not know that criticism of anybody will do much good, but it does seem to me that we must have some understanding if the system of pairing is to continue. We must avoid such occurrences in the future, and when these mistakes are

made they should be rectified in some way, not merely explained. I am glad, of course, to get the explanation, and I must say at once that, so far as I am concerned it has been an ample one. But, unless the vote comes from some hon. member in the last row it is always possible, when a member who is paired records his vote, for a whip to act promptly and to secure some member on his side who will refrain from voting. When it comes to five votes in one night, on the most important division we have had in the House this session, it becomes a somewhat serious matter. I only trust that these mistakes will not occur again. I have taken care to have every single pair initialed by the Chief Government Whip and myself so that there might be no mistakes. As soon as pairs are notified to me I see that they are observed, and if by any chance they are not, steps are taken to have the error rectified before the vote is concluded.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed this discussion to proceed because I feel that hon. members would like to have an explanation of what occurred last evening. But I may inform the House that according to British practice, the Speaker, as the spokesman of the House of Commons, ignores the pairs, looking upon it as a matter for arrangement by the parties themselves.

Mr. KYTE: If I may be permitted to say one further word by way of explanation, my hon. friend the Conservative whip (Mr. Boys) stated there were five votes which should not have been polled. I wish to explain that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) voted on the motion, but he was checked by the member for South Perth who did not vote.

Mr. BOYS: But there are still five; for the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Laflamme) voted twice.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska voted twice. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Blackadder) voted once only, on the amendment; I checked him and prevented him from voting on the main motion. So really the majority of the Government on the amendment last night should have been fifteen instead of seventeen.

GENOA CONFERENCE

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw attention to a matter which, I think, is of some little importance. I noticed in the newspaper a few days ago, in a report of the proceedings of the Genoa Conference, a statement that the Canadian Government, through its representative, had subscribed £1,000,000 to the consortium that was being established to deal with the re-establishment of business in Russia. I would like to ask the Government if they can give the House any information on the subject.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The report to which my hon. friend refers is not an accurate statement. The Government has not subscribed to anything. I understand there is being sent by mail from Genoa to the Government for consideration the proposal to which my hon. friend refers, but no decision will be reached by the Government until it has had an opportunity of examining it and ascertaining what it involves.

DATE OF THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think it was last Monday, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister said, in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), that the date of the Budget would be announced at an early day. I wonder if the minister can give us any information today?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I am almost as anxious as my hon. friend himself to be able to fix the date, but I will have to confirm what the Prime Minister said—that an announcement will be made at an early day. I do not want to emphasize the word "early" too strongly, but I can assure my hon. friend that I am very anxious to bring the Budget down as soon as possible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Next week?

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like to be too definite. If not next week, the date will be announced during the week, and then my hon. friend will know exactly when to expect it.

ALLEGED STATEMENT OF HIGH COMMISSIONER

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): About two weeks ago the hon. member for Swift Current (Mr.

Lewis) asked that the Government ascertain as to the correctness of a report attributing unfortunate language to the present Canadian High Commissioner in London. The Government promised to get the information by cable. May I ask for that reply, and also that the Government lay the correspondence—the telegraphic inquiry and reply—on the Table of the House?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Government did not have occasion to send a cable. Before there was opportunity to do so there was a message from the High Commissioner himself to the effect that he had made no such public statement. I shall have pleasure in laying his statement on the Table of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I read the report, a public statement was not attributed to him. It was stated that he had said that to a certain member of the Government and this was given publicity. He might say he had not made a public statement, but that would not be a denial of the report.

INSURANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): There are three bills on the Order Paper in my name, one relating to insurance, one to loan companies, and one to trust companies. When introducing these bills I suggested that the House would probably find it most convenient to consider them after they had been submitted for examination to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. If that be agreeable, I will make the motion that Bill No. 58 be now read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, and I will make a similar motion with regard to the two bills to follow.

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding, (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 58, to amend The Insurance Act, 1917, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

LOAN COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) Bill No. 59, to amend The Loan Companies Act, 1914, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

TRUST COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance), Bill No. 60, to amend The Trust Companies Act, 1914, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION

On the motion of Hon Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolutions, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

1. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Corporation of Quebec Harbour Commissioners, hereinafter called the Corporation, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of one million five hundred thousand 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. Resolved, 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 facilites, and such interest may be paid out of the said sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars.

3. Resolved, 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. Resolved, 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-four years from the date of issue, and bearing interest payable half-yearly at the rate of five per centum per annum.

5. Resolved, 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.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would like to ask the minister if in his judgment the present volume of business done at the port of Quebec would indicate that the corporation would be able to meet the interest charges on a capitalization of this amount?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not expect that the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec will

be able to meet the interest charges in the near future, but judging by the increase in the revenue during the last few years, I think we may expect that they will be able to do so in a few years from now. In 1913, when advances were made by the former government to the present Harbour Commission the receipts were $226,000. The receipts have increased gradually up till last year, when they amounted to $387,323.91, almost one hundred per cent increase over 1913. The port of Quebec is the head of navigation for the big transatlantic liners, and as my hon. friend knows, the tendency of the shipping companies nowadays is to increase rather than reduce the size of their vessels. There is another consideration which we must not lose sight of, and it is that perhaps the finest portion of the harbour of Quebec is consecrated to the immigration purposes of the Canadian Government, for which the port receives not one cent from the Canadian Government. This comprises 800 feet of the finest part of the harbour, and the commissioners have to expend money to make the necessary repairs and to provide all the facilities required for immigration purposes. Of course, there is a bill standing in the books of the commission against the federal government on that account. This bill has never been paid, and I do not expect that it ever will be. It is quite clear that the expenditure to keep the harbour of Quebec in good condition must be met by the Government. The port of Quebec is in a position by itself, with the exception of Montreal and Vancouver, where improvements are made under the same conditions. In Toronto, the Government does not make advances to the Harbour Commission, but all the work is done by the Public Works Department. The money is not loaned and we do not expect any interest or anything of that kind. In Halifax, the harbour improvements are made by the Railways and Canals Department, and in St. John by the Public Works Department. On account of conditions at the port of Quebec, the port was administered by a corporation prior to Confederation, which was called the Trinity House. In 1875 the powers and the property of the Trinity House were transferred to a commission called the Quebec Harbour Commission, composed of nine members. Different public bodies were represented on that commission, which worked up until 1912, when the government of the day, wisely, I think, reduced the commission to three, the number in Montreal, and since that time Quebec harbour has been under the control and administration of a harbour commission composed of three members. If the same plan were followed with Quebec harbour as with other ports, there would simply be an appropriation in the estimates of the Public Works Department, and we would hear no more about it, but so far as Quebec is concerned we have to make advances to the commission, bearing interest, which will be paid back if the port pays its way in the future.

In Montreal, I am pleased to say, the harbour is paying its own way. There is a resolution on the Order Paper for an advance of $5,000,000 to the port of Montreal. In the case of both these ports the resolution does not mean that the amount specified will be expended in one or two or three or four years. It simply enables the Government to make advances as required, and every item of improvement has to be approved by the Governor in Council before the advance is made. As I said, Montreal harbour is paying its own way and earning sufficient revenue to meet all the interest charges. They have already entered into contracts with the shipping companies providing for the payment of interest on the advances which are going to be made under the resolution standing on the Order Paper. I hope that in a few years Quebec harbour will be in just as prosperous a condition as Montreal.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): Is it the intention of the Government to protect the workers who will be employed by the Quebec Harbour Commission, by insisting on a fair wage clause in all contracts entered into by the Commission?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am myself agreeable to having a fair wage clause in all government contracts, but I do not know that it would be wise to provide for that in this resolution. That will be a matter between the Government and the Harbour Commissioners.

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming): I put the question because heretofore in connection with money expended on the Ballantyne pier in Vancouver, and I believe in Montreal also, there has been trouble owing to the lack of such a clause in the contract.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I have a great deal of sympathy with the very natural aspirations of the port of Quebec. They

have a magnificent harbour, and splendid facilities. The trouble is they cannot get people to use them, not that they lack the harbour, the water, or the facilities. There is a great grain elevator in Quebec with a capacity of two million bushels—with an outward loading capacity of sixty thousand bushels per hour, and with an unloading capacity for vessels—and the loading capacity from the cars is probably greater--of thirty thousand bushels an hour. As I say, they have a good equipment there. The matter has come before me in more than one way; it has come before me in the past as chairman of the Railway Board when questions as to rates, facilities, and similar matters have been up for consideration, and I have also had to do with it as Minister of Finance. The great difficulty with Quebec has been this: Take for example the grain trade in particular. The shippers of grain like to hold their grain at points where they can get just as many markets as possible, and efforts have been made from time to time to induce the grain trade to make some right use of this first great facility that is open to them; but I confess that the efforts made—and I was a party to them—have been unsuccessful. Now if I thought that another million and a half would do any good to that grain business; if I thought another million and a half would be of any real use to the Quebec harbour, and to the commerce of this country, and would be effective in inducing people to ship there who do not now do so, why the matter would be open for further consideration. But, as I see it, that port is pretty well equipped to-day. Furthermore the port has been well looked after so far as capital expenditure is concerned. The country has advanced it over $11,000,000. There is to-day more than $11,000,000 owing, moneys advanced to the Quebec Harbour Commission. As the account has been running for some time there are arrears of interest due which now amount to $6,251,000, so that we have been going behind very steadily and very regularly in connection with this particular investment. It is perfectly true that part of these facilities are of use in other directions rather than directly in relation to government activities. My hon. friend (Mr. Lapointe) is perfectly right when he says that first rate facilities are given there for immigrants. There is no doubt about that and there is no doubt also that part of the harbour he mentions, eight hundred feet is being used. Neither is there any doubt about the contra accounts. There are contra accounts, but they fall very far short of giving us any satisfactory reason why further investments in this direction should be made at the present moment. The Department of Public Works rent this immigration building, and there are arrears of rent in connection with it, from the year 1913 to the year 1921, amounting altogether to $455,209.04.

Mr. MURPHY: Is that a cross account?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, a cross account. In the same way the Department of the Interior occupies ground belonging to the commissioners. Their arrears run back to the year 1892 and amount to $351,000. Besides that there are other small charges bringing up the total contra account to $813,365.23 as against the $6,251,000 of interest as to which the commissioners are in arrear to the Government.

My point, in the first instance, is that we ought to be very clear that we do some good by spending this money; and in the second instance that we should not spend it unless there is a real emergency requiring such expenditure at the present time, because this is not the happiest moment for incurring that large expenditure. In order to give the committee some idea of the small extent to which these large facilities are used, I would like to point out that the five grain berths of Quebec, which hon. gentlemen familiar with the port will know of, were used during the whole of last season—and last season as the minister tells us was improving; they were doing a little more business—for only four weeks out of the entire season. The trouble is not due to lack of facilities but lack of business; and if we are really to help the port of Quebec our efforts should be to see to it that business in some way or other is handled in such channels of trade and so made available as to give the port some use for the existing facilities. The mere installation of more facilities and adding to the amount of idle space is not going to help the harbour commissioners of Quebec but will only add to the tremendous load of overdue interest to which they are now subject.

I may say that the matter has stood for so long that two years ago when I went over the capital assets of the country, with a view to trying to get out something like a fair and honest balance sheet, I was forced to remove from the books of the country these Quebec debentures. They were non-interest producing

debentures; the investment was an absolute uncollectable, non-revenue producing debt. They were taken off the active assets of the country and at the present time are in suspense. Further I do not know exactly why the resolution is worded in the way in which it is. I think that is probably due to an oversight.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman has mentioned a statement as to capital assets that he had prepared. Did he present that to the House, or has it been published?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Oh, yes, that statement is to be found in the Public Accounts for the year 1920, and also in the same blue book for the year 1921. As I recollect it the statement was also mentioned in the budget speech in the session of 1919-20.

Mr. MURPHY: A complete statement?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, a complete statement; the whole thing was given. I do not exactly see why the resolution is drawn in the way it is. I mean that part of it where it says that the new bonds and debentures are to be a first charge upon the property and assets of the commission except, I think it is, $1,150,000. The fact is that so far as this country is concerned we now have advances running up to $11,000,000, and I do not know exactly why they should be made secondary to a subsequent advance. In all sincerity I submit to my hon. friend that this is not helping Quebec. It is merely providing for the expenditure of money for additional facilities where those already existing are not being used to-day; and I submit also that the country cannot afford a further experiment of this nature.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not wish to discuss this matter from a provincial but rather from a national standpoint. In my opinion the minister should give the committee further details as to this item. It is proposed to grant a million and a half dollars for terminal facilities for the harbour of Quebec. In addition, there is another resolution on the order paper calling for an advance of $5,000,000 for facilities for the harbour of Montreal. Regarding the first-named port I think the constitution of the harbour commission is all wrong; it has not been the success which it should have been. There should be a new charter, a non-political commission and co-ordination of control. They are not getting the results from the expenditure at Quebec that they should. The development of one harbour by the improvement of terminals should benefit all harbours, because they are all a link in a chain of communication of waterborne traffic. I had a return of the amount of money spent in various harbours in Canada, and I find nine and a half millions have been expended on the Quebec harbour since 1896. Adding that to the million and a half expenditure under consideration now, we have about eleven million, as the hon gentlemen from West York (Sir Henry Drayton) pointed out, and about six million are overdue for interest. I contend that, if the constitution of the board were a little different, if the port of Quebec were kept out of politics, and a permanent commission and permanent officers appointed to administer these affairs, it would be a great benefit to the country from the commercial aspect, and from the point of view of developing the port and the ocean traffic, inbound and outbound. It would be much better for the port of Quebec if Quebec city contributed something also and the port was developed by asking the commissioners to link the harbour up with the Quebec park system, with the Plains of Abraham Commission, another federal commission which is spending money, and the Immigration Department, and co-ordinate it all under one commission.

Part of the money is for facilities which the hon. minister points out. These terminal facilities may be badly needed, but they are not all what they should be, if the desire is to keep pace with the growth of the country.

There are some features of this proposition which I do not agree with. In the first place, the details are not given. What does "terminal facilities" mean; what does "equipment" mean in the resolution? In the second place, how is it that votes for Montreal and Quebec are being brought on now by special resolution, instead of being dealt with when the main estimates are before the House? There are other ocean ports. For instance, we have Vancouver and Victoria, where four and six million have been expended since 1896. Then we have Halifax and St. John. How is it they are not brought on by separate resolutions also? Then we have the ports of the cities of Toronto and Hamilton. The citizens of Toronto, with the government, are spending $26,000,000 or $28,000,000 to rebuild the port, and are only getting five or six millions from the government and are themselves spending about

$21,000,000. Terminal facilities have been badly needed there. The city has an agreement signed by the harbour commission on one side and by the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk on the other, to rebulid the port, moving all the docks out into the bay a certain distance, and erect a station and viaduct, and provide terminals. The Government has been approached by the harbour commission and other bodies recently to ask the Grand Trunk Railway Company to carry out that agreement. Why is that port not dealt with by a separate resolution also? Is it because the province of Quebec is so hungry that they cannot wait for the main estimates? I would not like to say, and I do not say that that is the fact. I believe that all the harbours should be dealt with together, when the main estimates are brought down because I contend that what is good for the ports of Halifax, St. John and Montreal, is good for all the ports, and that those ports should be properly taken care of, with a view to expansion of business in the future, not only for ocean traffic, but for proper terminal facilities, to fit in with the National Railways and act as feeders for them.

It is in the public interest that the harbour of Quebec and other harbours should be kept out of politics, and that we should not remove the commissioners with every change of government. I have been on the harbour commission of Toronto since 1905—it was reorganized in 1911. It is a permanent commission. If we are to have proper development of a harbour, we must have continuity of management and control and a proper sale of bonds by tender. I say that the Minister of Finance should sell these bonds not by private sale, but by public tender. Toronto harbour sold two million by private sale and about fifteen million by tender. Instead of giving the bonds to one company, by private sale, tenders were openly granted. We opened up the door and we got about fifteen bids from Toronto, Philadelphia and New York. The public sale proved a good financial piece of business. We borrowed at from one-half of one to one and a half points better by public tender than by private sale. I submit the minister should call for tenders in reference to the bonds for Quebec harbour, and that the Government should annul all these commissions and co-ordinate the various expenditures of money on terminals in Quebec harbour and for the National railways, the Immigration Branch, the Public Works Department and other facilities. I think the Harbour Commission should negotiate with the city of Quebec if they cannot make such an arrangement. There is the work on the Battlefields' Commission, the Quebec Parks Commission, and the work of making Quebec a city with proper boulevards and driveways. This work would create an industrial area where industries could be located with proper arrangements for terminal facilities in the way of docks, etc., such as they have in New York. You would have a large revenue from the industrial and recreation areas which would go a long way to help pay the fixed charges on the bonds of Quebec harbour instead of their being a drag on the country, with the result that the interest and the sinking fund charges would be met. Some development of this kind should be made, and, if it were made, I believe that in time Quebec port would meet its fixed charges. We are going to meet these fixed charges in Toronto from our revenues and pay the fixed charges out of revenue on the $17,000,000 which has thus far been expended, by developing the industrial area in Ashbridge's bay and the amusement areas at Sunnyside.

I believe that if, instead of having politics in the Quebec Harbour Commission, they would change the principle and have a permanent non-political commission, they would meet with success. I represent a Conservative city, but on the harbour commission of that city, when it was formed, we had two Liberals out of five, and they were good. We have no politics there, and the harbour improvements, from revenues, are going to pay for themselves. These improvements will not, in time, cost the taxpayer a cent. What has been done in Toronto should be done in Quebec as well.

I think the minister should give us some explanation as to why the late commissioners and officials were removed. Were they not good men? Did they not do good work? What was the reason for the change of the commission? This is not the only vote before the committee. The next vote will be for Montreal. A motion is also on the Order Paper for a vote of a million dollars for terminals for Montreal, and the Government are asked for two hundred thousand for a world's fair, and five millions for a bridge—Quebec is getting hungry. No doubt they are hungry. I think the minister should give us some explanation as to the future policy of the port of Quebec—the terminals and inbound and outbound, the rates to be col-

lected, as to the change of the commission, and the broadening out of the commission as aforesaid.

In addition to that vote $23,000,000 was spent by the Government of Canada in deepening the channels between Quebec and Montreal, to give a deepwater channel to Montreal. I say every vote along those lines should be linked up—Quebec, Montreal and the depeening of the channel, from there to the Great Lakes. These deepwater channels should be extended to the head of the Great Lakes. We should have a declaration of policy along these lines. We have very little explanation about the port of Quebec. The Deep Waterways' Commission in their report deal with the future of the port of Quebec and the way it should be co-ordinated with the St. Lawrence scheme and I should like to hear from the minister his views on that subject. We would like to have the Government's views about the deepening of the channels from Quebec to Montreal and to the head of the lakes as recommended by the Deep Waterways' Commission.

Mr. NEILL: I would submit to the Labour Department that if this clause goes through some provision should be inserted that any contract entered into under it should contain what is known as the "fair wage" clause. It has been found in other cities, where a provision of this kind has not been made, that contractors with the harbour commissioners disregard the ordinary fair wage clause, contending that they are not under contract with the Government but with the Commissioners. This happened in connection with the Vancouver harbour commission, and I therefore draw the attention of the Minister (Mr. Lapointe), while we are on this subject, to the necessity for incorporating a fair wage clause in any contract made under the expenditure of this money.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My attention has already been called to this matter, and I shall certainly see that the fair wage clause shall be respected by the harbour commissioners of Quebec. I believe that contracts in connection with all subsidized works should contain a fair wage clause.

Mr. CALDWELL: I should like some information from the minister with regard to a supplementary estimate brought down last year on the 4th day of June. The item then discussed read:

Amount required to pay the Park St. Charles Company, Limited, for land occupied by the Quebec Harbour Commission, as per verdict of arbitrator, which verdict was later sustained by the Superior Court, in favour of the plaintiff company, $60,000.

I would also quote a part of the discussion that took place on that occasion on this matter. The first speaker, after the item had been introduced, was the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who said:

I object to the passing of this item. This is another land grab absolutely unjustifiable. It is a scandalous affair, and in the interest of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance I would ask him not to insist on the passing of this item. I remember the saying of an old cynic who was prominent in public life many years ago, that if at times he did purchase votes, at least he had the satisfaction of purchasing those votes with the people's money. This item is to make good the promises that were made during an election which has just taken place. The men who are interested in this land grab were most prominent in the election held in the county of Yamaska.

I shall not quote the whole of the hon. member's remarks, but I do wish to give his summing up of the matter. He proceeded:

I assert, Mr. Chairman, that this amount is not due. I know the value of land around that park, and it is an imposition on the good faith of the supporters of the Government to come before them with this demand in the dying hours of the session. The truth of the matter is that the country is being asked to pay the debts incurred in the Yamaska bye-election, because the men who are at the bottom of this land graft are the men who were sent into the constituency to interrupt my hon. friend from Quebec East and who canvassed the county in automobiles. Even if I have to stay here, I will not stand for this land graft, for it is a land graft. Ordinarily I support the city of Quebec, but as a taxpayer and as a representative of the people, I protest against any highway robbery from whatever quarter it comes.

The discussion was somewhat protracted, and further on the same hon. gentleman said:

When the next session comes—perhaps before—I will be in a position to establish to the right hon. gentleman and to Parliament that there has been fraud in this matter from beginning to end.

The then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) speaking on the question, is reported as follows:

We will expect the hon. gentleman to do it sooner than that. We would like to know, because if these people are entitled to their money they ought to have it. It is for him to establish by indisputable evidence before the department his charges of fraud and collusion in regard to this matter and we will provide the opportunity for him to do it.

Now, this was a pretty serious charge to make and if the Government had consid-

ered that there was no foundation for it they would not have withdrawn the item at that time. The Prime Minister of that day declared that a tribunal would be established to take evidence on the matter and ascertain whether or not the charge was true. We have had no indication since as to whether any action has been taken in the matter, and before we go further I should like the minister to say what has been done.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that no steps have been taken with regard to the Park St. Charles matter. As my hon. friend knows, this was an appropriation in the supplementary estimates. It was not voted last year, and I do not know whether it will be voted this year. However, that is not strictly relevant to the matter immediately under consideration.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend's recollection is at fault. Action was taken. The then Prime Minister said that he would withdraw the item in view of the gravity of the charge, and a tribunal was set up to investigate the question. That tribunal was appointed and an investigator was named under the Inquiries Act. The hon. member who made the charge was invited to go before that investigation and submit his proof, but he took the stand that he did not approve of that kind of investigation. He thought that the matter should be investigated by a parliamentary committee.

Mr. BUREAU: He challenged the jurisdiction of the tribunal.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes, he challenged the jurisdiction of the investigator.

Mr. BUREAU: And the Court upheld him.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me that the debate is going far beyond the scope of the resolution before the committee.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Possibly; but I have no doubt that the Chairman would like me to point out that all I am doing is answering statements made from the governmental benches on the invitation of my hon. friend to my left (Mr. Caldwell). If the whole discussion be ruled out, I do not mind.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I merely said that the Government had taken no steps in the direction of paying the amount.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. gentleman was referring to what had been done to implement the promise that an investigation would be held.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No; I was pointing out that we have not taken any steps.

Mr. BUREAU: He was speaking of this Government.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I admit that this Government is doing nothing one way or the other. I do not know whether they will bring on the investigation.

Mr. GOOD: I think we should have some reply to the rather serious objections registered against the grant by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). Personally, I want to preserve an open mind in regard to the matter, but this is a time when we cannot afford to give away any money which we need for other purposes, and there are some facts in connection with this matter which, I think, need clearing up. At all events, I do not feel like supporting the resolution at the present time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: As my hon. friend knows, this resolution is only the first stage in this legislation. It was my intention to give full explanations later on, but if my hon. friend so desires, I am quite willing to answer any questions which he would like to ask me now. My hon. friend from West York is quite correct when he says that this has not so far been a paying investment. The hon. member should not call it an investment at all. It is, of course, an investment in that it is intended for the general advancement of the country in developing a national port which is essential to the business of the Dominion. But as regards its being a paying proposition in the way of returning interest, it has never been considered in the light of an investment, and should not be so considered. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Church) is a nice fellow and I should not like to have any difficulty with him. He has invited me to go to his place and has promised me the time of my life.

Mr. BUREAU: Will he introduce you to Judge Cohen?

Mr. LAPOINTE: But I may tell him that Quebec would like to be in the same position as Toronto; it would also like to get money from the Government and give nothing in return. Such money is not considered in anyway whatever as being due

either in the way of capital or of interest by the city of Toronto or the Harbour Commission of that city. Even this year there is an appropriation in the public works estimates for the Toronto harbour improvements, and it is not provided that the harbour commissioners shall pay one cent of interest on the money contributed by the country. The conditions are not the same in any way whatever, and I think my hon. friend was wrong in using such rather strong language and saying that we in Quebec are hungry. At least, as one of my hon. friends on the other side told me, if we are hungry we are not thirsty.

Last year for the first time five million bushels of wheat were shipped from Quebec I may inform my hon. friend from West York (Sir Henry Drayton). We are in communication with the railway companies with a view to developing this export traffic, and the prospects are encouraging. But these advances are not for the purpose of developing or improving the grain facilities at the elevator there, except for a small amount of $20,000, necessary to complete the elevator. All the other items are either for the purpose of completing work already started or to make repairs which are absolutely necessary to preserve what has been already constructed.

The harbour commission of Quebec intended to build a cold storage warehouse, and they asked for $500,000 more than the Government has agreed to advance. We thought this was a new work that could very well wait, and we told them that their request would be reconsidered when the necessity for such a warehouse was more urgent than it appears to be at the present time. I have here a report of the movement of vessels in and out of the port of Quebec for 1919 and 1920; the report of the operations for 1920 and 1921 has not yet been received by the department. These are the figures for 1919 and 1920:

The movement of vessels inwards and outwards for 1920 as compared with 1919 shows an increase of 69 vessels, as follows:
Inwards: 1920, 460; 1919, 331.
Outwards: 1920, 214; 1919, 274.

I think these advances are necessary, Mr. Chairman; indeed, we would not ask parliament to sanction them if they were not absolutely necessary at the present time to preserve from destruction works already constructed, and to furnish the shipping accommodation required at this port.

My hon. friend from West York seems to think that no vessels are using the port of Quebec. What would the bigger liners do if they had not this port to use on the St. Lawrence route? Those liners do not go to Montreal, despite the money that has been spent, as my hon. friend complained, in deepening the channel between the two ports, because the underwriters do not think it would be safe for them to incur the risks involved. If any further explanations are required, I shall be happy to furnish them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The hon. minister gave us his receipts for 1913 and 1921. Can he give the House a statement showing his receipts and disbursements so that we may have an idea of the volume of business transacted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

1913—	
Receipts	$226,020 80
Expenditure	239,728 33
1921—	
Receipts	$387,323 91
Expenditure	335,303 17

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Mr. Chairman, anything I have to say on this resolution is more by way of securing information than argument for or against it. Part of the information I sought has already been supplied by the minister (Mr. Lapointe), supplemented by the remarks of the ex-Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton). It was not clear in my mind whether the moneys mentioned in this resolution were capital expenditure on behalf of the Dominion Government, or a loan to the Quebec harbour commissioners, repayable with interest. I rather gather—the minister will correct me if I am wrong—that it is a loan to the Quebec harbour commissioners with very little prospect of repayment either of principal or interest. Consequently we may just as well take it for what it really is—capital expenditure by the people of Canada generally to develop this particular port.

Were its development at the present juncture sufficiently urgent and important to warrant that expenditure in my opinion, it would have my support; but I wonder if such is the case. We have been told repeatedly during the present session that the one thing we must keep constantly before our minds is economy in the expenditure of public moneys. A week ago, in company with other members, I visited the port of Quebec for the first time, and I am free to confess I was very much impressed with the ample shipping facilities the harbour

commissioners have in their wonderful port, and the great opportunities for expansion. I know the hospitality of our friends from Quebec was too genuine an article to be sullied with any commercial or mercenary motives; any information furnished to us was received in the spirit in which it was tendered, and on my part at least I found it very valuable.

The harbour commissioners, as was pointed out, have remarkable facilities—and a grievance. But if I interpreted the representations aright, the grievance took more the character of it being impossible to secure the volume of business which the existing facilities were able to handle. I gathered that what would help the harbour more than anything else would be that traffic from the national roads should be so increased that the facilities would be used to capacity, which they are not now. When that stage comes it will be time enough in my opinion to consider the further expansion of those facilities. If that contention is right, it is so closely related to railway rates that we can scarcely consider the one without the other. I am not going to discuss railway rates as a concrete subject to-day; we had enough of that yesterday; but we who live in the interior and ship bulk products across the continent to the Atlantic ports, have been taught, and have come to belive, that all-rail routes, to the Atlantic seaboard points can never hope to compete with rail and water routes. Now, that principle may be subject to variation; but I wondered when this was brought to my attention whether, in that portion of the year when heavy commodities such as grain go by rail to the Atlantic seaboard, the port of Quebec could not be given the benefit of such freight rates on the National Transcontinental as would enable it to compete with other ports which are only a little closer to the interior than Quebec is, and not nearly so close to the European countries. I thought something might be done on behalf of the port of Quebec. Then, I had hoped to get some information as to the volume of traffic which is now offering. I did not wish to compare the various ports, but it was evident that the port of Quebec must always be our chief Canadian port in the summer season for passenger traffic, package freight, and shipments which must move hurriedly into the interior. Quebec has, it seems to me, adequate facilities for that kind of business.

[Mr. R. M. Johnson.]

Now, Montreal is, after all, the nearest point reached by rail from the interior to tidewater or to open ocean ports. Are the facilities at the port of Montreal—and I am asking simply for information, because I do not know—adequate to handle the business at present offering? The minister will perhaps answer that question later. I hope I would not be considered as taking a parochial view if I spoke of the relation of this subject to western problems, but after all, we cannot have the one without the other. What is the use of terminal facilities if you do not have adequate facilities at the initial points of shipment, and vice versa? I notice also, on page 35 of the estimates, that items which have been referred to by the member for North Toronto (Mr. Church), aggregating almost $2,000,000, for the improvement of various ports and harbour facilities, are chargeable to capital. And here is an item of $1,500,000 which, taking the information supplied by the minister a few minutes ago, I cannot look upon as other than a capital expenditure, in effect at least. So that we run up an item of $3,500,000 to furnish terminal facilities for the shipment of our products to European countries. In other words, we take care of the outlet for traffic originating in the interior, though we neglect—and I think I am speaking correctly, Mr. Chairman—we neglect the development of those facilities which are necessary to the gathering of that business. Many of us from western Canada have been most persistent in our representations to the Minister of Railways for branch line extensions, and we have been impressed by his argument that these works could not be undertaken owing to lack of money and to the necessity for economy. Well, we have taken him at his word; but it seems rather hopeless that we should be asked to vote large sums for the equipment and development of terminal facilities when we neglect the feeders which are so essential if the fullest use is to be made of the facilities which are already at our disposal. Much as I appreciate the situation as respects the harbour of Quebec, as well as other harbours mentioned in the estimates, and much as I would like to see them develop and made the best harbours in the world, I cannot see my way clear to support a vote for these improvements so long as, on the ground of economy, extensions and feeders back in the interior are left to wait for better times.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am most anxious to see Quebec become one of our great national ports. Perhaps there is some sentiment mixed up with my desire in that respect; I always look upon Quebec as the ancient capital of the land, and I believe that nature intended that it would become one of the great, if not the greatest, of our summer ports. But the statement which has been given to the committee this afternoon by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) almost staggers one when one attempts to consider the proposal now before the committee for the appropriation of another million and a half dollars. I can well remember the 4th of May in the year 1901, when a committee of the House was invited to go to the city of Quebec to examine the harbour, and I see hon. members in the House now who, with myself, went to Quebec on that occasion and had a most enjoyable day. History has been repeating itself, because I believe that a week or ten days ago another more limited committee went to Quebec with a view to looking over the harbour. Well, twenty years ago we started on fairly liberal expenditure in regard to the port of Quebec. We were very optimistic in those days as to the prospect for the future and felt very sure of the results which would be obtained. But, as I say, I was staggered this afternoon to hear the statement made by the member for West York as to the results which have been achieved after an experience of twenty odd years in connection with expenditures at that port. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Johnson) has, I think, properly put the matter before the committee; we must look upon this outlay as capital expenditure, not as a loan. An ex-Finance Minister of this country informs the House that our expenditures under this head in past years, amounting to about $11,000,000, have practically been written off as an asset. It is, then, a capital expenditure from which we have little hope of obtaining anything, either by way of principal or by way of interest. There is little doubt in my mind that if we spend another million and a half as proposed by this resolution we need not look for either the return of capital or the payment of interest. Now, the result in Montreal, I am informed, has been quite different. Montreal has developed into a very busy port. The bonds of the harbour commissioners there are saleable; the interest upon them is paid to the government; they are considered a fairly high-class investment. I am told also that the same thing applies to Vancouver, but for some reason or other it does not apply to Quebec. During the past two years I have visited the city of Quebec, particularly the military district there, on two or three occasions, and incidentally I have had interviews with some of the citizens in regard to the question of the harbour. I must say the impression I gained was just the impression given to the committee this afternoon by my hon. friend from Moosejaw. The complaint of the citizens of Quebec was not that the harbour facilities were inadequate; the impression left on my mind was that they had one of the best equipped harbours in the country or on the continent, but the regret was that there was no business to be done. The complaint was directed entirely to the fact that the business coming over the National Transcontinental Railway did not reach the city of Quebec.

The complaint was a complaint of freight rates. They complained of a rate which they said discriminated against the city of Quebec, and my information on those occasions was that if a proper adjustment of freight rates was made, the port of Quebec would be one of the busiest in the Dominion. Well, the freight rate question has not yet been adjusted. From information I gathered, and from anything I saw, I certainly formed the opinion that the facilities were there far in advance of the requirements. The facilities were there for a trade enormously in advance of any trade they are doing at the port of Quebec at the present time, or can hope to do within a reasonable period in the future. If that be so, would it not be idle for this House to advance another $1,500,000 at the present time?

I view the matter this way. I do not want by my voice or my my vote to interrupt the progress or development of that port. I want to see it go ahead, but at the same time would it be a wise thing to expend $1,500,000 under the conditions as we know them to-day in this House? Is not this a matter that can well wait for future consideration until we see what is going to be done about railway rates, railway schedules, and the like? If the conditions as they exist to-day are to continue in regard to railway traffic, there are more facilities at the port of Quebec now than will be used for many, many years. If a change takes place, the facilities there to-day will take care of a very largely increased business for a number of years to come. Then, cannot we allow this present

proposal to stand until the trade figures warrant additional expenditure, until we can see some hope of getting something back, or at least of having an investment of some value to the Dominion of Canada.

Criticism has been made against the city of Toronto. It has been suggested that the harbour expenditures there have been in the nature of gifts to the city of Toronto. I think it is something to the credit of the city of Toronto, a proof of their progressive spirit, that while the Government has contributed, and contributed on a fairly liberal scale, to harbour improvements in that city, the citizens themselves have also contributed very much more liberally. For every dollar that this Government has spent on harbour improvements in Toronto, I am told that the citizens have spent five or six dollars of their own money. I do not believe the city of Quebec has ever made a contribution of any kind towards its harbour, not for many years, at all events. It may originally have done so, but in the last twenty or twenty-five years there has been no municipal expenditure on the part of Quebec. So long as we view that port solely as a national port, I do not know that the citizens of Quebec should be called to make any expenditure, but these improvements are undoubtedly a convenience and an asset to the city. They are a help to the citizens; the more trade that is done there, the better for the city of Quebec, but during the last twenty or twenty-five years, I believe I am correct in saying, the citizens of Quebec have not paid anything towards their harbour, while the citizens of Toronto have taxed themselves to the tune of something like $20,000,000 for harbour improvements there. If the money must be spent now, if the minister can make out a case for this expenditure at the present time, I shall not stand in the way of it, but I must say that in my judgment this expenditure might stand for one or two or three or five years, until we see some business in sight at that port which is not there at the present time.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: I am really surprised to hear the hon. member state that the citizens of Quebec have never made any contribution towards their harbour, or any sacrifice to obtain what is due to them. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that on many occasions in this House I have had the honour to quote from the written agreement between the federal government and the city of Quebec, by which the Government bound themselves to make certain improvements and construct certain works at that port. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the attitude he has taken to-day with regard to this expenditure is not the attitude that his late chief, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, and his colleagues took when they were entertained at a banquet at the Chateau Frontenac in the city of Quebec in 1913. On that occasion the Prime Minister of that day told the citizens of Quebec that there was nothing too good for them, and that the pledges of the government in respect to the port of Quebec would be fulfilled. I would also remind the hon. gentleman of the statements made by Sir Robert Borden when he came down to inaugurate the works at the port of Quebec. He stated then that moneys would be provided for the Quebec Harbour Commission, and that the proper equipment would be provided.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have provided all that.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Is the hon. gentleman really able to state what has been done by the Quebec Harbour Commission lately? The promises which the late government made of improvements to the port of Quebec have never been fulfilled. I do not know of any solid promise which was made by the late government and the government of Sir Robert Borden to the city of Quebec which has been fulfilled. Millions of dollars have been promised the city for docks, wharves, grain elevators, and all kinds of improvements.

Mr. GUTHRIE: They have got all that.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: We have got a grain elevator, but it is only a small one, and not of the capacity we should have in the city of Quebec. An elevator of the proper capacity in that city would be a benefit to the country as a whole. Our elevator has a capacity of 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 bushels.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: A capacity of 2,000,000 bushels.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: We should have an elevator with a capacity of at least 10,000,000 bushels. That is what we were promised.

Mr. MILLAR: How much grain passed through that elevator last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: About 5,000,000 bushels.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: If we had the proper facilities, and the proper freight rates, so that the grain from the West could be brought to the city of Quebec, if we had the tariff of twenty cents a bushel which was promised, the business done would be very much larger and several millions of dollars would be saved to the people of the West. The country as a whole would benefit from the application of such a tariff, but even if we had the traffic, we have not the port facilities to handle it at the present time. I am delighted to see that the Minister of Marine has placed a sum in the estimates to enable proper equipment to be provided for the harbour of Quebec. But even that amount is only a small contribution towards carrying out the promise made to the citizens of Quebec subsequent to 1911, a promise which has never been fulfilled.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to point out to the hon. member (Mr. Lavigueur) that he is making a mistake in saying that nothing has been done. I am afraid some people will think we did a great deal too much for Quebec. It was thought a great deal could be done for "the fair city of Quebec" and we did hope to do a great deal. I would remind my hon. friend that the carrying out of that intention resulted in an expenditure of three and a half millions on the Quebec harbour in 1913; an expenditure of $2,000,000 in 1914; and an expenditure of $1,491,600 in 1917.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: The statement I made was that nothing has been done to carry out the written contract entered into by the late government. My hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) a few minutes ago stated that Quebec had never contributed anything toward the contemplated improvements in that city. I would point out that the city of Quebec has given property worth over $2,000,000 in order to secure a proper equipment for the port. Quebec gave up the Champlain market which was a property valued at over $2,000,000, and what did it get in return for that surrender? The late government built a terminal station on that site which is a disgrace to the city, and worth at the utmost only some twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars. Under the Laurier régime the contract was awarded for the erection of a station on the Champlain market site to cost over $1,000,000. When the Borden government came in they cancelled that contract, and instead of giving us the magnificent edifice planned by Sir Wilfrid Laurier they erected a miserable building which they thought was good enough for the citizens of Quebec.

Mr. MILLAR: It seems to me that during the years of the war period, and during the years when prosperity reigned, we acquired habits of extravagance. It is not easy to escape from these habits, but I believe the time has come when instead of talking in terms of millions when contemplating expenditures we shall have to be more economical and speak in the language of thousands. While formerly we talked in language that is parochial, looking after our own interests in our own particular section, we are now compelled to look at matters from a national viewpoint. Much of the discussion that has taken place to-day would indicate that the gravity of the financial problem confronting the Government at the present time has not been fully realized. I am not going to devote much time in repeating what has been already said, and said in better terms than I can employ. I would say, however, in reply to my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Lavigueur) in regard to Sir Robert Borden's reported statement a short time ago "that nothing was too good for the city of Quebec," that we are now living in other days. Many great changes have taken place since the time to which my hon. friend has alluded; and that whether we want to or not we are compelled to-day to prune down our estimates. Many of us thought that drastic cuts in the public expenditure could be made. Now we begin to realize that trade would be so upset and the inconvenience would be so great in consequence that we cannot go to extremes in the matter. But there is no doubt that there must be a paring down of expenditures.

There is one phase of this matter I would like to deal with particularly. I believe that many members of this House and many people in the country, consider the economic depression—and I refer more particularly to the state of agriculture—is such that all that is necessary is to have a little patience and things will right themselves in a very short time. I believe the people who entertain that view are very much mistaken. Let me indulge in a little retrospect. Many of those hon. members who have farmed in the West can remember the days when land on the prairies ready for the plough was purchased at $6 an acre—yes $2.50 an acre, the very best land that lies out of doors. That land was

absolutely free from weeds; all we had to do was to scratch the surface and it would yield a crop. In those days of prosperity we could stand a great many burdens, and we did support many and did not raise much complaint respecting them. We hardly counted the cost. We knew we were carrying great burdens, but we were living in times of prosperity and felt able to stand them. Now the time has come when that land is not so productive as it was. During the last twenty years it has decreased in production to the extent of six bushels per acre. My remarks, of course, apply to the prairie provinces. The cost of production has now become very high, and, in a very few words, I will give you my reason why there has been such an enhancement in cost and why we cannot get back to normal conditions without drastic efforts on the part of the federal government. The time came when competition was set aside by some of those engaged in manufacturing articles for our use, but at first we thought we could stand it. I will not say that the manufacturers of farming implements were the first to inaugurate this proceeding but I know they were among the first. Let me illustrate what took place by a concrete case. I said to a man who was a manufacturer and seller of sheaf loaders "That article should not cost $500; it should not cost more than $250." He replied "We do not figure the selling price according to the cost at all. We believe that the man who is threshing grain will regard it as worth his while to pay $500 rather than be without it. Therefore we charge him $500." Now that sort of thing has taken place all along the line. All the various interests have organized even down to labour. When labour organized and demanded a high wage, the time arrived when it was absolutely impossible for us to continue to pay that high wage any longer. During last fall, because of this economic depression, the loan companies took this action. They were not able to collect their loans or the interest. Of course matured loans must be renewed. They were renewed in many cases, not at 8 per cent, but 9 per cent.

THE CHAIRMAN: This discussion as to loan companies in the West can hardly be relevant to this particular issue. I observe the hon. member is drawing a comparison, but I think he is going a little beyond the length of address he is entitled to give in drawing that comparison.

[Mr. Millar]

Mr. MILLAR: I was only mentioning that as an incident, not dealing fully with it, but merely wishing to show that conditions surrounding agriculture are such that, unless economy is practised by the Government, so as to lessen the burden the country is carrying at the present time, no grain or other freight would go to the port of Quebec or any other port. An effort has been made to show that an expenditure on the port of Quebec would be wise if the railways could be persuaded to carry the freight east, instead of letting it go by water. This, it seems to me, is an effort to make water run uphill. The freight will go very much cheaper by water than by rail, and I see no good reason why any effort should be made to cause it to go by rail, in order that the port of Quebec may be built up. Considering that about $11,000,000 has already been spent on this port, and the amount of traffic passing through it has been very small, it certainly seems to me very unwise that another million and a half should be spent.

Reference has been made to the necessity for branch lines. A few days ago I received a letter from some gentlemen, who are interested in a branch line that has been partly built for some two or three years. Ties have been laid, and I believe a large quantity of rails is ready to be laid down, and these gentlemen said "If the Government is not ready to complete this railway at this time, we farmers of this district would like to complete it ourselves, and be paid for our work by way of freight on the produce, principally grain, that will be carried on the railway." At the present time one reason why this branch line should be built is because a great deal of the grain that would go to the Government railways is now going by the Canadian Pacific railway. When many districts require the expenditure of money that will bring good returns in order to help a basic industry like agriculture, I ask if it would be wise to consider spending another million and a half on the port of Quebec. It sems to me not.

5 p.m.

You may think, Mr. Chairman, that I have wandered a little from the subject, but I have not spent very much of the time of this House in discussing any matter. If it costs $2,000 an hour, as some have figured, to talk to this House, I believe other members have been greater sinners than I have. Let me say to the cities of the pro-

vince of Quebec, and to all other cities, that it is well that they should get together and consider this difficult problem in which Canada is placed, because the reaction has already set in. Manufacturing concerns and the railways are suffering; in fact, almost every industry in Canada is suffering. If hon. gentlemen stop to think for a little while, I think they will see why. You can lay such burdens on the basic industries of Canada that their purchasing power will be impaired, and that is what has taken place during the recent years and months. Those engaged in farming—and I suppose many others are similarly placed —are unable to purchase as they used to. They have to cut their purchases to the very bone, and when they cannot purchase, naturally those who are manufacturing have to close their shops. There is unemployment; the railways have not the traffic to carry and there is impoverishment all along the line. I think it would be well, for that reason, that those who think of spending money in Government work that could very well wait for a year or two, should take that fact into consideration. If they would wait a few years until the basic industries get on their feet again, and a certain degree of prosperity returns, then if the million, or two or three million, is required to improve the port of Quebec, or Montreal, or even Toronto—which, as a matter of fact, has been very persistent in its demands—I think you would find those who are engaged in agriculture would not be backward in supporting their demands. We are not looking at things in a narrow way, but rather in a broad way. We see that a reaction has taken place and that there is no chance of a return of prosperity in Canada until the basic industries receive the consideration to which they are entitled because of their importance. I ask the Government to give consideration to that point.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Who are the Quebec harbour commisioners at the present time?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. Power, Mr. Gauvin and General Tremblay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the minister's idea in changing the harbour commissioners?

Mr. LAPOINTE: To form a new board, in order that there might be co-operation in the work of the commission.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What reason had the minister to think that with the old board there would not be co-operation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend knows what the old harbour commission was, and he was anxious to have the documents of the House, and they have been laid on the table.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They give no reason.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am going to give reasons. I do not think anybody could accuse me of being a very bitter political partisan and, I think, if I have any reproach laid against me, it is quite the contrary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never heard the contrary reproach.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman is not in the right camp to hear that report.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think political patronage must be eliminated, as far as possible. But what were the conditions there? The chairman of the harbour commission was a friend of mine personally. He was a gallant soldier and did his duty for his country. Unfortunately, he is dead now, and it is a delicate matter to speak of him in any way, but I am sure my right hon. friend will not consider that I am speaking disparagingly of him when I say that he was a strong partisan of my right hon. friend and of his party. That was right; I have no complaint whatever to make in that regard. But he was the owner, the publisher and the manager of a newspaper in the city of Quebec called The Quebec Chronicle, which is perhaps the strongest political journal in that province.

Mr. BUREAU: Tory.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The chairman of the harbour commission continued as publisher, manager and owner of that newspaper after the new cabinet had come into office, and almost every day there were editorials in that newspaper not only against the Government, but directed against the Minister of Marine in particular. I have nothing to complain about concerning any such criticisms coming from any citizen, but my right hon. friend will admit that this was a condition of things that could not be tolerated. The chairman of the harbour commission is not, perhaps, a civil servant. If he were he would have been instantly dismissed for offensive political partisanship, under the Civil Service Act. But he is more than a civil servant; he is even more than a deputy minister, because there is less control over him. He is the administrator

of the harbour, and surely he must have some confidence in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as the minister must likewise have confidence in his officer. There could be no co-operation if the two were distrustful of each other so far as political questions are concerned. That was the only reason for my having asked for his resignation; and I may say that everyone expected it. The matter was not criticised by the friends of my right hon. friend in Quebec. The new Harbour Board is considered by all the citizens of Quebec as a good business body. They were entertained last night by all the business men of the city, Conservatives as well as Liberals, and I think that my right hon. friend will concede that it was impossible to act otherwise under the circumstances. At all events, I thought I did the right thing. I could not do otherwise, and I offer no apology whatever in this matter. If there is anything wrong about what I did, I must confess that I am an unrepentant sinner and certainly deserve all that may be coming to me in consequence of my action.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the offence of Mr. Gravel? Was he a criminal in the sense of being a Conservative too?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Three or four years ago, when Sir David Watson was appointed chairman of the Harbour Commission in Quebec, Mr. Pennington, who was a member of the board, did not resign. The former government, properly as I think, thought that when the board had to be reorganized and the chairman had severed his connection with it, it was necessary to appoint a new board altogether. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) shakes his head, but I know that that is what was done three years ago, and it was done this year also. It was thought advisable to retain one of the three former commissioners, and General Tremblay was retained. There was no question about political partisanship on his part. He was not the owner of a newspaper carrying on an offensive campaign against the Government, and nothing concerning him deserves criticism.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are any of the present appointees related to the minister?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not in the slightest degree. My right hon. friend has been utterly misinformed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not say I was informed at all. Now, I take a different view altogether from that of the minister of his conduct in this regard, and if I may interpret his own heart at this moment, I am not sure that he has fully confessed his own sense of his conduct.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I certainly have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: At the time Sir David Watson was appointed, one member of the board was asked to retire. As I understand, it has been the custom to have two French Canadians and one Protestant member on the board, and it was in order to maintain the two French Canadian members that the other one was asked to retire. That is what the late government did; it was not because of any political reason. On the contrary, so far as I know, the man who was asked to retire was a friend of the Government. But this government comes into office; it finds Sir David Watson with almost five years of service in Europe, service recognized by the appointment of him as Chairman of the Harbour Board. It finds him eminently successful in his office; it also finds Brigadier-General Tremblay in office, a man also of some length of service in the war. It finds him successful as well. It finds in office Mr. Gravel, who represented particularly the Levis side of the river on the board. And almost the first act of the minister is to write letters to these gentlemen and ask for their resignations. I have before me a copy of the letter which the minister wrote to Sir David Watson. Let me read it:

Dear Sir DAVID WATSON:

Since asuming the direction of the Marine and Fisheries Department, I have given consideration to the policies that should, in my judgment, be adopted by the Government with reference to the administration of the harbours of Montreal and Quebec. In order that the Government and myself should have a free hand in the creation of an administration in sympathy with those public policies, the former Commissioners from the harbour of Montreal voluntarily tendered their resignation.

I have not yet asked for the correspondence in that connection.

You will, I am sure, appreciate that the adoption of a similar policy respecting the harbour of Quebec is eminently desirable in the public interest. I have therefore to respectfully request you to forward to me your resignation as president of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, so that the Government may be enabled with as little delay as possible to organise an administration along the lines heretofore indicated. I am forwarding a similar request to the other members of the Commission.

The request goes to General Tremblay and to Mr. Gravel. I have the reply which Sir David Watson sent, as brought down

by the minister. It will be noted that the reason given by the minister for requesting the resignation of these gentlemen is in order that the Government may be free to appoint men in sympathy with those public policies which the Government contemplates in respect of the harbour of Quebec, without the slightest information as to whether or not Sir David Watson was in sympathy with those public policies. That is what the minister said in his letter. Without any intimation to Sir David Watson as to what those public policies were—and I suppose we are getting them now—the minister assumed, that he was opposed to them, and on that ground demanded the resignation of as gallant an officer as ever served this or any other country. I shall read Sir David Watson's reply and leave it to the House as to where the honours of the argument lay after the minister had received it:

QUEBEC, February 10th, 1922.

Dear Sir,—This will acknowledge yours of the 7th instant, in which you request me to forward my resignation as President of the Quebec Harbour Commission, and also note that you are forwarding a similar request to the other members of the Commission.

You state that you have given consideration to the policies that should, in your judgment, be adopted by the Government with reference to the administration of the Harbours of Montreal and Quebec, and point out that in order that the Government and yourself should have a free hand in the creation of an administration in sympathy with those public policies, the former Commissioners for the Harbour of Montreal voluntarily tender their resignations.

But when you go on to say that I will, you are sure, appreciate that the adoption of a similar policy respecting the harbour of Quebec is eminently desirable in the public interest, I fail to follow you. Since you have never enlightened me as to what these policies are that should, in your judgment, be adopted by the Government with regard to the harbour of Quebec, and have made no attempt whatever to ascertain my views relative thereto, I am at a loss to know by what right you can assume in advance that my administration would not be fully sympathetic to the public policies to which you allude.

It will be a surprise, not only to myself but to the citizens of Quebec, if you have any other policy in view than that of securing a maximum of business for the harbour, without prejudice to the legitimate claims of other Canadian ports, and of administering its affairs in general with efficiency and economy. With such a policy I am and have always been in complete sympathy; as evidence of which I may point out that for a great number of years, prior to my appointment, the Quebec Commission was administered at a considerable loss annually, due to lack of business in the port. Since my administration as Chairman, however, this deficit has been converted into a surplus as per extract from Official Auditor's report, handed in last week as follows:

"The revenue statement shows a marked improvement on the previous period, the gross deficit of $65,221.96 of last year being converted this year into a surplus of $52,020.74 showing a betterment of $117,242.70.

"Operating expenditures have been reduced from $387,619 to $335,303, a gain of $52,316. All items show a reduction except the 'Elevators' which against an increase in operating expenses of $22,322, show an improvement of $71,120 in revenue."

I was appointed to the chairmanship of the Quebec Harbour Commission in 1920, not by reason of services rendered to the late government or of sympathy with its policies—so far as the harbour is concerned I never hesitated to urge its requirements and its rights—but for the same reason as my fellow-commissioner, Brigadier-General Tremblay: in recognition of five years of continuous war service in France, in the interest of the people of Canada.

In this connection, I assuredly cannot agree with your policy of treatment of returned men as illustrated by your request for the resignations of Brigadier-General Tremblay and myself, and I further disagree with your policy if it is not directed towards the same satisfactory results as I have already been able to obtain, and which appears in the official Auditor's report quoted herein.

But above all I have no desire, nor would it be possible for me to co-operate with an administration whose policies appear from your letter to be so utterly at variance with the most elementary principles of justice and honour, and my resignation is herewith tendered in accordance with your request, to take effect at the end of the month.

Yours truly,

D. WATSON,

Major-General, R.O., formerly commanding 4th Canadian Division.

Brigadier Tremblay tendered his resignation. I do not know what may have transpired between him and the minister, but the brigadier, being a consistent Liberal appointed by the late government, was reappointed by this Government. Mr. Gravel, who had been appointed to the port of Levis, was requested to hand in his resignation, which was accepted, and he also was effectually dismissed.

Sir David Watson's offence, according to my hon. friend, was that he was the owner of the Quebec Chronicle. It is true he was the owner of the majority stock of the Quebec Chronicle. It is true that the Quebec Chronicle supported the late government, and has always supported the Liberal-Conservative party. I want to know if the holding of majority stock or control of a newspaper supporting the late government is a bar to the holding of office as a harbour commissioner under this Government. Did the minister speak to me?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was telling my hon. friend for George Etienne Cartier (Mr.

Jacobs) that Sir David Watson was not only the owner of the majority stock, but he was general manager of the paper. The paper was published under his sole control.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Assuming he was general manager of the paper, did that interfere with the performance of his duties as harbour commissioner? It did not appear to. The duties of that office were performed more successfully by him than they had been performed by any one before.

Mr. JACOBS: His other duty was to attack this administration every morning for breakfast.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. In the city of Quebec only one of the four or five papers is supporting the late government. A policy of purchase of antagonistic papers has been carried on by the friends of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. JACOBS: Name them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I take the name of a paper right beside us—L'Evenement. I did not have to go far, did I?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let those speak who know.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But where the attempt to purchase fails the big stick is applied, and the owner of the majority stock in the one remaining Conservative paper of the great city of Quebec is exposed to summary dismissal at the hands of my hon. friend though he was commander of the 4th Canadian Division for four years in France, and one of the most gallant men that this or any other country ever sent to the front. What offence did Mr. Gravel commit? I did not hear. The only offence he committed that I know of was to hold the office that the hon. minister wanted to fill with one of his friends. Everything the minister has advanced to-day, yes, many times in much stronger form, would be applicable to every case of political patronage the grossest that the country could conceive of; he could defend every case of patronage with the language he has employed this afternoon. Yes, patronage is bad enough, and I know how the minister is hankering to get back to it in all its various forms, but patronage as applied against the holding of offices that have been filled successfully by returned men is the most indefensible form of patronage.

Nor is this the only case to which it has been applied; there are many such cases throughout the country, reference to which has been made in questions put upon the Order Paper. But this is the most conspicuous one—a demand for resignation on a ground that is so manifestly indefensible and untenable that I am surprised the minister would put it forward. He had not the least reason to expect that Sir David Watson would change the political allegiance of his journal—a journal whose circulation was naturally with those of sympathetic views to itself. Sir David Watson personally was not in any sense active in the management of the Quebec Chronicle. He attended to his duties as harbour commissioner just as assiduously as he attended to his duties as general of our 4th Division in France; that was his conduct in office. Sir David Watson by his services to this country merited better treatment, and might have expected better treatment, at the hands of a generous foe. I may say that in correspondence received by myself from one of his friends, I am informed that the treatment accorded Sir David Watson was very severely felt by himself as unjust, cruel and ungrateful. To quote the last sentence of the letter:

> I personally do not consider it too much to say that what the Huns failed to do the Liberals succeeded in accomplishing—killing him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Who is that written by?

Mr. MEIGHEN: A close friend of the late Sir David Watson.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is his name?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will give my hon. friend the name personally, if he wishes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think my right hon. friend should give the name to the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will ask the writer of this letter for the privilege of giving the name. As soon as I get it I will give it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend should not read a letter in the House unless he is prepared to state the authorship of it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not a minister of the Crown. If a minister of the Crown reads a letter in the House, he is bound to lay it on the Table in support of policy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is the leader of a party; that carries with it some responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman will show me the rule, I will adhere to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are some rules that apply to ordinary courtesy, and my hon. friend ought to know them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman had better hold his own followers to that rule.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have nothing to complain of concerning what my right hon. friend has done or said; it is like him, absolutely. He cannot induce me to say anything against the late Sir David Watson. The committee understands how delicate the subject is under the circumstances, so I will confine myself to stating again that I think no minister of the Crown, on whatever side of politics he may be, can, in his capacity as head of a department, co-operate with a deputy minister or the chairman of a board under his jurisdiction when these officials are assailing each other every morning in the newspapers, politically or otherwise. It would simply be stupidity to take any other course than was taken, and were I placed again in the same position I would act exactly as I did.

Now, my right hon. friend, in his very insinuating way, has said that he does not know about the commissioners of Montreal because he has not yet moved for the correspondence. Let me tell him that as soon as this Government took office the harbour commissioners of Montreal sent in their resignations. They did it in a very courteous way, and they were pleased to welcome the new commissioners who were appointed by this Government.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Did not the chairman of that board previously resign to become a candidate in St. Antoine?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The chairman had resigned to become a candidate for my right hon. friend in St. Antoine, and the two other commissioners resigned as soon as this Government took office. The Montreal Gazette, which is a respectable organ of my right hon. friend and has always been a Conservative newspaper, had something to say about that. The Gazette certainly does not share the opinion of my right hon. friend as to the co-operation which should exist between the Government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the harbour commission of any port. Here is what the Montreal Gazette said in an editorial in its issue of February 1, entitled "The Harbour Board," in which it welcomed the appointments made by the Government:

> The office of Harbor Commissioner has always been political in the sense that its occupants come and go with the changing governments at Ottawa, and in view of the intimate relation between the port and the Government there can be no objection to this procedure. Montreal is the national port of Canada. Physical conditions have made it such, and on the progressive development and capable administration of the port depends not a local but a Dominion-wide interest. For progressive development it is desirable that the Harbor Board should be persona grata to the ministry at Ottawa, a fact of which no one is more conscious than the recently resigned commissioners after a period of exceptional progress, and good service.

I would not go as far as the Montreal Gazette did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Neither would I.

Mr. LAPOINTE: But I still maintain that when the chairman of a harbour commission is not only a strong political partizan, but takes an active part in political warfare; when he is the publisher of a newspaper which attacks the Government every morning, and when he assails the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under whom he is supposed to act—that is a condition of things which nobody in the House and nobody in the country would tolerate. I would not have been true to myself; I would not have been true to the position I occupy, had I been willing to permit such a condition to continue.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I do not want to assail the present Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, but I think the right hon. leader of the Opposition might complain if he were in my position. The first appointment made by the new harbour board was that of Captain Ambroise Landry as harbour master of the port of Quebec. Captain Landry was the man who sought to be my opponent in Bonaventure county four years ago. He was actually in the running; his nomination papers had been prepared, but he was pulled off by the Quebec committee, and Mr. Philippe Furois put in his place. I think the new harbour board of Quebec must be pretty liberal in their views when they appoint as harbour master a man who had been willing to be a Conservative candidate in the constituency.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He is not a commissioner.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): No, but he acts under these gentlemen who have been appointed by the present minister.

Mr. JACOBS: Probably he was appointed because they wanted the hon. member to have no opposition the next time.

Mr. CHURCH: Any questions asked from this side of the House are not by way of objection to items to provide for the development of our national ports. We are simply looking for information—because every member of the House was not invited to go to Quebec on that trip the other day. I myself was not invited. This resolution was placed on the Order Paper on the 24th of March. It was called almost every day, but was not gone on with until some members of the House had been invited to go and inspect these improvements. I am glad they did go there, because seeing is believing, and that applies to harbour works as well as to anything else. If you want to understand a harbour development, you have to see it. I do not blame the minister, as one of the representatives of the Quebec district, for his interest in Quebec harbour. He said that some were hungry who were not thirsty. I may say in answer that the minister is both hungry and thirsty to get this matter through in the form of a resolution rather than to take a chance with an item in the main estimates. The resolution is dated March 24, but it was not gone on with until the Progressives were invited to Quebec last Saturday. As I was not one of those invited, I may say to the minister that I do not know what it is to be either hungry or thirsty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CHURCH: It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that there has been altogether too much politics in connection with the Quebec harbour since Confederation. I have a table here which was prepared the other day in answer to a question, giving certain figures and total expenditures with respect to the various ports in Canada. As I say, there has been too much politics and too little business in connection with the development of our national harbours, and the mixing up of politics with the matter, and the absence of business methods, has cost the country millions of dollars. It is true that terminal facilities are necessary at ports like Quebec and Montreal to take care of the increased business, but how is it that some of these ports are dealt with by resolution, while the others are left to shift for themselves in the main estimates?

Here is the port of Victoria, B.C., badly in need of a dry dock and terminals; what is going to be done there? What about Halifax, St. John, Toronto, Hamilton and other places which need adequate terminal facilities also and cannot get them? What I urge is that there be equality of treatment. I do not blame the minister for what has happened in the past; he has been in office only a few months. But I do not see any reason why there should be a change of officials and commissioners at the port of Quebec or the port of Montreal. If you want good government of a port and value for your money you must have continuity of officials, engineers, management, commissioners, and financing. Things must be done in a businesslike way. As it is now, the officials change with the Government, instead of the ports being administered by a permanent commission along business lines. A permanent commission would be in a far better position to decide as to how much dredging was to be done this year, how many immigration sheds and elevators, etc., should be provided, what would likely be the revenue from the port, and what increased business they could get.

Mr. MARTELL: Were not the harbour commissioners of Montreal and Quebec changed after 1911? Every Liberal that cropped up then was discharged.

Mr. CHURCH: I am not interested in the past or in politics in the way the hon. member is. He has politics for his breakfast, dinner and tea. I am not interested at all in that phase of the problem. Never mind what has happened in the past. Let us concern ourselves with the future. Let us get value for this money that the minister proposes to spend.

What does the minister mean by equipment of the port? I see by this statement and comparison of expenditures in harbours that only very small amounts were spent on Quebec harbour in the years when immigration was the greatest. In 1895-96 only $8,000 was spent, and there was a large immigration in that year. The next two years $6,000 was spent. In 1910-11 the amount was much greater, $392,000; in 1911-12, $529,000, and in 1914 $497,000. Of the entire expenditure of $11,000,000 on the Quebec harbour, $5,500,000 was spent between 1914 and 1918 while the war was on. During the war the port was able to take care of all the business, of all immigration navigation, including inward and outward bound traffic at no very great expense.

I should like to see equality of treatment as between harbours and ports of this country. If the minister is prepared to go and do likewise for other ports and harbours that are badly in need of equipment and facilities, all very well and good. There are many places that want terminal facilities, but they have to pay for them. It does not do them very much good if they are hungry and thirsty in a terminal facilities sense, as they must provide for their terminal facilities themselves. It is the same with expenditures for post office facilities. I have no objection to the minister equipping Quebec harbour to make it fit for the business that will be done to-morrow, not only in an immigration sense, but a transportation sense, so that he will be able to take care of the great increase in navigation and general trade which will develop at the port in the near future. If the Government would extend the same treatment to other ports in the country and give them equality of treatment, I think such action would commend itself to the wisdom and judgment of the country generally.

Mr. LAPOINTE: May I say again to my hon. friend from Toronto that the only reason why this is being done by way of legislation is because it is the law. It would be much easier to have an appropriation in the Estimates, as is done for Toronto, than to bring down legislation which is closely scrutinized by the House. But the law requires this procedure, and that is the only reason why we are proceeding in this way.

Most of the discussion that has taken place has arisen through a misapprehension. I was very glad indeed to hear many hon. gentlemen speak of the magnificent harbour of Quebec and say that it possessed all the facilities that are required. For this to be said in the House of Commons of Canada is a good advertisement of the port, and I am glad for that reason. I must once again try to impress upon the members of the committee that these advances are not for the purpose of adding to the facilities which now exist at the port. They are not, as my hon. friend who spoke on the other side some time ago suggested, for the purpose of improving the harbour, but they are for the purpose of maintaining the present facilities. This money is required to keep in good order the present equipment. Perhaps I had better read some of the items on which it is proposed to expend the money which is the subject of the present resolution.

The first item is to cover the cost of operating the commissioners' bucket ladder dredge, for three seasons. The dredging to be done during the above period, will consist of widening out the entrance of the river St. Charles Basin, widening out the basin to uniform lines and grades, and removing materials that accumulate at the various berths, so as to maintain the standard depth of 35 feet at low tide.

An item of $25,000 is required to cover the cost of alterations and mechanical improvements for Grain Elevator No. 2, in order to render the operations more efficient. Last year when the grain was sent to Quebec it all came at the same time, and the men had to work day and night. It was realized that some alterations were necessary to facilitate the work and make the operations more efficient.

Then there is an item of $18,000 for a new floor at shed No. 26, as the present old floor from long use has become so worn as to render the work of trucking goods a difficult and costly operation.

An item of $20,598 is required to cover the cost of laying down a 2½ inch tongued and grooved flooring in shed 19, and surfacing the quay front and open wharf at east end of shed with concrete. This work is required as the present shed and wharf planking is worn out and requires to be renewed.

For breakwater facing $53,470 is required. This is to cover the cost of rebuilding the river face of the old breakwater, for a length of 880 feet. This work is rendered necessary owing to the fact that the wharf timbers from low water mark up to coping level have become decayed, and are no longer capable of retaining the filling materials in wharf.

Then $20,000 is required to cover the cost of certain alterations and additions to the foundations of shed 29 rendered necessary by the uneven settlement, due to the varying depths of the sand filling on which the shed has been erected.

An item of $30,000 is required to continue the work of reinstalling the long wharf at Indian Cove damaged by floods, and which work has already been approved to the extent of $53,900.

Six new floating fenders, amounting to $4,800, are required for the protection of vessels moored at pier No. 1.

Does my hon. friend want all the items?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It would be just as well.

Mr. LAPOINTE: An item of $6,000 is required for painting the exposed iron works out of the dock front grain galleries which have not been painted since erection, and are now depreciating for want of painting.

An item of $5,000 is required to cover the cost of installing the machinery, electrical wiring, etc., in the travelling grain loader, structural steel work, which was completed last year and is now ready to receive machinery.

An item of $2,520 is required to cover the cost of laying down concrete paving, to replace the present decayed planking over the space between the landing sheds 18 and 26 along the dock front.

An item of $15,000 is required to cover the cost of laying down additional railway lines to serve the space at the western end of the embankment.

An item of $113,191 is required to cover the cost of constructing a fixed fender for a length of 300 feet along the river face of pier No. 1 at shed No. 26 berth. This fender will take the place of the present floating fenders at this part of the frontage and will keep vessels at this berth clear of the wharf, as do the present floating fenders, except in case of severe storms of easterly wind, when they may become misplaced or be carried away, thus allowing the vessel to come in contact with the wharf and be liable to injury. It is to avoid this contingency and to make this berth as secure as possible under all conditions, that it is considered advisable to replace the floating fenders by a fixed one for a length sufficient for one vessel's berth. Then:

Oil tank, $42,275.

The commissioners have entered into an agreement with a company for the erection of oil tank for the supply of fuel oil to vessels berth in Louise docks. This amount is to cover the cost of laying down the pipes, installing the valves and other appliances required to complete the installation.

The commissioners have already entered into a contract with that company, and the amount which they will get from that company will be more than sufficient to pay the interest and the expenditure on that account.

Coal tower foundation, $17,572.

This is to cover the cost of replacing foundations for coal towers on the area leased of the Canadian Import Co. on the St. Charles frontage, and there is a continuation of a contract by which the commissioners lay down similar foundations in the wet dock for the same purpose.

Piers at entrance of St. Charles river, $125,000.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

This item is to cover the cost of constructing guide piers at the entrance to the river St. Charles quay frontage in order to protect vessels from the bank on the northern side of the entrance works and to render the navigation into this part of the docks easy and secure.

Landing stage and overhead passage at sheds Nos. 25 and 26, $30,000.

I think my hon. friend will see that this expenditure is not to provide new facilities in the harbour, but to keep the harbour in good order and maintain works that are already in existence.

Mr. LADNER: I have a question to ask. I happen to be one of those fortunate people who received the hospitality of the city and Harbour Commissioners of Quebec. My only disappointment is that before this question of harbour improvements came up we in Vancouver did not have our friends from the East visit us because then there would have been two resolutions introduced instead of one. Now my question is this: I understand that considerable negotiations have taken place and many representations have been placed before the Government in respect to the harbour of Vancouver. I happen to be one of the members for that constituency and I can say there is a real need for dock accommodation, a great business need, which exists at the present time because the larger boats are compelled to go to Seattle to secure that accommodation. Is the Government willing to complete the dry dock which has been undertaken at Vancouver?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will understand that I have no authority to speak on that subject. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works would know more about it than I do. All that I can tell my hon. friend is that works are going on in Vancouver harbour at the present time.

Mr. LADNER: I refer to the dry dock.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I refer to the works under the control of the Harbour Commission and undertaken on an advance made by this Parliament which has not yet been all expended. There still remains over two millions of that advance to be expended on the harbour of Vancouver and may I say this: Although some hon. member stated that Vancouver was paying interest on the advances made, the Government has not yet had the good fortune to receive any of that interest. I am sure, however, that Vancouver will pay its own way in the very near future on account of the very great facilities provided there.

Mr. LADNER: My question related particularly to the dry dock.

Mr. LAPOINTE: In regard to the dry dock I am not in a position to make any promise.

Mr. LADNER: For the minister's information I may say that I asked the same question of the Minister of Public Works and he had some reason which evaded the answer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see.

Mr. LADNER: I shall therefore await the next opportunity of trying to get an answer to my question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will endeavour to secure the information for my hon. friend.

Mr. CLARK: What work is to be done in Vancouver during the coming year with the $2,000,000 to which the minister has referred?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will be necessary to complete the Ballantyne pier.

Mr. CLARK: Is it not the custom to consult the Harbour Commissioners for the port during the season each year regarding the work projected?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The work is entirely under the control of the Harbour Commissioners. Of course, they submit for approval by the Governor in Council the various schemes upon which they decide, but we are not directing this work—they are doing it themselves.

Mr. CLARK: Have they not submitted any proposals to the Governor in Council this year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not for the works of the present year.

Mr. CLARK: In other words, there are no proposals at present before the Government that have not yet been dealt with?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No proposals for new work but, as I say, there is a balance of $2,000,000 to be expended there. Every advance must be approved by the Governor in Council, and any work to be done with that money must be approved by our engineers as well as by the Government.

Mr. CLARK: Have any new proposals been submitted to the minister or to the Government, with regard to the projected work on the terminal railway and connection with North Vancouver?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some proposals to that effect were submitted years ago but none have been submitted this year.

Mr. CLARK: Have those proposals been dealt with by the Government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. CLARK: Are they before the Government now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They may still be in the department but they have not come under my consideration. I will be pleased to look into the matter if the hon. member desires it.

Mr. GOOD: What amount of this $1,500,000 does the minister think will be necessary this year—I mean for maintenance, not for new construction?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As I have already said, this money will not all be spent this year.

Mr. GOOD: How much of it will be expended this year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think perhaps one-third. This legislation is to enable the Government to make advances from time to time to the Harbour Commissioners for work which they desire to have done. Such work will have to be approved by the Government but it may not be carried out for two, three, four or five years.

Mr. GOOD: Then why authorize such a large expenditure if it is not to be paid out this year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will understand that if we have to come every year and ask for legislation of this kind it will take up a great deal of the time of Parliament.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I wonder if the minister is really still of the opinion that this vote should be asked for? I would like to point out to him in the first instance that he is putting in some new work—not very much but still some. I would also like to point out to him that works of a commercial character have never been paid for by harbour commissions. Take for example the coal plant. The coal plant at Montreal, I am informed, was installed by the commissioners at their own cost, they making some money out of it. It is the same with the oil plant. There does not seem to me any reason why the Quebec Harbour Commission should have to make these capital investments. However, I would like to

seriously ask my hon. friend: Does he think it good business for this Government to issue bonds for any such purpose as mentioned? The explanation given by my hon. friend simply adds so much more force to what has been stated before as to the position of the Quebec Harbour Commission. They are owing the country these millions of dollars interest in arrears. Of course it is an investment, as my hon. friend knows, because the money could only be advanced in that way. It is intended to be, and really is an investment. In fact, it is an investment in Montreal, and will be an investment in Vancouver. But over and above all those tremendous losses, we find now that the business of this port obtained by the board is so small that they cannot keep up their current painting. Surely, it is about time they stopped issuing bonds for any such purpose.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Is the fair wage clause inserted in all contracts given by this corporation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have already said that I shall see that the Harbour Commission inserts such a clause. I am in favour of such a clause in all contracts on subsidized work.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): When was the last appropriation made for this port?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In 1917, five years ago.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I think the hon. gentlemen is wrong about that. That was the date of the legislation. The hon. gentleman was not asking as to enabling legislation, but as to when the last appropriation was made.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The money has been paid from time to time since 1917. There is no more money now that can be advanced under the legislation.

Mr. CLARK: Did I understand the hon. minister to say there had been no appropriation made for the harbour from 1919 to 1921?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I did not say that. I said the last legislation granting advances to the harbour was passed in 1917.

Mr. CRERAR: No appropriations have been made since then.

Mr. CLARK: The appropriation of 1916-17 was $1,532,244.33; in 1917-18, $1,121,-413.40; in 1918-19, $875,503.72; in 1919-20, $258,276.09; in 1920-21, $181,877.89, making a total of $9,573,085.97, from 1896 to 1921, as compared with $5,151,867.65 for the port of Montreal, and $4,415,860.64 for Vancouver.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All these appropriations are part of the legislation.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 78, to provide for further advances to the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

NIAGARA RIVER BRIDGE COMPANY

On the Order for the second reading of Bill No. 61, respecting Niagara River Bridge Company.—Sir Henry Drayton.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is a rather important bill and the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) is not in the House. I do not know anything about the matter and am not aware whether or not there is any objection to the bill, which has reference to an international bridge that is being constructed by a combination of two companies, one incorporated by the state of New York and the other by the province of Ontario, or possibly by the Dominion of Canada. This bill possibly might encroach on certain provincial powers, but as to that I do not know.

Mr. STEVENS: Should it not go to the Railway Committee? That is the proper forum.

Mr. GRAHAM: The principle of the bill is all right, and I am quite agreeable to its being referred to the Railway Committee, so long as it is understood that we do not acquiesce in its provisions, because as yet I do not fully understand them.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Meighen the bill was referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

PRIVATE BILLS

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate) for the relief of Ethel Turner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate) for the relief of Walter Michie Anderson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate) for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fredenburg.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate) for the relief of Sheriff Elwin Robinson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate) for the relief of Rhoda Renfrew McFarlane Brown.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 68, to incorporate the Frontier University.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate) for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz.—Mr. McQuarrie.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 23, respecting Prudential Trust Company, Limited.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 28, respecting The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 48, respecting Aberdeen Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

Bill No. 49, respecting Armour Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Manion.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

On motion of Hon. Ernest Lapointe (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

That it is expedient to amend Section 477 of the Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by adding the provisions that ships of war and hospital ships belonging to such foreign nation or nations as may be specified by the Governor in Council; and ships registered in Canada engaged exclusively in fishing; shall be exempt from the payment of pilotage dues.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under the Canada Shipping Act all vessels entering certain ports have to pay pilotage dues whether they employ a pilot or not. Certain exceptions are made in all other countries, of course, there are a few exceptions under our own act. We want to add the exceptions mentioned in the resolution. The first is with respect to war and hospital ships—of friendly countries, of course; that is why the matter is to be dealt with by the Governor in Council. As to fishing vessels registered in Canada, the custom has been to exempt them from pilotage dues, but the law does not permit that. This legislation is simply to enable the matter to be dealt with as it has been, but in a legal way.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I understand it, the act provides for the payment of pilotage dues by all vessels, with certain exceptions the minister has not mentioned. What are pilotage dues for? I must confess to a dismal ignorance of the subject. To whom are they payable?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The law makes it obligatory on all vessels to pay pilotage dues. They are not compelled to take a pilot if they think they can enter the port without one, but they have to pay the dues, just the same.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Do they pay them to the Marine Department?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, to the pilots themselves. They are usually formed into a corporation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, the ships are corporations of course.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. I mean the pilots. In Quebec, for instance, they have a corporation of pilots; the same is true of Montreal. The dues are fixed by the Governor in Council. The money goes into a general pilotage fund.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If they employ no pilot, whom do they pay?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The money goes into the common fund of the pilots.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, they pay the corporation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We are at peace with all countries now; why does the Government ask to have reserved to itself the power to select and make favourites of nations? Is not the minister afraid that might possibly lead to Order in Council government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I hope it will never happen; on the other hand, there is no injury to anybody to leave the matter in the hands of the Governor in Council.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): In the interests of the pilots themselves it is not wise that all these restrictions should be taken away. These men devote their whole lives to the business of piloting vessels into port, and they obtain their livelihood through the collection of dues from vessels that come in. Foreign vessels should

be required to pay, because the pilots have no other means of earning a living and their work must all be done in the summer when the harbours are navigable, The exemption, therefore, should not go too far.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But should Parliament not say how far it should go? As I understand the way it reads, the Governor in Council could exempt the ships of half a dozen nations and subject the vessels of all the others to the payment of the dues. Why does the Governor in Council want the power of choosing between nations? Why should it be a respecter of nations when we are on the same terms with all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Certainly we are on the same terms with all nations, but in the event of some nations not granting a similar privilege to British vessels, it is only fair that we should not grant these privileges to theirs.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That sounds reasonable. The purpose, then, is to grant them wherever corresponding privileges are granted to British vessels?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 79, to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Pilotage).

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION

On the motion of Hon. E. LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

Resolved, (1) That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, advance and pay to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, hereinafter called "the Corporation," in addition to the moneys, if any, heretofore authorized to be advanced to the corporation by the Governor in Council by any act, and which have not at the date of the passing of any act founded upon these resolutions, been so advanced, such sums of money, not exceeding in the whole the sum of five million dollars, as are required to enable the corporation to carry on the construction of terminal facilities in the harbour of Montreal, for which plans, specifications and estimates have been approved by the Governor in Council before the passing of the act founded upon these resolutions, and to construct such additional terminal facilities as are necessary to properly equip the said port.

(2) That no such advance shall be made in respect of the construction of terminal facilities, unless such detailed plans, specifications and estimates, for the works to be performed by the corporation and on which the money so to be advanced is to be expended, as are satisfactory to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, have been submitted to and approved by the Governor in Council before any work on the same has been commenced.

(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 five per cent per annum.

(5) That the principal and interest of any sums advanced under any act founded on these resolutions shall be payable out of the revenue of the Corporation mentioned in section 8, of chapter 10, of the Statutes of 1896 (First Session), and shall be a charge thereon as if the sums so advanced had been borrowed by the corporation under said chapter 10.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It will perhaps interest the committee to know what is the financial position of the harbour of Montreal. There has been expended by the Government for the harbour at Montreal, through the Public Works Department, $1,055,-725.08, and by the Harbour Commission $33,121,777.45, or a little over $34,000,000 altogether. The revenues of the port last year amounted to $2,891,274.42, or nearly $3,000,000, and the expenditure, including the interest paid on advances made by the Government, amounted to $2,724,-100.02. So as may be seen, the port of Montreal is a paying proposition. As my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said this afternoon, it is a good investment to make these advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. The commission needs the further amount stated in the resolution for completion of their works, and I am informed that for every addition which is going to be made to the port facilities, arrangements or contracts have already been entered into assuring a fair revenue to the commission.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree with the minister that this is a proposition entirely different from the proposal this afternoon, when this committee was asked to grant $1,500,000 to the Harbour Commissioners of the city of Quebec. I agree that the Montreal Harbour Commissioners have performed a very useful work for the Dominion of Canada. They have managed their business as a business should

be managed, and have been able at all times, I believe, to meet their obligations. It has been a great boon to the whole Dominion of Canada to have such a harbour as we have in the city of Montreal. I believe, of course, that Montreal has been specially favoured by Providence in as much as it is an ocean port about 170 miles farther inland than the port of Quebec, and has great physical advantages. I think Montreal will in all probability be able to maintain its supremacy as a shipping port unless it be that in the future the tonnage of our ocean-going ships so greatly increases that they will not be able to go up as far as Montreal by reason of the levels of the St. Lawrence. At the present time, undoubtedly, Montreal is the great summer port of Canada. It has been well managed in the past, and I assume it will be well managed in the future. The proposal here is in the nature of a loan which will be returned to this Government. We will accept the bonds of the Harbour Commissioners, and those bonds bear interest sufficient to pay the cost to this country of carrying the loan, but in the case of the Quebec Harbour Commission which we discussed this afternoon, the proposal was not in the nature of a loan at all, but a straight grant of money without the chance of obtaining any interest or even the principal for many, many years to come. Personally, I would approve this resolution without further discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The figures given by the minister disclose an investment that the country has in the port of Montreal of about $34,000,000. That is the aggregate of the various years right up from Confederation until now. The minister's figures also disclose a revenue last year that, if I figured it correctly in my mind as he read, amounted to about nine per cent. The commission pays, as I understand it, five per cent on its bonds. I do not think the whole investment is covered by bonds. Consequently, there will be more than four per cent of a surplus, or a surplus somewhere in the neighbourhood of $1,500,000. That surplus, of course, is not paid to the Dominion Treasury. It is held by the Harbour Commissioners. Is that surplus applied under the supervision of the Government towards improvements, towards extensions, towards facilities? If so, is this $5,000,000 in addition to the application of accrued surpluses by the commissioners, and what is the extent of the accrued surpluses that have been invested and are being invested this year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Improvements made that have been paid from revenue income amount to $2,266,777.45.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Improvements from surplus income last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, the figure I gave covers a number of years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The surplus received last year, according to the minister's figures was about $1,500,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister to read two million odd as the disbursements and $3,800,000 as the revenue.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No. The revenue last year was $2,891,274.42, and the expenditure $2,724,100.02.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not catch the figures the first time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Let me state that last year the total quantity of grain shipped through the port of Montreal amounted to 135,000,000 bushels, and of that quantity 55,000,000 bushels was United States grain shipped to Montreal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is, 135,000,000 bushels through the port of Montreal as against 5,000,000 through the port of Quebec?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in. Mr. Lapointe thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 80 to grant further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

SUPPLY

DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Maintenance and repairs to Dominion Steamers and Icebreakers, $1,600,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the item carry?

Mr. STEVENS: We are rather taken by surprise. We understood the Minister of Public Works was going on with his estimates to-night and we were all loaded for him; we did not expect that the esti-

mates of the Department of Marine would be taken up. I may say that we are also deeply interested in the date when the Minister of Militia is going to try his hand again after his somewhat harsh experience the other night. He knows, of course, that he has a lot of good friends on this side and we are very anxious to once again demonstrate that friendship to him. In reference to the present item, if I am correct it is the intention of the Government to repurchase an icebreaker that was sold during the war, or perhaps they have already done so. Is that repurchase included in this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it is not.

Mr. STEVENS: Then would the minister give us the details of what is included in this $1,600,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are twenty-seven ships whose operating expenses and repairs are chargeable to this particular appropriation. I may explain that the decrease of $150,000 in the vote is due to the reduction in the cost of fuel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In what service are the ships whose repairs are chargeable to this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In the lighthouse and buoy service.

Mr. STEVENS: If I recall correctly, the Government had several lighthouse tenders chartered on the Pacific coast. Are there any chartered there now?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are not any chartered now.

Mr. MANION: Does not the contract for icebreaking at the head of the lakes come under this item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it does not. But there is such a contract, I am informed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have 27 lighthouse and buoy service vessels. The service has more meaning to other hon. members than it has to me but still I have some idea of its nature. And it takes $1,600,000 a year to keep these vessels in repair and maintenance?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, for their operation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the economy effected is owing to the lower price of fuel?

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, and supplies generally, but it is especially owing to the reduction in the cost of fuel.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is all owing to reduced costs?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Examination of masters and mates, $20,000.

Mr. DUFF: Before this item carries I would ask the minister if this money is expended for the payment of salaries to the men who conduct navigation schools in different parts of the country—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I do not think so.

Mr. DUFF:—and teach the sailors navigation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, it is merely to pay the examiners of masters and mates.

Mr. DUFF: Who are they?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a resident examiner at the following ports: North Sydney, Yarmouth, Halifax, Charlottetown, Montreal, Quebec, St. John, Collingwood, Port Arthur, Toronto, Vancouver, Victoria, Nelson, Edmonton, and Selkirk.

Mr. DUFF: I think I am right in the belief that Captain O'Hara, who is in charge of the school at Halifax, would come under this vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. DUFF: Captain O'Hara is an experienced ship master of a great many years standing. At the present time he is in charge of the service at Halifax and he is being paid by the federal authorities the munificent sum of $110 a month. That just shows what little knowledge the Griffenhagens, the Arthur Youngs, and the rest of the bunch who made up the classification in the Civil Service a few years ago knew of their business. Captain O'Hara is worth at least $200 a month. His services to the shipping industry of Canada are something which we in the province of New Brunswick are very proud of, and we feel that he is doing a great work. Captain O'Hara left his ship some years ago to take up these duties with the promise that he would get a fair remuneration. Instead of that all he gets, under the classification referred to, is $110 a month. If the minister cannot get any satisfaction from the Civil Service Commission, who do not know any more than Griffenhagen, he should take some steps to see that Cap-

tain O'Hara is paid properly for the services he performs for the country, and I would like some assurance from the minister that this man, who lives in Halifax, and has to look after his family and pay rent—and rent is very high in that city—is properly paid for his services. It is impossible for him to live on $110 a month. It is unfair that he should not be paid a better salary. He is a good man, and should be properly paid for the services he rendered his country.

Mr. MARTELL: I want to reiterate what the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has said in regard to Captain O'Hara. He happens to be a personal friend of mine, though a political friend of the hon. gentleman opposite, and it is seldom that hon. gentlemen will find me advocating the claims of political opponents. He is a very excellent man. Large amounts of money are spent for the purpose of instructing people in other arts, and it is only fair that a reasonable amount of money should be expended in teaching the young Nova Scotians the art of navigation. The constituency that I have the honour to represent, in the old days of shipbuilding in the province of Nova Scotia, built the largest sailing ship ever produced in the country. I need not mention the name, and we have a great number of sea captains in my constituency whom I happen to know. Captain O'Hara is probably about my own age, and when he was a boy he began as a sailor before the mast, went through the various stages a sailor is required to go through and holds a master mariner's certificate. I believe if you were to ransack the whole Dominion of Canada you could not find a man more competent to discharge the duties of an instructor in navigation and seamanship than Captain O'Hara, and I would beseech for him a fair consideration at the hands of the minister. I suggest that in arriving at a decision the minister should take the advice of his departmental officers, and not the advice of Griffenhagen and Young.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This matter is engaging the attention of the department, having been placed before the department a few days ago. I shall certainly not forget the remarks of my hon. friend in regard to Captain O'Hara.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister purposes to have his department engaged in the individual cases of men who feel that they were not treated properly by the Civil Service Commission, there will be ample for him to do, without any of the real work of his department being done at all.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I admit that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So the minister's purpose is to deal with the unreal and not with the real. That is modern Liberalism, as I understand it. What I desire to call attention to is this: I am surprised that the minister did not state that Griffenhagen and Young and Company are not responsible for the classification. The responsibility for the classification rests with the Civil Service Commission. That commission had a Board of Hearing, before which all the officers could appear and make any case they cared to make, as respects any of their officials or clerks. That is where the classification question was decided. Griffenhagen arranged the mechanism under which the various officers would come, and what they did in that regard went again to the Civil Service Commission. We have had evidence of this already this session. One can never expect that the classification of anyone, when it comes to be arranged by the experts of the organization, will meet with the approval of all. Nevertheless, from the mouths of the Postmaster General, and as well from two or three other ministers, has come the frank confession that very large sums of money now left out of these estimates are left out just because of the work that Griffenhagen and Arthur Young performed.

Mr. KNOX: Did I understand the minister to say that we have an examiner at the port of Nelson?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There was one, but I see that the position is vacant.

Mr. KNOX: I hope the time will soon come when we will have an opportunity of making use of him in the district in Nelson. That is on Hudson bay.

Mr. TOLMIE: How often are these examinations held, and at what points in British Columbia?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think my hon. friend made a mistake. I was referring to Nelson, B.C.

Mr. KNOX: I did not understand that Nelson, B.C., was a seaport.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is a lake port. I remember having left Nelson, B.C., two

years ago in a boat, after having held a fine meeting the night before. In British Columbia there are examiners at Vancouver, Victoria and Nelson.

Mr. TOLMIE: How often are these examinations held?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Wherever there is a sufficient number of aspirants.

Item agreed to.

Investigation into wrecks, $12,300.

Mr. MARTELL: I presume that is the branch of the service presided over by Captain Demers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand Captain Demers, as the official investigator, conducts his court, and after he gives his decision there is no appellate court to which an appeal can be taken. He is known as the nautical assessor. What is the salary of Captain Demers?

9 p.m.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was voted under the civil government estimates. I have not the documents before me, and I cannot say offhand.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand the salary is in the vicinty of $4,000. I believe that Captain Demers presides over more courts than any judge in the Dominion of Canada. I do not believe there is a judge, either of a county court, of a court of King's Bench, or of an appellate court in the Dominion of Canada, who has half as much work to do as the official wreck commissioner in his investigations into marine casualties. Millions of money are involved in his inquiries, and there is no appeal from his decision. I believe it would be in the best interests of the service if Captain Demers were given a salary commensurate with his services and with the duties and responsibilities of his office. Will the minister take that into consideration? A wage should be given to him in accordance with his ability and responsibility.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will take that into consideration when decreases are suggested, because we have been asked to decrease salaries instead of increasing them.

Mr. MARTELL: Decreases are very good, but where you have a good official and a person exercising great responsibility and performing good service for his country, we do not want to give him a starvation wage.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. LEWIS: Does he come under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. LEWIS: One of the unfortunate lambs my hon. friend is pleading for?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Navigation schools, $8,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Where are these schools conducted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: At Halifax there are two instructors. Captain O'Hara gives his whole time and receives a monthly salary of $110 besides the regular bonus. Captain E. N. Young, teacher in mathematics, at $100, also devotes his whole time to the work of the school. There is a school at Yarmouth with two instructors, Captain Hilton, with a salary of $66.66, and Dr. Crowell, who receives $50 a month, working part time. North Sydney there is one instructor, Captain Sutherland, who works about four months. He receives $90 a month. At St. John the instructor, Captain Pollock, gives his whole time and receives $125 a month. There is one instructor at Quebec, Captain Alphonse Halle. He also gets $90 a month, working four months. At Kingston the navigation school in Queen's University gets a grant of $500. At Collingwood Captain Coles is paid as examiner, and at Vancouver Captain Charles Eddie, who also lectures on navigation, is paid in the capacity of examiner.

Mr. STEVENS: Is Captain Eddie paid for lecturing on navigation?

Mr. LAPOINTE: He is paid as examiner.

Mr. STEVENS: Captain Eddie is examiner of masters and mates, and I believe that he has performed the duties in this respect very satisfactorily for many years. But in addition to that, altogether in his own time, he delivers lectures to seamen on navigation, and in times past he was paid specially for this. Now I understand that under some new ruling these lectures are to be regarded as part of his services as examiner of masters and mates, and that strikes me as hardly reasonable, because I do not think that the amount paid him as examiner is in any sense excessive. I am not arguing for an increase, but I object to the cutting of that additional amount of $250 per year which in the past was paid him for the lectures he delivered.

Mr. LAPOINTE: He received two salaries formerly, one as examiner and the other as lecturer. These salaries have now been

consolidated, and he is receiving just as much as he did before.

Mr. STEVENS: If that is the case my complaint is of course unfounded, but I understood that one salary had been cut off. So long as what the minister says is correct, there is no ground for complaint.

Item agreed to.

Registration of shipping, $3,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent under this item last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: $2,719.50.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Less than half the vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: About half the vote. We have reduced the vote this year by $1,000.

Item agreed to.

Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, $5,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Some time ago I called the attention of the department to the fact that there was a derelict off Horton Bluff in the marine channel leading to Windsor, Hants county, Nova Scotia. This was a schooner belonging to the Comeau Shipbuilding Company of Weymouth, Nova Scotia. It sank and now forms a serious menace to navigation, besides interfering with the fishermen who engage in drift net fishing. Last fall the department put a buoy over the obstruction to warn off mariners, and I understood this spring that instructions were given to have the derelict blow up so that navigation might no longer be impeded.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The department has noted the matter and something will be done before the opening of navigation.

Mr. MARTELL: While there is really no law in regard to fishing to compel the removal of this derelict, it is competent to have it removed under the Navigable Waters Act. This obstruction is a serious menace to fishermen, and the Act should be invoked and the derelict removed, the cost being charged to the owners of the vessel. If this were done two birds would be killed with the one stone, so to speak; navigation would be safe and at the same time the fishermen's gear would be freed from the present liability to destruction. I would urge the minister to have some steps taken in the matter at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent under this item last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount was $15,252.77. Of course, it is almost impossible to foresee the expenditure for the year to come; it is always the result of some accident.

Mr. STEVENS: This is not the whole amount set aside for the removal of obstructions in navigable waters.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is.

Mr. STEVENS: What about the snag boat Sampson on the Fraser river? It is not maintained under this item.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It comes under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. STEVENS: Why should two departments look after the same work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister does not explain why he puts only $5,000 in the estimate this year. If $15,000 was required last year, and the minister cannot control the expenditure for the coming year, since it depends on the number of accidents, what is the justification for the estimate of $5,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The usual amount asked for is $5,000. Many years we do not spend more than that. Of course, I have no objection to increasing it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was the special cause last year for the expenditure of $15,000? What were the accidents to which that expenditure was due?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It was due to a serious obstruction at the mouth of the Welland canal at Port Dalhousie.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Due to an explosion?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A steamer was wrecked at that place last year.

Item agreed to.

To continue subsidies for wrecking plants—Quebec and British Columbia, $35,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was spent to the end of last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The whole amount. The work is under contract.

Item agreed to.

Unforeseen expenses, $5,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Several of our members from the maritime provinces who are absent to-night desire to discuss this item, and if the minister will let it stand over I shall be obliged.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I have no objection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Members from the maritime provinces would like to discuss these estimates generally, and this item would afford them an opportunity.

Item stands.

Life Saving Service, including rewards for saving life, $90,000.

Mr. HUGHES: Is there a life-saving station at Souris, P.E.I.; and, if so, can the minister give us the names of the officers and crew?

Mr. LAPOINTE: There is a life-saving station at Souris. I do not think I have the names of the officers and men employed there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister tell us now what was the total expenditure last year on ocean and river service of the $1,953,600 voted?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The expenditure to May 5th, 1922, was $1,491,211.35.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister means the expenditure chargeable against last year's vote only?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume the principal item not all expended would be the first?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I see I have given to my right hon. friend figures relating only to maintenance and repairs to government steamers, the first item. I do not think I have at hand the total of the other appropriations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would not be a very large amount saved out of the other appropriations, I should think.

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, that is the main amount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With the diminished cost of coal, which would account for $150,000, one would think the minister would be able to get along on the first item—of course I know it is passed—with a million and a quarter instead of $1,600,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have a decrease on the first amount of $150,000. I think that is a fair reduction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is only the difference in the cost of coal. But last year there was spent $300,000 less than the vote, so that would allow $400,000 as a fair diminution for this year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: My right hon. friend will realize that when we are operating twenty-seven vessels in a season we cannot foresee what may happen; there may be accidents.

Item agreed to.

River St. Lawrence Ship Channel—maintenance and operating dredging fleet, $613,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister give us particulars of that item?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is for maintenance and operating the dredging fleet engaged on the river St. Lawrence ship channel. The dredging fleet is employed in improving the ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, and Quebec and Father Point. The vote is the same as for last year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much was spent last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: A total of $588,055.88. There are four elevator dredges with tugs, one sea-going elevator dredge, two self-propelling barges, one self-propelling coal barge, two inspection and sweeping steamers, two stone elevators and one rock breaker; the greater part of the vote about $475,000, is allotted to them. There is also $135,000 for outfitting, docking and providing extra parts for the dredging fleet, including care of the fleet when not in operation, which includes fire boats.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the maintenance of the Sorel shipyard, comprising offices, shops and labourers, $90,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the maritime province members desire to discuss this item, and I should like the minister to leave it in the same category as No. 231 previously reserved, especially as I observe there is an increase in the amount asked for.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All right.

Item stands.

Amount required for the completion of one self-propelling, sea-going elevator dredge for service in North Channel below Quebec, $90,055.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this a new ship?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This ship has been under contract with the Vickers Company since 1914. The contract price was $833,-

700. The construction was suspended during the war but has since been resumed and the ship is now complete. This is to pay the final amount due to the contractors.

Mr. STEVENS: When was the vessel delivered?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Last fall.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister should give a statement of the amounts paid on the contract, when paid, and just how this item is made up. I notice there was no vote last year, nor has there been any for a number of years with respect to this contract.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Payments have been made to the extent of $743,645. The balance is being asked by this vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are no extras at all?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And no diminutions—that is to say, no set-offs?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am informed that the contractors are claiming extras, but we have not finally decided that such extras should be allowed and we are simply asking for the balance of the amount of the contract.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the department admit that the vessel is in accordance with contract, in every way perfectly satisfactory?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Absolutely, yes.

Item agreed to.

Amount required for the construction of one self-propelling hopper barge, $285,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this a new vessel?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is new to the extent that its construction has not yet been started. It is necessary in connection with the operation of the elevator dredge for which an amount has just been voted.

Mr. STEVENS: Has any contract been let?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet.

Mr. STEVENS: Have tenders been called for?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet.

Mr. STEVENS: Will tenders be called for?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely.

Mr. STEVENS: Will tenders be called for from the whole of Canada?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Surely.

Mr. KNOX: Is the work contemplated by this and the preceding item to be carried out on the St. Lawrence channel only?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is primarily for that purpose, but the dredge may be used elsewhere if it is needed.

Mr. KNOX: Is this work in the nature of permanent improvement?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. There is a very dangerous spot in the St. Lawrence river below Quebec called de Beaujeu Bank. It is proposed to deepen the channel on the northern side of the river so as to avoid de Beaujeu Bank. Of course, the work is asked for by the navigation companies and the public generally. It will have, among other effects, the result of reducing considerably the rate of maritime insurance and increasing the safety of navigation.

Item agreed to.

Lighthouse and coast service—agencies, rents and contingencies, $210,000.

Mr. LEGER: I would like on this item to put a few questions to the hon. minister with reference to the marine agencies in our part of the country. In the winter of 1918 the marine agencies in the maritime provinces, which since Confederation had been run on provincial lines, were changed, apparently by the Marine Department's officials, in a very arbitrary manner. The marine agency at St. John, which properly had control of all the aids to navigation in the province, had the whole of Baie des Chaleurs, Gulf of St. Lawrence and Northumberland Strait taken away from its jurisdiction; the latter district was transferred to the Prince Edward Island agency at Charlottetown and the Baie des Chaleurs agency was transferred to the Quebec district. I believe the change should not have been made; I would like to see each province have its own agencies. For instance, if anything happens in Kent county, or on the north shore district of New Brunswick, we have to get the agent from Charlottetown to come to that district. Now, some of the matters requiring attention are of a very trivial nature and a method of that kind is certainly not economical. I wish to read the following item bearing upon this matter which I took from a New Brunswick paper the other day:

W. H. Prowse, inspector of lighthouses, Charlottetown, crossed this week by the car ferry steamer en route to Buctouche and Richibucto.

That is in my county.

At the former place he held an examination of applicants for the position of lightkeeper, the former keeper having died some time ago.

The holding of an examination for the position of lightkeeper is not a very difficult thing to do; it should not be necessary to have an inspector of lighthouses make a trip of that kind to carry out so trifling a duty. Besides, the cost is considerable. The clipping goes on:

At Richibucto he will look into the matter of changing the Richibucto bar light, which change is necessary on account of the shifting of the channel.

This also, I am informed, is a trifling bit of work which almost any man around the district could do with satisfaction to the public. To my mind, the present system is an extravagance, and I would therefore ask the minister to look into this question with a view to providing each province with its own marine agency. It would give us a much better service. I hope the minister will bring back the old system that we had from Confederation down to a few years ago.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand that my hon. friend is advocating the autonomy of New Brunswick and her exemption from any control by Prince Edward Island. I sympathize with his position, but on the other hand the department came to its conclusion to change the system a few years ago on account of geographical rather than provincial considerations. However, I shall be pleased to look into the matter, and my hon. friend may rest assured that his representations will be carefully considered.

Mr. MICHAUD: I endorse what my hon. friend from Kent county has said in connection with this matter, and I hope the minister will look at the question not only from the point of view of geographical considerations, but will consider the needs of the province itself. We seem to have been neglected in the past few years so far as dredging and other maritime works are concerned, and I think it is high time that we should address ourselves to somebody who would take an interest in these matters.

Mr. MARTELL: I am sorry I cannot agree with the hon. member for Madawaska and the hon. member for Kent. My constituency, I believe, happens to be under the control of the agency in St. John, N.B. I think the department did the right thing when they placed these agencies where the agents could be got at most easily and from where the service could be best carried on. The counties all along the Bay of Fundy coast can be most economically and efficiently managed from the agency at St. John, and the western counties can be reached from Halifax. With all deference to my hon. friends, I submit that it is very much more easy for the agent at Charlottetown to have jurisdiction over the northern portions of New Brunswick than to put that territory under the jurisdiction of the agent at St. John, which would necessitate the inspection and supply boats all taking a roundabout way to get to the counties of my hon. friends. I think this change is one thing the department should be commended for. However, that was not my purpose in rising. I want to ask the minister how many subagencies there are in the province of Nova Scotia, and where they are located. I understand there is one at Sydney, and one at Pictou. Who is the agent at Sydney, and in what building is his office located?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The agent at Sydney is Mr. V. Mullins. His salary last year was $2,040. This year he gets an increase of $120, making his salary $2,160. The agent at Pictou is Mr. J. R. Davis. He is getting only $400.

Mr. MARTELL: Where is the office in Sydney, and what rent is paid for it?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The office at Sydney is provided by the Public Works Department. I am not aware just where it is.

Mr. MARTELL: I think it is in the Sydney Post building.

Mr. STEVENS: What amount was spent last year out of this $216,500?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount spent last year was $190,927.45.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is there any provision made for pensions for lighthouse keepers when they become too old to remain in the service? I understand their salaries are very small, not sufficient to allow them to put anything by for their old age.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Calder Act applies to the lighthouse keepers. Under that act the pension is based on the number of years' service and the average yearly salary.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and allowances to lightkeepers, $650,000.

Mr. TOLMIE: There is a lighthouse at the entrance to Victoria harbour, and another at the entrance to Esquimalt harbour. What are the salaries of these lighthouse keepers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I will look that up.

Mr. JELLIFF: The lighthouses and lighthouse keepers is something I have always been interested in ever since I was a boy and learned to sing that old song, "Let the lower lights be burning, send a gleam across the waves." I have often thought of those poor lighthouse keepers away out on some lonely rock or point at the edge of the ocean, and of their isolated, almost heartbreaking existence. Could the minister tell us how many lighthouses we have in Canada, how many lighthouse keepers, and what amount they are paid yearly for the splendid service they are rendering in guiding vessels to safety from the perils and storms of the ocean?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend will understand it is rather difficult for me to give all the details to-night, because there are 3,000 lightkeepers in Canada. Their salaries vary from $50 to $1,500 a year. Some of them are granted allowances apart from their salary.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Is there any provision made for superannuation in old age?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Under what act?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Under the Calder Act.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): May I ask the minister whence the title came, "the Calder Act"?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think it is the name of a distinguished gentleman who was a member of a former administration in this country.

Mr. STEVENS: What was spent under this item last year? While on my feet I would like to make this observation in connection with the light service: Speaking from a considerable knowledge of the Pacific coast—I do not know so much of the Atlantic coast—the light service is of a very high order. It has been maintained at a high standard of efficiency, and I think compares very favourably with a similar service by any other nation in the world. I am not at all inclined to criticize justifiable expenditure for this purpose. Will the minister give us the amount expended last year?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount expended last year was $649,296.12. That is a few hundred dollars less than the amount voted.

Mr. STEVENS: That was a pretty clever and capable estimate on the part of the previous government was it not?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must admit it, due to the good officers of the department.

Mr. SIMPSON: May I ask if the minister has received a report as yet from the district superintendent of my county—Algoma—with reference to the recent lamentable accident on lake Superior, when the government lighthouse boat Lambton is reported to have been lost with all on board, including some lighthouse keepers who were being taken up to their stations for the season's operations?

Mr. LAPOINTE: All the facts are being published in the press. We have no report except the one that came to the department that there is no trace of the vessel. It certainly is a case of complete loss of life and of property.

Mr. SIMPSON: Is it the intention of the department to have an investigation made?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I was asking that question in the department but there does not appear to be much to investigate.

Mr. SIMPSON: May I ask whether it is correct that this vessel left the dock at which she was moored much earlier than customary; also whether it would not have been more prudent for such a small vessel to turn back and take shelter in port when much larger vessels were doing that?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The instructions to the commanding officer of the ship were to leave as soon as the conditions of navigation would permit him to do so. Great latitude is left to the captains of these vessels. It is necessary, of course, that the lighthouses shall be operated as early as possible in the season, but the date of the departure of these vessels is left altogether to the discretion of their commanding officers.

Mr. TOLMIE: Has my hon. friend any information yet in regard to the salaries of the lighthouse keepers?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not yet, but many persons are working at the task of getting that information for my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $850,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much was spent last year on the service may I ask?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The expenditure last year was $800,411.62.

Mr. GUTHRIE: You propose an increase of $50,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. The money required under this appropriation is for the purpose of defraying the cost of maintenance of aids to navigation including the cost of supplies, fuel, illuminants, cleaning materials, delivering supplies, including freight and cartage, etc., also the cost of repairs to such aids to navigation including material and labour. I could give a statement in tabular form covering the last ten years, which would indicate, year by year, the growth of the service in principal aids to navigation and the cost of mainteance.

Item agreed to.

Construction of lights and aids to navigation, including regulation of traffic in the Detroit river and such other places as may be found necessary, $400,000.

Mr. LEWIS: Does this relate to the construction of lighthouses, and other aids to navigation? I notice the previous item has reference to lights, gas and signal buoys, etc.?

Mr. LAPOINTE: From this vote is provided all new aids to navigation, such as lighthouses, buoys, beacons, fog alarms and submarine signals, including apparatus and machinery, as well as large repairs to existing aids and the replacing of obsolete buildings and apparatus by equipment suitable for the protection of modern heavy draught vessels. It also includes the purchase of the plant necessary for the carrying on of the works as well as the purchase of lands, wharves, etc., the erection of such supplementary works as may be required, the chartering of any boats that may be found temporarily necessary to properly carry out these works, the regulation of traffic in the Detroit river and such other places as may be found necessary, and the administration and operation of the lighthouse depot at Prescott.

Mr. DUFF: Last year I called the attention of the then minister of Marine and Fisheries to the necessity of an aid to navigation off the Newfoundland coast. It was well known to this committee, of course, that Canada provides for the upkeep of certain lighthouses on the Newfoundland coast; and last year I asked that a powerful gas buoy or light ship be placed between Cape Pine and Cape Race. In this district, St. Mary's Bay, which is known as the graveyard of the Newfoundland coast, a great many steamers and sailing vessels belonging to Canadian ship owners, owing to the very strong current which runs along the south shore of Newfoundland are carried into this area and in the dead of night, or during heavy fogs, are cast ashore and wrecked with the loss not only of the ship but in a great many cases many valuable lives. That being the case it seems to me this is a very important matter and the Marine Department, in my opinion, should take steps to place there at a distance of about four or five miles off the land an aid to navigation in the shape of a gas buoy or light ship whereby vessels before they are drawn into the current will be able to hear the bell or the "droner," as it is sometimes called, before they get too close to the rocks. I repeat that this is a very important matter. Not only freighting vessels but fishing vessels pass up and down that coast, and from the conversations which I have had with the captains and crews of these ships—both steamers and sailing vessels—it is felt that the Canadian government would be doing the right thing by investigating this matter and placing some aid to navigation in this locality.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Do you want an answer?

Mr. DUFF: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (P. E. I.): I desire to bring a matter to the attention of the minister, although it is not so important as the question brought up by my hon. friend to my right (Mr. Duff). Down in our province we have a great deal of offshore fishing, and in two or three sections we have been asking that a small range light, as an aid to navigation, be furnished, to guide the fishermen coming in after night and to find the channel. Last year the matter was brought to the attention of the department and nothing was done. This year I have been endeavouring to persuade the hon. minister to give some attention to this small work. While it is not very important for our large seagoing ships, we have our humble fishermen who go to sea to earn their living, and why should we not give these men some as-

sistance? It is only a very small item. In some of these places two or three hundred dollars would pay for a range light to assist these men, and still they are denied this privilege. I simply want to bring this matter to the attention of the minister, and I know it will receive his careful consideration. I desire to refer to the question of a buoy on the Tormentine reef, where the ferry crosses from Tormentine to Prince Edward Island. Perhaps it does not come under this item, but I may not have an opportunity to speak to it again. One of the most expensive ships owned by the Government is on that route and the Captain of that ship has been asking that a steel spar bouy that will not go under the ice be placed on the reef, and I trust that before another winter the department will give that matter consideration.

Item agreed to.

Marine Signal Service, $80,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The amount spent last year was $74,997.07.

Mr. STEVENS: The Government did so well last year under the previous estimates, will the minister explain the reason of the increase?

Mr. McCONICA: Will the minister tell us whether it is splendid guessing on the part of the man who makes the appropriation, or on the part of the man who spends it? It is susceptible to both explanations.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It must be attributable to both; both must have credit. The amount is needed for increases of salary.

Mr. MANION: I desire to ask a question which, perhaps, should come under the previous item, but it might also be dealt with under this item. I refer to some of the lights that have been petitioned for at various times on Rainy river, an international water in my constituency, running on the boundary between United States and Canada. It is a good sized river, but used a good deal by small craft, fishing boats or small pleasure boats, some freight boats and passenger boats. I have taken it up with the late government, but I have not yet taken it up with this Government.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The hon. gentleman will fare better with this Government.

Mr. MANION: I might have better success with this Government. I think my hon. friend is probably familiar with it, and may give it kindly consideration some time when he is dealing with this question.

Mr. LAPOINTE: All the demands for aids to navigation are submitted to the lighthouse board. The Deputy Minister of Marine is the head of the board. The superintendent of lights, the chief engineer of the department, and some other officers, and the representative of shipping federation as well, are on this board. Although the minister is an expert on those things, he would like to be directed, to some extent, by that board.

Mr. MANION: I am sure the good officers of the minister would have a beneficial effect on the board.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are at your disposal.

Item agreed to.

Administration of pilotage, $300,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What does this item mean?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is for the administration of pilotage. Under part 6 of the Canada Shipping Act, the Minister of Marine has control of 41 pilotage districts including Quebec, Montreal, St. John and Halifax, which are under the supervision of this department. We spent last year $187,720.46. The increase is due to the condition of the boat which is doing the service at Pointe au Pere. The old ship Eureka is in bad condition, and will be replaced by a tug or motor boat, which will cost a hundred thousand dollars.

10 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is that included in the $300,000?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes it is included. That is the reason of the increase.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that the minister is the official head of the pilotage districts in Canada, and, in that capacity has to do, not only with granting licenses or certificates to the pilots, but regulating the whole business. My information is that, particularly on the river St. Lawrence, the pilots are rapidly growing wealthy. I have been informed that a pilot on the river St. Lawrence, in the course of a season of four or five months, makes as much as $6,000. At least, he receives as much as $6,000 for four or five months' work, and, during that four or five months, he

does not make more than 18 or 20 trips. If my information is correct, will the minister tell us how these fees or payments to pilots are regulated? I have seen notices of it in the newspapers, and have also heard it in conversation. There seems to be some complaint that the pilots are certainly not overworked, and that they are very highly paid, particularly on the St. Lawrence river district.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I must tell my hon. friend that there are two sides to the story. Not long ago I received a delegation of pilots, who complained that they were not earning enough money. The case presented by my hon. friend is a special case. The average salary of the Montreal and Quebec pilot is under $3,000 and they have to pay their own expenses to go and take trips and come back home again. They have to pay their expenses and buy their regular tickets. The amount they earn by the end of the season is far less than the sum my hon. friend has mentioned. We must also recognize the danger with which they are faced at all times of losing their positions. They have to undergo a very severe examination of their sight every spring, and if they do not pass the examination they are dropped. They are made responsible for all accidents which may happen, and the regulations, as well as the law, are very strict; so that they are taking many chances and running many risks. On the whole, I am not prepared to say that the rates of pay to the pilots are too high.

Mr. LEWIS: The resolution which the minister introduced earlier in the day provided that war ships, hospital ships and all vessels engaged exclusively in fishing should be exempt from pilotage dues. Is this item to provide for the payment by the Government of pilots who are employed on such vessels?

Mr. LAPOINTE: When such ships employ pilots they will have to pay them the usual rates, but they are not compelled to employ pilots. That is what the resolution which has been before the House provides. Such vessels are exempt from pilotage dues; other vessels have to pay whether or not they employ pilots.

Mr. STEVENS: The matter of pilotage dues is one of the main questions affecting the trade and commerce of the country, and it is one of the important items that enter into the cost of shipping coming into our ports. The minister a moment ago spoke of the St. Lawrence charges and the earnings of the pilots there. I am not acquainted with the details so far as the St. Lawrence is concerned, but on the Pacific coast we had a similar situation a few years ago. There was a good deal of complaint from the shipping interests, who complained that the pilotage dues were too high, and it was pointed out, if I remember correctly, that the pilots were earning around $4,000 and over a year for services which did not seem commensurate with the amount they received. But in that case they worked the full year. There was no close season as there is on the St. Lawrence. Now, I do not say that pilots should not earn a substantial salary. Not at all; I do not wish to offer too much criticism in that regard. But there is a sense of proportion that should be observed in all these things. Shipping should be made as cheap as possible. Charges against shipping, whether wharfage, pilotage, harbour dues, or any other charges, should be within reason. We found the charges too high on the coast. There was considerable discussion and investigation for a couple of years which resulted in a remedy which I think might be adopted in other parts. The minister was constituted the pilotage authority of the port. He is, of course, the pilotage authority over all boards. But formerly we had a board which was abolished and the superintendent of pilotage was installed under the minister. So far as I know, the result has been very satisfactory, and I believe the salary of the pilots was fixed at $250 a month, with perhaps some moderate allowances for travelling. The minister mentioned the fact about sundry expenses, but I think it will be found in checking up his reports that in addition to this salary which the pilots secure by dividing the fees amongst them on the St. Lawrence, these charges are paid. The fees are pooled and the charges are paid out of the pool. After that the remaining amount is divided as salary amongst the various pilots. So that I believe my hon. friend is in error when he says that out of their salaries they have to pay sundry charges. In addition to that, I know that in some cases the pilot has little or no travelling costs, because he gets passes very readily on all shipping if he is not actually employed as a pilot. I know this is the case on the Pacific coast. They used to charge up cost for travelling which they did not expend. There are a great many little things of that kind, all of which add

to the general cost of pilotage. I am entirely in accord with the idea that we want to make our harbours safe and our pilotage system the very best it can be made. But expenses should not be multiplied because of that fact. We should keep down the expenses to shipping by keeping the dues as low as possible, and I believe the country at large would benefit, commerce would benefit, and the port of Montreal would benefit if pilotage charges were less on the St. Lawrence. I think that the scheme followed on the Pacific coast might very well be tried in the pilotage districts referred to by my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. LAPOINTE: There have been so many conflicting representations made to me on this very question that I shall inquire very seriously into the matter this year. The pilots contend that their salaries are no higher than those paid elsewhere both in the United States and in other countries, while the shipping federation seems to be of another opinion. I shall have this matter fully considered, and my hon. friend may rest assured that I shall see that justice is done by both sides.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The information I had came from a member of the shipping federation, just about the time when a delegation of St. Lawrence pilots waited upon my hon. friend in Ottawa and pointed out to him that one of the great hindrances to successful shipping on the St. Lawrence was the matter of pilotage dues. I did not know how the matter was regulated. I thought the Government had some right to regulate the amount of dues, but his statement was that pilots who worked four to five months made as much as $6,000 on the St. Lawrence line, and he added that the shipping men found they could not compete.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The pilots say that this is the case of one pilot who has refused to become a member of the corporation. He is an independent pilot and the others claim that he is very friendly to the shipping federation and has been employed more than they have been; hence the salary he gets. Of course, his is a peculiar case and the amount he gets is not the average earned by pilots, which is under $3,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Does not what my hon. friend has just said emphasize the need of his taking actual control of the pilotage situation? Here, he says, is a pilot who because of some pull, if I may use the common phrase, with some shipping companies gets a sum far in excess of two or more times the amount the average pilot secures. That is wholly unfair and unsatisfactory, and we shall never have a contented, efficient and satisfactory pilotage system if there is to be preference of that kind allowed or even made possible. My hon. friend is facing now the very difficulties which the previous minister faced. The previous minister took all the arguments that had been presented to him and which have been referred to tonight. The same claims were made, the same arguments advanced, and action was taken.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Not in the Montreal district.

Mr. STEVENS: No. Action was taken on the Pacific coast, with satisfactory results. I strongly urge my hon. friend to do it in the interests of the shipping of the country generally, rather than in the interests of the pilots.

Mr. GRAHAM: There was rather a suggestion from the Press Gallery that the House should close at ten o'clock, and if hon. members would let the few items on this page go through, we might call it eleven o'clock and adjourn. We have reserved two items on which discussion could take place next week.

Mr. STEVENS: Why not have an understanding that we may have a general discussion on the item already allowed to stand on the previous list, which is a large item?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes. We will allow these other items to go through and then adjourn.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. LAPOINTE: There are two items of the Marine Department on the next page that I should like to have passed tonight, items 250 and 251.

Scientific Institutions—Department of Marine —Meteorological Service, including Magnetic Observatory, grants of $500 each to Kingston and Montreal Observatories, and allowance of $400 to L. F. Gorman, Observer at Ottawa, $262,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know anything about that item.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is for salaries.

Mr. STEVENS: I think, Mr. Chairman, we have done pretty well for the minister,

and as this is a somewhat important item it might stand over. I notice some matters here referred to that members not present would probably like to discuss.

Mr. LAPOINTE: They are all unimportant, but if my hon. friend thinks otherwise, I am quite agreeable to this and the other items standing over. I can assure him I have nothing to conceal there.

Item stands.

Progress reported.

CATTLE EMBARGO

CABLEGRAM FROM THE HIGH COMMISSIONER

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) spoke to me at the opening of the House to-day with regard to a communication received from the High Commissioner in London respecting the cattle embargo, and I promised to lay his telegram on the table at the earliest opportunity. I should like to do so before the House adjourns tonight.

Mr. SPEAKER: By leave of the House the Prime Minister will lay the telegram on the table.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will my hon. friend read it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes. The telegram is dated London, April 22, and addressed to, Prime Minister, Ottawa. It is as follows:

Am informed by Canadian Associated Press that Lewis asked in House if I had stated that unless cattle embargo removed it might imperil Canada's relations with Mother Country. I take earliest opportunity of informing you that whatever opinion I have held in private no public statement of the kind has been made by me.

LARKIN.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

Monday, May 8, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

CROWSNEST PASS AGREEMENT

NOMINATION OF SELECT SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved:

That rule eleven be suspended, and that pursuant to the resolution adopted by the House on May 5, the following members do compose the select special committee to make inquiry into the question of railway transportation costs and the effect upon the Canadian National Railways and other lines, as well as upon agricultural development and Canadian industry generally of the expiration of the suspension of the Crowsnest pass agreement on July 6 next: Messrs. Maclean (Halifax), Euler, Malcolm, German, Duff, Macdonald (Pictou), McMurray, Hudson, MacLean (Prince), Michaud, Mitchell, Archambault, Vien, Stork, Crerar, Forke, Johnston (Last Mountain), Fansher, Halbert, McConica, Shaw, Dickie, Jones, Drayton, Stewart (Lanark), Manion, Boys; with power to send for persons, papers and records, including the minutes and evidence taken before the committee of this House in previous sessions, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the attention of the House to rule 11, suspension of which is asked by the present motion. The rule reads as follows:

No special committee may, without leave of the House, consist of more than fifteen members, and the mover may submit the names to form the committee, unless objected to by five members; if objected to, the House may name the committee in the following manner:—each member to name one, and those who have most voices, with the mover, shall form the same; but it shall always be understood that no member who declares or decides against the principle or substance of a bill, resolution, or matter to be committed, can be nominated of such committee.

I notice in the list presented by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the names of some hon. members who have either spoken or voted against the motion. But the House is supreme, and if it be the unanimous wish of the House this rule can be suspended; the hon. minister has in his motion very wisely declared that rule 11 be suspended. If the motion passes unanimously as framed, there is no objection, but I desire to call the attention of the House to the rule itself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill No. 16 intituled An Act to amend the Immigration Act, be referred to a Special Committee composed of Messrs: Archambault, Cardin, Forke, Fortier, Hudson, Lapointe, Martell, McKenzie, McMurray, Murphy, Trahan, Sexsmith, Shaw, Stewart (Argenteuil), Stewart (Humboldt) that the said Committee have power to report from time to time and that Rules No. 11 and No. 40 be suspended in relation thereto.

I think we should have more members on this committee, and I have left a blank for the insertion of their names. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Meighen) will furnish us with the names of four hon. members, they can be added to the list.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I have no objection to the motion passing without the blank. Then if we desire to add further members as suggested, it can be done by subsequent motion to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill No. 17, intituled: "An Act to amend the Criminal Code be referred to the Special Committee on Bill No. 16, that the said Committee have power to report from time to time and that Rules No. 11 and No. 40 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 72 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Robert Lloyd Beamish.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clarence Robinson Miners.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 74 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Eleanor Menton.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 75 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harvey Easton Jenner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marie Louise Dagenais.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Lawrie.—Mr. Gordon.

CIVIL SERVICE BONUS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he has any information to give to the House with regard to the cost of living bonus to civil servants.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the supplementary estimates for the present year are brought down, the Government will make the following proposals respecting the distribution of the bonus to be allowed civil servants for the present year:

1. On salaries of $1,200 and under—(a) for members of the Service having one or more dependents, the bonus as existing in the fiscal year 1921-22 to be continued; (b) for members of the Service without any dependents, one-half the bonus as existing in the fiscal year 1921-22 to be paid.

2. On salaries over $1,200 and up to $1,800 (inclusive)—(a) for members of the Service having one or more dependents, two-thirds of the bonus as existing in the fiscal year 1921-22 to be paid; (b) for members of the Service without any dependents, the bonus to be discontinued.

3. On salaries over $1,800 and up to $2,400 (inclusive)—(a) for members of the Service having one or more dependents, one-third of the bonus as existing in the fiscal year 1921-22 to be paid; (b) for members of the Service without any dependents, the bonus to be discontinued.

4. On all salaries over $2,400—the bonus to be discontinued.

Provided: that in salaries of $1,200 or under, and in salaries of $1,800 or under, adjustments be made so that in no case shall a civil servant with a lower salary plus bonus receive more in compensation than a civil servant with a higher salary plus reduced bonus.

I may say that my hon. friend (Mr. McGiverin) informed me that he intended to ask this question, and I therefore had the reply prepared in this form.

DATE OF THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Sir HENRY DRAYTON (West York) I think this is the week in which the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) was going to tell us all about the Budget, Mr. Speaker. I know he wants to relieve our anxiety and to let us know the date as long as possible in advance.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I would remind my hon. friend that this is only the beginning of the week. I have the whole week before me within which to fulfil my promise.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PATROL BOAT PHALAROPE

Mr. GRIMMER:

1. When, and for what reason, were the services of the crew of the fishing patrol boat "Phalarope" dispensed with?

2. Who have been appointed to fill these positions, on what date and on whose recommendation?

3. Did any returned soldiers make application for such positions, and were any of them appointed?

4. If not, what was the reason for their not being appointed?

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. The services of three of the crew—which consisted of four persons—were discontinued at the end of December last. The services of the fourth member of the crew were discontinued on February 28th. The boat was laid up at the end of December and not commissioned again until the opening of the present season, about April 1st. Consequently the services of a crew were not required.

2. H. B. Kelly, captain; Manning Mitchell, engineer; Harry Calder, cook; Wilfrid Alexander, deckhand.

Authority for their employment when boat commissioned given on March 23, 1922. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

3 and 4. One returned soldier was appointed. The remaining three were appointed before further applications from returned soldiers were received.

CARAQUET AND GULF SHORE RAILWAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. What was the price agreed to be paid by the Government for the Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway?

2. Has any portion of the purchase price been paid?

3. If so, how much, and when was part payment made?

4. What claims, if any, have been filed with the Railway Department or any other Department of the Government against the purchase price of said railway?

5. Has any claim been filed by the Hon. P. J. Veniot, or any person on his behalf, with any Department of the Government against or to any portion of the said purchase price?

6. If so, what is the amount of said claim, and what is the nature thereof?

7. What are the causes of the delay in completing the purchase of said railway?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. $200,000 and cancellation of $87,705.39 due Canadian Government Railways.

2. Yes.

3. $150,000 on January 13, 1921.

4. July 10, 1911, W. S. Loggie Co., no particulars given, no amount stated. Dec. 4, 1919, Estate P. H. Melvin, for services as superintendent, amount, $6,500. June 30, 1920, G. & H. Duguay, for parcel of land at Caraquet, no amount stated. August 8, 1921, W. G. Pugsley, for legal services, amount, $4,971.54.

5. No claim filed by or for Hon. P. J. Veniot with Department of Railways and Canals.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. The railway company is unable to offer an acceptable title until the Lieutenant Governor in Council of New Brunswick passes a vesting order, which he agreed to pass but withholds.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GRANTS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. What different grants were made to the Canadian Northern Railway by the federal Government before 1911?

2. On what dates were these amounts paid and for what amounts?

3. What grants were made to the said company by the federal Government from 1911 to the time of the acquisition of the road by the Dominion Government?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Following cash subsidies were paid by the Dominion Government to Canadian Northern Railway Companies during the years in question. The statement shows payments made prior to 1911, and also between 1911 and the date of the acquisition of the railway by the government:

PERIOD TO 1911

——	Canadian Northern Quebec Railway	Canadian Northern Ontario Railway	Canadian Northern Railway Company	Halifax and South-Western Railway	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1883–1905	.....	.....	1,909,132 00	525,053 00	2,434,185 00
1905	.....	651,264 00	.....	226,815 80	878,079 80
1906	.....	420,608 00	.....	295,774 40	716,382 40
1907	256,870 40	244,224 00	91,200 00	316,567 73	908,862 13
1908	55,449 60	556,864 00	.....	.....	612,313 60
1909	164,172 29	250,982 40	.....	.....	415,154 69
1910	144,608 51	116,889 60	.....	.....	261,498 11
	621,100 80	2,240,832 00	2,000,332 00	1,364,210 93	6,226,475 73

PERIOD 1911 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1917

	Canadian Northern Quebec Railway	Canadian Northern Ontario Railway	Canadian Northern Alberta Railway	Canadian Northern Pacific Railway	Total
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1911	86,468 03				86,468 03
1912				2,705,378 00	2,705,378 00
1913		8,948,809 47	2,832,024 00	2,520,281 00	14,301,114 47
1914		2,343,335 80	262,080 00	178,077 80	2,783,493 60
1915		495,604 83		244,889 57	740,494 40
1916		358,180 41			358,180 41
1917		80,963 37			80,963 37
	86,468 03	12,226,893 88	3,094,104 00	5,648,626 37	21,056,092 28

2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

PEAT PRODUCTION

Mr. RINFRET:

1. Are there any peat bogs in Canada?
2. If so, how many are there in each province?
3. Where are they located?
4. Are any being worked at present?
5. What is the capitalization of each of the companies who are operating said peat bogs?
6. Has the Government subsidized the above companies?
7. If so, to what extent, either in the form of grants or for experiments?
8. What results have been obtained?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. Yes.
2. No record of total number.
3. The bogs investigated up to date are those considered of greatest potential value in view of their extent, and proximity to transportation facilities and probable markets.
4. One at Alfred, Ontario, and one at Ste-Therese de Blainville, Quebec.
5. The operations at Alfred are being conducted by the Peat Committee which was appointed by and financed jointly by the federal government and the government of the province of Ontario; and those at Ste-Therese by Le Combustible National Limitee, with an authorized capital of $500,000.
6. The federal government has provided funds to meet one half of the expenses of the Peat Committee since its creation in 1918.
7. The share of expenses of the Peat Committee paid by the federal Government from the inception of the work to April 30th, 1922, amounted to $149,358.44.
8. The Peat Committee was created in 1918 when the fuel situation was grave with a view to devising a process for the commercial utilization of a raw fuel possessed in abundance by Canada, and the results to date are considered far in advance of those secured elsewhere. The experiments are expected to be completed in 1922.

RICHMOND AND WOLFE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many rural mail routes are now in operation in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe?
2. What is the name of each route?
3. What is the name of the rural mail carrier upon each route?
4. How many miles are covered each day by each of the said rural mail carriers?
5. What salary does each of the said rural mail carriers receive?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1. 34 routes in full, 4 routes in part.

2, 3, 4, and 5.

Name of Route	Name of Contractor	Length of Route	Cost per Annum
		Miles	$ cts.
Asbestos R. R. No. 1	Zoel Jutras	28 3/8	1,000 00
Bishop's Crossing R. R. No. 1	B. J. McKenzie	23	780 00
Bishop's Crossing R. R. No. 2	R. A. Bloomfield	20 1/2	861 00
Bromptonville R. R. No. 1	William Provencher	27 5/12	1,080 00
Bromptonville R. R. No. 2	G. Hains	28	1,175 00
*Coleraine Station R. R. No. 1	A. Rouleau	18	810 00
Danville R. R. No. 1	P. Johnson	20 3/8	960 00
Danville R. R. No. 2	P. Johnson	18	900 00
Danville R. R. No. 3	O. Caouette	23 7/8	1,150 00
Danville R. R. No. 4	E. M. Leet	29 3/4	1,200 00
Garthby Station R. R. No. 1	Noé Dupont	32	624 00
Greenlay R. R. No. 1	F. Charland, Jr	14	600 00
Ham Sud R. R. No. 1	E. Goddard	20	700 00
Kingsbury R. R. No. 1	W. Armstrong	16	640 00
Marbleton R. R. No. 1	W. M. Bishop	12 3/4	488 00
Melbourne R. R. No. 1	G. M. Cox	16	640 00
Melbourne R. R. No. 2	J. Dunn	15	620 00
Richmond R. R. No. 1	P. Cote	29 1/2	1,138 60
Richmond R. R. No. 2	C. A. Chamberlain	15	600 00
Richmond R. R. No. 3	Adam Badger	23	920 00
St. Adolphe de Dudswell R. R. No. 1	A. Barter	20 7/8	850 00
St. Adrien R. R. No. 1	A. Boisvert	20	939 00
St. Adrien R. R. No. 2	E. Despres	23	900 00
St. Camille R. R. No. 1	A. Dion	29 1/2	1,200 00
St. Francois Xavier de Brompton R.R. No.1	G. Robert	11 1/4	490 00
St. Georges de Windsor R. R. No. 1	A. Frechette	23	900 00
*Sherbrooke R. R. No. 3	A. A. Lothrop	16 1/2	700 00
*Sherbrooke R. R. No. 4	E. Lessard	21	1,000 00
Stoke Centre R. R. No. 1	E. Marquis	23 7/20	1,050 75
*Trenholm R. R. No. 1	W. H. Stevens	17	725 00
Weedon R. R. No. 1	T. Lapointe	17	1,050 00
Weedon R. R. No. 2	P. Fortin	24 1/2	800 00
Windsor R. R. No. 1	H. Bolduc	17	760 00
Windsor R. R. No. 2	W. Courchesne	26 3/10	1,390 00
Wotton R. R. No. 1	D. Pinard	17 9/10	509 50
Wotton R. R. No. 2	S. Goulet	14 3/8	600 00
Wotton R. R. No. 3	L. D. Breault	17	600 00
Wotton R. R. No. 4	L. D. Breault	20 7/8	735 00

*Routes in part.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. When was the law amended to allow the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada?

2. What quantity of oleomargarine has been manufactured in Canada since that date?

3. What quantity of oleomargarine has been imported into Canada since that date?

4. When does the period fixed by law for the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine expire?

5. Is it the intention of the Government to further extend the said period?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. By Order in Council (P.C. 3044) dated 23rd October, 1917—in effect on and after 1st November, 1917—and later by Acts of Parliament dated 10th November, 1919, 18th September, 1920 and 4th June, 1921.

[Mr. Murphy.]

2. No information.

3. Imports of Oleomargarine entered for consumption in Canada—

	Lbs.
Fiscal Year ended March 31, 1918	2,262,514
" " " " " 1919	4,217,916
" " " " " 1920	6,497,031
" " " " " 1921	4,630,747
" " " " " 1922	1,345,784
Total..	18,953,992

4. 31st August, 1922.

5. On the Order Paper, under Notices of Motions, resolution No. 25 deals with this subject. In view of this fact there should be no pronouncement on the part of the Government with regard to the matter covered by this question.

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

Answer to Question No. 2: Up to 31st March, 1922, 27,061,132 pounds.

RICHMOND AND WOLFE POST OFFICES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What are the names of the different post offices in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe?

2. What amount is paid to or retained by the postmaster in charge of each of the said offices?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

Names of Office	Salary and Allowances
County Richmond	
	*$ 250 00
Asbestos	1,576 65
Bromptonville	1,543 69
Danville	3,643 30
Duplin	60 00
Flodden	72 00
Gore	85 00
Greenlay	239 08
Hardwood Hills	60 00
Kingsbury	606 59
Lorne	200 96
Melbourne	771 60
New Rockland	120 00
Richmond	4,082 04
St. Claude	124 29
St. Claude Nord	93 00
St. Cyr	82 00
St. Francois Xavier de Brompton	509 09
St. George de Windsor	412 86
Stoke Centre	336 37
Upper Melbourne	60 00
Windsor	2,461 88
Windsor East	971 29
County of Wolfe	
Beaudoin Centre	60 00
Belmina	60 00
Bishop's Crossing	799 06
Cote Mills	60 00
D'Israeli	1,407 75
	†210 00
Dudswell Junction	82 00
Fontainbleau	246 67
Garthby Station	797 06
Garthby West	60 00
Ham Nord	332 99
Ham Sud	245 79
Lake Aylmer	139 00
Lime Ridge	109 90
Marbleton	646 79
North Wolfestown	60 00
Notre Dame de Ham	327 65
St. Adolphe de Dudswell	271 11
St. Adrien	406 02
St. Camille	629 87
St. Fortunat	249 64
St. Gerard	520 84
Sanborn	80 00
South Dudswell	72 00
Stenson	178 00
Stratford Centre	264 84
Weedon	1,049 78
Wolfestown	313 12
Wotton	969 59

*Public Works Department pays $250; Post Office Department pays $100. Total, $350, lease of premises for Post Office.

†Public Works Department pays $210; Post Office Department pays $150. Total $360, lease of premises for Post Office.

SHERBROOKE POST OFFICE INSPECTOR

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Was any Order in Council passed by the late government, abolishing the position of post office inspector at Sherbrooke, Quebec?

2. If so, when, and why?

3. Was the said Order in Council later rescinded?

4. If so, when and why?

5. How many persons are now employed in the office of the post office inspector at Sherbrooke, Quebec?

6. What are their names and what salary do they receive?

7. Where did each of the said employees reside prior to their appointment?

Hon. Mr. MURPHY:

1, 2, 3, and 4. No Order in Council was passed specifically rejecting or abolishing position of post office inspector at Sherbrooke, but a general Order in Council was passed by which all inspectors were abolished and their duties merged with other duties to make up the work of the proposed District Superintendents of Postal Service. Under this Order in Council the Griffenhagens abolished the post office inspectorate of Sherbrooke and established twelve district superintendents throughout the country leaving some inspectors under the name of Post Office Inspector as a branch of the District Superintendent's office at the more important points, and under this, Mr. Dastous, Post Office Inspector, was left in charge of the Sherbrooke division, and his staff removed to other points, and the staff was restored by order of Hon. Mr. Belley and the Sherbrooke office opened with its former status as an independent inspectorate.

5. Eleven employees.

6. Dastous, L. E., $3,840; Soles, C. E., $2,880; Lallier, Jos., $2,760; Downing, J. D., $1,800; Mullins, G. (Miss), $1,800; Aubin, R. (Miss), $1,680; Frechette, R.,

$1,440; Choquette, J. (Miss), $1,140; Lefebvre, J. P., $1,260; Bousquet, P., $1,260; Genest, G. (Miss), $960.

7. Dastous, L. E. Sherbrooke; Soles, C. E. (Transferred from R.M.S.), Montreal; Lallier, J., Coaticook; Downing, J. D., Cookshire; Mullins, G. (Miss), Sherbrooke; Aubin, R. (Miss), Sherbrooke; Frechette, R., Wolfstown; Choquette, J., Sherbrooke; Bousquet, P., Sherbrooke; Lefebvre, J. P., Sherbrooke; Genest, G. (Miss), Sherbrooke.

CAMPAIGN FUNDS

Mr. BINETTE:

Is it the intention of the Government to amend the Dominion Elections Act, so as to make compulsory the publishing of the names of all subscribers to campaign funds, and the amount subscribed in each case?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Amendments to the Dominion Elections Act will be considered in due course.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER CANALIZATION

Mr. BINETTE:

1. Has the Dominion Government had any communication with the Imperial Government concerning the canalization of the St. Lawrence river?

2. Did the Dominion Government have any communication with the British Ambassador at Washington in this connection?

3. Has the Dominion Government had any communication in this connection with the United States Congress?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. Beyond transmitting copy of Minute of Council dated 24th December, 1919, expressing the readiness of the Canadian Government to join with the government of the United States in submitting reference to the question of the development and use of the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and lake Ontario to the International Joint Commission, no.

2. Yes.

3. No.

QUEBEC RIOTS COMPENSATION

Mr. PARENT:

Is it the intention of the Government to take such steps as will provide for due compensation to the innocent victims who, during the so-called riots in 1918, in the city of Quebec, have either been killed or wounded or have suffered damages at the hands of His Majesty's soldiers?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This matter is under consideration.

[Mr. Murphy.]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Is it a fact that appeals made by many civil servants who are dissatisfied with their classification never reach the Board of Hearing?

2. Is it true that such appeals are from the decisions of heads or chiefs of branches who declined to recommend the classifications claimed to be in accord with the character of the work done by such civil servants?

3. Is it true such appeals fail to reach the Board of Hearing because they are so prevented by the heads or chiefs against whose decisions such appeals are made?

4. If so, does the Government intend taking any steps to see justice done such civil servants, by having their appeals reach the Board of Hearing notwithstanding the opposition of such heads or chiefs against whose decisions such appeals are made?

5. If not, why not?

Mr. CHISHOLM:

1. Is the Government aware that there are instances of officials in the public service subordinate to deputy ministers who are in receipt of salaries more than those paid such deputy ministers?

2. If so, is it the policy of the Government to continue this custom?

3. What deputy ministers or other officials in the public service are receiving more than six thousand dollars per annum from any Government source?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many postmasters were dismissed from office, in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe, from the 21st day of September, 1911, to the 1st day of January, 1922?

2. How many postmasters resigned their offices, in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe, during the same period?

3. How many postmasters died, in the said constituency, during the same period?

4. What were, in each case, the names of the postmasters and the names of the post offices?

5. What was the cause of dismissal in each case where the postmaster was dismissed, during the said period?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many postmasters have been appointed in the constituency of Richmond and Wolfe, from the 21st of September, 1911, to the 1st of January, 1922?

2. What are the names of said postmasters, the location of post offices and the names of the persons who recommended the appointment in each case?

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming):

1. How many multigraph machines are in use in the various departments of the Government?

2. What was the volume of work done on these machines, by departments, during the fiscal year 1921-1922?

3. Is this work under the control of the Editorial Committee?

TRANSFER OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence passing between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, since 10th July, 1920, respecting the transfer of natural resources.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is no objection whatever to adopting the motion, but I would like to point out to my right hon. friend that the officers of the Department of External Affairs and the officials in my office state that there are letters, either in the Prime Minister's office or in the Department of External Affairs, from the Prime Minister of Canada to the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, other than those which have been addressed by myself, and replies thereto, which I am prepared to lay on the Table of the House now. The date referred to here is 10th July, 1920, which is, I think, the day my right hon. friend formed his administration. It may be that he is desirous of some correspondence being brought down to which he was a party. I would be glad to bring it down if he would tell me where it is, but I cannot locate it in the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid my hon. friend in taking office has taken on too many new assistants and secretaries, and kept too few of the old. These letters were dictated by me in the usual course, are purely official letters, and the copies must be there. I myself have sent for the copies subsequently to their being written and have seen them. There should be no difficulty at all in finding them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: So far from doing what my hon. friend suggests, I rather went out of my way to provide for his old secretaries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not in your own department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, in my own department. I am only too anxious to bring the correspondence down, but I am unable to locate it. I have had inquiries made, and shall make further inquiries, but up to the present I have not been able to find the correspondence on any file.

Motion agreed to.

ORIENTAL ALIENS

RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE FUTURE IMMIGRATION

Mr. W. G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of oriental aliens and their rapid multiplication is becoming a serious menace to living conditions, particularly on the Pacific coast, and to the future of the country in general, and the Government should take immediate action with a view to securing the exclusion of future immigration of this type.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to propose this resolution, I do so with considerable diffidence. I realize the importance and the comprehensive extent of the subject. I appreciate my own limitations and my incapacity to place this matter in a satisfactory manner before the House. My one comfort, however, is that I am to be followed by hon. gentlemen, particularly those from British Columbia, who will be able to make up for any of my deficiencies. There is a huge mass of material before me, and it will be necessary for me to make a comprehensive statement, but I intend to be as brief as possible.

The resolution calls for the exclusion of the immigration of oriental aliens. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that this does not include British subjects such as, for instance, East Indians, who are popularly described as Hindus. The word "immigrant" is defined in the Immigration Act as follows:

"immigrant" means a person who enters Canada with the intention of acquiring Canadian domicile, and for the purposes of this Act every person entering Canada shall be presumed to be an immigrant unless belonging to one of the following classes of persons, hereinafter called "non-immigrant classes,"—

i. Canadian citizens; and persons who have Canadian domicile;

ii. diplomatic and consular officers, and all accredited representatives and officials of British and foreign governments, their suites, families and guests, coming to Canada to reside or to discharge any official duty or to pass through in transit;

iii. officers and men, with their wives and families, belonging to or connected with His Majesty's regular naval and military forces;

iv. tourists and travellers merely passing through Canada to another country;

v. students entering Canada for the purpose of attendance, and while in actual attendance, at any university or college authorized by statute or charter to confer degrees; or at any high school or collegiate institute recognized as such for the purpose of this Act by the Minister;

vi. members of dramatic, musical, artistic, athletic or spectacular organizations entering Canada temporarily for the purpose of giving public performances or exhibitions of an entertaining or instructive nature; and actors,

artists, lecturers, musicians, priests and ministers of religion, professors of colleges or other educational institutions, and commercial travellers, entering Canada for the temporary exercise of their respective callings;

vii. holders of a permit to enter Canada, in force for the time being, in form A of schedule one to this Act, signed by the Minister or by some person duly authorized;

This definition should be borne in mind in considering the subject now before the House.

The resolution provides for the exclusion in the future of all alien orientals who may seek to enter Canada in any capacity for permanent residence. It is, to adopt the reasoning of the Californians, to prevent increase by direct immigration of an element in our population which, for the reasons hereafter mentioned, is not only undesirable but dangerous to Canadian interests. The method of bringing exclusion into effect and the working out of the details will be for the Government.

It might be of interest for us to consider for a moment the condition of the Canadian laws dealing with immigration to this country. In respect to the Chinese we have an open field. There is no treaty or arrangement of any kind between Great Britain and China dealing with this matter. The different governments which have been in power in Canada in the past years have however adopted a policy of restriction so far as Chinese immigration is concerned. A great deal of time and a great deal of consideration have been given to this question, and the regulations have been made as restrictive as possible. In 1885 a head tax of $50 was imposed. In 1901 that tax was doubled and made $100; and in 1904 it was increased to $500. It was thought at that time that the imposition of the higher tax would be prohibitive, and that we would not thereafter be troubled with immigration from the Chinese. However, the flow kept up. The Chinese, apparently, were quite willing to pay the $500, and they still came in in large numbers. In 1919 an Order in Council, known as P.C. 1202, was passed. This prohibited the entry into Canada at certain ports in British Columbia—all the ports of British Columbia I think—of skilled and unskilled labour, and that Order in Council applied to the Chinese as well as to other classes. Notwithstanding the passing of that Order in Council the Chinese still continued to come into the country. At first they came in as students. Apparently the Chinese who desired to come to Canada decided that it would be advisable for them to appear before the Canadians as students, and accordingly large numbers of so-called students entered the country. When that, to a certain extent, was stopped, and when the entry of students was confined to those who wished to attend universities conferring degrees, and could prove that they were going to do so, the wily Chinese adopted another plan. Those desirous of entering Canada became merchants, and last year 1,445 merchants came into the Dominion. It has been found that no matter how restrictive our regulations were, no matter how well they had been thought out and carefully planned, and no matter how stringently worded they were, the Chinese still kept coming into the country. In regard to the Japanese there is a treaty, known as the "Treaty of Commerce and Navigation", between the United Kingdom and Japan. This was signed at London, April 3, 1911, and the ratifications were exchanged at Tokio, May 5, 1911. That treaty provides, among other things, that:

The subjects of each of the High Contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel, and reside in the territories of the other, and, conforming themselves to the laws of the country,—

Shall, in all that relates to travel and residence, be placed, in all respects on the same footing as native subjects.

They shall have the right, equally with native subjects, to carry on their commerce and manufacture, and to trade in all kinds of merchandise of lawful commerce, either in person or by agents, singly, or in partnerships with foreigners and or native subjects.

They shall in all that relates to the pursuit of their industries, callings, professions, and educational studies be placed in all respects on the same footing as the subjects or citizens of the most favoured nation.

That treaty was assented to by Canada in 1913, under the Japanese Treaty Act of that year. In ratifying the treaty so far as Canada is concerned we provided:

That nothing in the treaty, or in the Act, shall be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Immigration Act.

That treaty came into operation on 17 July, 1911, and is to remain in force until 16 July, 1923, provided that:

In case neither of the High Contracting Parties shall have given notice to the other twelve months before the expiration of the said period, of its intention to terminate the Treaty, it shall continue operative until the expiration of one year from the date on which either of the High Contracting Parties shall have denounced it.

As regards the British dominions, colonies, possessions, and protectorates to which the present treaty may have been made applicable in virtue of article 26, however, either of the

High Contracting Parties shall have the right to terminate it separately at any time on giving twelve months' notice to that effect.

Now that treaty may, or may not, preclude us from adopting a policy of exclusion in regard to the Japanese—that is a matter as to which I do not care at this moment to express an opinion. But it has other effects. It prevents the legislatures of the various provinces from enacting what may be termed discriminatory legislation. In British Columbia, at various times in the past, enactments which might be placed in this class have been passed, and irrespective altogether of the political complexion of the majority of the legislature at that time. Last year the present Government passed an order in council which provided that all leases and grants of timber lands should contain the condition that Chinese and Japanese should not be employed thereon. That order in council was afterwards ratified by act of the provincial legislature. In February of this year a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada to the effect that that order in council and that act were ultra vires of the legislature of British Columbia, because the subject of naturalization and aliens, under the British North America Act, is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament, and because the act and the order in council cil conflicted with the treaty to which I have just referred. Now I submit that a request should be made to the British government to give notice to Japan to terminate that treaty in July of next year. That notice can be given by Great Britain on behalf of Canada without reference to the other parts of the Empire involved in the treaty. There is also in effect what is known as a "Gentleman's Agreement". In 1907, and previous to that time, large numbers of Japanese came into British Columbia; I think in 1907 over 7,000 Japanese landed on our shores. There was a great deal of objection to that from the people of British Columbia, and in the city of Vancouver there were unfortunately race riots which resulted in considerable damage. Upon the matter being brought to the attention of the government, the present incumbent of the Speaker's Chair of this House was sent to Japan to see if some friendly arrangement could not be made to restrict immigration from Japan to this country. Some kind of an arrangement was entered into which is the "Gentleman's Agreement" referred to. The terms of that agreement have not been made public, we have not been able to ascertain what they are; and it is questionable to my mind whether it is a proper thing to have an agreement of that kind in force and to place in the hands of a foreign nation the right to say who shall come to our country. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that that agreement should be cancelled.

Immigration laws of this country as they exist to-day are apparently objectionable to the Chinese. A despatch from Montreal, dated March 23, appeared in the Vancouver World on that date and reads as follows:

Canadian immigration laws as regards the Chinese are a disgrace and should be remedied without delay, declared Hon. C. Teur, Chinese consul-general to Canada, in the course of an address to members of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association here Wednesday.

"There is no reason why such discriminating laws should be in effect," he said. "Chinese labourers do not want to come to this country, but Chinese students do."

It is quite true that the Chinese have a right to complain, I think, that they are being badly treated, inasmuch as a head tax of $500 is imposed on any one of their subjects who desires to come to this country. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be much better, indeed, in that regard if a change were made, and that, instead of having the $500 head tax, we should have exclusion altogether of Chinese immigration to this country.

The Japanese are very fond of protesting against discrimination by Canadians against their people. It might be very interesting to look at the situation so far as Canadians in Japan are concerned. In Hansard of May 5 of this year, on page 1514, I find answers to questions which were handed in that day by the Prime Minister in reply to the hon. member from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie). These answers show that, in common with other foreigners, Canadians cannot, as individuals, hold land in Japan, and may not become owners of ships flying the Japanese flag, and may not, as individuals engage in mining. The answers continue:

They may not become shareholders of the Bank of Japan, the Yokohama Specie Bank, the Bank of Korea, the South Manchuria Railway Company, the Oriental Development Company and certain other companies, or of shipping companies in receipt of a Government subsidy. They may not become members or brokers of the various exchanges in Japan. They may not as individuals become members of Japanese Chambers of Commerce. They may not engage in the emigration business or hold shares in any company so engaged.

Foreign unskilled labourers may not pursue their callings in Japan outside the limits of the former foreign settlements or the "mixed residence" areas without the express permission of the administrative authorities. Labour-

ers for this purpose are defined as being persons engaged in labouring pursuits in connection with farming, fishing, mining, public works, building, manufacturing, transport, hauling (of vehicles), stevedoring and other forms of manual labour.

Hon. gentlemen will note that we have certain privileges over there and these restrictions do not apply to persons in domestic service or persons following the calling of cooks and waiters.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can a Canadian lease land in Japan or engage in agriculture?

Mr. McQUARRIE: As far as I know a Canadian may not lease land in Japan and may not engage in agriculture for profit.

I have had a great deal of difficulty in ascertaining the present oriental population of Canada. I have been struck with the dearth of information which is possessed by our immigration and other government officials in this respect, but I have been able to make an estimate from various sources. I find that, according to the 1911 census there were in Canada at that time 19,568, and in the whole of Canada 27,774 Chinese. I also find that immigration to Canada since 1911 has been 29,359 Chinese. I am told that the births of Chinese about equal the deaths. We may assume that we have a total of about 57,133 Chinese in Canada at the present time, and of this number there would be approximately 38,000 in British Columbia. It is to be noted that the Chinese population of Canada has doubled in the last ten years. I find also, according to the same census, that in 1911 there were 8,587 Japanese in British Columbia, and in the whole of Canada 9,021 Japanese, and that Japanese immigration to Canada since 1911 has amounted to 7,290. The birth rate of the Japanese is such that, I think it is safe to say, we have at least 16,311 Japanese in the country at the present time most of whom are in British Columbia. I have in my hand a pamphlet which was published by the Canadian-Japanese Association, which was sent to me through the mail some time ago. In that pamphlet it is stated that the Japanese population in Canada at the end of 1920 was only 15,453. Now of this number 7,153 were stated to be males of 20 years and upwards, and their occupations are given—fishermen, farmers, domestic servants, dock labourers, businessmen, etc. —As to the first, the number is placed at 1,467. We know that more than 1,467 Japanese were engaged in the fishing industry of British Columbia in 1920. The official returns from the Marine and Fishery Department show that in that year there were issued to the Japanese 2,227 gill net licenses, and 519 trolling licenses, making a total of 2,746 licenses. If you take it on the basis of two men to a boat—and I think there are at least two men connected with each one of the licenses,—you will find there were in 1920 engaged in the fishing industry in British Columbia 5,492 Japanese as actual fishermen. There are other licenses as well, as the hon. gentleman from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) points out. We have purse seine fishing for instance. If you take it on the same basis, the same proportion,—and take it for granted that the Japanese made the same mistake in giving the figures for the total population of Canada —you would find there was in Canada in 1920 a Japanese population of approximately 50,000. There have been many charges of surreptitious entry, more particularly in regard to the Japanese. I am not in a position to say whether those charges are justified or not. I would point out that the Japanese birth rate in British Columbia indicates that, in that province, there are many more Japanese than we have had any idea of. The Japanese birth rate in British Columbia is very alarming. These figures, which I am about to quote, were compiled by the Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada:

Year	Total Births in British Columbia	Japanese Births	Proportion of Japanese to Whites
1910..	5,005	20	1 in 252
1911..	5,841	30	1 in 198
1912..	8,008	43	1 in 186
1913..	11,088	80	1 in 138
1914..	10,418	172	1 in 61
1915..	10,516	303	1 in 35
1916..	9,841	280	1 in 31
1917..	9,433	321	1 in 29
1918..	9,010	393	1 in 23
1919..	10,022	386	1 in 26
1920..	11,532	657	1 in 17

For the first six months of 1921 the number of Japanese births was 438, which would be equivalent, in a growing ratio, to a total of not less than 900 for the year or about one in 13.

To verify the correctness of our figures let me give the figures for the birth rate in California. I quote from the San Francisco Examiner of September 14, 1921, a cartoon which is headed "Crowding of the Cradle." This gives California's birth rate statistics, birth record by races:

	Birth rate per 1,000
Japanese	69.4
Chinese	19.2
Whites	18.1
Negroes	16.7
Indians	10.7
Other races	4.9

The oriental population of Canada is largely confined to the province of British Columbia, and it is most noticeable in the cities. The condition in Vancouver gives a fair indication of what exists in all the principal cities of British Columbia. The orientals have made an alarming advance in the last few years. In 1920, out of 486 grocery licenses issued in Vancouver, 171 were granted to orientals. There were 80 oriental laundries; 713 orientals were employed in restaurants, 50 per cent of which were owned and operated by orientals. There are 62 oriental barber shops in Vancouver. Sixty per cent of the merchant tailors in Vancouver are orientals. Ninety per cent of the garden truck sold in Vancouver is produced by orientals. The truck gardening industry of British Columbia is controlled by the Chinese. They own or lease practically every acre of land in the Ashcroft district; they monopolize the Ashcroft potato industry, the truck industry at Lulu island, and the celery and truck industry in the Okanagan valley. In British Columbia, there are 1,080 Japanese and Chinese farmers employing large numbers of Asiatic farm help. Orientals own or lease or cultivate 26,919 acres of most fertile truck and orchard lands in the province. There are sixty logging camps in British Columbia owned and operated by Japanese. The Japanese have practically a monopoly of the British Columbia coast fisheries. I went into that subject so exhaustively a few days ago that I do not intend to give any statistics in that connection. They are engaged in exploiting nearly all our natural resources. They are in the hotel, grocery, drygoods and other businesses, almost every industry coming under their influence.

4 p.m.

This year, in the schools of Vancouver there are 1,045 oriental children who are seated side by side with white children in the class rooms. What will be the prospect five years hence when the heavy cradle roll swells that school population? Last year 1,448 Chinese merchants entered Canada to compete with the small traders in the commercial field. All British Columbia cities have their oriental sections, and some towns, notably Steveston at the mouth of the Fraser river, are almost exclusively composed of oriental establishments. The orientals have invaded the province of Alberta where they own or control many hotels, restaurants and laundries. They are also well established in the prairie provinces, and in eastern Canada. In Ontario, I understand, there are at the present time in the neighbourhood of 3,000 orientals.

The demand for exclusion is not a sectional one in any way; it is not limited to the province of British Columbia; but it is general and Dominion-wide. The legislature of British Columbia, following the policy of all previous governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, unanimously passed on November 1, 1921, these resolutions, and ordered copies to be sent to the Government, the leader of the Opposition, and the leader of the Progressive party.

1. That a respectful address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying him to convey to the Dominion Government through His Excellency the Governor General of Canada the respectful request of this House that the Dominion Government take the necessary steps under Article 27 of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between His Majesty the King and His Majesty the Emperor of Japan to request His Majesty the King to give His Majesty the Emperor of Japan twelve months' notice of the intention of termination of this treaty as far as the British Dominion of Canada is concerned.

2. That a respectful address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor praying him to convey to tne Dominion Government through His Excellency the Governor General of Canada the respectful request of this House that the Dominion Government amend the Immigration Act of Canada so as nearly as possible to totally restrict the immigration of Asiatics into this province, keeping in view the wishes of the people of British Columbia that this province be reserved for people of the European race, and that the Dominion Government consult with the Provincial Government on the proposed amendments.

At the Dominion convention of Retail Merchants' Association of Canada, held at Kingston last year, a resolution was passed calling for the exclusion of oriental immigration. In connection with the Retail Merchants' Association, this is a copy of a letter which has been sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King):

Retail merchants throughout B.C. are watching the McQuarrie resolution in the federal House, calling for oriental exclusion, with intense interest.

To us it is not merely a question of competitive merchandising, aggravated by lower standards of living. It is in fact a struggle of far deeper significance in which home, family

and citizenship considerations outweigh mercenary motives. We are solidly behind Mr. McQuarrie in his efforts to get federal action on this issue.

In view of this we urge that if, for any reason, it should not be possible to pass the resolution as it stands, your Government give the matter the serious consideration it urgently calls for.

As Canadian citizens first and retail merchants afterwards, we ask that this issue be constructively dealt with at this session of the federal House.

The situation of to-day is acute. The situation of to-morrow will be embittered. Can we with equanimity bequeath to the Canada of the future a race problem worse than the negro heritage in the southern States?

Many telegrams have been received from various branches of the association throughout the Dominion, endorsing the resolution.

The Great War Veterans Association at its Dominion convention held at Port Arthur in October last passed a resolution of this subject to the following effect:

Whereas, for many years past there has been an increasing influx of Chinese and Japanese into Canada, and especially British Columbia;

And whereas, the standard of living of such races makes it impossible to compete with them industrially, considering also that white men cannot buy land in Japan, and that the Chinese are the principal channels through which the drug habit is being spread in Canada;

And whereas, there is a great deal of unemployment among white men, and particularly returned soldiers in British Columbia;

And whereas, it is of the utmost importance that the present almost unbearable condition, due to the influx of the alien Asiatics into British Columbia, be dealt with without delay and in the interests of the people of this country;

Therefore be it resolved, that this convention go on record as being in favour of the exclusion hereafter of alien Asiatics;

And further, that legislation be enacted to prevent the sale and lease of land to said aliens either directly or indirectly;

And further, that the incoming Dominion executive be instructed to lay this resolution before the proper authorities and vigorously prosecute the same.

I may add that I have received telegrams respecting public meetings held in British Columbia which were specially called to press for the exclusion of orientals, one of these meetings having been held at Nanaimo and another at New Westminster quite recently.

I have also a telegram from Charles F. Macaulay, secretary of the Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada. That league, I am told, has a large and representative membership. The telegram is dated April 4, 1922, and is as follows:

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Forty thousand British Columbians, members of Asiatic Exclusion League stand solidly behind you in your fight for a white Canada.

The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, with a membership of something like 225,000, at its last annual convention held in Winnipeg, on August 22, 1921, passed a resolution calling for the exclusion of oriental immigration, and I also have here a letter from the president, Mr. Tom Moore, dated April 7, 1922, in which he says:

Organized labour in Canada is to-day asking for the total exclusion of oriental immigration, and item 3 (b) of the legislative requests, presented to the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet, asks for "Exclusion of Asiatics." This request is based upon the decision reached at our last convention held at Winnipeg, in August, 1921, when 694 delegates were assembled from all parts of Canada.

In past years the Trades and Labour Congress have actively supported measures for the restriction—

I would ask hon. members to pay particular attention to this part of the letter:

—of Asiatic immigration, but our experience has been that no effective restrictions have as yet been devised, as is illustrated by the present over-running of the province of British Columbia with orientals and the considerable extent to which the Chinese have spread through other parts of Canada, especially in the restaurant and laundry business.

The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada look upon this subject as one of national importance, and realizing the vast difference in the economic development of Canada and oriental countries, have become convinced that the only way in which Canada, especially the Pacific province, can be retained and developed in the interests of the white race, is by the immediate application of a policy of exclusion of further Asiatic immigration.

The United Farmers of British Columbia, at their last annual convention, held in Vancouver, on January 25th of this year, passed the following resolution:

Resolved that we are opposed to orientals owning or leasing land in the province of British Columbia.

That all oriental produce be marked as such.

That we go on record as against all leasing and selling of property to orientals.

That in future all oriental immigration be excluded from British Columbia.

Resolved, that this convention of the United Farmers of British Columbia suggest to the Government that a graduated tax, according to the numbers of orientals employed, be placed on all employers of orientals in the province. This to apply to all oriental employers as well as to white employers, and that all proceeds be placed to the credit of the hospitals of the rural districts of the province, and cities wherein collected.

Then we have the Army and Navy Veterans, Disabled Soldiers' Association; we have Farmers' Institutes; we have various

trades unions; we have teachers' associations; we have city councils; we have boards of trade; we have the Native Sons of British Columbia, and other organizations, all demanding the exclusion of oriental immigration.

The question has excited Dominion-wide interest, articles having appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press, the Toronto Telegram, Macleans Magazine and other publications, and it is now no longer a question of purely provincial significance.

I submit that drastic action is necessary. Modern history affords notable examples of the danger of bringing into a country races which cannot be assimilated. Our great neighbour to the south has a serious race problem in the negro population of the southern states. Who could have foretold that so many millions of negroes would have descended from the comparatively small number of slaves imported from Africa? That problem is entirely internal, and apparently nothing can be done to solve it.

The United States also has another grave problem in the Japanese menace. Hawaii is overrun by the yellow race. The United States census gives the population of the Hawaiian islands at 255,000, the Japanese portion of which numbers 114,000.

The Japanese practically control the island, not only in a business sense but in the political sense. When I visited Honolulu a few years ago I learned the reason why the Hawaiian Islands had gone to the United States. It appears that the Hawaiians were afraid they would be taken over by the Japanese. They sent their king and queen to London and offered their islands to the British Empire. The statesmen over there, unfortunately, did not see fit to accept the gift; they thought the islands were valueless and that they would only be a burden to the Empire. Later on uncle Sam got his chance and took over the islands. They became a great national asset. Not only was there a large production of sugar in these islands, but they furnished a strategic naval base in the mid-Pacific. At the entrance to Honolulu harbour the Americans established a fortress in the crater of an extinct volcano, which is one of the greatest fortresses in the world. Now, the Japanese kept on going into the Hawaiian Islands, and I am afraid that the islands have turned out to be a liability rather than an asset to the United States.

Having accomplished his desire in Hawaii the enterprising Jap turned his attention to the mainland of the United States, invading the states of California, Oregon and Washington. To-day these states have their oriental problem, which is almost exclusively a Japanese problem. Last year a large meeting was held in Vancouver at which this subject was discussed. That meeting was addressed by Alderman Phillip Tindall, of Seattle, who referred to the conditions existing in the state of Washington as very alarming, and pointed out that nearly one-third of the grocery stores in Seattle were Japanese and nearly one-third of the hotels and lodging houses owned or leased by Japanese, though operated, possibly, by white managers. I quote from a report of that meeting:

> "It is a fight for life between the white and the brown race" said Mr. Tindall. "We must insist upon this being a white man's land". He predicted that if steps were not taken now to put a stop to the menace, the time was not far distant when bloody war must result, because the white man would assuredly not allow himself to be crowded out when he became aroused to the danger.

In California there is a Japanese population of approximately 100,000, and with the alarming birth rate to which I have already referred, the situation is very serious. The Californians have been taking active measures to exclude the Japanese from that state. I hold in my hand a brief prepared for the State Department at Washington on behalf of the Japanese Exclusion League of California, in support of the declaration of principles on the part of the league as approved by the California Legislature. That declaration is in part as follows:

> This is our country, and we are under no obligations to admit any foreigner; that we should tactfully but firmly let the world know that we claim the right to exclude any one we wish to exclude; that the life of this democracy depends upon the sort of immigrants admitted; that there is nothing discreditable to the Japanese in our attitude on this question; that we will not admit them because they do not and cannot assimilate and because in economic competition they drive our people to the wall; that we will not admit immigration freely under such conditions from any country no matter what the consideration offered or the consequences involved.

I submit that is a declaration which could be subscribed to by all Canadians, more particularly by British Columbians, who will I am convinced stand solidly behind our cousins in California in their demand for exclusion.

The question which naturally presents itself is, why should orientals be excluded? I have put down certain reasons in brief

and concise form. I will read them to the House:

1. They cannot be assimilated. They will always exist as a foreign element in our midst. The real test of assimilation is intermarriage. The divergence of characteristics of the two races is so marked that intermarriage does not tend to perpetuate the good qualities of either race. The races are fundamentally different. Their morals are different, and language, heredity, religion and ideals will militate against and prevent even sociological assimilation of orientals. In this connection I refer to the California brief, page 42. So far as I am aware, intermarriage between the white and the oriental has always produced unsatisfactory results. Japan does not encourage intermarriage. In the Japanese pamphlet before referred to, the claim is made that the Japanese can be assimilated and can become good Canadians but it is not suggested that they should intermarry. To quote again from the California brief, page 38: "They (the Japanese) are undesirable as immigrants and permanent residents because they and their children form an unassimilable alien element which cannot be absorbed in the melting pot of this country." Exactly the same arguments will apply to the Chinese.

Now, I have here certain articles which have been written on this subject. I am not going to read them all to the House, but there is one from which I would like to read a short extract. It is an article by H. Glynn-Ward, published in the Vancouver World on March 14, 1921. It reads, in part:

> Between the Orient and the Occident there is more than a mere ocean, there is a great divide, intangible and insurmountable. The leopard cannot change his spots any more than a white man can be orientalized or an oriental be brought to live by the customs and laws of the European. The morals of the one are neither worse nor better than the other; but they are different. So different that an attempt to combine them can result in nothing but disaster.
>
> Marriage between orientals and whites has never been known to produce anything but degradation for both because it is an unnatural thing. Therefore, as the Japanese can never in a thousand years assimilate with whites to produce a race desirable as future Canadians, their influx into the country and the hold they are taking thereof is unwise and undiplomatic.

Now, the Japanese cannot object to the principle of exclusion, because they themselves have adopted it in regard to the Koreans and the Chinese. In this connection I would again refer to the California brief, which at page 37 says that the policy of exclusion so far as it applies to labour skilled and unskilled is that followed rigorously by the Japanese themselves under Imperial Ordinance 352 against Koreans and Chinese. The reason she assigns is that to permit entrance into Japan of such aliens whose standards of living are lower than the Japanese would submit their own people to disastrous competition. That is the argument that we ourselves make. The standards of living of the Japanese are certainly lower than ours. They live in a different way altogether, and in British Columbia they do not conform to our customs to any great extent. They are a foreign settlement in our midst, and they cannot be assimilated.

2. If their peaceful penetration is allowed to continue it will eventually lead to racial conflict and international unpleasantness.

In this connection I would again point to the Vancouver riots in 1907, and say that if some action is not taken by this Government, riots just as bad or worse are likely to happen.

3. Their standards of living are lower than those of our people.

4. Our people cannot compete with the Japanese and Chinese in certain lines.

5. Unemployment will be decreased.

6. They are responsible, to a certain extent, for the drug traffic.

7. They cannot become good Canadians because of their dual citizenship. Even if they become naturalized, they do not divest themselves of their allegiance to their own emperor.

8. It is desirable that we should have a white Canada and that we should not become a yellow or mongrel nation. This is a great national question and our future progress and prosperity are at stake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the practical question: What should be done? My answer is threefold:

1. The Japanese Treaty should be abrogated, so far as Canada is concerned.

2. The "Gentlemen's Agreement" should be cancelled.

3. The Immigration Act should be amended so as to provide for exclusion. The details of this will have to be worked out by the Government.

Mr. ALFRED STORK (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, this is a question which very vitally affects the province of British Columbia, and as a member from that province I am very pleased to have the opportunity of rising in support of this resolution. We have in this House thirteen

members from the province of British Columbia, and it is very pleasing to know that all thirteen are unanimous, so far as I can gather, in their opinion towards this resolution.

The oriental first came to the Pacific coast in 1849 at the time of the California gold rush, and the people of California were tremendously pleased with the orientals because they were of the opinion that the fame of their mines had challenged the attention of the whole world, and that the fact of men coming from China bore tribute to the fact that California was a big mining country. In the first Fourth of July parade ever held in San Francisco, orientals took part, lending to it an air of novelty and oriental splendour which was very pleasing to the people of California. But the joy of the Californians was very soon turned to dismay when they discovered the effect that the orientals were having on the social and economic life of the state of California. From California the orientals spread north into the province of British Columbia. The British Columbians had at their disposal the experience of the people of California, and those earlier settlers of the Pacific coast province did not view with a great deal of approbation the influx of the oriental, because they believed that as the number of orientals increased, the opportunities for the white race decreased, and so we find that in the first session of the first legislature conveyed in the province of British Columbia in the year 1872, a resolution was passed calling for a head tax of $50 on every Chinaman coming into the country. In the same session a resolution was passed prohibiting the employment of orientals on public works. In 1874 a resolution was introduced calling for a head tax on orientals. In 1876 there was a resolution asking for a tax of $10 per head on all males wearing long hair in the shape of a pig-tail or cue. In 1878 a resolution was passed that every Chinese person over twelve years of age should take out a license of $10, payable every three months in advance. In 1878 the oriental question was discussed for the first time in the federal parliament. In 1884 the member for Victoria in this House moved a resolution to exclude orientals altogether from the province of British Columbia—a resolution very similar to the one we are debating to-day. In 1885 a bill was passed imposing a tax of $50 per head on Chinese. In 1891 seventy petitions were received from the province of British Columbia by this Parliament praying for the total exclusion of orientals. In 1892 more petitions were received by this Parliament than had been received in 1891. In 1899 the head tax was increased to $100, and in 1902 it was again increased to $500. Last year the province of British Columbia enacted legislation to prohibit orientals from taking part in any work on government contracts. This legislation, we understand, has since been disallowed. I am not prepared to discuss the disallowance of that act of the British Columbia legislature, any more than to say this, that the very fact of the legislature of British Columbia deeming it wise and expedient to enact such legislation simply goes to prove the absolute and complete necessity of having something done to restrict the progress and the march of the oriental so far as British Columbia is concerned.

All of these proceedings that I have related were accompanied by much argument, by long speeches and lengthy talks in the various legislatures, and there were some very great prophecies as to what would happen if oriental immigration was not somewhat curtailed. We are to-day in the presence of prophecies matured, prophecies fulfilled. The seed has been sown, and the harvest is here. We find that these various acts and the different attempts that have been made to deal with this question have to a very large extent merely skirted around the question. There has never yet been a comprehensive dealing with the issue. We find legislation passed against men with long hair; we find that a head tax has been imposed from time to time, but these attempts have been altogether ineffectual to cope with the situation. We are now confronted with a fifty years' growth problem. There is an old saying, and a very true one, that possession is nine points of the law.

I believe that it is good policy to settle this oriental problem with the oriental while the white population is still in possession of the province of British Columbia, rather than to defer the settlement of the issue until the time when the oriental himself is in full and complete possession of that great province. One of the serious handicaps, Sir, that we suffer from, I think, is the handicap of indifference. There was a time when that great stretch of country now known as the states of Oregon and Washington was British territory—the Columbia river was supposed to be the international boundary.

When the question of boundaries arose and demanded settlement, tradition has it that one of the officials dealing with that question stated that the country was of no use for the reason that the salmon in the Columbia river would not rise to the fly. I am not prepared to say whether that story is true or not; but I believe that indifference had a great deal to do with the moving of the international boundary up to the forty-ninth parallel. Later on we had the Alaskan boundary award. If you will look at the map you will find that there is a very small, narrow strip of northern coast line of what used to be British Columbia but is now part of Alaska. This piece of coast line is not of any particular benefit to Alaska because they possess no hinterland. But it is a very vital land to the province of British Columbia because the location of the boundary line deprives us of over half of the coast line of our province, and we find ourselves to-day without sufficient ground upon it to erect even a wireless station. Take the Premier mine, the richest in British Columbia—I might even say the richest on the North American continent. That mine is in Canada within half a mile of the international boundary. The product is brought down to tide water by means of a tram line, extending for a distance of thirteen miles, and this tram line travels almost entirely through American territory. In covering the northern part of my constituency I have to travel through Alaska by way of Skaguay, the White pass and Yukon railway. The people of Canada regard this, I suppose, as a matter-of-fact proposition. They say no doubt "Well, that coast line belongs to Alaska" and they are very largely indifferent to it. But to the people who live on the northwest Pacific coast this is a very vital matter. To-day we are having daily reminders of the disabilities under which we suffer, and I may say that in the settlement of that question indifference on our part played a very large part.

So we find ourselves to-day confronted with the silent and the steady absorption of the province of British Columbia by the orientals. A few years ago the Japanese were regarded as a simple, childlike and interesting people; but experience has shown us that they are the very incarnation of commercial aggressiveness. In the year 1920 in the matter of the number of post office money orders sent out of Canada, the United States had the largest number, Great Britain was second, and Japan was third. We find in the same year that the total number of money orders sent to Japan from Canada was 28,807; and the number of money orders arriving in Canada from Japan was 434. These oriental people came to British Columbia willing and anxious to serve; but, Sir, they have no intention of remaining as servants. The Jap who pulled the oar in the fishing boat on the Skeena river is now in full possession of a gasoline launch operating on the Fraser river. He has performed menial tasks in the cannery and incidentially he has mastered the fishing business; and so we find that he is now in the fishing game on his own hook, so to speak. The humble cook who has done the work in the lumber camp has, at the same time, made himself conversant with the lumber industry; and we find throughout the province of British Columbia that a great deal of the lumbering business is carried on there by Japs who first took their post-graduate course through the cookhouse door. The chore boy who has done the chores on the farm is now the man who owns or leases the farm on which he was formerly employed as a servant, and the oncoming hordes which are operating in Canada are glad to do the menial work in connection with that province. So as master and servant we find them working in perfect unison; they are proceeding to roll up the map of western Canada so that one day we shall find that the summit of the Rocky mountains will be the western boundary for the white population of this Dominion. There is no lure on the plains and the prairies of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba for the oriental. It requires brain and muscle, intelligence and patience to farm successfully in that vigorous climate, and the oriental prefers the warm sunshine, the mild climate and the fertile valleys of British Columbia,—British Columbia with its wealth of fisheries, of timber, of agriculture; the California of Canada which fronts on the Pacific whose waves wash the coast of Canada as well as the shores of the Orient.

An unequal contest, Mr. Speaker, is going on in the province of British Columbia. The white man is handicapped by the responsibilities of civilization; the oriental is prepared to struggle for his solitary existence. Organized society has erected a fabric and an institution to which the oriental contributes nothing. He is not concerned in municipal, provincial or federal problems; he is filling a field that would solve the unemployment problem in western Can-

ada. He is the human teredo so far as organized labour is concerned, because he has created an industrial stratum into which the white man cannot descend. If the final occupation and possession of British Columbia is to be determined by such an unequal contest, we from British Columbia decline to enter such a contest. This is our country and we regard this House as the proper tribunal in which to state our case. We ask this House to pass an act for the total and absolute exclusion of all orientals on the ground of pressing economic necessity. If in the considering of this problem the principle of sacrifice is involved, I have no hesitation in saying that I am opposed to the sacrificing of Canadians for the benefit of orientals, or the inhabitants of any other country. If the powers who settled the terms of peace in the Old Country had decided that British Columbia was to be given over to the oriental you would find the people of this country on their feet to a man disputing that proposition; you would find them once more pledging the last man and the last dollar in defence of British territory. Let me say that thirty-three years of knowledge of the conditions in British Columbia justifies me in expressing the belief that unless we deal with this matter we are parting with the province of British Columbia just as effectually as if we gave British Columbia away by signing a treaty.

Mr. CARROLL: I did not wish to interrupt the hon. member's argument while he was speaking but I would like now to ask him a question. Does he argue that we are incapable of contending in commercial life with the Japanese or Chinese? Is that my hon. friend's argument?

Mr. STORK: In reply to my hon. friend I would say that they have a standard of living so much lower than ours that they are gradually absorbing the province of British Columbia.

Mr. W. T. LUCAS (Victoria, Alta.): As the seconder of this resolution I would like to say that while it was introduced by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), and while perhaps the oriental question is more acute in the province of British Columbia at the present time than in any other province of the Dominion, yet I submit the question is one that vitally affects the Dominion as a whole. The hon. member for Prince Rupert (Mr. Stork) who has just taken his seat made the statement that this question did not affect the prairie provinces to the same extent as it did British Columbia. While that is true at present, yet the time is fast approaching when we on the prairies are going to be confronted with the keen competition of the oriental. Permit me to say at the outset that I do not wish to say anything detrimental to the members of the oriental races. But their standard of living is a lower standard than ours, and, therefore, we are not able to compete with them. I am speaking more from the point of view of the prairies and other parts of Canada, because I believe the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia will deal fully with the question as it affects their province. One of the reasons the orientals are not engaged in agriculture on the prairies to-day is that they are too wise to engage in an industry that is being conducted at a loss. I will give the House a few facts regarding the question in Alberta, in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. An oriental living in the town near my farm two years ago purchased a quarter section which contained as fine land as it is possible to obtain in the province. He engaged in mixed farming, that branch of the business which we were told would be a panacea for all our ills. After putting in two years he allowed his farm to go, accepted a loss of $2,000, and, in his own words, stated "It did me no good, no money in farming." If agriculture comes back to the stage where it belongs, to a condition of prosperity, they might take it up. The oriental came into British Columbia in the early days and engaged in the laundry business. We always connected an oriental with the laundry. He worked in the laundry business until to-day, in that province, we find that he has control of that business and of the fishing business; he is fast getting into the lumber business, and fruit farming. As he succeeds in one business he pushes on to other fields, and I do not think the climate will prevent him from coming to the prairies and other parts of Canada, as soon as he sees that he can make a success of it. Coming to Ontario, we find that in Toronto last year $1,820,000 was paid by the public to Chinese laundries. We come to the capital of the Dominion and we find 65 Chinese laundries, 4 grocery stores and 21 restaurants. Out of 21 restaurants 12 are not being conducted in such a way that they would be recognized as Chinese restaurants; they are being conducted under other names. They are called the Metropolitan, Hamilton, Kingston,

Chicago, British, Elgin, New York, Boston and other names. These are the restaurants. Of course the public do not know whom they are patronizing. Coming to Montreal, I find an item in the press of Friday last which reads:

> Found dying in her room at 367 St. Dominique street at ten o'clock last night, a girl, who is known as Anita, passed away before medical attention could be given. It is suspected that the girl died as the result of drug poisoning, and the police are looking for a Chinaman, who is an alleged drug peddler, and who was with the girl some time before she died.

This is a very vital question, Mr. Speaker. We find the Chinese engaged in this drug traffic which is demoralizing the standards of our people. One of the greatest problems before our government to-day is the immigration policy. The Government are trying to decide whom they will admit to this country, and I think we have a perfect right to decide that question. We should give very close consideration to the oriental, with his lower standard of living, and we should consider also the fact that he cannot assimilate with our people. We do not want any class of people in this country who cannot be assimilated and who will not in time make good Canadians. I should like to hear expressions from both sides of the House, because this is not a party question or a sectional or provincial question. We should deal with it in a truly national way. I have much pleasure in seconding the motion.

Mr. GEORGE BLACK (Yukon): I will not attempt to discuss the subject matter of this resolution in detail, but propose to address to the House a few general remarks, and present my own judgment and the conclusions that I have arrived at from experience and actual knowledge of the state of affairs. I do not need to be told by any one of the seriousness of this menace which faces us to--day. If members present are not fully informed on this question, they cannot do better than give an attentive hearing to the members who have come here prepared to discuss this subject from every angle, without partisanship and without a tinge of politics, but to discuss it as Canadians, in view of the effect that it is having and will continue to have on our national life, and to discuss it without any personal antagonism to the Asiatics, coming to Canada, because the more convinced one is of their undesirability in this country the more we must admire them for their good judgment in coming.

[Mr. Lucas.]

The House will not fail to become convinced of the sincerity of hon. members who address it on the subject, when it learns that actually the life blood of constituencies represented here is being sucked out by these orientals, and the commercial life of these constituencies is being undermined. Labour is being, not temporarily, but permanently, thrown out of employment. The standard of living in these constituencies is being reduced. Countless whites, young men and young women, are being mentally and physically ruined by the contact with these orientals.

For my part I need no convincing; I have personally encountered this menace and have seen it grow in volume. I have seen the white man retreat before the menace, as helpless to prevent it, or to hold it back, as he is to prevent the rising tide of the sea. The only thing for the white man to do is to retreat, back up, flee before that tide overwhelms him. Under present conditions it is impossible for him to do otherwise. If hon. members are not seized of this menacing condition of their own knowledge, they cannot fail to be convinced by other hon. gentlemen who to-day, with their fellow-citizens in the various constituencies, are engaged in a struggle for existence against the Asiatics. That fact shows the seriousness of the problem. Being convinced that defensive measures and action are now necessary, I am sure hon gentlemen will not be so remiss in their duty as to delay taking defensive action and taking it forthwith, by supporting the resolution before the House.

The remedy is simple; it is entirely in our hands, as a government, as a Parliament and as a people. Heretofore, the policy of governments in Canada in dealing with this question has been one of "hush, hush." It has been something to be spoken of in whispers, not in plain, understandable language. We were, in an unexplainable way, perhaps, given to understand that if governments did speak up and say what they felt, thought and wanted, some terrible calamity would happen to Canada. Just where this was going to come from was not quite clear; but, at any rate, we were told that we must speak the truth in whispers. In fact, an attempt was made to convince Canada that this was a cross that we must bear without murmuring. I think the time has come to stop this pussy-footing and to deal with this matter squarely, to make it understood by all Canadians, no matter what part of Canada they live in, and further than that,

to make the position of Canada clear before the world. Let us take our stand and to maintain it.

It is said that, if orientals were excluded from Canada, a trade boycott would ensue. Well, better lose trade even to the extent of shutting out Chinese eggs than surrender the country. Hon. members may feel that the words "surrender the country" are extravagant. I do not think so. If you turn to British Columbia, you will find large portions of that province, which is a part of Canada, surrendered already to the oriental and completely and wholly under oriental control. Why does this happen in British Columbia? Simply because British Columbia is the outpost nearest to the invading army. If China and Japan were situated to the east of Canada and eastern Canada was nearer to Japan and China than the west and British Columbia, the eastern provinces would be the first to feel the force of the invading army which would spread from east to west instead of from west to east, as the movement is directed now. The invaders are consolidating their position in British Columbia; they have made their way into Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the advance guard is right here in Ottawa making its presence felt. Do not make any mistake about that. Soon, the people of eastern Canada, as the people of British Columbia to-day are, will be battling with these people for an existence. That is what this invasion amounts to. It will soon be too late to rid ourselves of this scourge—and it is nothing less—by any such simple methods as are open to the country to-day.

In my constituency, the Yukon, we have only, I am happy to say, an insignificant number of Japanese and no Chinamen. The Yukon is so situated that people coming into that country by any feasible route are obliged to come through the territory of Alaska, through territory governed by the United States, and the presence of a level-headed immigration officer at practically the only point of ingress gives him an opportunity to use very good judgment as to who shall cross that boundary and who shall not. Consequently, we are not troubled by this class of undesirables. Once upon a time it was reported that a large influx of Chinamen might be expected into the gold fields of the Klondyke. The miners of that district, who are a law-abiding class of people, considered this an event of such importance that it should receive special consideration from them. Consequently, a very large reception committee was appointed to meet those visitors, and it was definitely understood that the members of that committee would not leave behind them that innocent implement of their occupation, the very useful pick-handle. Somehow, the word went out to the Chinamen that they would be met with due ceremony, and for some reason the visitation was postponed and to this day we have not had a Chinaman in the Yukon.

Canada wants settlers; but she wants only settlers who will adopt Canadian and British ideals, people who will become Canadians. We want only races which will intermingle and which can intermarry with our people and become not only with us, but of us. The Asiatics are not of those races. With them, naturalization is nothing more or less than a farce. A naturalized Japanese remains a Jap and a naturalized Chinaman remains a Chink, no matter what forms they may go through in Canada. The Japanese government does not recognize naturalization of its citizens in this country, and they are never released from their allegiance to Japan. Why should we go further?

Some sentimentalist has referred to these people as our "little brown brothers". As a matter of fact, in case some hon. gentleman may think of these people as little, innocent, harmless brown men, let me tell the House that many of them are not little at all, but great, big, hulking giants. I have seen them and know them. But it has been said, with a good deal more practical force—"what about these people for brothers-in-law?" It is all very well to refer to them as brothers; but would any hon. gentleman of this House consider an alliance between a sister or a daughter of his and a Chinaman or a Japanese? Is there an hon. member to whom such an alliance would appeal? That is what will happen if we allow these people to invade our land, to colonize it and to breed as they are doing on our soil. We must face that sooner or later.

Personally, I am strongly in favour of the total exclusion of Asi-

5 p.m. atics, and I would go further; I would advocate expropriating the property of those who are now here and deporting them to the land whence they come. There are enough here now to constitute a serious menace, because they are the advance guard of the forces who are yet to come. Can anything be said in favour of surrendering Canada to the Asiatics?—because

that is what our present policy ultimately means. Supposing a million or, perhaps, ten million of these people took it into their heads to come here at once as fast as ships could carry them, would any hon. member hesitate a moment to do everything in his power to stop that movement, to head off that invasion, even by the exercise of the last atom of power and force at his disposal? If so, then why hesitate now to put an end to this peaceful penetration which ultimately means millions and, in the end, surrender? This is a sort of painless method, but it results in the same thing after all. Can Kipling's words: "Daughter am I in my mother's house, but mistress in my own" be more applicable than in referring to Canada's ability to deal with this question herself?

I am convinced that there is no constitutional difficulty in the way, that there will be no rupture of diplomatic relations, and that the power to deal wisely, decisively and effectively with this question has been rightly reserved to Canada. This phase of the case will be made clearer to you by members who will follow me.

Now, admitting that we have the authority, let us be men, let us be Canadians, and let us not turn a deaf ear to that S.O.S. call for help from the people on the front line out there in British Columbia. For that is what it is. If their present plight does not move hon. gentlemen from eastern parts of Canada, let them remember that the condition of the people of the West to-day will be their condition to-morrow. That ought to appeal to them and dispel their apathy. Let them take action forthwith, commencing with the support of this resolution, towards making and keeping Canada a white man's country. It is our country. Should we have to show cause why we should keep it for ourselves and for those that we consider it wise to invite to join us in its development?

I submit that hon. members can do nothing more effective as patriotic Canadians, wishing to keep Canada a white man's country, than by supporting the resolution now before the House.

Mr. J. A. CLARK (Burrard): There is an old saying that it is better to see once than to hear a hundred times, I can readily understand the apathy with which this question is received not only by this House, but by the people of Canada, and by the white world, because the great majority of the white world at any rate have not seen, and although they may have heard many times, I am afraid, the appeals fall on deaf or irresponsive ears.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a British Columbia question, it is not even a Canadian question, but it is a question which vitally affects the white world to-day. In my opinion the basic factor in the future of the white race is a racial type. That is the basic factor in the future of the Dominion, and if our race is to be mixed with that of an oriental country, we cannot have a racial type. We cannot assimilate the yellow races, nor, as a matter of fact, any colored races. You have only to go back to the earliest history of the white race in confirmation of that statement. We find the white race first in the west Central Asia, that is its cradle, and to-day west Central Asia is a colored country.

Take briefly the history of the white race for the past four hundred years. Going back to 1500 we find that the white race then occupied territorially about 2,000,000 square miles; to-day about 22,000,000—ten times as much; as compared with 31,00,000 occupied by the colored races. Take our own British Isles, in 1500 the population was 3,000,000; in 1900, 45,000,000. And take the growth of Europe, in 1500, 70,000,000; in 1800, 150,000,000; in 1900, 450,000,000—an increase in the 100 years of 400 per cent.

But it is very significant that although the white race increased so tremendously in that hundred year period, it composed only four-tenths of the total population of the world; and more significant still, of a total of 550,000,000 white people throughout the world in 1914, four-fifths occupied one-fifth of the white territorial area. In other words, one-fifth of the total white population occupied four-fifths of the total white area.

Now, there are very significant features connected with that white development during those four hundred years, and the first and most outstanding, I think, is the tremendous expansion politically in that period of the world's history. In 1914 nine-tenths of the total world area was controlled politically by the white race, as compared with one-twenty-fifth in 1500. The world trade had increased from $2,000,000,000 in 1800, to $22,000,000,000 in 1900, and to $40,000,000,000 in 1910.

Those are outstanding features of our development. But the transitory character of that imposing political control is shown by the world war. How many countries

were upset politically during four short years of war? Let us look back at the history of Greece and Rome, and how short was the period it took to upset their political control of the world. The same possibilities exist to-day, and we have only to review the last twenty years of our history to show the seriousness of the present situation in regard to the white race.

I think the first and most outstanding feature is the declining birthrate. And unfortunately the most useful part of our stock is not propagating; it is the least useful that is increasing in numbers. The result can mean only one thing—race deterioration.

The second outstanding feature is the effect of the result of the Russo-Japanese war of 1904 upon the oriental mind, and I venture to say that it will prove to be one of the turning-points of world history. The effect upon the oriental mind is something that we have not yet comprehended. It showed the oriental that the white man, even in war, is not deteriorating. And then we had what we all call the Great War, but which might be called the white civil war, because as a result of it fifty million white persons laid down their lives. Think of the effect on future generations of having so many of our best men killed off and having thousands who lived so impaired in health as to be under a great disadvantage in life. Turning to the present day, you find the white races torn with domestic dissension. On the other hand, what do we find on the part of the oriental countries? There is no perceptible decline in the birth rate; on the contrary, we find that the population of Japan is increasing at the rate of 800,000 per annum. They must, therefore, have an outlet for their surplus population; and the same is true of China. Now, this is the question we must ask ourselves: What are the openings for immigration from those countries? There is the island to the north of Japan, Hokkaido; there is Formosa, Korea, Manchuria, Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan, North and South America, Australia, and the islands, peninsulas, and so on between China and Australia. For some generations at any rate, these countries will provide a field for Chinese immigrants, but not so with Japan, because all these countries, with the exception of the Americas and Australia, are subject to extremes of climate. Japan is a country which is temperate in climate, and so far the Japanese have not emigrated to countries or sections of countries with extreme climates. Their eyes, therefore, are turned to-day upon the United States, Canada—largely the Pacific Coast—and portions of South America and Australia. I submit we must take our stand on this question and take it at once. We must be firm; we must be clear and definite in our policy. If we do that we shall be respected; if we do not, we shall be treated contemptuously. If hon. members are interested in the ambitions of the oriental countries to-day I would refer them to a book which has been published this year, entitled "The Rising Tide of Colour," by Lothrop Stoddard. It contains a complete analysis of the subject, and deals with the ambitions of those races in a clear, interesting and illuminating manner.

When I refer, Mr. Speaker, to this menace that we are facing I do not look at it from a military point of view. It is not the conquest of our country by a coloured army that is to be feared so much as that enduring conquest which is bound to result from unlimited immigration into a white country. It is a matter for the white race, particularly the Canadian white race, to consider and deal with now before the menace becomes such that our whole country is more seriously threatened than it is to-day. I am in entire agreement with my fellow members from British Columbia, and I sincerely hope that this House will take the matter firmly in hand without delay.

Mr. C. H. DICKIE (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session I unburdened my soul to some extent with respect to the question of the exclusion of orientals as viewed by one who comes from the Pacific coast. During a residence of nearly forty years in that part of the country I have had numerous opportunities of observing the oriental and the effect which his immigration to the Pacific coast has had on our national life. Previous speakers have dealt fully with this matter and I associate myself with all that has been said, except, possibly, the suggestions which have been made as to the deportations of Japanese; it cannot be conceded that that is possible at the present time.

As to the Anglo-Japanese alliance, I never quite realized just what it meant until early in the war when the Pacific coast was in danger of invasion by the German warships Nuremberg and Scharnhorst. The people in Victoria, my home city, were alarmed for fear these warships would make a raid on the city. We had at that time an obsolete warship called

the Rainbow, and two submarines, but we were not sanguine as to the result of an engagement, should one occur, between them and one of the up-to-date German warships. South of us there were warships belonging to our American cousins, but they were swinging indolently on their anchors and we began to think that the words—"blood is thicker than water" were meaningless. However, on the morning of the 23rd of August there came steaming into the harbour of Victoria the battleship Idzuma, an up-to-date armoured cruiser, swarming with little brown men, and we gave a mighty cheer for Japan when we saw that ship; we knew then that we should receive ample protection. Five days later the Newcastle came in, followed by two more ships of the Japanese navy and then, Sir, we in British Columbia realized the importance of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. This question is a very important one indeed; it must be dealt with diplomatically and not by demagogues, otherwise the danger will be great. We are not allowed privileges in Japan which we concede to the Japanese people in this country. Although the difficulties are great, I have no doubt that an arrangement could be entered into with Japan that would ameliorate our condition with respect to this invasion.

It is impossible for us to compete with the Japanese in British Columbia. People say: Why, you are of the white race; you are a virile people; can you not compete with the Japanese? We cannot compete with them for this reason: their standard of living is away below ours, and they work, men, women and children, all hours, and longer hours than our labouring men will work, longer than we would want them to work. They have a community of interest and of activities to themselves. They work together with one aim in view, and work incessantly. We cannot compete with them industrially, we cannot compete with them agriculturally. They are entering into every line of our business, and we of British Columbia who have lived there so long want to retain that country for the white man. I remember distinctly having to leave the province of Ontario many years ago. I left there because at that time the manufacturing interests in Ontario could not compete with our southern neighbours and many of us, indeed, the majority of the young men of Ontario and the maritime provinces, went into American territory because better opportunities awaited us there than were to be had in Canada, and six out of every ten of those people who went were of Scottish descent, and when a Scotchman has to leave a country there is something wrong with its economic conditions. I remember some longshoremen stood on the wharf at Victoria one day watching a ship go by. One of them said, "It is a Norwegian ship," another said "It looks like a German," but an Irishman said "It is a Scotch ship." They asked him why, and Pat said "It must be Scotch because there are no sea gulls following it."

I believe that an immigration policy can be enacted that will keep from obtaining a foothold in our country people with whose descendants our descendants cannot intermarry. We cannot conceive of a commingling of the blood of our Canadians with that of the Ethiopians; we cannot conceive of a commingling of our blood with that of Asiatics. The little Jap desires to keep his blood pure just as we Canadians do. I have spent some time in Japan and I know that the Eurasian, part European and part Japanese, is simply persona non grata among the educated classes; he is not even respected by the coolie classes. They wish to preserve their race pure and, as the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Black) told us, they will be Japanese for all generations. They come to our country, they have a right to come here, and I have a great admiration for these little people, but we cannot withstand their incursions. We or our descendants must either leave the country, or they must be prevented from coming in. Even though not another Japanese came to our country, we have still a stupendous problem on our hands in British Columbia. We have a tremendous birthrate among the Japanese that are there. It has been estimated that in nine years from now there will be as many Japanese children born in British Columbia as white children. You can realize what that means in a country such as we have, hemmed in with lofty mountains, with not too much arable land, and with the Japanese scattered along the coast. We can never have a dense population in British Columbia, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if we allowed the Japanese to come in unchecked for two years, they would simply drive every white man out of British Columbia with the exception of those engaged in transportation and matters of that kind. I never could see where it was possible for a white man to succeed in Japan except in some financial institution or with some transportation system.

I know the psychology of the Jap fairly well, I think, as well as most people know it. It is said by people who have sojourned in Japan that you go there for a week and write a book on the country; you remain a year, and you write a magazine article; and if you stay there indefinitely, you do not know what to write. Nobody understands the Japanese or the oriental mind except they themselves. They look at things differently from us. We can never look at things through their eyes, and they can never look at things through our eyes. There is one thing, however, that the Japanese do respect, and this is straightforward dealing. That is one reason why the Japanese are sincere admirers of Great Britain and her institutions, and I say that in dealing with these gentlemen we should play the game, lay our cards on the table face up, and tell them we cannot compete with them, that their entry is against the interests of our country. We cannot concede them privileges which they do not extend to us. We cannot let them come because they will inevitably displace our race. We can say to them "There are thousands of you engaged profitably in industry here to-day; we have thousands of idle white men walking up and down our streets looking for work, with their families at home in want. We cannot stand that. You would not stand these things." They will realize the sense of that position. No Chinaman who will work for less than a Jap would be allowed to work in Japan. The Japanese would not stand for twenty-four hours what we have stood from them. They are reasonable men, astute men, wise men of the East, who will understand this thing if it is put to them right. But do not let us put it to them through the mouth of a demagogue. Let some big man whom they respect—I know the type of men they do respect—go to them wide open and explain the case to them; tell them that because of their community of interest and of activities it is impossible for a cosmopolitan race such as we have in Canada to compete with them. Let him show them by figures that in ten years they would conquer British Columbia by peaceful invasion. There would be no trouble. Great Britain could not object, and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe for one moment the Japanese would object. In that little country of Japan, fifty years ago, they had 33,000,000 people; to-day, they have 57,000,000. For Japan's population to remain stationary, hundreds of thousands of people must leave the country each year, and they have been doing that. The island of Formosa has been densely populated by them during the last five years. The Hawaiian islands, which hoped a very few years ago to attain statehood with the United States, have given up all hope of that because the Japanese absolutely control their industrial and economic life, and it is said that in five years more the Japanese will own every sugar plantation in the Hawaiian islands. In the Philippine islands they also dominate the economic life. It is very doubtful indeed if the Philippine islands will ever be given their freedom, as was expected they would shortly after the United States took possession of that country. We have the Japanese in Chili, and in California to an alarming extent. We have them coming to our own country on the Pacific. They must spread, and they are spreading. They have taken Korea. They simply must spread, but we do not want to give them that most lovely part of the Canadian Dominion, Vancouver island and the southern portion of British Columbia. It is the choicest part of God's footstool to-day, a country of lovely valleys where, in Byron's words, "The mountains look on Marathon and Marathon looks on the sea"—that country laved by the waves of the Pacific redolent with memories of the tales of Robert Louis Stevenson and other great writers. There is a sub-tropic atmosphere around the southern portion of British Columbia that cannot be explained, and I can only described its effect in this way: I have never known a man or woman live there for ten years who would live anywhere else afterwards. I have known men from the Old Country and from India come to British Columbia and become dissatisfied with the economic conditions—they could not get cheap help in their houses to which they were accustomed—and return disgusted to India or England, but invariably they came back to southern British Columbia. That is a great tribute to our country.

We want to reserve that country for the poor as well as for the affluent of our race. We want to retain it for a white population. We want it as a breathing ground, a pleasant land to which our people can retire from the less congenial climate of the prairies if they care to do so. If they do come we will gladly welcome them to British Columbia. But I can assure you, Sir, that this question is a very serious one—more serious, I think, than is realized by the people of this country as a whole. I say it with all respect to these

industrious, virile little people, the Japanese. I admire the Japanese and nobody can help but respect the Chinese for their unceasing industry. They attend to their business, they mind their own affairs, and invariably succeed. As I say, if we stop them we shall still have our troubles with a certain proportion of our white people. I yield to none in respect for the character of the white workingmen of British Columbia, with the exception of a few that are easily influenced and led astray by the specious arguments of soap box orators, and others, who are trying to instill into them an insidious and pernicious doctrine calculated to tear down the institutions of our country. But, Sir, the white people who cause us trouble are in a minority in that province. Nevertheless, before we allow the orientals to pour into that province we certainly should consider the great future of British Columbia, and take the necessary steps to preserve that valuable heritage for our people.

Mr. L. W. HUMPHREY (West Kootenay): I have the honour to represent a constituency in British Columbia which is close to the eastern border of that province, and would like to take time to explain the situation which has developed locally and the position in which the people of West Kootenay find themselves owing to the invasion of orientals into our province. Situated on the eastern border of the province we feel that we can speak with authority upon that invasion, more particularly as to the effect of the birth rate and the operations of the immigration law. First of all, we find that we in the eastern part of the province are now in the same position that our fellow-citizens on the coast were in a few years ago. We find that the orientals are crowding farther east and looking for more territory in which to expand. It was only a short time ago that we in eastern British Columbia felt that we were not very directly affected by the movement of orientals and not directly interested. The movement eastward of the orientals of recent years and their encroachment on territory within West Kootenay itself have been brought home to us with such force as to make us realize that it is not a local question, nor a provincial matter, but a national issue, with which the federal authorities must deal. I would like to speak particularly upon the question of the urgency of an exclusion policy. Is it not true that if Canada were in danger of being invaded by orientals, or by white races seeking to gain control of this Dominion to the great detriment of our population of eight and a quarter millions, that we should take immediate steps to put in force a policy of prohibition or exclusion? That is the situation, I believe, which threatens us to-day. That is the great issue we are confronted with in the future unless steps are speedily taken to offset the threatened movement. As previous speakers have explained measures will have to be taken to stop the immigration of oriental and the growth of that population within the country. Otherwise the time will not be long in coming when we shall cease to have a white Canada. I entirely agree with the terms of the resolution and endorse it most heartily. In my opinion the day has arrived when legislation along the lines indicated must be enacted if we wish to preserve this country for the white race. I believe the day is past when we can depend upon merely restrictive measures, or when we should have recourse to "Gentleman's Agreements" in handling this question. What we must decide upon is a policy of exclusion or prohibition.

Let me endeavour briefly to describe the local conditions in West Kootenay, and I believe that in the statements I have to make I shall be voicing the opinions of the white residents of that constituency. Speaking as a returned soldier, upon coming back to Canada after a service of four years service overseas, the inroads that the orientals had made during the great war at the expense of loyal Canadians heartily sympathetic to our cause were very noticeable to myself and my companions. When the great struggle in Europe began orientals were not present in excessive numbers in the eastern part of British Columbia. Returning when the war was over, we found they had appeared in great numbers and I as a returned man, voicing the sentiments of returned men, object to the condition in West Kootenay such as we find existing to-day. We find that orientals have secured greater control of our natural resources and have improved their position to such an extent that they are better off financially than the average citizen of British Columbia. They took advantage of the war period, when wages were high and labour scarce, to secure a footing in different industries to the extent that it is almost impossible to dislodge them to-day from places which

should be occupied by returned men. From another angle we believe that it is a deplorable state in which to find our country, especially for those who sacrificed themselves during the war, looking that good might come, looking to protect our Dominion from invasion, from the democratic point of view, looking to make it a better Canada for Canadians. We believe it is not a healthy state that these conditions should exist in Canada to-day. We cannot believe that this is what our soldiers made sacrifices for,—that at the conclusion of the war the yellow races might benefit. These facts have been set out by the previous speakers to-day, and each fact can be substantiated. It is not a healthy condition or a healthy atmosphere from a national point of view. Unless legislation is enacted as soon as possible it will only be a short time when Canada will not be a white man's country, but the greater percentage of control will be, as in British Columbia at the present time, in the hands of the yellow race.

I desire to present for the benefit of hon. members the conditions in respect to the unemployment situation. I believe we can attribute the unemployment situation to a certain extent to the laxity of our laws in connection with the increase of population of Chinese and Japanese. The figures show that seventy per cent of the unemployed throughout the Dominion of Canada are returned soldiers. We find that in the province of British Columbia to-day that there are very few unemployed orientals, and the figures given by previous speakers show that the number of orientals in that province is very large. I hope the present Government will see their way clear to enact such legislation as will bring relief to us in British Columbia, for the benefit of the Dominion, because I believe it will be in the best interests of this country. If such legislation is enacted, it will overcome, not only one phase of the difficulty but a great many, and will remedy the economic conditions in regard to unemployment. It will create a greater market for our labourers, and will give us better control of farm and fruit lands, and will prevent the orientals getting control of our natural resources.

I wish to repeat that I agree with the resolution in its entirety and take great pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. E. J. McMURRAY (North Winnipeg): I am glad to say that I can support this resolution and yet not be obliged to resort to distasteful methods in condemnation of the oriental people. In common with the hon. member from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) I can bear tribute to the many fine qualities of the Japanese and Chinese. The patriotism of the Japanese is marked. The integrity of the Chinaman is pronounced. But we must look at this question from the point of view of its great national importance to us. Canada is a young nation, and compared with other nations is merely in its infancy. The nations that succeed are those that have been built up slowly of one homogeneous people. The nations that have stood the test of the late war in Europe have been those that were composed of one stock, French, British and German. Those nations have stood the test, but the conglomerate and polyglot nations of Europe, such as Austria, composed of all sorts of elements, dwindled and smashed before the force of the war. It will take us hundreds and hundreds of years to develop our national resources. It will take us a far longer time to build up a distinctly Canadian type which must come in the process of time, and that type must be absolutely homogeneous. Without that it cannot survive. A rock washed by the waves, of the ocean, if it is not composed of one element, sooner or later will disintegrate. And so it is with the nations; if a nation is not built of one stock and woven together into a national fabricate, it will sooner or later crumble. As to the Japanese and Chinese, they have a great illustrious history. They have been great because they are of one stock; they are unconquerable as nations, because they are of that stock; but there is a vast chasm in every way between the oriental and the occidental. We have only to think of the western people, who, for instance, reside in India. We see the officials there longing for furlough home. We see the merchant there acquiring, at as rapid a rate as possible, his fortune, in order that he may leave the country and go home. We find the planter there overcoming the monotony of the time with his whiskey and his black cigar. We see the people there running frantically to all kinds of sport to wear away the dull edge of time, longing to get back to the western world. For three or four hundred years our people over there have never entered into the life of the nationality of the country. You will find that is the case in the occidental colonies in Yokohama, Hong Kong, Calcutta—everywhere throughout the eastern world. That

vast chasm exists to-day in thought, in tongue, in physical form and colour. These people can never, or will never, intermingle and intermarry with our people. The descendants of Chinamen and Japanese coming to this country will be Chinamen and Japanese respectively in five hundred years from now; there will be no difference. The money that an oriental earns in this country goes back to his native land, and after his death his very bones are taken back to the sacred soil that gave him birth.

There has been no amalgamation of these people in any shape or form into our national fabric; there can never be any. At the present time, our complaint against them is probably on account of their industry, and that has been borne out here. But whatever attributes they may have that are essential, they are producing in this country at the present time, particularly on the west coast, a condition of affairs in which our people cannot compete at all. They are not, however, going to be limited to the west coast; they are already crossing over the mountains. If you go through any small town in western Canada, you will find those people more abundantly in evidence as the years go by.

Thus, there is the future to be considered. The China of to-day is not the China of twenty years ago. The China of to-day is looking out over the world. Twenty years ago, the Chinese soldier was armed with a quilted coat, a steel pot and a long pole. To-day, Chinese armies are battling around Peking, fully equipped armies, armed with machine guns and aeroplanes. There is no enmity between this country and Japan, or between this country and the oriental; but if these people come here, in years to come, there may be a difficult question to settle; and, just as good friends sometimes, at election times, keep away from visiting each other for fear troubles may come, it would be well that the oriental races and the occidental race represented by Canada should recognize that there may be a difficulty here some day; that it must almost inevitably come on account of the people of the Orient settling in this country. We must settle this question, and I think, if we put it fairly in a diplomatic and reasonable way to the people of the Orient, they will appreciate that the settlement of this question at as early a date as possible may relieve a very dangerous situation in the future, not long distant or long distant, who knows? But this question is a cause of irritation and a danger to us. Kipling has said:

> East is East and West is West,
> And never they twain shall meet.

The difficulty is that they may meet some day in the future. Whether they will meet or will not meet, it is certain they will not mix, and I think that is the view that Australia and New Zealand have, that you cannot build up a strong national people unless you build them of homeogeneous elements; that your immigrant coming into this country must have one absolute feature, that he can be welded into the national character and woven into the national fabric, politically, socially and in every other way.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, we have had various aspects of the Asiatic question dealt with in the course of this debate, and before it is concluded other speakers will deal with its economic and political aspects, as well as with certain of its social phases. My particular part in this debate relates to the sociological aspect of Asiatic immigration —the forces which influence and determine the organization and development of the social group.

I submit that perhaps no feature of this question is more important than that of assimilation. In the European countries you will find certain racial differences so far as origin is concerned. For instance, you will find in France that the northerner differs considerably from the southerner; in Switzerland you will find citizens of French, German and Italian origin, each group maintaining their mother tongue, but all capable of assimilation; you will find in Belgium the Walloons and the Flemings, each a distinct type, but all Belgian citizens with a common outlook on national affairs; even in Great Britain you have the English, the Scotch, the Welsh—and, I might still add, you have the Irish, although some people do not agree as to that.

Mr. LAPOINTE: You have the French also.

Mr. LADNER: In Great Britain?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes.

Mr. LADNER: Well, we have the French very near. They are a welcome race, no matter where we find them. Now, I submit that in order to have national harmony, the people must hold in common such great fundamentals of nationhood as, national ideals and aims, the Christian religion, race tradition—the colour and habits of the race, and, perhaps, most important of all from the standpoint of immigration, the practice of intermarriage. These are powerful sociological forces which make possible and bring about national harmony.

We read in Wells' "Outline of History" that most of these races trace their origin back to twelve thousand centuries ago, and they have been gradually differentiating until to-day we have the various races which now people the world. During the five thousand years of their recorded history we know that Japan and China have maintained their national characteristics, and although they have lived side by side they have not intermarried, nor has it been possible for them to assimilate with each other. If that is so with those two nations, how much more so is it as between Asiatic peoples on the one hand and those of Anglo-Saxon stock on the other? We need only look at the past, and, taking our lessons from history, adopt a sound and sane policy for the future, although it may be intertwined with certain international difficulties at the outset.

The Eurasian, produced by the union between the white and brown races, has no social standing on either side of the Pacific. We all respect Japan as a nation and the splendid qualities of her people, likewise we must respect the good qualities of the Chinese; but it is the coming into this country of a particular section of those peoples, of the Mongolians and the lower educated classes, which has produced the educational and other problems that we are faced with to-day.

In order to indicate the difficulties with which the West is confronted, and with which the whole of Canada will sooner or later be confronted if this question is not dealt with promptly and satisfactorily, I have decided to refer for a few minutes to the ramifications of the drug traffic throughout Canada as disclosed by investigations conducted by committees in various parts of the country. The lowest dives, harbouring the lowest moral depravity, are found in the Chinese quarters of our cities. The drug traffic is organized like any large business. At the head of it are trained and capable men, and they have their financiers, their importers, their wholesalers, their retailers, and even their street peddlers. Drugs in large quantities come to this country from China and Japan by our Pacific liners. In some cases the drug is secreted by members of the crew, who smuggle it on shore in small quantities. In other cases barrels of narcotics are dumped off the great liners as they pass south of Vancouver island. A speedy launch goes out, picks up the floating barrels, and takes them to some spot among the islands; in that way the drug is brought into the country. It is then given to men whose special and only business is to distribute it in large quantities. This business is mostly engaged in by Chinese and Japanese —not so much by the Japanese; I should not say that, but almost entirely by Chinese. The men engaged in the business, the men who sell the drugs, do not take it themselves, because they see the awful human wrecks which are the result of the use of narcotics. In a cold, calculating way, therefore, these men carry on this nefarious business, distributing the drugs throughout the community.

I would like to make it understood that these observations are not merely of a general character based on guesswork. The statements which I am about to make are founded upon official reports; upon information gathered by a citizens' committee appointed in the city of Vancouver, and upon information which I have collected from police authorities all the way from Vancouver to Halifax. Before giving some illustrations, let me explain, having touched upon the system of distribution, how the market is extended; how consumers are induced to take the drug; how they are inveigled into the practice until they become incapable of exercising their own will. What is known as "snow parties" are held. Chinamen of great wealth, engaged in this odious practice, and living in expensive, luxurious quarters, give parties at which white women, whom they employ, act as hostesses. Young girls are invited from about the city to take part in these so-called social functions—perhaps a dance, perhaps a card party; something of that kind. Interspersed among these young people are two or three addicts who are trained and whose business it is to inveigle other people into the use of narcotics. It is established beyond question that these parties take place periodically; that cocaine which is under strength is used to induce young people to acquire the habit. They are dared to take it, just as they would

be dared to jump across a ditch, or some other such trifling thing. They are dared to smell this stuff—a small quantity of it on a knife or spoon, and in that way the first step is taken. Before my remarks are finished, I hope, with proper reluctance and due regard to the dignity of this House, to describe to you the depths to which addicts to the drug can go and to point out that one of the chief causes of this terrible traffic arises out of the intercourse between China and Canada and through the medium of the Chinese who are engaged in it.

I received a letter last week from the secretary of the Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada, the honorary president of which is Brigadier General A. D. McRae. In his concluding words referring to the illegal drug traffic, the secretary says:

> Here we have a disease, one of many directly traceable to the Asiatic. Do away with the Asiatic and you have more than saved the souls and bodies of thousands of young men and women who are yearly being sent to a living hell and to the grave though their presence in Canada.

We have received certain information through the police officials. In Okalla prison, the largest in British Columbia, during the spring of 1921 out of 320 inmates 110 were drug addicts As I mentioned a moment ago, the citizens' committee, at the head of which is one of the best known citizens of Vancouver, employed nurses and detectives in their investigations. One of the men who assisted them was a theatre owner, an actor by profession and a man philanthropically disposed, who took advantage of his talent and ability as an actor to disguise himself in the dress of a drug addict. He went about Vancouver and other cities as well, and in that way he gained the confidence of some of the men engaged in this traffic and discovered things that the police would not have found out in a thousand years. He found that within a block of his own theatre he could buy, in an illegal way, large quantities of narcotic drugs from Chinese who carried on the business in their laundries, tailor shops, jewelry shops and establishments of that kind.

The results of these findings are exceedingly interesting. It was found that much of the illegal drug importation comes from China and Japan and that the drug traffic was increasing all over Canada. The police reports that we have gathered corroborate that. The drugs are usually retailed in Chinese stores, laundry or tailor shops, and many other kinds of establishments. Now, in order that the House may be apprised of the extent to which this work is undertaken and the terrible condition of affairs brought about by it—and it applies not only to Vancouver; these drug addicts move all over the North American continent; we found the trade was carried on in all cities right through to Halifax—I will give you some actual cases. I will not, of course, give the names, but I will state the facts in the best manner that I can, considering the nature of the cases.

[Mr. Ladner.]

One girl of sixteen became a user of morphine and cocaine and was associated with Chinese, Japanese and Hindus. She appeared before the committee of investigation and on that very morning she had yielded to Chinese, Japanese and Hindus in order to gain $5.50 with which to purchase drugs. I have here a list of several pages of individual cases which were investigated, and the facts were not only testified to by the addicts themselves but confirmed by corroborative evidence. A girl of twenty-three, through the use of morphine and cocaine, had a child by a Chinaman named Pete Kong, a notorious Chinese drug peddler. She injected morphine into the infant with a hypo needle until it died—her mind being so distorted. I am only giving some of the cases from this list which it is possible to divulge under the circumstances. It was found that the traffic was indulged in not only by persons who might be designated as among the lower classes, the uninformed or uneducated classes, but through the machinations of this organization people from the very best families became addicts. Here is the case of a woman who was a clergyman's daughter, accomplished in music, well educated. She is a subject of morphine and cocaine; she is associated with Chinamen, and at present is serving a jail sentence. There is a large list of names here, but I will conclude with one case, that of a man who is related to one of the best known public men in Canada. He served with the Princess Pats overseas, was badly wounded, and on his return to Vancouver got into the Chinese quarter and became a dope fiend; now his business is going around and carrying out a function known as "filling orders". A telephone message comes in giving a certain order, and he goes out and fills it—administers a hypodermic injection for which he charges a dollar, or something of that kind. I have a case here of another woman who actually spends from $10 to $30 a day for drugs, and a Chinaman named J. J. Wing secured

from $2,500 to $3,000 worth of jewelry and furs from her. This came out in evidence in a lawsuit instituted by the woman for the recovery of the stolen articles.

In another list which I have before me there is an account of thirty-one cases which were investigated. They were taken in order as they came before the court, and twenty-one of the thirty-one cases were Chinese, so hon. members will see the extent to which these people are engaged in the traffic. From the moral and sociological standpoint alone, if from no other, these immigrants are of such a class that we would be a thousand times better off without them irrespective of their effect on our economic, commercial and industrial life.

In conclusion, I shall read a letter which was written to the secretary of the Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada, and forwarded to me. It is from a Japanese in Vancouver, and I read it in order to show the mental attitude of these people towards our country. Hon. members will note the irony and invective which runs through this letter.

CHAS. L. MACAULEY,
306 Tower Bldg,
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sir,—I read with interest "Danger".

That is the small publication issued on behalf of the Asiatic Exclusion League. The letter goes on:

I paid 20 cent. One hundred Japanese read it, very cheap.

The first step very good. Getting his start very poor insult to our government and very insulting to the individual Japanese.

We Japanese are a nation like the English, the Scotch, or the Irish, but not like the latter altogether, we have abolished bigotry. If you like we are like the German, we are a nation, we love our country first and foremost. We love riches, and all that riches will bring, but we will not sell our country for money.

Hon. gentlemen will not find a case where a Japanese has been caught selling his country for money.

You never hear of a Japanese traitor. In Canada you have many traitors. In the United States there are many traitors because you are only people and have not nationhood.

That is the point. He goes on:

In China they allow all deceitful and crooked men to govern, so in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: The letter must be a very old one. What is the date?

Mr. LADNER: The 6th of December. He goes on:

We Japanese did not force our way to Canada. Your money changers ask us to come, we were cheap. O yes very cheap. In Japan our government is honourable. One member who does dishonour to his country must die by his own hand if possible, but he must die. In Canada your government is different, one member sells his people and he is soon great like our merchants trading in commerce, but our merchants do not sell Japan or the people, they sell merchandise. Japanese merchandise always, if possible. Your members sell their soul and their land, and the people, and when the election is over half the people cry with joy for one week and then they cry for four years. Is this not so, Mr. Macauley? We do not hate Canadians, the clown and the jester is never hated.

We Japanese living in the province and making an honourable living will watch your political pantomime with interest. When you become a real nation we will do good business with you still and you will admire us more.

Very truly,

SATO.

I can conceive of no stronger argument for the necessity of fortifying ourselves in the building up of our nation than the attitude disclosed by this Japanese living in British Columbia. If we are to become a nation, and have an outlook and a permanent place in history, we can well profit by the lessons of other nations who have built before us. It is not necessary for us to jump in the dark, because we have the light of history to guide us, showing how nations have developed in the past. I submit that the Government and all members of the House, irrespective of their political affiliations and looking only to the real interests of this country, can by adopting this resolution lay the foundation of a policy which will overcome the international obstacles and enable us to emerge twenty-five years hence a real Canadian nation, with a white country, instead of a mixture that we would not be very proud of.

Mr. T. G. McBRIDE (Cariboo): It is not my intention to take up very much time this evening, as many aspects of this question have already been dealt with. When I spoke in the debate on the Speech from the Throne I made the statement that one of the most important questions that could come before the House this session was the oriental question. I repeat that statement here to-night. I stated then that it was hard for the people in the East to realize fully what the people in the West were up against in this oriental problem. The people who have to live and associate and compete with the Orient are the people who know what a menace the oriental is to our country. People in the East speak of Vancouver as the gateway to the Orient: the Orient speaks of Vancouver as their gateway to Canada.

Ship captains who have sailed the seven seas speak of the port of Vancouver as the best harbour they have ever entered. Tourists speak of the sunny slopes of the Pacific as the land of sunshine, the California of Canada, a land loved by all who dwell there. Why should we, with a country like that on our Pacific coast turn it over to the Orient, and that is what will happen in the future if the laws of this country continue as they are at the present time. It seems to me that every person who has the vision of a greater Canada should try and keep British Columbia a land for the white race to dwell in, and not turn it over to the Orient. People who live in the West know from experience that if immigration of the Asiatic race is not checked and if the tide of immigration flows as it has in the past, the time will soon come when the white race will have to retreat across the Rocky mountains and British Columbia will be left in the hands of the Orient. The present state of affairs has only to continue for a short time for that day to come. I ask who will be responsible for that state of affairs? It will be the members sitting in this House to-night who will be responsible if they do not enact laws here that will stop oriental immigration to our shores. Why cannot that be done now, and done once for all?

The increasing tide of oriental immigration at the present time is striking at the very root of our civilization. It is tearing the foundations from beneath our home life, and home life reflects itself upon a nation; it always reflects itself upon the prosperity of a nation. We cannot have an A-1 country and a C-3 class of people. It is against all laws of economy to expect such a thing. Home life either makes children good citizens or a public nuisance; and I say that so long as the working man in this country is forced to compete with the oriental they cannot have in Canada the home life he ought to have. Our workingmen cannot even have the semblance of home life if they have to compete with Asiatics. Why should not the interests of the Canadian people come first? Why should we have to cater to the Asiatic? Why should we allow these people to land on our shores? Let us look for a moment at the manner in which the Japanese treat white men when they go to Japan and let me say in this connection that I am not going to make statements that cannot be verified. There was a man named Mr. C. J. Kirkpatrick, formerly of the Royal

Naval Service but who for five years was employed as a civil engineer at Yokohama by the Japanese government. Let us hear what he says about what the white people are up against in Japan. This gentleman declares "There is absolutely no law for the white man in Japan." He goes on to make several other statements. He tells of a practice on the part of the Japanese rickshaw men of demanding a fee of 25 yen for carrying a European or an American whereas they only ask 5 yen for carrying a Japanese. Imagine what an outcry there would be if we were to extort 25 cents from the Japanese or the Chinese on our street cars, and only charge our own people 5 cents. That would be discriminating against the Asiatic race, they would tell us. Well, that is the kind of discrimination which is carried on in Japan against the whites.

A few months ago a Mrs. J. Gray, wife of an accountant in the Lane-Crawford Company, a large wholesale establishment in Yokohama, refused to pay what she considered an exorbitant fee demanded by the rickshaw men. What happened? One of the men caught hold of the lady, twisted her arm and abused her in a most shameful way, and because her husband interfered he was summoned before the courts. Notwithstanding the evidence, which was wholly against the rickshaw men Mr. Gray was convicted of a criminal offence, and only escaped a sentence of six months in a filthy Japanese prison by the whole white population of Yokohama going to the authorities and offering an apology.

Mr. Kirkpatrick has made the statement that at the time of the riots in Vancouver some of the citizens of Japan boasted that if they did not get the same rights in Canada as the white people, the Japanese in Vancouver would cut the water mains and set fire to the city. They further declared that if the military were called out they were well prepared to take care of themselves. I have no doubt of the accuracy in the main of the latter statement, bearing in mind that all the Japanese who come to Canada are trained, either in the navy or in the army, before they are allowed to leave the Empire.

At the present time the Japanese companies are making a determined effort to secure control of the Pacific shipping and the Japanese government is giving—or at least it was a year ago—a subsidy to help these companies to control the shipping. Now what are the orientals doing in Can-

ada? On the Pacific coast they are driving the white men and women from the most fertile valleys we have, and at present they control over 27,000 acres of the best land in British Columbia. Some years ago Chinamen started in peddling vegetables from door to door in Vancouver and Victoria, underselling the white man in every case. Finally they drove the white man to the wall and to-day the people of these cities are paying more for vegetables than is paid in any other city on the Pacific coast. The reason of that is that the oriental is in control of the market. Out of nineteen firms classified as retail and wholesale vegetable dealers in the telephone directory of Vancouver eighteen of them are under oriental names. The orientals are also getting well advanced in many other lines. Take, for instance, the wholesale and retail merchants of the city of Vancouver. Over 300 of them are orientals, and this number does not include Asiatics trading under the names of white men. A number of these firms combine together and purchase at wholesale prices. Then they retail the products bought in this way to the oriental restaurants at the wholesale rate. This is gradually driving the white men who are trying to run restaurants out of business. It is a very effective way of killing opposition.

What are they doing in the case of the logging camps all along the coast in which employment was given to hundreds and thousands of men? Over forty logging camps on the Pacific coast are controlled and operated by the Japanese. How can white men compete with orientals who can board themselves for twenty-five or thirty cents a day and live in shacks not fit for human beings to dwell in? Surely the people of Canada do not want to allow into this country a class of immigration that will lower the standard of living for the workingman. Why should the laws of this country not be such that they would raise rather than lower the standard of living of the workingman. The workingmen and women of this country are the backbone of Canada. No country can long continue in the forefront whose people are not workers.

The white people in the West are waiting to see what the members of this House are going to do about this question. The fishermen on the Pacific coast are eagerly waiting to see the stand this House will take on the oriental question; and the farmer and his family, who realize that they will finally be run out of house and home by the oriental if the immigration laws of this country are not changed, are eagerly waiting to see whether this Government is or is not going to take some action. The lumbermen and the logger are eagerly waiting to see whether they will get a square deal at the hands of this Government. The laundrymen, who employ hundreds of our boys and girls, are eagerly looking for action on the part of this Government. The small merchant is also eagerly expectant of action. The young girl, who, through lack of employment, is forced to work in the restaurant with some of these orientals, is eagerly looking to see what the members of this House are going to do on this question. The mother of the little school girl—dear to her as life itself—is anxious to know if any relief is in sight, or if she will still have to continue sending her little one to school to sit in the same seat and associate with oriental boys twice her age. Yes, and the little girl herself who resents such company wants to see a change brought about. If this Government takes hold of this situation and passes legislation that will stop orientals entering this country they will have done more for Canada than any other government that was ever entrusted with the administration of public affairs in the Dominion.

Why should this Government not assume the responsibility and put an end to this at once? Why should it not assume the responsibility the people sent it here to assume? I will admit that you can educate the orientals, but it is simply like painting a pump to purify the water in the well. You can never change their disposition. The oriental is not a man who will develop the country. He will not go out and cultivate the country. He stays rather in the city, and takes the jobs from our women and young people. I read a statement in a paper the other day about this question, and I may say I do not believe in people coming into this House and spending hours reading the newspapers. When there are so many young women out of employment, the oriental problem becomes a serious affair. One young woman said "I have two bits left". I have lived for the last two weeks on two pints of milk and two doughnuts a day, and when I go to look for a job I mostly meet a Chinaman at the door and am told that I am not wanted." It is pretty hard for these young women that we have allowed into our country orientals to fill jobs that our own people

should fill. Another young woman said "I am supposed to be good, I have got 75 cents left, I am two weeks behind in my rent. The landlady says I must pay the rent or she will take my clothes. I have to earn the money some way". And yet the Chinamen are taking the jobs that those women ought to have and want to fill. Is it not time to wake up to the situation, and stop sidetracking it, as has been done in the past? Is it not time that we realized our responsibility to the people of Canada, that this House took some action in the matter and stopped once and for all the immigration of orientals coming into our country?

Mr. J. A. MacKELVIE (Yale): There never has been a time, I think, during the somewhat extended period of 35 years during which I have been a resident of British Columbia, in which this subject of oriental immigration has not in some degree loomed up before the people of that province. I have seen it growing to very alarming proportions. I have seen it when it might be compared to a small cloud the size of a man's hand on the horizon, and have seen it develop into a menace that practically overshadowed the sky. I do not believe a question has ever been debated in this House to which more wholehearted support has been given by those who thoroughly understand it than this resolution. I believe that every member in this House who comes from British Columbia has time after time discussed this matter in his home constituency, and it is altogether probable that, either by way of pledges given in the campaign in response to questions, or by promises given of his own volition, he has announced in some way his intention of pursuing this subject on every opportunity which presented itself in this House. I do not believe that any member from the westernmost province of this Dominion who casts a vote in favour of the resolution will ever vote with more sincerity or cheerfulness on any resolution or motion which comes before the Parliament of Canada. Something was said by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) this afternoon which indicates the measure of affection with which the people privileged to live in British Columbia regard that province, and he did not depict in one whit too glowing terms the natural beauties and great endowments which have been lavished upon that country by a munificent nature. And is it not, Sir, a heritage worthy of preservation for ourselves and for succeeding generations of Canadians that may come after us? Is it not our duty to preserve intact, as far as possible, that magnificent heritage to the people of this country, and yet it is slowly but surely slipping away from us?

Various aspects of the question have been, I think, very well dealt with by the speakers who have preceded me in this debate. I purpose to speak very briefly on the aspect which relates to the occupation of lands by orientals. Coming, as I do, from one of the farming sections of British Columbia, the Okanagan valley, known pretty well throughout Canada and other parts of the continent as one of the great fruit-producing sections of the West, I can give testimony to the fact that a very grave danger indeed confronts the residents of that section. I am not speaking so particularly in regard to the fruit culture as in relation to the general business of farming in that country. The member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Munro), who, I think, intends to speak in this debate, will, no doubt, be able to inform the House how, on the lower Fraser, vast areas of land producing small fruits, strawberries, raspberries, loganberries and other fruit of that description have passed absolutely under the control of the orientals during the last few years.

To a smaller degree this obtains in the Okanagan, where they were employed rather extensively in orcharding work, during the war period, and I believe that if statistics could be furnished it would be shown that perhaps no section of this entire Dominion possesses such a magnificent war record as that Okanagan country. I believe it could be shown that about 22 per cent of the entire population voluntarily took up arms in support of the Empire when war was declared or shortly afterwards. Naturally, under those circumstances, a very sparse population was left to cultivate the land, and the Chinamen immediately took advantage of the situation which thus presented itself, and during the war, and in the years which have since intervened, I think it would be a conservative estimate to say that 80 per cent of the vegetables produced in that country were produced by the Chinese residents.

Can you imagine, Sir, with what feelings the returned soldiers viewed this state of affairs when they came back to the land which they had left, sought to resume their occupation on the farm, and found that

their places had been filled with orientals? Indeed, I have frequently thought, in spite of the very bitter complaints made at their meetings, that the Great War Veterans and kindred associations maintained a very great degree of restraint indeed, when they did not proceed to further measures than those which they have taken in this connection.

I wish to draw attention to a very specific instance which will give some idea of the feeling entertained by the people of that locality regarding the Japanese invasion of the land. Possibly some of you know that situated close to Vernon, where I live, lies a prosperous fruit-growing district known as the Coldstream municipality, and very close to it the Coldstream ranch, established as a fruit-growing property by a former Governor General of this country. It contains, in one block of 800 acres, the largest commercial orchard in Canada. You can imagine the consternation which obtained in that district when it became known, a few years ago, that negotiations were being pursued by the Old Country owners to dispose of that property to a Japanese syndicate. The municipality of Coldstream is settled by a very superior class of people, largely, if not entirely, by people coming from the Old Country, cultured people, men of means, many of them retired army and navy officers, who have spent a great deal of money in providing themselves with fine homes in surroundings that, perhaps, cannot be equalled in this country. You can surmise with what feelings they heard that the great Coldstream ranch, round which were clustered their holdings, was to be passed into the possession of a Japanese syndicate. It can also be easily conceived that the people of the town of Vernon, contiguous to that municipality, were not slow to realise that, if the deal were put through, very soon their town would be degraded into the position of a little, mean village, and all the advantages of which they are so proud now would speedily be taken away from them. Under the circumstances it was not surprising that a very strenuous effort was made to block that deal. Deputations were sent to the provincial legislature and to Ottawa, and, in both cases, without much success. They were informed that difficulties stood in the way of preventing any sale of land to any person in this country who desired to acquire it. Finally, to make a long story short, the deal was stopped, because a measure of influence was brought to bear upon the owners of the property in the Old Country who withdrew the ranch from the market. This is a concrete instance of what might happen to any part of Canada under existing conditions. As I said a moment ago, those conditions already have been brought about to a very alarming degree on the lower Fraser where the small fruit lands of that section have passed under the domination of orientals.

As was outlined by the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Stork) this afternoon, legislation has been attempted on various occasions in our provincial legislature, and inevitably it has met with a check when it has come down to this House. Some years ago we passed and re-passed what was known in British Columbia as the Natal Act, called by that name because it pursued a course similar to that adopted by South Africa in the determination of the people of that country to keep out orientals. Briefly stated, that act provided that when an oriental or any immigrant of an undesirable class presented himself for entrance to this country, educational tests should be put to him; he should be asked by the immigration officer to read and write a certain number of sentences in any European language. Under those circumstances it was easy to shut out any oriental or other immigrant whose exclusion was desired. But that legislation was checked at Ottawa for reasons connected with the various treaties then existing between Great Britain and Japan. One of those treaties, known as the Anglo-Japanese Alliance has now been scrapped. Instead of it, we have the Four-Power Treaty which was recently consummated at Washington, and which, I have no hesitation in saying, should work out very much more satisfactorily than the previous agreement. Another treaty was mentioned this afternoon by the mover of this resolution, and I am free to confess that, in the four corners of that commercial treaty which he read, there appears to exist some difficulty which confronts such legislation as we are now seeking. It must be remembered that provision is also made in the treaty which apparently gives to the Parliament of Canada absolute jurisdiction regarding its own immigration law.

I do not think any speaker approaches this subject to-day without a clear conception of the responsibility which rests upon him in debating it. He must be seized with the idea that this is not a provincial affair

entirely, nor a national affair entirely; that its scope is largely international; but I for one am convinced that no insuperable difficulties present themselves in that direction. I am fully convinced that if, as was argued by some of the speakers, the matter is put forward in a frank manner with all our cards on the table, and if we explain the situation fully to those people, we shall encounter no difficulty in implementing any legislation which this House may provide along the lines suggested in this resolution.

None of us who has watched history, can have failed to admire the wonderful progress made by Japan during the last fifty years. That little nation has rapidly forged ahead until it has taken a position well in the forefront amongst the great powers of the world, and along with that progress has naturally come a feeling of national pride. Accordingly, and quite rightly, they would maintain a position which would lead them to resent anything approaching an affront passed upon their national pride, and nobody in this House would, for a moment, suggest that a course should be followed that would give them the slightest cause to feel that they were being subjected to any slight or discrimination. But it has been pointed out with great force, I think, this after-
9 p.m. noon how their own legislation affects us if we seek entrance to their country, and it is only a matter of reasonable quid pro quo that we should demand the same privileges which they are prepared to give to others, and nothing further. Australia has found a way to settle this difficulty; she has been hampered by no fear of international complications. In spite of the fact that the Japanese alliance with Britain was in effect, Australia, during the last few years, passed legislation which has the effect of absolutely excluding orientals from that island continent. The matter was one of self-preservation with them, and there is an old adage that "self-preservation is the first law of nature." This should apply to nations as well as to individuals, and we are asking this Parliament to place no more power in the hands of the people of this country than that which has been taken, without any objection from any source, by the people of Australia and the people of South Africa.

Mr. CRERAR: Might I ask a question purely for information, because I do not know? Can the hon. member inform the House as to the character of the legislation which Australia has passed and which produces that result?

Mr. MacKELVIE: It is exactly of the nature of that legislation of which I spoke a moment ago, which was passed by British Columbia some years ago, by way of educational tests. That subject and other constitutional points will be dealt with later on in the debate, I understand, by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), who has made a thorough and exhaustive study of all the constitutional aspects of this question. The speaker who opened the debate this evening (Mr. Ladner), dwelt, in a manner which must have engaged the earnest attention of this House, upon the moral degradation which has followed the introduction of the drug evil largely through oriental influence. I do not intend to dilate on that, nor to enlarge upon the tremendous evil which this has brought to our country. If any person desires to acquaint himself with how degraded human nature may, under certain circumstances become, all he has to do is to visit certain oriental quarters in British Columbia cities, where he will find a condition of filth and vice, vice which must be unmentionable before audiences such as this, which ought to convince him that the fewer of this class of people that any country has within its bounds, the better it will be for its people and for its civilization to progress upon really proper lines. Now, I have spoken very briefly upon the international aspect of this question. I realize that the administration naturally will have to give very serious consideration to it. But fully sensible of the gravity of my words and of the words of those who have preceded me, I venture to assure the Government that in my opinion, and in the opinion of every man in British Columbia who has given the question the attention which it demands, there is no remedy save that of absolute exclusion. We have tried restrictive measures for many years, and you can see where that policy has landed us. Now, we say: Cut right down to the root of this evil, cut right home to the very marrow of this disease, and apply the only effective remedy that will meet the situation—absolute and complete exclusion from this day forward of alien orientals entering this country.

We urge therefore that the commercial treaty between Great Britain and Japan, which expires in July, 1923, unless notice be given a year previously, be denounced with-

out delay as far as Canada's part therein is concerned. We also think we are right in asking that what is known as the Lemieux agreement, a more or less secret arrangement regarding immigration from Japan to this country, be denounced as well. We believe that an open, above-board agreement excluding absolutely from our shores all the labouring classes from that country is the only remedy that can be satisfactorily applied. That is the spirit and the intention of this resolution.

No one who has given any attention to it can begin to speak about this subject at all without a thousand different aspects of it surging into his mind, and if he gave free rein to his thoughts he could discourse upon it to an almost unlimited extent. But recognizing that many speakers have preceded me and that many are still to follow, I have no intention of speaking at any further length. I can only add that in my humble judgment it is not too much to say that the future of this country depends to a very large degree upon the fate of this resolution to-night.

Mr. E. A. MUNRO (Fraser Valley): Like other members who have spoken on this subject, I also consider it the most important that has engaged the attention of this House so far this session or that may engage it in the future.

The question involved means to the people of British Columbia in particular, and to the people of Canada in general, their right to develop the highest type of manhood and womanhood with a great national destiny after the best traditions of the British race in their own country. These rights, Mr. Speaker, no one will dare to challenge, nor will a Briton ever dare to forfeit.

It has often been said that Great Britain is generous to a fault. Modern history furnishes us with some examples in our own country where this generosity has worked a hardship on some of the members of this great confederacy. We have performed the filial duty of self-abnegation with more or less grace for the good of the Mother Country. When one considers the length, strength and alacrity of the British arm of justice in succouring even a single British subject from danger or distress, or demanding full restitution for foul play, we must confess after all that the seeming injustices done have been accompanied with the best intentions, and have grown out of her multiplicity of cares and her non-acquaintance with the peculiarities of the case rather than of maternal neglect.

The position in which we find ourselves in British Columbia with respect to orientals has grown out of lack of knowledge of the real conditions there on the part of the Mother Country, and also on the part of Canadians generally. No sane Canadian knowing, as we British Columbia men know, by actual observation and experience, could be cold or indifferent, as we see day by day, year by year, one industry after another, one farm after another, one locality after another, change ownership, character and colour from white to yellow.

A councillor in our country told me last fall how the Japanese acquire land and cultivate it. He said that if a Japanese is able to buy five acres of land, he can send to Japan and get a man to come over to this country under contract for two years at a wage of only fifteen or eighteen dollars per month—I have forgotten the exact amount. Each man is employed during those two years on a berry farm. A great many Japanese run small fruit farms in the province, and during the summer months their men under contract work on these farms, and in the fall they go into the mills and take away the jobs of white men, drawing down good pay. Next summer those contract men are back on the berry ranch again, and at the end of two years they have learned the berry industry and are in very good shape to start themselves. If a Japanese owns ten acres he gets two men under similar terms.

It is not necessary for me to repeat the reasons why we will not and cannot meet oriental competition, or why we cannot assimilate the oriental, more than to say that it is largely a matter of rights and standards. Rights are measured by certain standards, and the higher the civilization the higher the standards. We in this country recognize a standard of decent living conditions; we recognize a standard working day of so many hours for so much pay; we recognize a standard of individual obligation to the community and the state; we recognize a standard of education; we recognize a standard of morality based on the Ten Commandments. How many of these standards do the orientals we get conform to? Not one. Where are the men and women in Canada who are prepared to live and raise their children under any other standards? These standards cannot be maintained and are not being maintained where orientals dwell in sufficient numbers.

This Parliament is on a hill almost three thousand miles away from British Col-

umbia where the tragedy is being enacted. Perhaps not ten per cent of the members of this House have resided in British Columbia in recent years for a sufficiently long period to see and know by personal observation the insidious and deadly encroachments of orientals in almost every field of operation to which our province lends itself. Yet for almost a quarter of a century this Parliament has complacently disallowed and killed the oriental exclusion legislation that the legislature of British Columbia has passed for the protection of her own people.

It is always dangerous firing at long range where the visibility is poor. In every instance you have been wounding and maiming your own friends while the enemy went unharmed. Yes, this Parliament is on a hill, and although not very steep it would sometimes seem as though Knowledge and Truth, like some poor wayfaring men, had not always made the grade.

British Columbia, like the Psalmist of old, has been looking to this hill and saying: I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills whence cometh my help. But no help cometh, though our eyes be blinded with supplication, though our hearts be pierced with a cruel apathy and our sacrifice is replete with degradation and despair. Evidently the hills failed the Psalmist too, for he goes on: My help cometh from the Lord who made heaven and earth. Must we in our martyrdom exclaim,like Cardinal Wolsey in those immortal words: If we had served our God as faithfully as we have served our King, he would not have given us over in our gray hairs.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast." Once more we come to seek redress in this House.

> Like dying embers on the hearth
> We light the beacon in the night
> To guide the mariner aright.

Our country raises monuments in honour of those men who discovered and explored new territories and planted the British flag thereon. We have such monuments in British Columbia and we are very proud of them. We have some other monuments,—joss houses and totem poles. We are proud of our totem poles, but we are doubtful if the spirits of the great navigators and explorers who gave to us that vast heritage would be proud of us if they could see the heritage they left us in the grasp of an alien, yellow race. The red men of this country are the wards of the white men; do the white men of this country want to become the wards of the yellow men? Like brave men we talk; like cowards we retreat, sacrificing our country as a peace offering to a heathen people with their strange manners and their strange gods, whom we have not offended and of whom we wish no evil. We have always been ready, in peace or war, to rally round that flag "that for a thousand years has braved the battle and the breeze"; the flag that stands for protection and freedom. But we are not protected; we are invaded by the deadliest foe. We are not free, because we are not masters in our own house. What is the price of the peace we are asked to keep? A lost manhood, a lost province, the brightest gem in the Canadian confederacy,—the province of British Columbia. "There is a green hill far away" beyond a city wall, a land flowing with milk and honey, her mighty rivers filled with fish, her fertile valleys that produce thirty, sixty and one hundredfold, her harbours and her emerald lakes nestling in the bosom of the everlasting hills; her snow-capped mountains filled with precious minerals; skirted with giant cedars and Douglas pine; her varied climate from the forty-ninth parallel to the Arctic circle, her golden sunsets and her midnight suns—

> Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> This is my own, my native land!
> Whose heart hath ne'er within him burned
> As home his footsteps he hath turned
> From wandering on a foreign strand?

Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a proposed amendment. I do not intend to move it, because that would only block or spread-eagle this debate, and we do not want the discussion to take that form, but I want the House to listen to it in order that there may be an understanding of what is going to happen if something is not done to remedy the conditions which exist in British Columbia. This is the proposed amendment; that the following words be added to the resolution:

> And; if for imperial or other reasons it is considered unwise to stop all future immigration of this kind to Canada, our immigration laws be so amended whereby all oriental aliens coming to Canada after such amendment, shall be taken in bond to the province of Ontario where they and their offspring shall permanently reside, under a registration system, so long as they remain in Canada or until such time as the oriental population of Ontario stands in the same ratio to the white population of Ontario as prevails in the province of British Columbia, after which another province may be substituted for that of Ontario.

I do not want the province of Quebec to be jealous or any other province. The object, Mr. Chairman, of this proposed amendment is to find out if the people of Ontario and the other provinces are prepared to pay as high a price for imperial considerations as the people of British Columbia have paid. We offer you a draught from the bottle that for long years you have been pressing to our lips —formulated by your own physicians, mixed in your own laboratory. I doubt if an hon. member in this House would be willing to advocate that British Columbia should receive any more orientals. Assuming this to be correct, we have but two positions left: the one is in line with the resolution, total exclusion which we British Columbians demand so far at least, as our province is concerned and which we recommend generally. The second and last position is that we cannot stop all oriental alien immigration to this country for various reasons, therefore, these Asiatics must be settled outside of British Columbia. If it is all right for British Columbia to be loaded to the gunwale with orientals it is all right for the province of Ontario. If it is a good thing for the province of Ontario to be like British Columbia, vote for the amendment. But if it is a bad thing for the province of Ontario to be like British Columbia, why, vote for the resolution.

We will take it as an evidence of British fair play and of good faith towards the province of British Columbia if you shall rid British Columbia and Canada of this octopus by this resolution or take the pressure off British Columbia by the amendment.

It may be said that Canada never forced the orientals to settle in the province of British Columbia. Quite true, but Canada forced us to accept them by her disallowances, which brought the same result. Freely we have received; freely we have given unto you. There is an old saying that what is good for the goose is good for the gander. We have been the goose long enough. Now we are looking for the gander.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution and proposed amendment are dead in line and ready for action if something is not soon done to arrest the blighting and withering effect of oriental occupation of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, the phase of the question which I intended to deal with to-night was not that with respect to the situation in British Columbia. I had left to other members from British Columbia the task of dealing with the conditions as particularly affecting that province. But in California you have the handwriting on the wall; you have an indication of where British Columbia will be in a very few years if something is not done. In California they are five or ten years ahead of us. Not very many years ago, in one of those old moss and ivy covered Scotch churchyards which date back to the thirteenth century, a place where really you almost like to die and rest—on one of the tombstones there I read an inscription supposed to be addressed from the man in the grave to the casual passer-by. I forget the first lines of it, but the latter part went something like this:

> As you are now, so once was I;
> As I am now, so will you be,
> Therefore prepare to follow me.

So with the situation in California to-day; from the grave of agricultural and industrial conditions, from the grave of Asiatic domination, they are saying to us in British Columbia: "As we are now, so will you be". It is for us to take warning from the writing on the wall. If I said such and such a thing would happen, you might or might not believe me, but when I point to you an actual condition of things now in existence, we may well take warning.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I would like to be allowed to place on Hansard a couple of documents; they are too lengthy to read, but they contain valuable information. One of them contains the evidence given before the House Immigration Committee at Washington quite recently on February 9 of this year, by a man named Mr. McClatchey who prepared the brief, that was alluded to this afternoon, of the state of California on the Asiatic question. The other is a letter by him to Viscount E. Shibusawa dated January 3, which gives a wonderfully clear and concise compendium of the situation. Instead of reading these documents I would like, with the permission of the House, to lay them on the Table for insertion in Hansard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member shall have leave to hand in the two documents to which he has referred for insertion in Hansard?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was waiting for the leader of the Government to rise. I have no knowledge at all of the contents of the

documents or of their nature, but I do think that it is creating a very serious precedent to permit the indiscriminate reading into Hansard of documents. It is a practice we have not followed in this House save in the case of the Budget or of detailed statistics, or, in other special instances. It is not my business particularly to object, but I do think it would be in the best interests of the House not to indulge the precedent.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I might say that I agree with what my right hon. friend has said. I did not take any exception at the time because I happened to see in my hon. friend's hand the document he proposed to insert and it did not appear to be one of very considerable length, and this debate is on a question so all-important that I felt I would not be justified in raising the point at this time. I should like, however, to associate with what the leader of the Opposition has said and to ask the House not to consider it as establishing a precedent in any way if it permits this document to be inserted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that, in this instance, the hon. gentleman shall have the right to insert the document unread in Hansard?

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Will you allow me, Mr. Speaker, as an old member of the House to express my approval of what has been said by the leaders on both sides of the House, and to point out that in the old days a request of this sort was absolutely refused except in the case of government statistics and tables of figures in government speeches on the Budget, and so on. If this is allowed in this instance, the House, not having heard the document read, will not be in a position to vote intelligently to-night as we shall not be able to read the statement until we get to-morrow's Hansard. Therefore, I do not think it would be proper for the hon. gentleman to insert the document.

Mr. NEILL: Might I suggest that it be referred to the Speaker, the leader of the Government, or the leader of the Opposition while I continue my remarks, for an opinion as to whether it might properly be inserted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is purely a question for the unanimous decision of the House.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): The document which the hon. gentleman asks leave to insert in Hansard may be very informative and very interesting. I do not know, of course, but I assume the hon. gentleman would not ask leave of the House for its insertion unless it was relevant and important. Nevertheless, this is the first instance that I can recall in which any hon. gentleman has asked leave at this stage to insert a document in Hansard when it is of a character merely supplementary to his remarks. It is quite another thing for a member of the Government to ask leave to insert statistical tables or information of that kind, but I think it would be a great misfortune for the House if we were to institute the practice which is suggested this evening.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I associate myself, I think entirely with what has fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). If we adopt the practice in this House of permitting extracts to be inserted in Hansard, it will be very difficult to draw the line, and I can conjure up a vision of Hansard growing to two or three times its present size. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he either quote extracts from the article in question bearing on the matter, or that he read the document in its entirely. If the document has any bearing on the subject I think it should be placed before the House so that we can more intelligently vote on the question when we come to do so.

Mr. NEILL: I would have no hesitation in reading the article in its entirety; I am a comparatively young man, but as other speakers are to follow me to-night, it would not be fair. We have agreed on a schedule of speakers, and it is not fair to take up the time of the House in reading this document, but if any hon. gentleman would care to see it, I shall have much pleasure in showing it to him privately.

Dealing with this California question, in April, 1921, just last year, the Senate and legislative assembly of the state of California passed by unanimous vote a joint resolution in connection with this subject, called the Declaration of Principles. It consisted of four paragraphs, some of which I should like to allude to. In order to save time, I shall allude to them as briefly as possible.

The first declaration demanded absolutely the exclusion of Asiatics from the

United States. I may say that this Declarations of Principles was sent on as a state message from the state of California to be submitted to the federal government at Washington. They asked for rigid exclusion. It is curious how absolutely we are in agreement on a great many points. Our conditions are very similar. We also in British Columbia want rigid exclusion. We also want something else which hon. members who have spoken so far in the debate have not touched on, and that is that to make rigid exclusion worth anything we must have some system of registration because there are more orientals coming into British Columbia by the underground route than through the open door. It is no use shutting the lid on the top if you leave the underground passage open, and some system of registration such as we had in the war must be put into force, or we need not bother about putting restrictions on at the other end. I will show later the numbers that are coming in by the underground passage, and the only remedy for this is to have some system of registration.

Accompanying that Declaration of Principle the state of California submitted to Washington what they called a brief. It is a statement very carefully and very skilfully drawn up amplifying the Declaration of Principles and expressing the attitude of California. Yesterday I laid on the desk of hon. members copies, as many as I had, at any rate, of this small booklet. There is a certain amount of pathetic interest attaching to these little pamphlets. They were sent to me by a man in the Shaughnessy military hospital at Vancouver, which is practically a hospital for those who are going to die, for those who are so badly injured that the best thing for them is to allow them to die quietly and peaceably. The man who wrote me said that he had collected there the money to buy a hundred or a hundred and fifty of these pamphlets, and he sent them on to me in the hope that I would distribute them, so anxious were these men to try and get the true conditions in British Columbia before this House, and as the man who wrote the letter said, "Since I began this letter one more of our number has passed away—a man who only last week was fully and heartily engrossed in the presentation of this subject." It is pitiful to think of these young men taking such an interest in this question, and I hope hon. members will find the opportunity to read this little pamphlet and the proofs contained in it. One might almost call it a message to hon. members from the grave.

As regards the preamble of this brief, I shall quote only a very few words. They say that "the facts presented offer conclusive evidence of a grave and imminent danger, not only to California and the Pacific states, but to the nation itself." That is the considered judgment of the state of California.

The second clause deals with the desire of the state of California to govern that rigid exclusion themselves, and not by the state of Japan. Under the Gentleman's Agreement, Japan decides who shall come in and who shall stay out. The state of California wishes the Gentleman's Agreement denounced and says: "In future let us decide who shall come in and who shall not." I might say that that also applies to British Columbia.

The third clause refers to a sort of protest against any possible action on behalf of the federal government interfering with the Alien Land Act of California, which prevents aliens from owning or leasing agricultural lands, the same as in Japan. This protest urges the federal government not to give way to any representations on the part of the Japanese government to alter or over-ride that act, or to change the act which says that aliens in the States cannot be naturalized.

The fourth clause which I need not quote asks—it makes it one of the principles of their platform—that justice and freedom shall be given to the Japanese already in California. They put that squarely and unmistakably, and the only exception they make is that aliens must not be allowed to lease or own land, and they quote for their reason the treaty between Japan and the United States, in which that provision is absolutely laid down. In neither of the contracting countries are the subjects of the other allowed to own or lease land for agricultural purposes, and the state of California asks that that be adhered to.

I might explain the difference between the law in the States and our own law in that regard. In the States they have a law which forbids the naturalization of any aliens of brown or yellow race. I need not go into the details—that is a fact to-day—and they put the law in three words: This act shall apply only to free white people. There is also a provision for letting in the Filipinos and negroes but it excludes

orientals absolutely. No oriental if he lived a thousand years in the States could be naturalized.

I wish to Heaven we had the same provision in British Columbia. In Canada, as you know, we do allow them to be naturalized to our everlasting regret; and on looking up some old books I found that as far back as 1898 there was a scandal on account of Japs being naturalized after they had only been four and a half months in British Columbia. It was discovered after investigation—you will find it all recorded in the sessional papers of British Columbia—that Japs over from Japan and only a day, in some case two days, in Vancouver, were posted up to the Skeena river and given naturalization papers, certifying that they were naturalized British subjects. They were naturalized in batches, and where there was a rush to get them to the canneries they did not even stop to naturalize them—they rushed them right up and got a notary public afterwards to make out naturalization papers and sent the tickets up to these men. That is all to be found in the evidence in the sessional papers referred to. That is how we in British Columbia naturalized Japanese who were supposed to have been in the country four or five years whereas, as I say, some of them had only been four and a half months. It is in the light of these experiences that we are asking to-day that you shall not naturalize oriental aliens.

In the States, however, there is also another different condition. If a man is born in the States, no matter what his parentage is, he is a United States citizen and has all the privileges connected therewith. He becomes a United States citizen, even though he is the child of an alien, since he has been born in the States. We, of course, have the opposite attitude here. We refuse the franchise to even the children of a naturalized alien born here; but we only do so by a provincial law and we never know the moment that law may be attacked and perhaps successfully attacked. There was a very clever pamphlet got up a few months ago appealing to every sentiment of the British ideal fair play. It spoke of "Taxation without Representation" and was a very cleverly gotten up thing, demanding and begging that the Japanese in Canada should be given a vote. We have refused them as yet under our provincial law but the subject will be more complex when the children born in British Columbia become twenty-one years of age. Therefore we too are asking that oriental aliens, as in the States, should never be naturalized. I see that in the States also they are asking that they should not give to aliens born in that country any privileges as citizens. In other words we require what they have and what we lack, and they are asking to be given what we have and what they lack. It shows how close together our wants come in that regard.

As regards this rigid exclusion I want to ask the House this question: Is rigid exclusion unfair? Japan says it is but let us seek for the answer to that in the acts rather than in the words of Japan. This is what Japan does herself:

> The policy of exclusion is that followed rigorously by Japan herself by section of the Imperial Ordinance No. 353 against Koreans and Chinese. The reason she gives is that to permit the entrance into Japan of such aliens whose standards of living are lower than the Japanese would submit their own people to disastrous competition.

Substitute the word "Canadians" for "Japanese" and you have exactly our sentiments in British Columbia to-day. Surely precedent is better than argument. That is what Japan does, not what she says, and that is what we are asking to have done—only to follow the example of the Japanese themselves.

Now the second clause asks that the control of this immigration shall be put into the hands of the United States instead of left in the hands of Japan. Roosevelt, who arranged this Gentleman's Agreement, added a clause to it that if it was not effective the States would immediately pass an exclusion law. Unfortunately he left office and Taft who succeeded him allowed that clause to be taken out so that the United States surrendered every atom of control over the situation. The Gentleman's Agreement of the States was more rigid than our agreement. It did not permit, as we do, the entrance of 400 labourers a year; it called for the exclusion of labourers entirely; but it said that when a man came along from Japan with a Japanese license or immigration certificate he would be admitted, that being proof he was not a labourer; and the labourers flowed in by the thousand. They had tickets from Japan which said "This man is not a labourer" and in he had to come even though the officials knew he was a labourer. So they kept coming in by the thousands. That is the result of handing over, or surrendering, the rights of any nation to deal with their own immigration. Roosevelt truly says that never in the history of the

world except under dire compulsion did a nation surrender her rights in that way. Accordingly in the States they are asking, and asking very strenuously, that that be done away with. We ourselves have suffered in the same way. We have an arrangement that not more than so many will come in. Notwithstanding that, they enter the country by dozens, they come in armed with Japanese passports.

Now what is to be done about it? In addition to that of course there is a secret immigration which helps very largely indeed. As this brief very truly says the agreement should be cancelled. What is the good of talking about a Gentleman's Agreement because even assuming—and I say it is a big assumption—that Japan has lived up to it in good faith, it has failed utterly to accomplish the purpose for which it was avowedly entered into. Then it gives examples—I have found hundreds of them here but I shall only cite one. In California they have a Chinese Exclusion Act which means what it says and says what it means. In California the Chinese Exclusion Act has decreased the Chinese population fifty per cent in a given period while the Gentleman's Agreement has enabled the Japs to increase fourfold since 1906. Making necessary allowance for births 47,000 Japanese came in during that period, nearly all labourers, not one supposed to come in under the so-called Gentleman's Agreement. There were 20,000 Japanese in Mexico when the Gentleman's Agreement was first made but there are only 2,500 there now. Where have the rest gone to? Do you think they have gone to Japan or to Heaven? Anyway you will find them in California to-day, and, Sir, it is far easier to evade laws in British Columbia to-day in that regard than it is in California. We not only have the long international boundary line but we have an enormous and very sparsely populated coast line.

The Japanese line of steamers, manned in every case by Japanese—they carry no white crew and no white passengers—pass, at regular intervals, within ten miles of the west coast of Vancouver island where there are numerous fishing settlements with hundreds of Japanese fishermen. What is there to prevent boats with one or two Japanese on board from going out at night and coming back next morning with two more Japanese added to the number? And this could go on uninterruptedly. Off the west coast of Queen Charlotte island the settlements are composed of Japanese to the extent of ninety per cent. They send their schooners over from Japan to get lumber and shingles. What is to prevent them bringing with them hundreds of Japanese and landing them at night? Once ashore they are free. Who is to know how much of that underground system has been going on in spite of the existing agreement and the so-called Gentleman's Agreement. We are like the man in the Bible who said "All I know is, whereas before I was blind now I see." We in British Columbia will say "Before, we saw one Jap and now we see ten." We cannot argue about documents and treaties, but we know the Japs used not to be there, and we know too surely that they are there now.

There is another way in which the Japanse ingenuity comes in. The Gentleman's Agreement says they must not exceed 400, but that means in one year. That means 400 coming direct from Japan. Japan professes to have no control over her nationals outside Japan, and, therefore, she takes care to send 400 direct from Japan, but that does not mean that any amount of Japanese may not come from Mexico, Honolulu, or any other place. All they need is to break their journey for a couple of days, and then come in. In that case they are not coming direct from Japan, and they are allowed to enter. An Order in Council of this Government provides that no labourers are allowed to come in, but that is a temporary thing for disastrous times, and by and by that will be taken off, and the treaty with Japan will continue to go on as before.

The Japanese are experts at evading the law. As soon as a law looms up in California, they start to evade it. I never saw any nation more successful in evading the law than Japan, and if they cannot evade it, they get around it. They are a most intelligent race, and they can always devise a means of getting the Japs in. They saw there was likely to be trouble, and what did they do? They realized that a man born in the United States was an American citizen. They said, "Let us get together and get in a population and breed Japanese-American voters, and in pursuit of that policy they began what is called the picture-bride proposition. Under the Gentleman's Agreement the wives of men then in California—mark that—were to be allowed in. There were hardly any wives then in California. But they started this mail-order proposition, by which you took

a book of pictures and picked out your wife, and sent to Japan for her. That was called the picture-bride system and they boasted of the success with which they had evaded the act, the very spirit of the so-called Gentleman's Agreement. They brought them in by the thousands. The people soon began to get interested, and the Japanese saw the trend of it before it went too far, and they said to the officials of the United States, "We have started the picture-bride business, but we see you don't like it." The picture-bride business brought the birthrate of the Japanese so high that it amounted to 69 per thousand as against 19 per thousand for the white race.

What was the next thing? With their usual alertness, they found another loophole. In Seattle the authorities discovered that almost more Japanese children were being born than there were Japanese women, and they thought that, even for a Jap, that was something remarkable. They investigated the matter. They had reason to believe there was something wrong, that there was collusion between the Japanese doctors and the midwives, and false returns were being made. Then it was arranged to obtain birth certificates, and a Japanese boy was sent over from Japan on that certificate which had been obtained, and when he got to the States he was an American subject. The authorities in the States are now proposing to take the finger prints, the foot prints and the description of every child born.

When the agitation to stop the picture-bride business began the Japs said, "Sure, we are always ready to meet you." The hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) said he was sure the Japanese would understand. Yes, they understand before we do. They then started a system called "kandokan" or excursion-bride. The relation between the excursion-bride and the picture-bride is much the same as the relation between Eaton's and Simpson's catalogues, in other words it is exactly the same, only it is more so. Under the excursion-bride or kandokan-bride system perhaps three and a half more women were brought in than under the picture-bride system. So that we are only hoping that there will not be an agitation to stop the excursion bride, or the last state will be worse than the first. I am reminded in that connection of Lloyd George. It is said he went on triumphantly from one defeat to another. These Japs go from one defeat to another, and each time they are more successful than before.

I am trying to drive home one argument, and that is that there is only one remedy. That remedy is rigid exclusion and a system of registration. They are much too smart for us under any other arrangement. We hear talk from some people: "Oh, they are naturalized British subjects, what are you going to do about it"? There are 90,000 Japanese subjects in the United States to-day,—born and registered in the United States, and of these 90,000 only 73 have applied to be expatriated from Japan. If it were 73,000 out of 90,000 there might be some comparison, but it is only 73 out of 90,000, who have applied to Japan to be expatriated, which means to give up their rights as Japanese citizens, and of that 73 only 63 have been granted papers. So that out of 90,000 Japanese subjects in the United States, with their loyalty pledged to Japan, only 63 have been American citizens. And then we hear the prattle about treating them as naturalized citizens. There is no naturalization of a Jap any more than of a German, and they have their training just exactly as the Germans have it. There are to-day between ten and fifteen thousand native born Japs back in Japan getting educated in the traditions of their fatherland. They send them back at eight or ten and then send them back here again, at eighteen or nineteen years of age. Will they be American subjects after that, or will they be true to their country?

I will not deal with the land question, except to say that there was a treaty made in 1911 or in 1913 between Japan and the United States, which said that no subject should own land or lease it for agricultural purposes. They keep the treaty as regards Britain, but break it in California, and California passed a law making it more prohibitive. In two years they passed another law making it still more prohibitive. They passed another law in 1920 to try and make it still more prohibitive. The Jap gets around all that. How? He gets his kid of six days old and buys property or land in his name and manages it in his name. The native born Jap can own land and the alien cannot. And we talk about allowing immigration of people who are so adroit as that.

I wish to congratulate the hon. gentleman from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) on his excellent speech, and I agree with almost everything he said, excepting, when he said that he was sure the matter could be ar-

ranged with the Japanese. You can arrange nothing with them unless it is to their advantage. I recollect the fact that 24 years ago the hon. member and I sat in the British Columbia legislature struggling with the same question. The width of the House separated us then. Time has brought us nearer together, and perhaps experience has brought us nearer together in thought and view. It is 24 years ago that we sat in the legislature and the subject is but little more advanced now. I suppose in 24 years from now he and I will be wandering up to the pearly gates, and I suppose from force of habit we will be asking Saint Peter "How are you on Asiatic exclusion here?" I do not like these cycles of 24 years. They do not happen often enough. We are told the Japanese will not like this proposition, that owing to their services in the late war we should not take this action, and that we must not remember that service. The member for part of my district, Alberni, Major Burde, and a man with a good war record, spoke in the local House on the same subject, and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) will remember that he said "Yes, Japan makes a treaty with Great Britain and British Columbia pays the price".

Are we not, as the hon. member for the Fraser Valley (Mr. Munro) said, tired of paying the price, and is it fair that we alone should pay all the price? Our Canadian soldiers went to fight against Germany, in order to support the mother country; if Britain was defeated, Canada might have been turned over to Germany as a colony. Did our soldiers fight against Germany, in order that British Columbia now, and Canada as a whole afterwards, should be turned over to Japan to be a Japanese colony? Heaven preserve us from such a consummation. We did not fight the Germans in order to be handed over to the Japanese. Some weak-spirited people go so far as to say that we must be careful of offending Japan; that Japan might fight on that issue. What is the issue?—Japan will be fighting in these days when war is so unpopular and when you must have some national opinion behind you when you go to war, to compel us to give her rights that she denies to other nations. Is it likely that Japan would go to war for that reason? I hardly think there is much danger. Since when has it become a part of British policy or Canadian policy to say that we will give up our just and lawful rights for fear somebody will fight? That is not the principle on which the British empire was founded. If we are to fight—let us carry the argument to its absurd—for it is absurd—conclusion, and say that we must fight. Is it better to fight now when Japan controls only one half of British Columbia or to leave the fighting until ten years hence when she will, by peaceful conquest, have absorbed the whole of British Columbia and have thousands of her trained troops scattered throughout British Columbia and the other provinces beyond the Rocky mountains. If the matter has to come to a fight, it will be better to have it settled once and for all, but this has only to be mentioned for one to realize the absurdity of it.

I should like to have gone into the question of imperial jurisdiction, but that will be dealt with by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). The question really resolves itself in final analysis into this. Have we in Canada jurisdiction over our immigration or have we not. I have here an Order in Council issued by this Government or by the late government before it ceased to hold office, which Order in Council states that immigration of labourers of any kind into certain parts of British Columbia is prohibited, owing, of course, to lack of employment. That applies as well to the Britisher as to the oriental or any other immigrant. It applies to the Britisher, but it does not apply in its entirety to the Japanese. It applies to the Japanese who would come from Honolulu or 'Frisco but not to the Japan-

10 p.m. ese who comes to the country as one of the gallant four hundred whom we are compelled to bring over annually. I have this on the best authority. The Immigration Department states:

> All Japanese entering Canada are subject to all the provisions of the Immigration Act—

And that means this Order in Council as well.

> —with the exception of such provisions as would conflict with the Lemieux agreement.

Therefore as regards the four hundred people we cannot exclude them while we are at the present moment restricting immigration of British subjects.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the date of that Order in Council?

Mr. NEILL: One is dated the 9th June, 1919, and the other the 13th December 1920. I think those are the two. I thought this was last year; it was the year before. The

principle is this, that we absolutely prohibit British immigration and then we say that we cannot prohibit Japanese immigration. One hon. member who spoke this afternoon quoted Kipling's words about Canada being daughter in her mother's home and mistress in her own. Are we mistress in our home or are we not? Kipling said we were daughter in our mother's home; he did not say "illegitimate product" or "hired girl"; he said "daughter". Canada has all the privileges of a daughter. Will the fond mother—and Britain has ever shown herself to be a fond, lavish mother to her children—refuse to her well-beloved eldest born child, Canada, the privileges and rights that she has granted to her other children, Natal, New Zealand and Australia? Is it likely that she would, and at whose dictation would it be? An alien, yellow Germany. I can add another word; I can say a yellow, alien, heathen Germany.

I know it is unpopular in this day and generation, and considered old fashioned, to introduce any question of our relation to our God in a matter of public or even private affairs; but perhaps we might for one minute turn aside from the pursuits of the material and ask ourselves: Do we, can we, should we, expect Providence to bless this nation in its undertakings when we deliberately open our doors to an influx of an alien, heathen population in ever-increasing numbers? Japan is in the peculiar situation. Japan is not a nation living in ignorance or for lack of opportunity concerning the gospel message at all. Japan is heathen to-day by solemn and deliberate choice. Quite a number of years ago the Japanese appointed what I suppose in this country would be called a royal commission to settle two questions: Would it be for the benefit of Japan as a nation to change its religion, and if so what religion would they adopt? They were quite impartial; any religion that was good and practical would have received their sanction. After due deliberation they decided to remain heathen, and heathen they are likely to continue. A few missionaries will catch a few converts. A Japanese will turn Christian to-morrow if he thinks it will promote his interests in this country or in the United States, but at heart he remains a Japanese and a heathen. To-night when we are voting on this resolution we must remember that we are voting in accordance with the interests of our constituents and our country, but we must also remember that we owe some responsibility to the God whom we at least profess to follow in our religious experiences.

I submit that this House and this Government must alone assume the responsibility if this legislation is not enacted. We were told again that the Japanese are a proud race and that we must not hurt them; that they will fight. Yes! The pride of a race that makes a gentleman's agreement with the United States of America, that makes a gentleman's agreement with the Dominion of Canada and before the ink of the paper on which the agreement is inscribed is dry, that starts to break that agreement and evade its promises! If it is not in their official declarations—and I can show it in one instance at least—it is in their public press: you will see it openly boasted how they have broken their promises. The Gentleman's Agreement! the very fundamental basis of the existence of which is in the good faith of the contracting parties!

So much for the good faith of Japan; so much for its national pride. They are much more sensitive in their national pride than in their sense of honour. But if we must soothe and assuage that national pride, let me say we do not claim that they are to be excluded because they are an inferior race. They are far from that; I must admit; we must all admit that in many respects the Japanese can outbeat us in the field of industry. For instance, we must admire their thrift, their industry, their large families. Their unity as a nation is a remarkable feature. The family is behind the individual, the company behind the family and the nation behind them all. They are absolutely a unit in working out any industrial or economic pursuit. I for one am not ashamed to say that Canada will not survive in competition for economic advantage or racial supremacy under present conditions of Asiatic competition. That is an humiliating statement to make, but it is true, as every man in British Columbia knows. I said, under competing conditions. On equal grounds, we can meet them, but we cannot meet them under competing conditions. We might imitate their habits of thrift or industry or even as regards their large families, especially in these days when race suicide is coming to the fore; but we do not want to imitate them in their low standard of living or in the way they work, their lack of recreation, lack of comforts and lack of culture.

We do not want our women working long hours in the fields and factories, regardless

of the fact whether they are mothers or expectant mothers. In a word, we do not want to bring our white race down to the level of Asiatics, and for that reason, and that reason alone, we cannot compete with them. But the greater the disparity between the two systems of living, the greater the necessity to afford us in British Columbia that much-needed relief.

Now, Sir, we are come to the parting of the ways. Never before has the way appeared to be so clear, never again perhaps will the time be so opportune. We are told of difficulties. Of course, there are difficulties. Nothing is attained in this world without difficulty, struggle and sacrifice. But let us meet those difficulties with a bold spirit, and there is no doubt that we will succeed. The poet says:

> Still the bold, brave man is fortunate.
> He keeps his object ever full in sight,
> And that assurance keeps him firm and right.
> True, 'tis a narrow way that leads to bliss,
> But right before there is no precipice.
> Fear makes men look aside and so their footing miss.

Paul says: Let us be strong and of good faith; let us take our courage in our hands. If we follow his advice I am confident that a way can be found and legislation can be enacted.

If this House accepts the resolution, and the Government enacts, not only the necessary legislation indicated in the resolution, but also the registration scheme I have already indicated, I believe we will to-night do a great thing for British Columbia, a great thing for Canada, and a still greater thing for posterity. For I have a vision, Sir, of a greater Canada, of a Canada, far greater than that which our narrow vision and our limited ambitions to-day can realize. I wiil not live to see it, but it will come, a Canada spreading from ocean to ocean, with a teeming, contented population, numbering millions where we now see thousands, and thousands where we now count hundreds. From the Atlantic to the Pacific ocean I see that great Canada peopled with one great white race, the worthy descendants of the two races that now occupy Canada; I see one race, speaking perhaps the two languages still, but one race in everything that counts, one race in their unity as a nation, one race in their allegiance to the flag they follow, one race in their adherence to the God they worship.

That is a dream that will come true some day, and for my part when the time arrives, as it must for us all sooner or later, whether very little sooner or very little later makes little difference, when we must prepare to pass, or perchance pass without preparation, through that veil that hides the Great Beyond—for my part I can think of no higher eulogy of our political record, I ask for no loftier requiem to be sung over our ashes, than that it may be said that, in our humble way, we served faithfully our day and generation, and at this stage by wise and far-sighted legislation made it certain, or at least possible, that for all time to come this nation, this great Canada to be, shall be consecrated to the use of a white race and of a Christian people.

Hon. JAMES HORACE KING (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the subject of this resolution is not new in this House, but I think we are warranted in bringing it before Parliament at this time in view of our further experience of these Asiatic people who have been located in western Canada of recent years, more particularly in British Columbia.

It has been my privilege to take part in debates on this question in our provincial legislature, and it cannot be said that the British Columbia House has been remiss in regard to this matter. For many years back resolutions have been passed suggesting and urging action by the central government in order that this menace—and I think that term is accepted by hon. members to-day, because if one has followed the conditions that now exist in the West he will realize that this oriental immigration is indeed a menace—might be dealt with. Our legislature in that province has by means of an education test endeavoured to exclude these immigrants, but without success, such legislation having been disallowed by the Dominion government.

To-day we have arrived at the stage where we must appeal to the people's representatives in this House to give this question their very serious consideration. We have not only our own experience but we have that of the states on the Pacific coast, more particularly that of California, as to the great danger involved in the continuance of this immigration into our province.

Years ago the representations made as to the gravity of the condition came largely from our labour organizations, and so much was this the case that both parties at one time treated the question as a political football. That day has passed, and to-day all parties are united in their efforts to deal effectively with this menace to our national well-being. Indeed, throughout this debate

there has not been the slightest effort to make this a political question.

It is true that on the public platform in British Columbia to-day you will not hear a debate carried on as in former years in reference to the entrance of the Japanese, because British Columbians realize that in the Japanese they had a loyal ally during the war. But that change of tone is not to be taken as indicating any weakening in the attitude of the people of British Columbia in regard to Asiatic immigration. On the contrary, the question has assumed a graver aspect, and it is generally recognized that unless this immigration be strictly controlled, it will probably become a question of increasing difficulty between the two countries. Therefore it is of vital importance that the question be taken up between the two nations and brought to a satisfactory conclusion without further delay. As a resident of British Columbia, there is no doubt in my own mind that not only is this Asiatic immigration a serious menace to the people of that province, but that the people of eastern Canada are also involved and must face the seriousness of the situation.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to prolong the debate. The ground has been well covered on other occasions, and it has been very well covered this afternoon, the various treaties having been discussed and their operation fully dealt with; but I wish to assure the House that it is the desire of the people of British Columbia that action should be at once taken in regard to this matter in order that we in that province may have a better condition of affairs than at present obtains as a result of the continued immigration of Asiatics.

In conclusion, I may say that in order to counteract the effects of the presence in the province of persons of that class, in order that we may take care even of the present situation, it is essential that we bring in many good Britishers and thus regain predominance so far as the proportion of the different classes of the population is concerned.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate at this late hour to delay the House in the further discussion of this problem and would not do so were I not convinced that the matter is one of paramount importance, and that if we fail to give it complete consideration to-night there will be difficulty in our doing so at any later period in the session. If, therefore, I touch in some measure on points that have already been dealt with I ask the indulgence of the House and assert that I do so with but one desire, that of driving these points home and convincing my fellow members of the House, just as we on the Pacific coast are convinced, of the seriousness of the problem.

This is not, Sir, a racial question; I desire to lay that down at the very outset of my remarks. In approaching the question, I treat it, as I think all do who understand it thoroughly, as a sociological, an ethical and essentially an economic problem. There is very much in the oriental philosophy, their history and their religious beliefs, etc., that is attractive and that forms a most pleasing study for the scholar. But, Sir, we must realize this, and Parliament and the Dominion of Canada must realize it, that the two races are distinct in type, in tradition, in ideas, in their whole outlook on life. They are distinct branches of civilization. It matters not how highly we value the attractive features of oriental civilization, the question before us to-night is this: which shall prevail, ours, or theirs? It is from that angle that I desire to approach the discussion of this subject.

The first reason which I offer in opposition to further immigration from the Orient is based on a very keen appreciation of the magnitude of the source. Let me say to the House that there are 800,000,000 orientals facing us on the Pacific slopes of this country—60,000,000 in Japan; 340,000,000 in India; 400,000,000 in China; many millions of others in smaller spheres. Just visualize, Sir, for a moment what it would mean if there was even a tremour of immigration, unrestricted, from such a prolific source of supply as a population of 800,000,000 to a country the total population of which is 8,000,000. We in Canada cannot absorb any considerable movement of immigration from such a source as that.

Then, Sir, in looking at this question from the economic point of view, I find myself in most excellent company. Many hon. members may hold the view that the position taken by British Columbians and western Canadians is a narrow and prejudiced one. But when I read to the House very briefly a statement by Lord Milner I think I offer a reference, if I may so term it, which warrants my taking a position similar to that which he took in years gone by. As representative of the British Crown in South Africa he gave this question intimate study under the most trying circumstances, and he has this to say:

If we are to resist the influx of Asiatics into this country let us take the strong, unassailable grounds of social and economic reasons.

And it is upon these grounds, Sir, that we are appealing to the House at this time.

May I say to the House also this—and I submit it is important: there have been since the dawn of history movements of people from one country to another. I shall not go into detail; I shall simply state the fact so that the House may get the proper perspective. There have been movements of people from place to place, and it is on record that frequently the peoples originally established in a state have been literally thrust out by the incoming or migrating races. The pages of history are replete with cases of that kind. But let the House remember this: until very recently large migrations have been difficult; the lack of available space and the lack of transportation facilities offered a fair protection. But this protection to-day is gone. With our splendid transportation facilities—which in one case enabled us in the space of a few weeks to move literally millions of men across the Atlantic—with the consequent rapid movement of people from one part of the world to another, the presence of these 800,000,000 people as a source of immigration becomes a very serious problem.

Now, I shall deal briefly with one or two economic reasons which are irresistible to those of us who have witnessed their actual operation in this country. Where there is a large portion of the population consisting of orientals the effect of their economic pressure upon the community is startling—indeed terrifying. It inevitably means this—and it is proved by the experience of all the Pacific states and of British Columbia—that wherever the white man is brought into competiiton with the Asiatic, the standard of living must be reduced or there is no possibility of successful competition. It is a law that you cannot escape any more than you can escape the great laws of nature. It is there; the effect is before our eyes, and we witness it—nay, we experience it day by day and year by year.

An hon. member asked this afternoon why we could not compete. We cannot compete, Sir, for two reasons. First, in regard to the Chinese, we have in Canada to-day and have had for the last thirty years, to my personal knowledge, a veritable slave system. Chinese syndicates bring into Canada large numbers of individuals, pay their $500 head tax, their passage, their expenses. These Chinamen so brought into Canada remain the bondmen of that syndicate until they have paid off not only every dollar of that expense money, but usurious interest as well. Sometimes for fifteen or twenty years they remain the bondmen of the heads of those syndicates. When you want to hire Chinamen in British Columbia you do not go to an individual Chinaman and ask him if he wants a job: you go to the head office of some syndicate and there you hire one or a dozen as the case may be. They send them to the job; they collect their wages; they give them their keep. So we are perpetuating in Canada, under cover, it is true, a system of veritable slavery. So we ask the House, those of us representing that province: is Canada to be a nation of bondmen, or is it to be a nation of free men? We stand for Canadianism as we understand it, with all its weaknesses, with all its faults, realizing that in many cases, perhaps, there are difficulties and there are delinquencies. But we say this: We prefer Canadianism, as we understand it, to the asiatic or oriental bondservant system.

Another economic effect which I shall briefly refer to before coming to my main argument is this: for manufactured goods and the produce of the farm the home market is always recognized as the best market. Now in any community in which a large section consists of orientals it is noticeable that that community is a mighty poor market for the manufactured goods and for the white man's food from other sections of the country. All that you have to do is to realize this: that a Chinaman, and to a lesser degree the same is true of other orientals, will live upon a handful of rice day in and day out, mixed perhaps with a little fish. Where does the consumption of Canadian food come in? In regard to manufactured goods, he lives under conditions that no white man will live under, under conditions we positively refuse to ask our white people to live under, and so, I say, you destroy the home market for the supply of the goods of the country.

Let me say a word in regard to revenue. I have not the figures for Canada, but an exhaustive investigation was made in South Africa over a period of ten years, and it was found in Natal that the average annual per capita contribution to the revenue of the country was as follows—and I ask the House to get this in this day when we are looking for revenue and the distribution of taxes over a larger num-

ber. Here are the facts: The whites paid £30 11s. 4d., and the Asiatics paid £1 6s. 4d. In other words, over a period of ten years, on careful investigation by the British government, it was found that the white man paid into the public treasury $22 for every $1 paid in by the Asiatic. That is something we should think about when we talk about filling up this country and the distribution of taxes. Let us keep these figures in mind when we speak of bringing in immigrants for the purpose of sharing the burden of taxation.

There are those who suggest the importation of Asiatic labour in the form of indentured or contract labour. I wish to register very briefly, because I have not time to discuss it, my absolute and unqualified opposition to that. There is not a country in the world where indentured labour has been tried, where it has not been found that the labour that was indentured formed a very difficult problem in the country after the expiration of the indenture. I am not going to discuss that. All I wish to say is this: Canada, above all others, is not a suitable country for indentured labour. This is a country for Canadianism, for democracy, for men and women to build homes in, where we may have a standard of living at least commensurate with the ideals of the white race, and in such a country as ours indentured labour, which on its face is branded as of an inferior type, should have no place.

I wish to deal as briefly as I can at this late hour with perhaps the most important point in this whole discussion and one which I apprehend may be thrown into the arena in this debate by the Government itself, because the Government must take cognizance of it. I want to say to the Prime Minister that in approaching this part of my remarks, I do so, as far as I possibly can, free from any prejudice or from any desire to offer embarrassment to his Government or to the Imperial authorities. I think if he will follow me closely, I can show to the Government and to the satisfaction of this House, that the argument against our position because of Imperial reasons is not a well-founded argument.

In regard to that particular phase of the question, I hold in the first place that it is the inherent right of Canada, in common with all other countries, to determine the conditions upon which any one may be admitted within the bounds of the state. I lay that down as a primary and fundamental right, referred to indirectly by other speakers. Let me repeat it; that it is the inherent right of Canada, in common with all other countries, to determine the conditions upon which any person from any other state may enter its jurisdiction. Am I stating that too strongly, or am I in any sense violating what is known as international or recognized statutory law? Let me refer the House to this fact: that that principle, that doctrine, is recognized in the statutes of Canada, and has been for years. I hold in my hand the Immigration Act. I shall not read any lengthy portions of it, but just very briefly cite what is to my mind a vindication of my position and of that doctrine. In clause 38 of the Immigration Act under which we are operating, and have operated for years, it is provided that:

> The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order whenever he deems it necessary or expedient—

Do what?. Several things I shall not refer to, and then comes this:

> —prohibit or limit in number for a stated period or permanently the landing in Canada of immigrants belonging to any—

What?

> —to any nationality or race or of immigrants of any class or occupation by reason of—

What?

> —by reason of any economic, industrial or other condition temporarily existing in Canada or because such immigrants are deemed unsuitable having regard to the climatic, industrial, social, educational, labour or other conditions or requirements of Canada or because such immigrants are deemed undesirable owing to their peculiar customs, habits, modes of life, and methods of holding property,—

And so forth. Could any one ask for a clearer declaration of the principle to which I have given utterance than is embalmed in our own statutes? I am not however, limited to that. I have in my hand the Sessional Papers of 1907-1908 where I find that this Parliament laid on the Table the correspondence between the government of the day and the Imperial government. I want the House to get this point because it seems to me if they do, we meet absolutely and without any difficulty the problems of Imperial complications. I find here certain correspondence of which I shall only read brief extracts, and anyone who desires to peruse the correspondence will find it in Sessional Paper 74B, in the session of 1907-1908. Lord Lyttleton who at that time was Secretary of State for the Colonies, I believe, wrote to the government of the day in Canada pointing out

to them that they might now (in 1905) become a party to the Japanese treaty, and in doing so he made this statement, which is I think significant:

> Do the Government of the day desire to enter the convention under the same terms and conditions as Queensland?

What were the terms and conditions in Queensland?

> (1) that stipulations contained in first and third articles of treaty shall not in any way affect laws, ordinances and regulations with regard to trade, immigration of labourers, artisans, police—

And so forth. In other words, the Imperial authorities, through the Secretary of State, notifies the government of Canada in 1905 that it is their privilege to adhere to the treaty with this reservation, which was granted to Queensland and the other dominions. Now the government of the day did not accept the reservation, and I want the Prime Minister not to misinterpret my position here—I am not criticizing the then government for that; that is their business. What I want to do is to bring to your attention a certain telegram from the same gentleman, Mr. Lyttleton to the government here, in which he says this:

> In reply to your telegram received to-day, please inform your Prime Minister that before taking steps as regards the adhesion of your government to Commercial Treaty with Japan, His Majesty's government awaiting reply to telegram of July 14.

That was regarding this reservation. A second telegram was sent in which the government said they would adhere without reservation. Now my point here is this—I am not offering any criticism for their having done so, not at all because it was rectified later—but the point is the British government offered to the government of Canada this reservation. That is that we should retain control of our immigration, that we should have the right to say to the Japanese in this case, or to any other people "As far as you are concerned we do not desire to admit your people as permanent residents in Canada —that is as settlers, as immigrants if you like." But that is not all. I find in another copy of the sessional papers a despatch from Mr. Chamberlain, who was the Secretary of State in another government, in July 1898. Now this despatch from Mr. Chamberlain representing the Imperial government was in regard to certain correspondence disallowing some acts of British Columbia—the act referred to by my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie). That is the British Columbia legislature passed an act similar to the Natal Act whereby they imposed the educational test. This act was disallowed but Mr. Chamberlain says in a despatch addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, Governor General of Canada, and date 20th July, 1898:

> In the meantime I have to request that you will impress upon your ministers that restrictive legislation of the type of which this legislation in question appears to be is extremely repugnant.

Then he goes on.

> And you should not fail to impress upon them the importance if there is any real prospect of a large influx of Japanese labourers into Canada, of dealing with it by legislation of the Dominion Parliament on the line of the accompanying Natal Act, which is likely to be generally adopted in Australia.

And he sent a copy of the act to the Dominion of Canada telling us—this Imperial minister who was doing the negotiating on behalf of the Imperial government and the government of Japan—telling us "Here is an act; pass this act". Now I have a copy of the act. I take another step. Do not forget this—that Mr. Lyttleton and Mr. Chamberlain, both of them representing the Imperial government, both of them at the time considering the very problem we are considering to-night offered or suggested—indeed they said to impress upon the Canadian ministers the desirability of adopting—this Natal Act. Now this Natal Act was adopted by South Africa, by New Zealand and by Australia, and the one clause to which particular reference was made is as follows:

> Immigration . . . . is prohibited of any person who fails to pass the dictation test, that is to say who, when an officer dictates to him not less than fifty words in any prescribed language, fails to read them out in that language in the presence of the officer.

Now I am not here to say that is the best or that it is the correct method; but I am here to say that when the suggestion or argument is advanced that we must not deal with this question because of Imperial difficulties, the Imperial government is officially on record twice in urging us to adopt the Natal Act. I am here to tell the House that the Natal Act has been in force in Natal and in the other portions of what is now the Dominion of South Africa, in Australia, and in New Zealand. Not only is it in force in these countries but it has been taken advantage of to restrict oriental immigration. Not only is that the case, but I find that this Parliament, as recently as 1913, again asserted this doctrine to which I am giving utterance, to which I

cling tenaciously, and upon which I believe, Sir, this question may be decided one way or the other. If you admit we clearly have this right to restrict—yes, Sir, to refuse admission to Canada—all persons we consider not to be desirable, if we once admit that right, if we once realize that that right has been asserted by the British government and by the Overseas Dominions, surely we place ourselves in a position where we no longer fear the argument. But we have it again in the Statutes of Canada, 111-IV George V, 1913, referred to this afternoon by the mover of this resolution. Let me just put on record what is definitely stated in the statutes:

> Nothing in the said treaty or in this act shall be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Now I have read the provisions of the Immigration Act as they are and as they have been on the statute books for many years. I have read this treaty with Japan. In other words the Japanese government in 1896, in 1905, and in 1913 admitted and embalmed in these treaties our right to restrict their immigration if we so chose. The Imperial government has urged us to so restrict it. Now, Sir, what remains to be done? Simply that we exercise this inalienable right in the interest of the Dominion of Canada as a whole.

Now let me turn to another point in this matter, let me refer to the Washington Conference. It has been said that owing to the peculiar manner in which the British Empire was closely, and intimately one could say, allied with Japan that nothing should be done by Canada that might in any way disturb the kindly relations between the two. With that I am wholly in accord but, Sir, only a few months ago in Washington this dual responsibility was ended, and the burden of the solving of the problems of the Pacific was placed upon the shoulders of four great nations—Great Britain, France, the United States and Japan. These four great nations entered into a treaty that, whenever questions arose of a perplexing or threatening character, a conference would be held and a solution would be found. I want to say to the House that that pact at Washington removed from Great Britain a very serious anxiety and perplexity indeed. Now, Sir, I wish to take a step further. Leaving that Imperial question, leaving the international question which I think I have shown—

Mr. McKENZIE: Before my hon. friend leaves that point with which he has been splendidly dealing, does he notice the distinction which the mover of the resolution makes between "restriction" and "exclusion." The two things are very different indeed. Which of the two does my hon. friend favour?

Mr. STEVENS: I take, without reservation, the position of exclusion. I am grateful to my hon. friend for raising the point. It was that there is a finely drawn distinction between what was an adequate restriction on the one hand and exclusion on the other, and that brought about these very conferences and the correspondence to which I have referred, and which resulted in the Natal Act being adopted by the other Dominions, Australia, South Africa and New Zealand. While, perhaps, the act does not state frankly that they are going to exclude, yet in effect it does exclude, and it was to obtain that result that this act was passed. This is not a restrictive act; it is an exclusion act. I said a moment ago that I was not here to say that this is the best method, but I do say that it is an effective method, and if we are to go by precedents, if it has been adopted, as it has, and been in operation for many years by the other Dominions, we are justified, at least, in taking a step to that extent.

"Canada a white man's country" is not merely an empty phrase. I want to say to the House that this is an essential doctrine. The time has come that we must determine in Canada whether we are going to preserve this country as peculiarly and essentially a white man's country, or whether we are going to share its resources, its national, social and economical life, with other races, whose type of civilization, however good, is distinct wholly from ours. The other Dominions have had this problem before them for many years in a very active and vital form, but you will notice that in Australia, New Zealand and South Africa there are large areas that are semi-tropical, in which, perhaps, there is some excuse for saying that those areas are not a white man's country, but no man on earth can say that Canada is not essentially, climatically and in every other way a white man's country. It is necessary for us to take cognizance of this point, that we must determine whether or not Canada is going to be preserved as a white man's country. We may make blunders in taxing or in penal laws, but we can rectify those blunders at the next session of Parliament, or in the next generation, but if we make a blunder in this regard and allow the entry

into Canada of a very large number of persons who are wholly incongruous in conditions and life, who are incompatible to the race here, no action on our part can remedy it in the next generation. It will be gone forever, and Canada's purity of national type will be gone forever, and that is, sir, a situation which I look upon and look towards with a great deal of fear.

Indeed, Sir, the problem facing us is this: a conflict between theoretical international justice and stubborn internal, economic and sociological facts. That is the problem this House is called upon now, and it has been called upon in the past, but never with the insistence that it is at this hour, to determine as between these two points, whether any fine-spun theory regarding the conventional rights of an individual to move untrammelled wherever he desires is to prevail as against stubborn economic and sociological facts. I know in addressing the Prime Minister, I am appealing to one who has given considerable thought to social and economic problems, and I think he will appreciate my arguments when I once again remind him that Canada cannot admit of a dual standard of living. We cannot admit of a standard of living under conditions that the white population will not tolerate, while there is an upper strata, supposedly ruling the country—and he knows this, and I appeal to him as one who does know and others who have studied it will agree with me—that sooner or later that under strata will draw the so-called upper strata down to its level and very rarely is there any record in the pages of history where a large numerical growth has been elevated from a lower to a higher standard, that is, where there is a distinction in type and in racial construction. I desire to emphasize the point that procrastination in this matter will do no good. Not only will it do no good, but it will just serve to intensify the perplexity and to increase the force and the number of the difficulties with which we are confronted. There never will be a time when we can solve this problem as easily, as expeditiously and as successfully as we can do it now. But the longer we let it stand the greater will be the difficulty and the more intense will be our trouble.

I am going to state briefly where I stand on this problem; I do so after 25 years of close observation in Canada and in the Orient, and I do it after the most intense study of the problem to the best of my ability and with full acquaintance with the facts. I stand for the exclusion of the Asiatics as permanent residents of Canada. I pause here to say that perhaps that may shock some, but it need not. I am not saying that we shall not deal with, trade with, and admit bona fide traders or tourists or students to the country, but let them be bona fide and not come into this country ostensibly as traders and then become labourers in competition with our labourers. Let them come in here as bona fide students, and not under the colour of being students, and then turn out to be cooks or workers in our mills. That is the experience we have had in recent years.

We have had thousands of Chinese come in as bona fide students, and I think the immigration authorities did their best to examine and restrict them strictly to that class. We find thousands of them coming in as students, and then being distributed over the country as common labourers. In the fall of 1920, there came in as merchants, 1,400, whereas in months previous they had come in over many years at the rate of two or three a month. At that rate we could easily absorb them. There would be no great difficulty, but when suddenly the immigration rose to two, three, or four hundred per month, so that in four months 1,400 came in, it was time for us to take cognizance of it, and with the result that we found a regular scheme or system inaugurated in Canton by persons who had no other object but to gain money for themselves. They were entering Canada under these false colours. Now, Sir, there is plenty of room for regulations or, within regulations, for the promotion of trade and commerce and for communications of the character to which I have referred.

I wish to emphasize the fact that we in British Columbia, where we have been faced with this problem intimately for years, stand on the ground of total exclusion of oriental settlers. Let us take that question of persons who come into Canada to settle and remain. We stand in absolute opposition to any system of indenture or contract labour, and we also stand for a fair and just deal for all who are legally in the country. We want no oppression now, but straight British fair play for those who are in the country. I have a word to say in regard to indenture labour—the indenture labour referred to so frequently by individuals as a method of helping Canada to develop her natural resources and to settle her western lands. Another answer, which I should have given

a moment ago, which I desire to lay before the House now, is this—and hon. members will at once see the force of it.

You cannot show me any instance where the oriental has pioneered in Canada. Can you? They do not pioneer. How have our prairies been settled? They have been settled by the hardiest white men in Canada. Who were the pioneers in Quebec, the maritime provinces, northern Ontario, the wilds of British Columbia, the mining districts? White men, the best of white men. But your oriental, where is he? He is in the heart of the cities. Where is he in the Okanagan? He comes in there after the white man, struggling, experimenting and suffering disappointment and perplexity, has developed the country. After the white man has done the pioneering work in developing the markets, along comes the oriental and picks the plum. Where is he in the cities? He is to be found in the very heart of our cities, living under conditions which are anything but satisfactory. I want to emphasize that point. The oriental does not pioneer; he contributes nothing towards the opening up and development of the new country; he does, however, come along behind the pioneer and pick the plum.

In conclusion, let me ask this. Shall Canada remain white, or shall Canada become parti-coloured? Shall British institutions, traditions, ethics, and social standards prevail; or shall they, by blind neglect and purposeless procrastination, submit to a peaceful conquest by the forerunners of the hordes of Asia? Shall Canadianism, which we are always proud to picture as the perfection of British democracy, prevail; or shall it recede before the races that, as I have already said, are incongruous and incompatible with our mode of life? This is the problem before the House; this is the danger that we call upon the Parliament of Canada to avert, and this is the menace which we who know the difficulties, who understand the problem, are absolutely determined to resist to the uttermost extremity.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie), has said, and others who have spoken in the debate have agreed with him, that this is not a local, nor a provincial, nor, for that matter, a national question; that it is larger than a national question, it is a question of great concern to all parts of the British Empire; it is a great international and world problem, and it is from that point of view that I think we must all consider the arguments that have been presented this afternoon and evening. The House is to be congratulated on the tone of the debate from the moment it commenced. There has been an effort on the part of hon. members to approach this subject from the point of view of national interest, and to keep away from anything in the nature of party controversy. I need scarcely say that, in this regard, I am most anxious to follow all who have spoken before me in the course of this debate. The question should not be considered as a party question; it is a great national question, a great imperial question, a great international question, and we should all deal with it from the point of view of the responsibility which a question of such magnitude brings. If I refrain from going into the figures which have been quoted in the course of the debate this afternoon; if I refrain from making any mention of the statistics of the number of Japanese or Chinese who have come to this country during the last few years, I do so simply to avoid introducing any element of party controversy into the discussion, for hon. members will see at a glance that there is nothing that has happened since the 6th of December which could make this question so burning at the present moment. The argument that has been presented to-day all refers to immigration from the Orient during recent years, during the period of the administration which preceded the present one. For that reason and that alone, I shall refrain from saying anything about the statistics which have been quoted in the course of the debate.

11 p.m.

Respecting the problem itself, may I say that I agree entirely with the view of the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), as to this being fundamentally a great economic problem? In stating that it is an economic problem, he simply reiterated what has been said by most of the speakers who have addressed the House on the subject this afternoon. It is partly a racial question, partly a great political question; but it is primarily an economic question, a question of competing industrial and social standards. I have given a little thought to this problem during recent years, having had occasion several years ago to investigate the causes of immigration from the Orient, and ever since, having seen with increasing clearness, the vast significance of the problem to our country and other countries.

May I illustrate the point I should like to make by citing an example which affords a striking parallel? In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, an officer of the Crown of that day discovered what he claimed to be a law governing the precious metals, where metals of different qualities or quantities of fineness were put into circulation as coinage in competition with each other. That law has come to be known as Gresham's law of the precious metals. What Gresham discovered was that, where two kinds of metals were in circulation as coinage, if one was of finer quality than the other, the baser metal tended to drive the finer metal out of circulation. The latter came to be either hoarded or melted down and sold as bullion, or used in the international exchange; and that, in the course of a very short time, the only metal that remained in circulation was the metal of less fine quality of the two. That was but an illustration of the law of competition applied particularly to the precious metals. I believe that economic science will yet come to assert that a similar law obtains as between competing industrial and social standards where such exist. And in this great problem of immigration, of peoples of different races, different habits and different modes of thought and life being brought into competition with each other, I think we view the matter aright when we assert that, sooner or later, the particular civilization that has a lower standard will, if it is permitted to compete with a civilization of a higher standard, bring the higher standard down to its level. It is for that reason that I regard this subject as of so great importance to our Dominion. In speaking of the oriental standard as different from our own, I do not wish to imply that orientals are in any way a less splendid people than peoples of European races. When oriental labour in this country comes into competition with white labour in this country, it does so under conditions vastly different as between the two. White labour, with the associations that are attached to family life as it exists amongst those of our own families, carries with it obligations of a character which do not adhere to the family life of those who come to us from the Orient and who enter into competition with our labour. I need only mention that all white labour in this country has obligations of a character which are related to the social life of our country, with regard to which the labour that comes from the Orient does not have a like relationship, for example, the observance of one day in seven, the obligations attaching to the education of children, the membership in labour organizations, the affiliations with clubs and churches and the like,—all these and very many other associations that I might mention go to make up the social standard of living of our people. The people from the Orient when they come to our shores do not have like standards to maintain. The result is that unless our labour is protected against this competition, sooner or later it is brought down to the economic level of the race that is competing against it. I think that has been demonstrated very clearly in a number of our industries. There is no doubt that in many parts of Canada where competition of the Orient with our own labour has been great, our own labour has been driven completely out of the field of effective effort. From this point of view we are justified in regarding this question in all seriousness, for what has been going on on a limited scale to-day may in course of time proceed on an international scale.

North America is peculiarly situated as respects this problem because on this continent European civilization is brought into competition with oriental civilization. It is here that these two civilizations are brought into competition with each other. This continent has already for the most part been peopled by the white races of Europe; they have established their standards here. Of recent years the peoples of the Orient have been coming in increasing numbers, and their civilization with its lower economic standards is being brought into competition with our own. Consequently the great problem to be decided is, which of these two civilizations is to prevail. If I am correct—and I believe I am—in the assertion that it is a great economic law that the lower civilization will, if permitted to compete with the higher, tend to drive the higher out of existence, or drag it down to the lower level, then we see the magnitude of the question viewed as a great national problem.

There is not only that aspect to be considered. There is another important national aspect that claims our attention—the desirability of a country having a homogeneous people. It must be admitted that every country should have the right to control the composition of its own population. That is a fundamental right which I think we are in duty bound to assert. As has been said over and over again in this debate, it is impossible ever to hope to assimilate a white population with the

races of the Orient; the two will not assimilate. We wisely recognize that, we realize that if the question of oriental immigration ever became one of any considerable magnitude, we would be face to face at once with the loss of that homogeneity which ought to characterize the people of this country if we are to be a great nation. From that point of view we have to assume responsibility in this matter.

There is one other aspect which I think we cannot consider too seriously, and that is the obligation that exists at all times to avoid as far as possible the danger of social and industrial unrest, to say nothing of the vaster possibility of international strife. It is futile to contend that that danger is not pregnant where the oriental races are brought into competition to any great extent with the white races. Some fourteen or fifteen years ago I had the privilege of investigating the causes of Asiatic riots on our Pacific coast, and in the light of what I learned at that time, it would be impossible for me to do other than assert that that danger is existent wherever these two different competing industrial standards make their effect felt the one upon the other.

So, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the maintenance of our social and industrial standards, from the point of view of the desirability of maintaining a homogeneous population, and from the point of view of avoiding social and industrial unrest and the possibility of international strife, I feel very strongly that this matter of the restriction of immigration from the Orient must be dealt with, and dealt with effectively. I believe strongly in the restriction of oriental immigration, and I think it is the duty of the Government to do all in its power to make that restriction as effective as it can be made, maintaining the good-will as far as it can be maintained of all the peoples that go to make up the vast human family.

Now, let me say a word in regard to two classes of oriental immigration which have been referred to this afternoon. I think the mover of the resolution has very wisely made no mention of the immigration from India, because there are special reasons which should incline us to take up that problem with the greatest possible care. But in the last analysis we must remember that the arguments which apply in the case of immigration from China and from Japan are applicable also, when it comes to matters of industrial competition, to the population from India; and for that reason I think any position which we take on this question with respect to Japan and China should be regarded as being equally applicable to peoples from other parts of the Orient because we will have that question as well again to deal with sooner or later.

In regard to the Chinese, it has been mentioned this afternoon that the restriction sought in that connection was effected by the imposition of a head tax, at first fixed at $50, then at $100, and now and for some time past at $500. That that has been insufficient and ineffective is perfectly plain. The figures speak for themselves. The numbers of Chinese coming into this country despite the $500 head tax are very considerable. I think we might well say that the imposition upon the peoples of another country of a head tax by a nation professing a christian civilization is somewhat of a contradiction in terms. Something has been said tonight about the heathen and the pagan. Certainly the heathen and the pagan mind must find itself somewhat confused when it seeks to appreciate the Christian ethics that lead a Christian people to make money for their country out of a tax imposed upon persons coming from another country to follow a livelihood in the country which is to profit by them. I would favour the elimination of this head tax altogether and the substitution of a method that would be not only less objectionable but also more effective.

Some years ago the Liberal government of the day sought to bring about just such a change in the method of restricting immigration from China. In 1908 I had the honour of representing this country at an international conference at Shanghai. Before going to the conference, Sir Wilfrid Laurier mentioned to me that it was his desire to do away with the head tax, if possible, and bring about an arrangement with China whereby immigration from that country to Canada thereafter would be restricted by the adoption of a system of passports over the numbers of which our government would have control. He asked me, while in China to take up this matter with the Chinese government. I did so, and as a result of the negotiations an agreement was drafted between the Government of Canada and the Government of China, doing away with the head tax and substituting therefor a passport system, with the restriction of numbers in the hands of the Canadian Government. At the time that this matter was under con-

sideration with the then government the question of the reciprocity agreement with the United States came up, and it was decided to leave over the matter of oriental immigration until the reciprocity issue was determined. As hon. members well recall, the government of the day was defeated after the reciprocity campaign, and subsequently the government of China, which had been the other party to this preliminary negotiation, was also changed as a consequence of a revolution, so the negotiations fell through about as effectively as any negotiations could. But I would like to say to-night on behalf of the Government that we have already taken steps to resume negotiations looking to the restriction of Chinese immigration by a system of passports, the numbers of which this Government will control. That, we believe, can be made a system of effective restriction so far as that class of immigration is concerned.

One further word in regard to this question of Chinese immigration. Very little has been said this afternoon about the admission of Chinese students to this country except that in some cases Chinese have come in, supposedly as students, but in reality as labourers. I think we should make an effort to encourage Chinese students to come to our universities. In that view I believe we have the support not only of those who are interested in trade and commerce, but, I believe, of practically all classes in this country. When the deputation of the Trades and Labour Congress was before the Government I spoke to its members on this point, and the delegation expressed no objection to the admission of Chinese students to our universities, provided that the Government could make sure that this particular class came in with proper safeguards.

There are several reasons why Chinese students should be admitted to our universities. In the first place, if this country is to develop a trade with the Orient—and I take it that all people in the country would like to see trade develop between Canada and the Orient—it is wholly to our advantage that Chinese students should come to our country, that they should know something of Canadian conditions and after returning to their country help to make our conditions known in China. The American Government after the Boxer trouble in China, when a considerable indemnity was to be paid by China to the United States, believing that it was in the interests of trade to encourage Chinese students to come to their universities, agreed to allow that indemnity to be applied towards the paying of the expenses of Chinese students in American universities. The result is that hundreds of students have come from China to American colleges and have gone back to their country, and with their knowledge of American conditions have done what they could to stimulate trade between China and the United States. Spending some time in travelling in China on the occasion to which I have referred, I was impressed with the extent to which the Americans had invaded the markets of the Orient. On practically all trains on which one travelled, the cutlery, a great part of the canned food, many of the articles in use on the dining tables, were from the United States. In the City of Peking there was a store every article in which was labelled as having been made in America. In different parts of China and Japan it was very noticeable that the contact which educated orientals had had with the United States had gone a long way toward furthering trade in that country.

But there is another argument which, I think, is also important from a national point of view. If this continent is ever to meet the competition of the Orient, which will be an increased competition as years go by, it must make a contribution to the Orient which alone can save the situation. The Orient must become acquainted with our higher standards, as we call them—our higher social and industrial standards—see the wisdom of them and gradually come to adopt them. We may send all the missionaries in the world to China to preach the gospel of a larger humanitarianism, but that will never begin to effect what a few men who have studied in our universities, who have become accustomed to our civilization, will be able to effect when they return to their country and, in their own effective way, impress the benefits of that higher civilization upon their countrymen. I do not wish, Mr. Speaker, to take up too much time on this subject, so I will hasten on and refer to the question of the Japanese, the other class alluded to in this resolution.

Mention has been made of the existing trade treaty with Japan, and it has been suggested that the Government should give notice that twelve months hence the treaty will be abolished. It may be that such is a wise and desirable course, but I think, Mr. Speaker, before it is taken

the Government should consider very carefully the advantages which might thereby be lost, and whether it is really necessary to sacrifice those advantages in order to attain the object which hon. gentlemen who have spoken have in view. We are asked to make appropriations for facilities of trade with the Orient for the ports of Vancouver, Victoria and Prince Rupert. We are asked to do a great deal for the cities on our western coasts. For what reason? Because they claim that the trade with the Orient is a growing trade, and they hope to see it expand even more and more. Is it advisable, if it can be avoided, that the Government should take any step which may prove a barrier to the development of trade between Canada and the Orient? I submit that Parliament should consider very carefully the effect upon the possible development or commercial relations between this country and the Orient, of every act that it may enact or propose.

In the present treaty I find the following clause, which has already been mentioned by the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens):

> Nothing in the said treaty or in this Act shall be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Immigration Act.

Now, that may refer to the Immigration Act as amended up to date, or it may refer only to the Immigration Act as it existed at the time this agreement was adhered to on behalf of Canada in 1913. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that by negotiation with the Japanese government it will be possible to ascertain whether the Japanese government have any objection to that clause being construed as applicable to the immigration laws of this country as they may be amended at any time. I am inclined to think they will take that view, but if they should not do so, then I think it would be time to consider whether in the national interest that treaty should be abrogated.

But the further step that is suggested is that we should abolish what is called the Gentleman's Agreement now existing between Japan and this country. I am somewhat surprised at the statements which have fallen from the lips of some of the speakers this afternoon to the effect that the Japanese government have not lived up to that agreement. In this matter we have to consider very carefully the source from which the Japanese immigration into British Columbia has come, and to what extent the prevention of further immigration is likely to be effectively brought about through the abolition of an agreement to which at the present time the Japanese government is a party, and which I believe the Japanese government have adhered to loyally.

One hon. member mentioned that a few years ago there were a very large number of Japanese in Mexico and that today they had dwindled down to a very few. He asked where they had gone, and the assumption was that they had gone into the United States. If that be true, it cannot be suggested that these Japanese went into the United States in violation of any agreement existing between that country and Japan for which the Japanese government were responsible. They got in through evasions of the immigration laws, apart altogether from the agreement between the United States and Japan. May it not be equally true in regard to British Columbia that the Japanese have been coming in there from the United States, apart altogether from any attempt on the part of the Japanese government to stimulate immigration to this country from Japan?

When I investigated the causes of immigration from the Orient some years ago, under royal commission, I found that practically all the immigration that had come to Canada from Japan had been at the instance of private companies, apart altogether from any action on the part of the Japanese government. I think we should be careful in a discussion of this kind and of this importance to discriminate between immigration that may owe its origin to evasions, which would not be affected at all by any change in an existing agreement, and to immigration that can be put down to some deliberate effort on the part of the Japanese government to ignore an agreement to which it is a party. I wish to say that I think the Japanese government has been wholly honourable in the manner in which it has carried out the terms of that agreement, and I do not think unless we are very, very sure of our ground, that we will help to solve this question by attributing any false step or imputing any wrong motive to the government of another country, particularly a country which has been our ally for years, and which, as was mentioned by one or two of the speakers this afternoon, rendered our country vast service at a very critical moment in the course of the last few years. We will gain more in the long run by recognizing the difficulties and endeavours of other gov-

ernments to deal with these very problems, as well as the difficulties of our own government. This question is not an easy one to be dealt with by the Japanese government itself. They have their problems, as well as we have ours, and if it is to be effectively solved, I believe this will only be by the governments of the two countries working together with the one motive. I believe they can work together with the one motive, of bringing about an effective solution.

In regard to the attitude of the Japanese government, may I refer the House to a statement which appears in Hansard of April 29, 1919. In a debate on that day the Hon. Mr. Calder, who at that time was Minister of Immigration, had this to say in regard to the manner in which he thought the Japanese government had been living up to their agreement:

> The House is aware of the fact that some years ago an arrangement was made whereby a limited number of Japanese would be permitted to enter Canada. I have gone into the situation very carefully, and I can tell the House that the agreement has been lived up to by the Japanese government to the letter. As a matter of fact, taking the figures for the last four or five years, there are in the neighbourhood of 400 or 500 fewer Japanese in Canada to-day than three were in 1914.

That was the statement made by the Minister of the Interior in the Government of Sir Robert Borden, and of my right hon. friend, with respect to the manner in which the Japanese government had lived up to the terms of their agreement up to that time 1919 and I know of no reason to believe that the Japanese government have not ever since been equally vigilant in living up to the terms of the agreement.

To hurry to a conclusion may I say just a word about the difference between the use of the word "exclusion" and the use of the word "restriction", because that point has come up in the present debate. Just because this question is of the magnitude it is this House cannot be too careful in the impression which may be created abroad as a consequence of any phrase or word which may be used in debate or in resolution. The word "exclusion" in regard to these matters of immigration has come to have a meaning that to the peoples of the Orient is most offensive. If you read the debates that have taken place in the different Imperial Conferences, in the Peace Conference at Versailles, in the Conference at Washington, and in conferences which my right hon. friend attended of the premiers of the different countries, you will discover that wherever the different nations have come together to deal with this question in any of its forms, they have been careful to avoid in any formal resolution the use of the word exclusion, and I say without fear of contradiction that there is not to-day as regards any part of the British Empire—South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, or any other part—any exclusion act so termed, nor do I know of any exclusion act on the part of any nation in the world. That is not a matter of chance happening. That has been the result of very careful thought and deliberation upon the consequences of using particular words where those words are known to have an offensive meaning in the minds of other people upon whom they may appear to reflect. My hon. friend has spoken of the Natal Act. He said that it was to all intents and purposes an exclusion act. Well, I agree with him that it is so to all intents and purposes, but it is not an exclusion act. Australia has enacted what is to all intents and purposes exclusion against Japan, but Australia has enacted no exclusion act.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend is perhaps overlooking the fact that the United States have an exclusion act against the Chinese though not perhaps against Japanese.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking of the Japanese. I am glad my hon. friend has mentioned that. The reason why the enactment was in the nature of an exclusion against China and not against Japan was that China was regarded as a second-rate power, not a first class power.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend will again permit me. He used the phrase that there was no such thing as an exclusion act in the world. That is the reason I rose to correct him.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I must thank my hon. friend. I was talking of the relations between Japan and this country, and I was thinking of no exclusion act against Japan.

I might point out that in 1901 when Australia adopted what was termed the Natal Act, she applied an educational test, and the educational test as fixed in 1901 by Australia was that any immigrant coming to the country would have to be able to write down a sentence of some fifty words, at the dictation of an officer, in any European language. Four years later, in 1905, the words "in

any European language" were changed to read "in any language", and the change was made in order that there might be no offence to the Japanese. At the same time the government of Australia agreed to admit by passport into that country tourists, merchants, students and other classes, the Minister of External Affairs of the Commonwealth undertaking to control the number of passports that were being issued. Now that was not exclusion; that was effective restriction. The same thing is true of New Zealand and South Africa; and I contend, Mr. Speaker, that this House would make a great mistake if it took a course which, after great care and thought, no other part of the Empire has thus far taken. Let me say that I am in entire sympathy with the motive and the purpose of the mover of this resolution. I think if the resolution is to serve the avowed purpose he has in mind it is all important that it should pass this House as an unanimous resolution. I do not think we will help the cause of effective restriction of oriental immigration if there is any division of opinion in this House as to the resolution which should govern in the matter. If my hon. friend is prepared to substitute the words "effective restriction" for the word "exclusion" in his resolution I will, on behalf of the Government, agree to accept his resolution; but if he is unwilling to do that, I should feel that the reasons I have mentioned are sufficiently grave as to constitute a justification for the Government not accepting the resolution in the form in which it has been moved.

Now I wish to address one word in the nature of an appeal to my right hon. friend who sits opposite. When he was in the place which I now have the privilege of occupying, he spoke to me about the advisability, in these matters of foreign policy and larger questions of international purport, of the House rising above any question of party, and considering such measures when before the House solely from the point of view of the national interest—in other words considering what would best serve the interest of Canada, the interest of the Empire and the international obligations of which we might be seeking to take account. I make that appeal to him to-night. I would like this House to rise above any consideration of party one way or the other. I would like its members to view this question in the light of the responsibility which we have, not only as citizens of our own country, but to all parts of the British Empire, and also our obligations to the other countries of the world. Let us adopt a resolution which this House can agree upon unanimously, and avoid attempting to pass any motion which is certain to be misunderstood by the other party to the arrangement. There are two methods of dealing with these grave international questions. You can attempt to deal with them by law, by enacting legislation which in all probability will prove ineffective and serve only to antagonize and arouse bitterness and misunderstanding on the part of others; or they can be dealt with by negotiation between the governments of the different countries concerned in a spirit of good will, a spirit of friendly relationship with a great object in view. I contend that we are now dealing with one question which should only be dealt with from the latter point of view. We must seek to-day, above all times, to further good-will and to eliminate anything that is going to make for ill-will as between the nations of the world. There have been conferences for the purpose of establishing a League of Nations; there have been conferences for the purpose of doing away with the possibility of future war; conferences to bring about peaceful relations between the different countries of the world. We have a chance in this House of Commons to-night to help forward that new movement of good-will as between the different nations, or we can set it back and create an entirely new and very serious international problem. To-day, as this matter stands, we are in the position of appearing to have a grievance as against the orientals because of their coming in, in too large numbers, into our country. Let us enact an exclusion law, let us pass a resolution which will be understood by the oriental as meaning exclusion, and the grievance immediately becomes one on the part of the Orient as against us. Now I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we shall not help to solve the situation that has arisen in that way, and I plead with hon. gentlemen opposite not to embarrass the Government in its efforts to deal with this great problem, but in a cordial and wholehearted way to lend their assistance to the administration in its endeavour to elevate this question beyond the plane of party considerations to a realm which will help to further international good-will, friendly relations, and at the same time effectively deal with the problem to which my hon. friend's resolution refers.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the wording of the resolution moved by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) is as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of oriental aliens and their rapid multiplication is becoming a serious menace to living conditions, particularly on the Pacific coast, and to the future of the country in general, and the Government should take immediate action with a view to securing the exclusion of future immigration of this type.

I read the resolution in order to emphasize its limitations rather than its extent. The resolution contemplates the exclusion of immigrants of a certain class —the limitation of immigration. Immigration has a well-known meaning, it has a defined meaning in our statutes. Within the confines of that definition there would not be included many of those referred to by the Prime Minister, in the address that he has just finished, as of the class who should not, in the common interest, and in the common international interest particularly, be forbidden from our shores The resolution does throw into the arena of this House the question of restriction as against the question of exclusion, and the House must decide between the two. I am not here to argue for a moment that a question of this sort should be a matter of party controversy. The Government of which I was the head maintained a policy of restriction. That has been the policy of Canada up till now—that is to say it has been as respects the Japanese. At the same time we had, in the development of our nation, reached the stage when we must come to a conclusion as to whether we are going to have the exclusion as permanent residents of oriental aliens or not. We have to decide it. If we are going to pass a resolution in favour of effective restriction we really pass a resolution in favour of just what we are asked to do. We pass a resolution against taking further steps, by such means as the Government may devise, of going farther and stopping immigration, as such, from oriental alien lands.

Now I know it is a serious step to take; it would have been taken years ago had it not been a serious step. If this House decides that there has transpired in these years sufficient to convince us that we must in our own defence take this action then it is for the House of Commons to say so —not in terms of offence to any land but in terms of firmness and terms of decision. I propose to inquire very briefly whether we have reached that stage or not, and I propose to state m views in language that will be, I think, clear, in language that certainly will not be offensive, and I hope in language that will be very brief. In discussing this question it is needless to affirm that we must use the utmost care that no language be adopted that is unjust, and that offends the susceptibilities of any nation or any people in the world.

The resolution has to do with the relations between the British Empire and two great nations, China and Japan. There is a special reason as to both of them why we must be careful that the good relations now existing may continue. As to China because we have been parties at the recent disarmament conferences, to action there looking to the rehabilitation of that country, and its elevation again to the front rank of nations. Canada has taken a leading part in that work. Our relations with China have always been friendly. We pray that they may always be so.

As to Japan, there is perhaps still greater reason, not at all because she is a stronger power, but because the intimacy between the Empire of which we are a part and the Empire of Japan has been greater than it has been between that Empire and China. We have been historically—that is looking back over two or three decades—allies of Japan. We were allies under the Anglo-Japanese treaty until the winter that we have just passed through, and under the ægis of that alliance we joined hands together in the greatest war in history. Under the terms of that alliance, Japan stood at a great price true to her obligation and assisted magnificently our own Empire and all the allies in the struggle. Japan particularly took part in that measure of defence that had to do most directly with our own safety as a dominion here. Japan lived true and stood square with all the burdens of the Anglo-Japanese alliance: that is to say, in so far as they particularly related to our country, at least.

Nor have I any complaint to make at all as to the manner in which Japan has conducted herself as bearing on what is known as the Gentleman's Agreement conducted by yourself or rather arranged by yourself, Mr. Speaker, back in the year 1907. I had not heard before that there was any cause of complaint over Japan's fidelity to that treaty. I believe with the Prime Minister that Japan stood true to

the obligation she entered into with us there, consequently we must take care that whatever we say will be such that this country could take no umbrage if corresponding language were uttered in the Diet of Japan, and that we must take no action as such that, if the converse action were taken by the Diet of Japan, there would be objection taken in our Dominion.

Now what are the facts? We have had for some years, dating back, I think, to about 1886, some immigration from Japan and considerable immigration from China. I have the figures before me, extending back to 1905. Within that time I find that 42,085 have come to our shores as per the immigration figures from China, and that, in the same period, 20,883 by the same figures have come from Japan. It is claimed that we have at present, though perhaps the census may not disclose it, approximately 20,000 Japanese in our provinces of whom about 15,000 would be residents of the province of British Columbia. That number of itself is not relatively large having reference to our population. Across the border in the state of California there are said to be 100,000 Japanese, and in the other states of the Union about 50,000, a total of 150,000, as against a grand total of about 108,000,000 in the republic. The numbers there of Japanese would also appear not to be alarming, judging by the figures alone, relative to the whole population of the states.

But nevertheless we know—we cannot help but know, and we all know—that both in the United States and in Canada the numbers, by reason of the occupation and the modes of life, the habits of the people, are alarming, in view of the increase. No one can go to British Columbia, even for a visit, or to the further parts of Alberta, and not come back convinced of the sincere state of alarm in which virtually the whole population of the mountain province is found now because of the extent of Japanese aggression within that province, and of Chinese aggression too. The very same condition exactly obtains in the states to the south. The reasons have been disclosed in the arguments this afternoon. I do not intend to repeat them now. They are based on the fact that both the Chinese and Japanese people are accustomed through generations, through centuries, through ages to a standard of living far below, or, if it is better so to express it, far different from ours, so much so that there is no possibility of competition in industrial life between those of our race and theirs—based on the fact as well that their temperaments, their habits and their very natures are such that assimilation with our people is an impossibility.

Assimilation is always an impossibility where marriage itself is forbidden by the very essence of the fact. Marriage is forbidden between the Japanese and the Chinese on their part and the whites on the other—not forbidden by any special law, but it is proved through the ages not to be a habit, will not become a habit, and when it cannot become a habit a state of non-assimilation exists and we have to face the facts. The rate of propagation is such that in our own province it appears probable, judging by figures also before me, that the years will not be many before the births from those of Japanese origin in British Columbia will equal the births of the whites. How many those years will be no one can figure exactly, but when I notice that the births stood at 252 to 1 only in 1910—252 whites born to one Japanese—and when I see now not 252 to one, but last year 17 to one, then one is, at least, within the mark in saying that we are approaching the time, and it is not very far distant, when the rate of birth of the one will equal the rate of the other.

All this is equally feared in the country to the south. The process going on here has been parallelled there, and the state of alarm existing in the western states is at as high a peak as that which exists in our own province; consequently though we who are living in the more western and central provinces of Canada are not disposed so readily to measure the menace in the strong terms that it is measured in by our brothers in British Columbia, still we know that, however one may feel when he lives here, just have that man go out and live for a month, six months or a year in the Pacific coast provinces, and he comes back with his opinion just the same as the opinion of the rest of the population of that province. Now when that is a fact and has become a fact, this tremendous progression of all these races made there under the conditions that have obtained, under the laws that have obtained, under the traditions and in compliance with the treaties that have governed us through these years, surely it is not illogical to conclude that those laws, that province, those traditions and those understandings have not been sufficient to meet the situation.

Is there anything else we can do besides deciding upon exclusion of immigrants? By

immigrants, of course, we mean those coming here for permanent residence, to make this country there home. Is there anything we can do without going to the extent of the exclusion of that class? I really do not see that there is. I do not know what we can do but go to that length. The point then is to inquire what are the perils about going to that length. What is there that is offensive, that is wrong, about such a course? I do not think there is any disposition on the part of any nation to take umbrage at a law that excludes their people from the borders of another country. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) may have read reports of conferences at which I was not present but I cannot recall the question of exclusion coming up, or yet its being emphasized, in any way at conferences at which I was present, that there was aversion to that term on the part of other countries. I do recall a resolution which will appear in a document which has been laid on the Table of this House, which was passed at a conference which I attended last summer, and in which it was distinctly affirmed that full and unrestricted control of immigration rested in each dominion of the Empire, even as against the inhabitants of another dominion or of India, and I do not think a stronger resolution on that subject or a stronger expression of opinion could be possible. It has been said that exclusion is a term not used. The Prime Minister went rather far in that assertion. It is, of course, much too far to go to assert that laws have not been passed in countries excluding from their borders those of a certain race or those of different classes of races. That has been done more than once. It is the law of the United States to-day as respects China. None of us disputes that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it the law as respects Japan?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. There is effective exclusion in the United States of Chinese. There is effective exclusion in Australia. We may have exclusion without using the word exclusion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is the same arrangement as we have.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As regards Japan?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought my hon. friend referred to Australia. I will not state to the House what is allowed under the understanding with Canada as I have always been under the impression that those figures were not to be made public, but in the United States they have some similar understanding. What their figures are I do not know. But there is effective exclusion in Australia, and as I understand the matter, effective exclusion in New Zealand. Exclusion can be effective even though, in the statute upon that subject, the word "'exclusion" may not be used.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: When my right hon. friend speaks about effective exclusion, do I understand that he means that no one is permitted to come in?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If he does not mean that, if he means "effective restriction," there is no disagreement between us.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I mean what I said, and I tried to be clear. I mean effective exclusion as regards immigrants as defined by our law, and that is as far as the resolution goes—exclusion of immigrants, not exclusion of students. Students are excepted under the terms of our definition; students are, in practice, excepted; tourists, clergymen are excepted. There are six or seven cases excepted within the definition of our law, if my memory serves me aright; and as long as the spirit of the term is used, that is as long as the restrictions as regards only those coming to reside are kept up, it would be quite consistent with the terms of that resolution that those exceptions might be modified.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does my right hon. friend not recognize, in using such a word in a State document, if I may so describe it, or resolution, a danger that is very grave in these international transactions? May not the use of the word "exclusion", even in this resolution imply, when the cable reaches Japan to-morrow, that this Parliament has enacted a resolution in favour of the exclusion of Japanese? It is that danger that the Government is seeking to avoid.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There could not be justly a cable sent except one that was faithful to the resolution passed. I will proceed to argument that we ought to be able to say, without offence, that the time has come for effective exclusion of that class of people from our shores as residents here. That is all we intend to say by this. Let us proceed to argument. I stated first that there had been effective exclusion of the inhabitants of China in the United States.

12 m.

My hon. friend says: "Oh, yes, but China is not a first class power." Are we to modify our language according to the number of troops that there may be in the nation to which that language refers? I do not think Japan would expect us to do that; I do not think China would be flattered to know that that is the reason she is excluded. The United States has for years excluded the Chinese. I do not know whether Canada once excluded them or not; I am included to think she did. I quote this from a speech delivered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the 2nd day of April, 1913, in this House. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was speaking at that time on a motion by Sir Robert Borden for the second reading of a bill ratifying, on behalf of Canada, the Immigration and Trade Treaty between Japan and Great Britain. Sir Wilfrid Laurier supported the ratification and he used this language:

> We did not hesitate some years ago to exclude by statute Chinese people from coming to this country, but when consideration had to be given to the question of excluding the Japanese by hostile legislation the late government—

That is, his own government.

> —would not do so, for the simple reason that the Japanese were our allies, and we did not care to submit them to that indignity.

If that is correct, we did formerly exclude Chinese, and we did not maintain wholly the exclusion, but subsequently came to a policy of restriction by means of a head tax. There is effective exclusion, though the term may not be used, in the legislation in Australia as regards both Chinese and Japanese. There is effective exclusion in New Zealand of both. There is effective exclusion in the United States of Chinese now; and if Sir Wilfrid Laurier was right, we once had effective exclusion of Chinese. Why should this be offensive to any country. We do not ask for the exclusion of any people unless we are prepared to accept at their hands the very same treatment. There are reasons existing to-day why we are denied in Japan certain things that the Japanese are not denied in this country. I make no complaint of that. That suits their policy. There may be reasons why we should deny the Japanese certain rights in Canada which they would not feel like legislating as against us. But if they feel like doing that, certainly we can take no offence. We suggest, we ask for the exclusion, not out of any disrespect for the Japanese empire or the Chinese empire. We ask for it because it is for the permanent interest of the people of both those countries, that we maintain here our racial purity, just as they have considered it in their permanent interest to maintain their racial purity. It is not that we consider them an inferior race. Who can consider the Japanese people an inferior race? They have different standards of living from ours, standards of living that we describe as lower; but the Japanese nation in the last thirty years has, perhaps, made the greatest progress of any people of the world. It has made great progress in the advancement, not only of their military standards, but of their science, in the development of their arts and literature. In all that goes to make the highest type of a civilized nation the Japanese have gone ahead in the last thirty years faster than has any other great nation in the world. It is simply because they as a people so differ from us that the two races will not assimilate. They cannot work together industrially. Therefore it is for the peace and concord of both that we wish to say to them frankly: You can keep us from your country if you desire; we must keep your people from becoming residents in our country; and we will be better friends if we adopt that policy.

Suppose we take that stand, suppose this resolution passes, it is quite open to the Government to bring about the result in the method adopted by Australia. But that is not effective restriction, that is effective exclusion. Change this resolution to read, "effective restriction", and at once there is no authorization to the Government to change the present law at all, it would simply leave things the way they are. If the Government do not care to do it that way, they can do it the way it is done in other countries for there are other ways of bringing this about. I do not see why it is less offensive to say to Japan: "We won't let your people in unless they can speak French", when we know there is not one of them can do so, than to say: "We will not let them in, and frankly the reason why is because they won't assimiliate with us." I prefer to take the second course, but the first is open to the Government.

So long as there is effective exclusion of people coming here to live as defined by our law, then the terms of this resolution are sufficient; but if this resolution can be modified so that it will mean exclusion without saying so, then I have no objection at all to the modification. But I do not want to accept a modification that really does not call for any change in the present

law at all, that won't get us where we frankly want to get, namely, to the point of exclusion, because after we have exclusion there is going to be a sufficient multiplication of these races in this country to constitute all the race problem that we want to have for many years to come.

We want to get to the point that is at all events mentioned. I know it is the almost unanimous opinion of British Columbia, and I find that opinion moving eastward pretty rapidly. There is no doubt in the world that before very long opinion in Alberta will be just as pronounced as is opinion now in British Columbia, and at the rate this immigration is going on that opinion will in time be as pronounced in provinces further east. Let us therefore take occasion by the hand now at a time when it is less difficult, because the more Asiatics you get here the more difficult the problem is going to be. Permit those races to be multiplied twice, three times, four times over, whether by procreation, immigration or by some other process, and then put your exclusion up and you will be faced with an infinitely more difficult problem than confronts you to-day.

Therefore I think we must go to the length of saying to the Government that the will of this House is that we have effective exclusion of the oriental type of immigrants. Let us go that length. By what language you achieve that goal I care not. The language suggested by the Prime Minister would not reach that goal at all, and for that reason I cannot accept it.

Let it be understood that so far as I am concerned I favour exclusion. I think we must have it. I do not care how it is brought about, but I do think it has got to be brought about. Restriction will not do, It must be restriction of such an absolute character that it excludes. That is the position I take on this motion, and I appeal to the Government to help us reach a wording that will leave no doubt in the minds of the people of Canada or in the minds of the people of Japan as to just what the will of this Parlament is.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with close attention to this debate, for naturally as the minister in charge of immigration I am intensely interested in this question. I am interested, too, because it has become a question we must take notice of in the province from which I come. I know something, although not a very great deal, of the conditions existing in the province of British Columbia, where the question has become so acute.

I am not going to enter upon a further discussion of this question to-night, because I think everything has been said about it that could usefully be said. All I want to add is that there appear to be two or three salient facts. I think my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen), knowing full well as I do the care which he exercises with respect to matters of this kind, slightly overstepped the mark in the position he has taken to-night. I agree with what my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said. Indeed, I agree with practically everything that has been said, except in respect to this one word in the resolution which everyone who has spoken this afternoon has asked for—that the Government "exclude" the immigration of orientals into Canada. That is what is being asked for.

You admit in the same breath that there is an agreement between Canada and Japan which you are not very clear upon, and that that agreement has been lived up to. If I followed the speeches correctly this afternoon, nearly all the speakers referred to what is known as the Lemieux arrangement.

Mr. STEVENS: Although I know the minister would not do so intentionally, still I would not like to have our position misstated. We do not ask for exclusion and for the continuance or recognition of that agreement. We say that the agreement and the existing methods have been ineffective and disastrous, and we ask for the abrogation of that agreement and the substitution of exclusion.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Exactly; I had not misunderstood my hon. friends. There is an agreement in effect. I am not arguing whether it has been lived up to or not, I do not know, but in my short experience in public life I have learned upon more than one occasion that an agreement is a sacred thing and an agreement with Japan is just as sacred to the people of Canada, at least to those of British stock, as an agreement with any other nationality. Therefore that must be taken into account when you are dealing with this matter in a resolution of this character.

Mr. CLARK: Does the hon. minister suggest that the agreement with Japan was made for all time?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): No. If my hon. friend will give me a chance, I think I shall reach the point I am trying to make. I am not suggesting anything like that. I am just as anxious as are my hon. friends opposite that we reach a basis that will be satisfactory to the people of western Canada, because I take it I am as much interested in this question as any hon. member sitting opposite. I said that I accepted everything that had been said about this question. I accept the description of the menace as presented by hon. gentlemen opposite, but we are trying to get to the point where the Government can take this matter up and deal with it effectively. What the Prime Minister said was that he did not think you were putting the Government in a fair light if you adopted the resolution as it stands upon the Order Paper now. The hon. member for Vancouver Centre did not say that in the case of Natal, Australia, or New Zealand the words "effective restriction" were used; it has been shown that by means of an educational test exclusion was practically effected. An hon. gentleman asked me a moment ago whether we could not make a new arrangement with the countries concerned looking to restriction of immigration. Well, the Prime Minister has just stated that already he has taken steps with that purpose in view; but I cannot agree with the leader of the Opposition when he suggests that before we begin negotiations we state by resolution of Parliament that we demand exclusion. I want to say to every hon member who has spoken on this question that so long as I remain in my present position I will make every effort to bring about the condition they are so desirous of establishing, but I do not believe it can be brought about in this way. I do not think we are going about it in the right way if we seek to begin negotiations on any such premises.

My hon. friends say that we have dallied with this question. Well, for years I have read of it in Alberta; I have read of discussions taking place in this House and being participated in by representatives from British Columbia,—but apparently no action was taken. So far as I am concerned, and so far as my influence in the Government is concerned, I am ready to back up the Prime Minister in settling this question in a satisfactory way. I realize fully the menace, I realize that the question is one that must be dealt with. But in view of the suggestion that negotiations should be entered into, I do not think we should set out by stating definitely that we cannot make an arrangement on any other basis than that of exclusion. I think my rgiht hon. friend the leader of the Opposition would not want to approach the question from that point of view if we were to negotiate upon it. I do not think that we will reach any satisfactory conclusion; I do not think we will obtain the desired end, if we start out on such premises.

My hon. friends, with the best intentions in the world, have said some very hard things about the Japanese people. I do not know whether or not they are true; I have no information on that point. I do know the menace; I do know that I am ready and willing to go the full length in meeting them. We have the absolute right to say whom we shall have in Canada; there can be no question about that. All I am questioning is the desirability, in the face of an agreement already in effect, of proceeding by using the words set forth in the resolution.

Mr. LAFLAMME: Will the minister allow me a question? A distinction seems to be made between absolute or rigid exclusion on the one hand and effective exclusion on the other. I have not been able to understand that distinction.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I am sorry, but I do not catch my hon. friend's question.

Mr. LAFLAMME: I understood the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) to urge a rigid or absolute exclusion, and if I followed the remark of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), he seems to incline toward what he calls effective exclusion. I cannot see the difference between the two—"effective" on the one hand, and "absolute" on the other.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Mr. Speaker, I have not had a legal training and do not get these fine distinctions. All that I know is this: we are all endeavouring to get to the one place. I do agree with everything my hon. friends have said about this matter; I am entirely in sympathy with the object of the resolution, but if that object is to be obtained, we must be careful about the methods we employ. As I have already suggested, not one of my hon. friends has pointed to the use of the words "absolute exclusion" in the case of Australia, New Zealand, and Natal, yet

there is effective exclusion from those countries of the people whom they do not wish to have. The Government have already gone into this matter; would it not be better, in the interests of all parties concerned, to bring about the object aimed at without arousing the antagonism of the Japanese by the use of a word that undoubtedly must be offensive?

I hold in my hand a resolution passed by the British Columbia legislature on the first of November, 1921. It reads as follows:

> That a respectful address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant Governor, praying him to convey to the Dominion Government, through His Excellency the Governor General of Canada, the respectful request of this House that the Dominion Government amend the Immigration Act of Canada so, as near as possible, to totally restrict the immigration of Asiatics into this province, keeping in view the wishes of the people of British Columbia that this province be reserved for people of the European race, and that the Dominion Government consult with the provincial Government in the proposed amendments.
>
> Be it further resolved, that His Honour the Lieutenant Governor be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honourable the Secretary of State at Ottawa, the Hon. the Premier of Canada, the Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, and Hon. Mr. Crerar.

I do not intend to follow the argument any further. I presume I shall have some small part to play in this matter, and I shall do what I can to further the objects sought to be attained. But I do think you will put us in a much better position if you agree to the elimination of the word "exclusion" in the fifth line of the resolution. I therefore move, Mr. Speaker:

> That the word "exclusion" in the fifth line of the resolution be struck out and the words "effective restriction" be substituted therefor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the permission of the Prime Minister, I might make this suggestion. In the act passed in 1910 the following language appears:

> Prohibit for a stated period, or permanently, the landing in Canada, or the landing at any specified port of entry in Canada, of immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or requirements of Canada, or of immigrants of any specified class, occupation or character.

That is an act which gave power to exclude any race, but the word "prohibit" is used. I would suggest, if the word "exclusion" has any historic meaning carrying with it offence, that the word "prohibition" be used instead, and that to make it clear after "immigration" the words "for residence purposes" be added.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria City): While this oriental question has been brought before the federal House of Commons on many occasions it is very doubtful if it has ever before received the reception that it has on this occasion. For many years this has been a problem peculiar to British Columbia, but as the orientals have scattered over Canada towards the east, we find that it is becoming an eastern question as well as a western question and that our eastern friends now lend a more receptive ear to our warnings of the dangers of this oriental invasion.

Having been born and brought up in British Columbia, I have had an opportunity to observe the development of these Asiatics. I remember the day when there was but one Chinese store in the city of Victoria, and at that time the present site of the city of Vancouver was a timber limit. I have watched their development in agriculture. I have seen them absorb completely the truck-farming business. I have seen excellent Old Country gardeners come out and attempt to compete with them and be wiped out of existence, first, because the Chinamen would work much longer hours and work on Sundays, and secondly, because the Chinaman met a Chinese cook at the door when he went to sell his vegetables who stood in with him and bought his vegetables from him in preference to the white man.

I have seen them take hold of the small fruits industry also. At first they were received with open arms in some portions where fruit farming was carried on. The fruit growers welcomed them because they expected to produce their fruit at a lower figure on account of the cheap labour, but they soon found out that their employee of yesterday was their competitor of to-day and to-morrow and right along. The Chinaman and the Japanese went into these farming districts and worked for wages first. After that they insisted on working on shares, and later they would lease the land and finally purchase it, if possible, and put up a very strong competition with the white grower.

As has been pointed out this afternoon, our fisheries are largely now in the hands of the Japanese. It was pointed out that we have no less than sixty logging camps on the coast operated by Japanese. Only a few weeks ago I saw that the Japanese were negotiating for some of the largest timber holdings in the province of British Columbia.

There is hardly a steamer leaving the Pacific coast that does not carry tens of thousands of dollars shipped by these orientals to their home land; so the man who spends his money with an oriental in British Columbia or any other part of Canada is building up a home in Canton or Yokohama or some other eastern place, at the expense of the country where the money was earned.

With the Chinaman came the opium den, followed by the usual demoralization of the white race. We have found the orientals handling narcotics to a great extent, so they certainly have not raised the morals of the Canadian people by their coming. We find that the Japanese are much more aggressive than the Chinamen and you will probably have noticed the tremendous progress orientals have made in the last ten or twenty years as compared with previous years. It is largely attributable to the fact that they are now worth more money, and having that capital on hand, they are in a position to make much greater progress than they were before.

It has been clearly pointed out this afternoon that we cannot assimilate with these people. Therefore, they are a bad class of immigrant to allow into this country, which is a white man's country. We have had pointed out to us the conditions in California and the Hawaiian islands. Are we to stand idly by until we reach that point, or shall we be up and doing and protect ourselves against this Asiatic invasion? We have in our hands a very heavy responsibility, the responsibility to preserve this country for the white generations to come after us. It is simply a case of this kind: We have either to keep out these Asiatics or get down to their level to compete with them. We have noticed great improvements in late years in our methods of living, in education and so on. This is very desirable and should be encouraged in every way, but the Asiatic is going to prove a very great barrier to any improvement along these lines.

Why do we hold out for this word exclusion? That word was placed in there simpl because the restrictions of the past did not satisfactorily restrict. They have not given us results, and we feel, those of us who have been living in British Columbia for a number of years right up against these Asiatics, that the methods used in the past have not been suitable and therefore it is necessary to adopt even more drastic measures in the future.

I do not think that the exclusion of these few immigrants coming from these countries where there are hundreds of millions of people will interfere very seriously with trade, particularly when we take into consideration the fact that these countries have restrictions against us. I feel that if we can sell our raw products at a satisfactory price both the Chinese and the Japanese will buy them, whether we allow their immigrants here or not.

I fully realize too that the relations of the British Government with Japan make it rather more delicate for us to pass any legislation of this kind through this Parliament. Still, at the same time, I believe that when it comes to a show-down the British government will pay a great deal more attention to the welfare of one of her important Dominions than she will to her relations with any of these countries. Therefore, I strongly support the resolution as presented by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie).

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, it is certainly not my intention to take up very much of the time of the House at this late hour. That this question is a very important one is evidenced by the fact that we have been debating it since three o'clock this afternoon, and I doubt very much if anything new in the way of argument can now be said upon the matter.

I agree with the observation that has fallen from the lips of some hon. members that the question of immigration, particularly in a new and developing country like Canada, is of the greatest importance. In providing for immigration to Canada, and laying the foundation of the future nation to inhabit this Dominion, we have seen to it in the past, that that foundation has been laid in the stocks of the peoples of Europe. It is true that there has been diversity among those people who have come to our shores; it is true that among those we have welcomed to Canada there have been differences in language, differences in religion, differences to quite a considerable degree in social standards and social ideals; but nevertheless these peoples that we have brought from Europe to Canada are such that we can look with confidence to the future, to find them coming together and evolving a distinctive Canadian type. I have a great deal of sympathy with my hon. friends from British Columbia in

the position they have taken. Without saying anything in derogation of the Japanese or the Chinese, both great peoples, we are nevertheless conscious of, and must realize the fact, that ethnically these peoples are different and we cannot expect to successfully assimilate them. The question then arises: How shall this problem be handled? We have heard this afternoon—particularly from hon. members from British Columbia who are close to the conditions which they describe and who I am sure speak with certainty of knowledge—that economically the oriental alien, against whom this resolution is directed, is supplanting, and will supplant, the white or Caucasian races in the economic sphere. That in itself is not the most serious matter to my mind however; it is not so serious as the other objection that I referred to a moment ago—the ethnical fact that these peoples will not unite in the future. I think it is no reflection upon either the Japanese or the Chinese to make that statement. They are different peoples from us. They are great peoples. I would say that there is nothing in the realm of science, of art, or of literature that the Japanese could not do, probably with as great, possibly with even greater distinction than the European races. Consequently I offer that observation without the slightest hint or suggestion that there is any inferiority in these races—I base the observation on larger and broader grounds than that.

We come then to the consideration of how this question shall be treated, and I must take issue with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the argument he has advanced in respect to the resolution. Let me read it. It is:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of oriental aliens and their rapid multiplication is becoming a serious menace to living conditions, particularly on the Pacific coast, and to the future of the country in general, and the Government should take immediate action with a view to securing the exclusion of future immigration of this type.

The criticism of my right hon. friend, I think, is that unless the resolution were couched in this precise language it would fail to carry the full meaning that would necessarily obligate the Government to make a change in policy. In that respect I differ with him. I propose to support the amendment that has been offered by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Stewart) and I propose to do so for this reason. We must in these international matters—and this is a question of international concern—observe with the most scrupulous care the necessity of giving no offence whatever to a great and friendly power I think that is absolutely essential. After all, Japan has lately been the ally of Great Britain, and probably would be the ally of Great Britain to-day had it not been for the fact of the Washington Conference, and the change in the international situation that that conference brought about. But even to-day Canada is a signatory with Japan to the treaties that were negotiated at Washington only a few months ago, and this House will shortly be asked to ratify those treaties. We are also aware of the fact that Canada, along with Japan and China, is a signatory to the Peace Treaty that was negotiated at Versailles in 1919 and that all three countries sit in the League of Nations as equals. Consequently these facts require this House to observe the greatest possible care in its treatment of this quesiton.

The resolution as it stands at the present moment is open to this objection—that no matter what the views of the hon. members who have discussed it may be, pass this resolution as it stands on the Order Paper and it will go out not only through the papers of Canada and the papers of the United States but over the cables to Japan that the Parliament of Canada has voted to exclude the Japanese from this Dominion—you cannot put any other construction upon it. And yet, if I understood aright the argument advanced by my hon. friends from British Columbia this afternoon, they do not propose to go even so far as that—they propose still to admit to this Dominion those who may be of the student class, those who may be of the tourist class, those who may be of the merchants class coming here temporarily for the purposes of trade

I think the amendment offered by the Minister of the Interior is one that should be accepted by the House; and in all sincerity, and with a single desire to further the cause that my hon. friends from British Columbia have at heart , I would suggest to them that they should accept this amendment. What does it mean? It means, in the first place, that there goes from this House a unanimous expression of opinion on this question, and if you read the resolution that emanated from the Minister of Interior it can carry no other meaning than this: It is a declaration from this House that there is to be a change of policy in respect to this matter, if you like, perhaps not a change of policy but at any rate an absolute and complete enforcement of the idea that stands behind the resolution. That,

I take it, from the statement of the Prime Minister, is the intention of the Government; and I have no hesitation in stating that in my opinion it is the policy that should be followed by the Government. We do not wish to ban from oriental countries, those who wish to come here for the purposes of trade, who wish to come here as tourists, who wish to come here for the advantages of the educational facilities that Canada possesses—we should welcome all of these. The great hope for the future lies in disseminating the best ideas of education and giving these people all that is valuable in our culture and if possible getting for ourselves all that is valuable in their culture.

I submit, Sir, that end will be obtained if the amendement which has been moved by the Minister of Interior is accepted. Under that amendment, I think, it would be quite possible for the Government by friendly negotiations, by friendly means, to secure almost precisely the same position that exists in South Africa, that exists in New Zealand, and that exists in Australia today. And that can be done without, in a public way, by declaration of this Parliament, offending the sensibilities of a proud people in a manner which I am sure hon. members from British Columbia and other members of this House do not wish to do. My hon. friend from British Columbia would be well advised, in my opinion, and would further the very cause they have at heart, if they accepted the amendment offered by the Government. If that is done, and the Government are given an opportunity, they can be held to account in this House if they did not seek earnestly and seriously to give effect to the sentiments that have fallen from hon. gentlemen's lips in this House on both sides in respect to this very important question.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Winnipeg Centre): There are a few things which should be said in regard to this question.

An hon. MEMBER: At this time of the night?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, at this hour of the night. A good deal has been said with regard to the maintenance of our Canadian standards, and especially with regard to the necessity of seeing that the standards of labour should not be lowered. I agree that, under existing circumstances, with as much unemployment as we have at the present time, it becomes very essential that we should restrict immigration. That is a temporary expedient, but I should like to have it clearly put before this House that it is, at best, but a temporary expedient. It is no solution of this great problem which we face. A great deal has been said with regard to the orientals coming into this country and forcing themselves upon us. I should like to know who brought them into this country. For years labour has been pleading that something should be done to prevent unfair competition. The great corporations went over to China and Japan and brought coolie labour into this country. Why? Simply for two reasons, in the first place because it was cheap labour, and in the second place because it could be more readily handled. That is undoubted, and we can go all over the coast, and we have been able to do so for a good many years, and find great corporations who are doing this. In the first place the Canadian Pacific Railway brought the orientals in to work on construction on the docks and later on at other kinds of work. Other large corporations brought in these orientals because it was cheap labour and easily handled. Some of the orientals who have been brought in during these years are beginning to acquire a little money and going into business, and now, for the first time in all these years, we hear the cry going up from some business men, the retailers' association, and some of the financiers, that something must be done, as these orientals are beating us at our own game. I think it is well on this occasion that we should review the past and recognize very clearly that it is these big corporations and financial organizations that have been responsible for the oriental immigration to this country. I desire to suggest here that, even if we passed exclusion laws at this time, we would not begin to solve the problem. Why? Simply because we are beginning to get cheap labour done over on the other side of the Pacific. We have our transportation facilities now, our ships and so on. I remember two or three years ago while working on the docks in Vancouver, handling a cargo of crude tobacco from the southern states that came over the Great Northern. It was sent to China. I cannot say that the very self-same firm to which it was consigned afterwards sent back the return cargo, but I know there was a return cargo of manufactured cigars and cigarettes. If some of the big firms cannot get the cheap labour here they are going to get it over there. It is only

about a year ago we read in the financial papers that some of the big steel companies were finding that steel manufactured in China could be laid down more cheaply in San Francisco than steel manufactured in Pittsburg, and from that time steel plate was to be brought from the Orient, rather than to be manufactured on the American side of the water. As long as we permit competition of the kind we now have we will not solve our problems by saying that we are not going to have cheap labour on this side of the ocean. We will have it on the other side.

A good deal has been said that showed racial prejudice and an appeal made to racial bigotry. I want to protest that the civilization of China and Japan is not what we have sometimes called "heathen" and that it is not a low type of civilization. We must remember that we face a much bigger problem than has been suggested. It has taken several thousand years for the white race to travel, first by slow stages across Europe and then after crossing the Atlantic, to cross in the course of the last hundred years the North American continent. We are to-day faced with a world problem. The west has met the east. We have gone completely around; the circle is complete, and to-day the west looks out to the east.

I do not believe for a moment that the 800,000,000 of people in the Orient are expecting to come over and invade our coast. The picture was overdrawn. I do not know that Japan is very anxious to take Canada as a field for exploitation, but I recognize that we face a serious national and international problem. That being the case, it is all the more necessary that we do nothing to alienate any of these oriental nations, that we recognize the seriousness of the question and proceed in such a way as will promote, as the Premier has well said, a feeling of good will. It has been suggested that we have a much higher type of education here and that these people are illiterate. With regard to the Chinese, I desire to say that after their children have finished the regular day's school in Vancouver they proceed to their own Chinese school, as some of the Jewish people do in Winnipeg and Montreal, in order that they may further their education.

One of the troubles with us, as has been admitted on the floor of this House, is that a great many of these people are more competent than we are, and unless we look to our educational system in this country, we are going to be outdone either in this country or by competition from other countries. I had a few years ago the duty of making some investigation as to educational conditions in the western provinces. Among very large groups of our immigrants I found one-third of the children not attending any school whatever. If I remember the figures aright—and I have been somewhat in touch with the question of education in Japan—96 per cent of the Japanese children between the ages of 6 and 16 are attending school. Unless we are more careful than we have been in caring for the people in this country, and seeing that they are not unfairly dealt with, we are going to have to face this problem unprepared and confessedly be unable to meet the competition.

A great deal has been said of the way in which these Japanese and Chinese are increasing. For the past two or three years I have had a good deal to do with the loggers on the Pacific coast. I may say that of some 20,000 loggers in the union, as I am informed by the men who know best the personnel of that union, 75 per cent are unmarried. Under the conditions under which logging is now carried on, these men can never hope to have homes of their own. I would venture to say that you may bring in all the exclusion laws you please but so long as you force our own white people to live so that they cannot afford to have wives and children, you are not going to keep Canada a great empty country with the orientals locked out. These are matters which should be studied in connection with a debate of this kind.

What is the solution? One or two things I should like to mention. The first perhaps a temporary restriction of immigration, such as has been suggested. Certainly I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) has taken the right position when he says that we have a right to stand guard over our doors and to say who is to be admitted to this country. We have a right to say, under what conditions, this great experiment of building up a nation is to be carried forward. It would seem to me however that we would be attacking the problem on a great deal safer ground if we decided that we would maintain in this country certain minimum standards. Why is it that, as we were told to-day, girls go into Chinese restaurants? Simply because they are driven into doing so, because they cannot get decent wages. Why is it that Japanese women work long hours? I have seen them working in the canneries

at Steveston. Who is employing them? They are employed by white corporations that refuse to pay the wages that will keep our people there. That is where the trouble lies, and that is something that ought to be said. We would be going, perhaps, along saner lines if we said that we would make it a crime for any individual or corporation to pay any man or woman less than a living wage. As Paul Kellogg years ago said in his Study of Oriental Immigration in the United States, if we had minimum standards, we would erect an immigration tariff that would be more effective than any other kind of tariff we could possibly have.

We say that these orientals can get on better because they are united. Let me say that they have strong unions of their own. Although for many years labour has been bitterly opposed to oriental immigration, some labour unions—not many, I confess, are beginning to see the necessity for organizing the orientals who are already in this country. Speakers have said to-day that the orientals have succeeded because they have a strong organization. Yet there has been and there still is in existence, across this country from coast to coast, a policy that would tend to crush the unions that are the only safeguards that hitherto the labour people have had. I can take you to the coast, where my home has been for some years and still is and show you at the mines how, in the last few years, again and again the labour people have endeavoured to keep the oriental out of the mines. It is with the greatest difficulty that they have accomplished this. Indeed there are certain mines in British Columbia where the orientals, despite what the labour people have been able to do, are working not only above ground but underground. I can take you among the loggers. I know the Japanese have captured the shingle-bolt industry up the coast, and why? For the self-same reason, that they were willing to work long hours and under conditions which a white man would not tolerate. As one large employer said to me one day: "Why do we take these orientals? We want them because they will work cheaper and because they are a great deal easier to handle." He thought he could deal with them individually, put them to work longer hours at less agreeable types of work and all that kind of thing. That was the reason why to-night, even at this hour, I could not let the opportunity pass, in connection with this debate, without saying that we are not going to solve this

[Mr. Woodsworth.]

problem short of a definite effort to maintain in this country certain minimum standards for our people.

Sometimes we have failed to recognize how the world is unified to-day. I for one contend that we cannot maintain this idea of positive exclusion of one race from this country, and hope that that will be the solution for any of our problems. The world is too much unified to-day for anything of that sort. We remember that Japan remained a hermit nation for years, and Japan stagnated because of that; we remember that it is centuries since China tried to put a wall around herself and exclude other nations, and China remained static for many centuries. We would suffer the same penalty if we could keep ourselves away from the rest of the world. I maintain it is impossible in this day to do anything of that kind. We are trading in all parts of the world; goods from the Orient as well as from other parts of the world are coming into Canada; and if we maintain our trading and financial interests with other parts of the world, I cannot see how we are to adopt a rigid policy of exclusion of the people who are coming here. Some people say that this ought to be a white man's country. What about South Africa or India to-day? We claim the right to go in and dominate India, and yet at the very same time refuse to let the races of India come into Canada in any numbers at all. I am not pleading for permission for them to enter this country, but we must have regard to the larger international issues. May I be permitted to read just a word or two with regard to our rather arrogant position from a recent work by Stoddard on "The Rising Tide of Colour?" He says:

> I showed that the white stocks together constitute the most numerous single branch of the human species, nearly one-third of all the human souls being whites. I also showed that white men racially occupy four-tenths of the entire habitable land area of the globe; while nearly nine-tenths of this area is under white political control. Such a situation is unprecedented. Never before has a race acquired such a combined preponderance of numbers and dominion.

I have no desire to extend this debate at this hour; but we would be dealing wisely with this question if we realized these larger international questions which, especially since the world war, have been borne in upon us, and recognized that we cannot solve this particular question in a negative sort of way by mere rigid exclusion, without having regard to those larger international

1 a.m.

problems that face us on every side. Even should we exclude the orientals, we cannot thereby succeed in maintaining those standards of living which apparently has been the main purpose of the mover of this resolution.

Mr. NEILL: Can the leader of the Government give us an assurance that, in his mind, the words "effective restriction" in the amendment convey such a measure of restriction as is, at least, equal to the present Immigration Act in force in Australia to-day?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have in mind the same object exactly as the people of the country, to which my hon. friend has referred, had in mind when they enacted their legislation, namely, to have a restriction that will be effective. If there is any meaning to the English language at all, the term "effective restriction" comes as near as anything that I can think of to describing what has been aimed at where it has been sought to bring about an effective restriction of any character. I cannot find words to describe anything short of exclusion other than the words "effective restriction".

Mr. MANION: Could not "effective restriction" be variously interpreted by various people?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think there can be a doubt as regards the intention of the Government in the mind of any one who reads the debate after what I have said this evening and after what the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) has said. I think it must be perfectly clear both in our use of words and in the phrases and every expression we have used.

Mr. CLARK: Does the hon. member not suggest that the present restriction is not effective?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Most decidedly so. I think the present restriction is not effective; the Government is prepared to seek to make it effective. That is what we wish to do.

Mr. STEVENS: Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to make my position clear on the amendment.

An hon. MEMBER: No more speeches.

Mr. STEVENS: I am doing this out of courtesy to the Government. I have as much right to speak as has the hon. gentleman who interjects his observation.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member has a right to speak on the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot support the amendment. If time would permit I should like to go into some argument on it, but I shall not do so. If I put my position bluntly, I trust the Government and the Prime Minister will not misunderstand my motives. I think I can speak for a large section of British Columbia in any case when I say that we feel that this is exactly the kind of attitude with which our demands have been met by the rest of Canada. I do not want to appear to draw a distinction; but there must be one, because it has been emphasized by those who have spoken against or in question of the resolution that it is peculiarly a British Columbia question. We feel that that would just simply be doing what has been done in the past, putting the question off. My hon. friend the minister (Mr. Stewart) warranted me, I think, in taking that view when he said he objected to "exclusion" because it meant stating your position before you negotiate. What are you going to negotiate? We are opposed to further negotiations regarding how many orientals shall come in; we want immigration from the Orient stopped. We are not prepared to negotiate on the question as in the past of a limited number, and if time would permit I think it would be quite possible for me to convince my hon. friend and others opposite, with due regard to the intentions of the Government of Japan to observe the Gentleman's Agreement, that in fact that agreement has not been observed. I do not say that the individuals who evaded the agreement, who came in spite of it, were doing so at the instigation of the government of Japan, but I say that so far as Canada is concerned we suffered because of the evasion of that Gentleman's Agreement.

For that reason I would only add that so far as I am concerned I cannot support the Government. We offered a change in working to "prohibition", we are prepared to offer the Government other phraseology, but the Prime Minister does not seem to be willing to accept that offer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEVENS: Some hon. members laugh at the word "prohibition" but it is

used in the Immigration Act. For instance, "The Governor-in-Council may, by proclamation or order", and so forth, "prohibit the landing," and so on. The word is used half a dozen times.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): You have it in one Order-in-Council practically bearing upon all immigration into Canada, with the single exception of immigration from the one nation with who you have an agreement. My hon. friend's interpretation does not quite bear out what I said. All I am asking is that you insert nothing offensive to the government of Japan while that agreement is in effect. I think it is sufficient to say that this Government is already negotiating with Japan for the very purpose which your resolution sets out.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I want to make perfectly clear to hon. gentlemen opposite the position of the Government in this matter. If they are sincere in desiring exclusion of oriental immigration they will not insist upon a resolution which includes that word.

Mr. STEVENS: We offered in substitution the word "prohibition", which is recognized in the Immigration Act.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think we have had enough of prohibition.

An hon. MEMBER: British Columbia prohibition is not effective.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I might point out to my hon. friend that last November the legislature of British Columbia passed a resolution on this very subject, but it did not use the word "exclusion". It was left out advisedly. They used the phrase, "restriction as nearly as may be possible." I am quite agreeable to that. I do not see any reason why we should be called upon to go further than the legislature of British Columbia itself has requested us to go in a communication addressed at the time to my right hon. friend opposite.

In order that hon. members may see the possible consequence of passing a resolution such as that moved, let me ask them to consider for a moment what feeling would come over this country if we read to-morrow morning that the parliament of Japan had voted a resolution in the nature of exclusion against Canadians entering Japan.

An hon. MEMBER: Exclusion of immigrants?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend asks, "exclusion of immigrants." He knows as well as I do that among the great body of people reading the press of the country there is not that careful discrimination or discernment in the use of words that is to be expected among members of the legal profession, and if to-night the parliament of Japan were to pass a resolution in the terms of the resolution before this House, the impression of the Canadian people to-morrow on reading the cabled despatches would be that the Japanese were excluding Canadians from their country. A similar effect would be created in Japan to-morrow by any resolution we might adopt in this form. If this country wished to create a grave problem for the whole British Empire, we could not do it more effectively. I plead with hon. gentlemen opposite to consider not only their duty as Canadians, but their duty as citizens of the British Empire, and to try to uphold the position that the Empire has sought to assume in its relations with oriental peoples.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was present at the conference of premiers in England last year, and I can point him to the proceedings of that conference where oriental immigration was discussed and the greatest care was expressed on the part of those present to avoid the use of the word "exclusion" in touching formally upon matters of this character. I took care before speaking on this resolution to read the proceedings of the conference at Paris, and I found that there over and over again the discussion turned on the question of whether the word "exclusion" might or might not be used, and that conference, composed of the nations of the world, decided that it would be inadvisable to use the word in any single resolution that was to be adopted. Are we in this Parliament going to create an international problem not only affecting the British Empire but other countries, simply that hon. gentlemen opposite may be able to point to the word "exclusion" when they go before their constituents in the province of British Columbia? Let us be honest.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to raise a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My hon. friend is wholly unfair.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, he is not.

Mr. STEVENS: I am speaking to a point of privilege. I took the initiative in bringing the British Columbia members together, and we have presented this reso-

lution to the House without the slightest tinge of partisanship. My hon. friend is doing us gross injustice when he seeks to place that construction on our attitude.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to do anyone injustice, but I do wish the House and the country to know exactly what took place. A few days ago I spoke to the mover of this resolution (Mr. McQuarrie) about the serious international consequences involved in the use of the word "exclusion," and I told him we would gladly accept his resolution if he used language acceptable to the different countries comprising the British Empire. He came to me a day or two ago and told me he regretted that that step could not be taken because the British Columbia members attached so much importance to the word "exclusion."

Mr. STEVENS: Our action was non-political; the supporters of my hon. friend and the supporters of the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) were included in a joint meeting—the whole of the members from British Columbia, of whom we here number seven and the others six.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then I accept my hon. friend's interpretation that it was non-political; I will appeal to him now on the ground of national interest as against sectional interest. A few days ago, I made an appeal to our western friends to consider the interests of the Dominion of Canada as a whole in regard to a measure that was before this House. I appeal now to hon. gentlemen directly opposite in the interests of this country as a whole, and as a part of the British Empire, not to insist upon a resolution the adoption of which is certain to embarrass not only our own country but all parts of the British Empire. Let me say this further and make it perfectly clear, speaking with a full sense of the responsibility that is mine: If this Government to-morrow tried to bring about an effective restriction with Japan and had to meet the Japanese with a resolution to the effect that this Parliament stood for exclusion of Japanese, the Japanese Government would refuse to treat with us. Where would we be? Where would the hon. gentleman go? Whom would he look to in the matter of carrying out a resolution of this kind? How are we going to carry it out?

Mr. STEVENS: Have we no powers?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What powers have we to pass a law that is offensive to another nation, in terms that are offensive and which will not bring about the desired results?

Mr. STEVENS: Does my hon. friend suggest we have not the power or the right to pass any law with regard to the exclusion or prohibition to land in Canada of any immigrant from any part of the world that we choose?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I made it plain that every country should have the right to control the composition of its own population.

Mr. STEVENS: Then why negotiate it in Tokio?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is not negotiated in Tokio.

Mr. STEVENS: That is what my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I suggest nothing of the kind, and my hon. friend knows that perfectly well. He may be attempting to ascribe to me a motive and a position that are absolutely false. But I want to put the position of the Government plainly before him. The Government are anxious to bring about an effective restriction of this oriental immigration in a manner serviceable to all parts of this Dominion. We believe that we cannot do that if a resolution passes this House using the word "exclusion." We believe that we can do it by negotiation, by seeking to foster good-will between the different countries and to keep down ill-will. It is for that reason and that reason only that the amendment has been moved.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I submit that the Prime Minister has used language much stronger than the circumstances warranted. In my judgment he was not justified in going the length he did as respects what would be the attitude of any other nation or as respects just what is going to happen if we do this or do that. I do not myself know how he knows; furthermore, I do not think he does know. We presented this resolution—or, rather, it was presented by an hon. member on this side and another hon. member to the left—with the desire to get an expression of the will of this Parliament upon the real question. There was no desire to offend any nation; indeed, we were not aware of the fact that there was

some special offence hovering around the word "exclusion," but if it was thought that there was, we were prepared to substitute for it another word. Now, how are we met? We are met, in the first place, by an amendment which says that it is the duty of Canada to put in operation a policy of effective restriction. If that had the same meaning as what we desired to have Parliament express, that would be quite as good to us; but "effective restriction" is one thing and "effective exclusion" is another. Restriction means letting in certain—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: May I ask my right hon. friend a question, please?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What is the difference between the expression "effective exclusion" and "exclusion"?

Mr. MEIGHEN: None at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Certainly not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not pretend there was. But effective restriction means that we should adopt a policy of letting some more into this country and keeping some others out—letting some in and keeping some out. That is what effective restriction means.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who is it that is murmuring? Am I not making myself clear?

Mr. DUFF: Do not look at me, please.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For myself, I do not want to be a party to a resolution which affirms it to be the will of this Parliament that we should adopt a policy of letting some more into the country. I do not approve of that course, even if it is accompanied by a policy of "effective restriction." Now, my hon. friend says that we can have exclusion all right if we do not use the word. Well, I have tried to meet him in that respect, and I will try again. But I want him to understand now—and I say this without the slightest offence—that I am not prepared, for my part, to agree to a resolution which means something that I do not believe should be the future policy of this country, even though to say that may help him to make something else the policy. I do not think that is the right way of getting any policy. If we want a certain policy, let us express our desire for it, not in language that is offensive; let us choose language that can carry with it no offence at all. I do not know why "exclusion" has become a word to be shunned, but if it has, let us use something else. I used the word "prohibition," and also I suggested that after the word "immigration," in order that there could be no room for misunderstanding at all, the words "for residence purposes" be inserted. My hon. friend does not discuss the merits or demerits of the word "prohibition." I adopt it only because it is the word that had been adopted before in the language of the act of 1910. Now, I suggest this—and I ask the Government to consider it; if they do not, then it appears to me there is no use of our trying further to come to common ground—that instead of the words "securing the exclusion of future immigration of this type" we use this phrase: "bringing to an end further such immigration for residence purposes."

Some hon. MEMBERS: What is that, again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read the whole resolution with that inserted instead of the words it would replace. I am not moving it by way of amendment for the moment, but I should be glad to have that done if it meets with the approval of the Government:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the immigration of oriental aliens and their rapid multiplication is becoming a serious menace to living conditions, particularly on the Pacific coast, and to the future of the country in general, and the Government should take immediate action with a view to bringing to an end further such immigration for residence purposes.

The House divided on the amendment of Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) which was carried on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,	Cahill,
Beaubien,	Caldwell,
Béland,	Campbell,
Binette,	Cardin,
Bird,	Carroll,
Black (Huron),	Carruthers,
Boivin,	Chevrier,
Boucher,	Chisholm,
Bourassa,	Clifford,
Brown,	Copp,
Bureau,	Crerar,

d'Anjou,
Davies,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Desrochers,
Duff,
Elliott (Dundas),
Elliott (Waterloo),
Ethier,
Fafard,
Findlay,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gardiner,
Gauvreau,
Gendron,
Good,
Gordon,
Gouin (Sir Lomer),
Gould,
Graham,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Hodgins,
Hoey,
Hudson,
Hughes,
Hunt,
Irvine,
Jelliff,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kennedy (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Essex),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
King (Huron),
King (Kootenay),
King, Mackenzie (York),
Kyte,
Laflamme,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Lapointe,
Leader,
Léger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lovie,
Mackinnon,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
Macphail,
McConica,
McCrea,
McDonald (Timiskaming),
McGiverin,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McMurray,
McTaggart,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Mercier,
Michaud,
Millar,
Milne,
Mitchell,
Morrison,
Motherwell,
Murdock,
Ouimet,
Papineau,
Parent,
Pelletier,
Pritchard,
Putnam,
Rankin,
Raymond,
Reed,
Rinfret,
Robinson,
Ross (Simcoe),
Sales,
Savard,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Argenteuil),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Thurston,
Tobin,
Trahan,
Turgeon,
Walsh,
Ward,
Woods,
Woodsworth—130.

NAYS

Messrs.

Anderson,
Black (Yukon),
Boys,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Church,
Clark,
Dickie,
Garland (Carleton),
Grimmer,
Guthrie,
Harris,
Hubbs,
Humphrey,
Kellner,
Ladner,
Lewis,
Lucas,
MacKelvie,
McBride,
McKillop,
McQuarrie,
Manion,
Maybee,
Meighen,
Neill,
Ross (Kingston),
Senn,
Simpson,
Spence,
Stansell,
Stevens,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Tolmie,
White—36.

PAIRS

The list of pairs as furnished by the Chief Whips is as follows:

Messrs.

For the amendment Against the amendment
Macdonald (Pictou), Ryckman.

Motion as amended agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 1.45 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 9, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORT

Annual report of the Air Board for the year 1921.—Hon. Mr. Graham.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac) moved:

That the fees and charges paid on Bill No. 22, and act respecting Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company, be refunded, less the cost of printing and translating the same, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines.

Mr. STEVENS: Would it be possible to amend that motion to include a similar case, that of the bill respecting the Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, which was thrown out by the committee? I think the same treatment should be extended in this case, but I am not a member of the Railway Committee, and even as the one in whose name the bill rested, I have not the privilege of so moving in committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case a recommendation would be necessary in the form of a report from the committee, and if the hon. gentleman will take the necessary steps to have that recommendation made, the fees will be refunded in accordance with the usual practice. As it is, there is only one recommendation from the committee and it is with respect to the Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Junction Railway Company. Of course, it is only a matter of procedure.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution in favour of amending Part XII of the Canada Shipping Act, relating to Harbours and Harbour Masters.

Motion agreed to.

POTLATCH INSTITUTION

NUMBER OF INDIANS SERVING GAOL SENTENCES

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. FINDLAY (South Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Government to a matter which, I feel, requires some explanation. On Wednesday, May 3, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), in reply to a series of questions placed on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), gave certain information. Question No. 6 reads as follows:

> Are there at the present time twenty-three Indians serving jail terms for having taken part in potlatches?

The reply to that by the minister is:

> No; four are serving sentence, the parole of three of whom is under consideration by the Department of Justice.

I hold in my hand a telegram from a resident of Vancouver dated May 8, which reads as follows:

> Stewart stated last week in reply to Ladner's question that all Indians except four had been released. All are yet in jail. Demand explanation on floor of House immediately.

That message is signed by a gentleman in whose honesty, veracity, and caution in making statements of this kind I have the greatest confidence. I would like the minister to make some explanation.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I am sorry to say that I was not able to hear more than half a dozen words of what my hon. friend said. However, I gathered that it related to some matter affecting a reply made by the Minister of the Interior with regard to Indians. If so I will confer with the minister and with my hon. friend and will try to let him have an answer from the minister before the day's proceedings are over.

SUPPLY

MILITIA AND DEFENCE

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

[Mr Speaker.]

Militia and Defence—annual drill, $1,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Power had moved by way of amendment that item No. 90 be reduced by the sum of $1,100,000. Shall the amendment carry?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): I do not see the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment, but he probably will be here. The only way we can proceed, I suppose, would be either to declare the amendment lost or carried, or to move a further amendment.

I wish to make a short statement to the House before proceeding with this item. It is the desire of the Government, of course, to meet the wishes of Parliament, for Parliament is supreme. After hearing the discussion the other day I conferred with my officers again, and while they maintain that the original estimates are the proper ones, and the ones that should have been put through the House for the efficient carrying on of the work, they have given me a schedule of proposed reductions, and they tell me that if these reductions are made, the balance will provide for the training of a proportionate part of the force. The training last year was not complete, but it was approximately so. This year, I am informed, if the reduction which I am going to suggest is made, the artillery can be trained, city corps, and possibly a portion of the country units, for it must be remembered that a number of the city corps go into camp. The amount remaining after the reduction is made will provide for this drill as usual, the number of days being nine. It will, of course, reduce the percentage of strength of the various units, but my officers assure me that it will not altogether destroy the training or drill. I wished to make this statement before we proceed, because if the amendment be adhered to, I shall move a sub-amendment.

The reductions proposed by the officers of the department are as follows: Annual drill $400,000; cadet services $100,000; clothing and necessaries $21,000; Dominion arsenals $50,000; engineers' services and works $50,000; ordnance arms, lands, etc. $9,000; pay of staff $10,000; schools of instruction $50,000; and Royal Military College $10,000; making a total reduction of $700,000. That is a pretty drastic cut, when it is remembered that there was a marked reduction already in the estimates as compared with last year. I might add, however, that last year there was about $1,000,000 that was not expended. I now

beg to move in amendment to the amendment that the figures $1,100,000 be stricken out and the figures $400,000 be substituted therefor.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would call the attention of the Chairman to a point of order. The minister is the mover of the original resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, the Minister of Finance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the Minister of Finance the mover of all these resolutions in Supply?

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a resolution that he moved. The committee went into Supply on the calling of the Orders of the Day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it your ruling, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance is the mover of all motions in Supply? The resolution is undoubtedly a resolution moved by some member of the Committee of Supply. Who is the mover?

The CHAIRMAN: As the particular resolution before the committee was moved by the Minister of Militia the amendment to the amendment should, in my opinion, be moved by a member other than him.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am willing to move the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Lapointe) is that the figures $1,100,000 contained in the amendment moved by the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) be stricken out and the figures $400,000 be substituted therefor. That represents a reduction, I understand, of $400,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I desire to raise a further point of order. Can there be an amendment to an amendment to a resolution in Supply?

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion there can be. The question is upon the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MEWBURN: I should like to say a word or two before the motion is put. When we reported progress on these estimates the other night, we were dealing with an item of $1,400,000 for annual drill, and we had a most extraordinary spectacle in this House on that occasion. After the minister of a department, who had prepared his estimates after consultation with his technical officers, and had had those estimates considered by the Privy Council and approved by them, presented them to the House and moved their adoption, we witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the estimates being attacked by one of the minister's own supporters, and being supported by the Opposition. In my judgment the support of the Opposition was justified, because in the view of this side of the House to which I now have the honour to belong, the matter that is involved here is a question of principle, a matter of national importance, and not merely a political question. I very much regret that after the mangnificent statement made by the Minister of Militia when these estimates were last before the House, on the 25th of April, these estimates did not go through as presented. I thought that the statement he made could not but meet with the heartfelt approval of every hon. member. I am just as anxious as any hon. member to see economy in every department of the Government, but I think in this department we can go a step too far and cut down the estimates to a point that we shall regret sooner or later. If I may offer a suggestion to the minister—it is probably a dangerous thing for anybody to give advice, particularly to a minister of the Crown; when I was a lawyer I always felt that it was inadvisable to give advice unless, first, you were paid for it, and secondly, unless you thought it would be accepted; but I am going to risk making this suggestion; I have every confidence in the desire and ability of the minister to effect economy in the departments over which he now presides. Some weeks ago he brought down a bill for the purpose of bringing together under one head the Militia Department, Naval Service, and Air Board. I do not know what he is going to do about the estimates of the other two departments, but I have every confidence that had the estimates before us carried, the minister during the course of his administration might have found ways and means of not expending the total amount voted for the year, but would probably have been able to come to Parliament next year and show that he had saved some money.

But I regret exceedingly to see that the minister has taken anything off the item of "training," for the reason that I suggested in the House the other day. I draw his attention to one item wherein I think he could possibly effect economy, and that

is regarding the permanent force vote of some $5,500,000. In Canada we have not got what is known as a standing army. The permanent force was organized many years ago for a particular object—for instructional purposes for the militia of Canada. During the war a great deal of criticism was levelled against the permanent force, I think unjustly because they have justified their existence. Nevertheless I believe the permanent force could be utilized to greater advantage, and in certain military districts in Canada a very considerable saving could be made. We have to-day in Canada the following military districts: No. 1, London; No. 2, Toronto; No. 3, Kingston; No. 4, Montreal; No. 5, Quebec; No. 6, Halifax; No. 7, New Brunswick; No. 10, Manitoba; No. 11, Victoria, B.C.; No. 12, Regina; and No. 13, Alberta. It seems to me that great economy could be effected in connection with these districts. I know this will not be popular, but I believe the minister is anxious first of all to decide, if we are going to have any militia in Canada, that it should be as efficient as possible, commensurate with the expenditure we are going to make on it. Now, I believe that great economy could be made by wiping out district No. 1, at London, and putting it under the command of Toronto. Years ago it was under what was known as the Western Ontario command with headquarters at Toronto. I am not quite sure, but I am inclined to think that great economy could also be effected in military district No. 3, in Kingston. A good deal of the administrative work there could go under the headquarters at Ottawa, leaving an officer at Kingston in charge of the artillery there who could carry on the staff work in that district. In portions of district No. 5, Quebec, there is evidently no desire to do any training. I would advocate doing away with military district No. 5 and putting that under Montreal. Doing away with military district No. 7 in New Brunswick would not, I know, be popular. Years ago that was under the Halifax district. At Halifax was centred the administration of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I believe that could be done again. No. 12 district, Saskatchewan, I think, could be eliminated. Thus you would save a large amount of money in connection with the administration of these various districts.

I would strongly urge that the permanent corps should be concentrated, at least once a year, in camp for training purposes, preferably in one of the best camps on the North American continent, Petawawa. You could bring the permanent corps there for two months' training, and also bring here during the summer months your technical militia units which do require, it must be admitted by any military officer, training in camp. When I speak of technical units I refer to the artillery, the machine gunners, the signallers, and the engineers. They could be brought into camp and could take their instruction while the permanent force is assembled there. After the camp is over—I would strongly urge the minister to consider this suggestion—the permanent force, instead of going back to the various military districts where they are not very actively employed, should be continued in a more efficient state for instructional purposes for which they were originally organized. Without any extra expense, and to relieve many of the city corps of the burden they are under in paying out of their own pockets for sergeant-major instructors and others, you could very easily detail an officer and non-commissioned officer from the permanent corps to the city units for instructional purposes. The condition to which I have referred has existed for years and it could be met in the way I have indicated.

Then comes the question of barracks. We have hardly any permanent barracks in this country. Some people may say we do not need them, but I do not agree with that view. In Halifax there is practically nothing of the kind to-day. After the catastrophe which occurred there, the old barracks was practically destroyed; and, may I say in passing for the minister's information regarding Halifax, that all that military property there was taken over by the Dominion government from the Imperial government on the understanding that that property would be maintained for military purposes. The arrangement, as I understand it, was in the nature of a trust deed—that the property, or a portion of it, could only be sold with the consent of the War office and in the event of any sale the profits resulting therefrom should be returned to the War office. That matter came up during my administration of the Militia department, and after the Halifax catastrophe we took the matter up with the British War office in 1918, when I was privileged to be over there, to see if we could not get the arrangement modified. I contend that in view of Canada's effort in the war, the British government could

very well hand over the whole of the Halifax property to us to do as we saw fit with, because it was admitted that it would be useless to spend money in trying to rebuild any of these fortifications in Halifax. An officer was sent out from the War office, General Jackson, who took up the whole question of the defence of Halifax, and also the fortifications in British Columbia, because the Esquimalt property also owned by the Imperial government was in the same position. After many negotiations the idea I had proposed was carried into effect. But what I am getting at is this: The Militia Department, or the government acting through the department, could very well sell a large portion of that property in Halifax, which was valued by the Imperial government at $5,000,000, and that money should not go back into the general coffers of the Government, because it was handed over to Canada with the idea that it would be used for military purposes. My contention is that that money could be utilized for building permanent barracks in Halifax, in Montreal, in Toronto and if necessary in Winnipeg. We have other property in the Dominion belonging to the Militia Department that could very well be sold. We have a large amount of militia property in the city of Quebec which is absolutely useless for militia purposes. True it is now being rented at a nominal rental; but why should not the Militia Department sell that proproperty? The proceeds thereof could go to build proper permanent barracks, to properly house the permanent force of Canada and make it, if we are going to have any force at all, the proper official corps for instructional purposes and available in the event of any trouble arising. Some provision of this kind should be made, because we have given away a lot of the property in which the permanent corps were formerly housed. In Toronto we gave Stanley barracks to the city, and in Winnipeg we gave Osborne barracks to the province of Manitoba. We have practically no barracks in Canada for the permanent corps. My contention is that if the department would energetically go into these matters, enough money could be raised to properly house the small permanent force without causing, I think, one dollar of expense to the taxpayers of this country.

Now as to the question of cutting down the militia: I spoke the other day in regard to the city corps. Since the war the city corps throughout Canada have done tremendous work. I think it is admitted by everybody that their maintenance prior to the war was justified. During the recent great struggle in Europe they gave the best in them. I made the statement in the House that I thought the first Canadian contingent consisted to the extent of 98 per cent of trained militia men. The minister brought down a return to the House in which the number is stated to be over 92 per cent; but they could not figure on the balance on account of the state of the record, I do not think I was far wrong when I said that 98 per cent of the first Canadian contingent consisted of men who passed through the Canadian militia in some capacity or other. Also the officers who went overseas—not only in the first contingent but in subsequent contingents—who rose to high command in the army, were officers who derived their training in the militia in the early days. My contention is, Sir, that to-day you should not cut down this vote for training purposes. As I said before, bring your permanent corps into camp; train your technical units in camp; let your city units train at local headquarters giving them an instructional officer, and a non-commissioned officer who can act as sergeant major for the purpose of carrying on courses of instruction in training throughout the year. The officers composing the city corps to-day, and I think the large bulk of the non-commissioned officers, who served with distinction overseas and are heartily sick and tired of war, have linked up with the city battalions, and batteries, machine gunners, signal corps, and other units, for the purpose of spending one, two or three years to give the new men that are within these units the benefit of their experience. As I said the other night in the House, I do not think there is a city corps in Canada, in which there is an officer, non-commissioned officer or man, who draws one cent of pay that goes towards his annual drill at local headquarters. That money is all funded back for the purposes of the unit. The peace establishment of an infantry battalion is something like 460. Nearly all the city battalions are raised up to something like five or six hundred men. The extra uniform and equipment is paid for out of the fund that goes back to the regiment from the pay and not by the government. When a man applies for a commission he has to qualify in the school of instruction. When qualified he gets his commission, and has to supply his

uniform and equipment out of his own pocket, and it costs the government nothing. The various units of the militia corps—bands, sergeant-majors and so on —are paid for out of the moneys of that unit. I think, therefore, the money that is expended in training the city corps at militia headquarters is money well spent, and a great assurance for the country in time of need. We do not have to go far across the borders to find what they are doing. They have a standing army in the United States. True they are paring it down, but they are building up in a tremendous way throughout every state what is known as their national guards, similar to our militia. Every national guard unit throughout the United States to-day is being built up stronger than before the war. The war proved to them how weak they were, and they will take no chances again, and I venture to say you hardly ever pick up a paper from some parts of the United States where you do not find an item that the local guard has been equipped to preserve law and order. Thank goodness, we do not require that in this country, but we do not know when the day will come when we may require trained men within our borders for our own purposes, as well as for defence. Therefore, I think this Parliament would be criminally neglectful if it decided to pare this militia to a point where its usefulness would be absolutely nullified. Let us take advantage of the fact that we have the splendid men who served overseas with credit to Canada, and who would be prepared to serve in the future. Surely the inculcation of patriotism and the spirit of comradeship is worth while. I would like to see some of the estimates referred to a committee of the House—I do not suppose it will be done—especially the militia estimates where the technical officers could come before the committee and justify the expenditure brought in by the minister. In that way we would get technical knowledge which, probably, some of us do not possess at the present time. I am in favour of the proper training of the militia.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member has proposed that, instead of the present estimate, extensive reductions should be made in the vote for the permanent force. He has referred to districts 1, 3, 5, 7 and 12. Can he tell the committee what these reductions would amount to in money?

[Mr. Mewburn.]

Mr. MEWBURN: I am afraid I cannot tell the reduction in money, but I think in military district No. 5 they have had a general officer commanding, general staff officer, district intelligence officer, district signal officer, and assistant adjutant general in charge of administration, deputy assistant adjutant and quartermaster general, and technical departments and services, transport, medical service, pay services, and so on. My contention is that in that district the administrative staff should be cut down, and the administration could be performed under the supervision of the general officer commanding. And the same is true of Toronto and London. We have officers in command of the permanent force stationed in Quebec. There is a garrison there, and a senior officer in charge. All that could be done by the O. C. in the district with headquarters in Montreal.

Mr. MURPHY: You have read the list of officers relating to district 5.

Mr. MEWBURN: They are all the same.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood the original suggestion was that No. 5 might be wiped out, also district No. 1, and possibly one or two others. It would be of value to the committee if my hon. friend, with the extensive experience he has had, could tell the committee what the saving would be in money.

Mr. MEWBURN: I think the minister has his deputy there and the deputy could tell; I could not tell in dollars and cents. I suggest that No. 1, London, should be merged into Toronto. You would have an officer there. I do not know how far the minister could cut down, but I have absolute confidence in the minister, and I think that in his reorganization he could take those matters into consideration, and the whole of this vote ought to stand. He would have two or three months to work it out. I do not think he could tell now, but in a year he would be able to ascertain. I honestly feel that the members of this House have enough confidence in the minister to feel that he will do his best, in justice to the militia. I think he could do it within the year, but not offhand just now.

Mr. WOODS: I listened with interest to the discussion in connection with the military estimates. As has been stated by hon. gentlemen, we believe that the people of this country are tired of war, and we also believe that it is absolutely necessary to cut down the expenditure of this country to a

minimum. We believe there is no expenditure of government that a great many hon. members of this House, as well as the people in the country, would rather see cut down to a minimum than the military expenditure. Reference has been made by hon. gentlemen to the fact of men giving their services without remuneration, or very little remuneration. That is one of the common things that go with war. We know that the boys who went to France enlisted in the service, went over, and went into the trenches, suffered hardships and privations, and many of them laid down their lives. They went over there without the promise of any remuneration which would have any tendency to draw them in that direction. They received $1.10 per day, while foreigners in this country were making as high as eight and ten and twelve dollars a day working here. So that, so far as the remuneration of the officers and men was concerned, there is very little argument on that side of the question. As I view it, the annual drill is one item that the department might pare down as readily as any other, and yet practically lose nothing from a military point of view. I am not familiar with the annual drill, particularly of late years, but when I was a young man, many years ago, I took some part in the annual drill as a volunteer in the service, and I know that many of us young men went to annual drill to the camp at London. We rather took it as a little outing and a good time. We did not go for the money that was in it by any means, but we went there and rather enjoyed a little outing for a time. In my experience, and in the locality in which I live, the young men who enlisted and signed up for three years' annual drill, usually dropped out at the expiration of their three years' service. I do not know whether that was a general thing or not; but in my locality it was quite common and it was the case with myself. At that time the period of annual drill was two weeks, although at present I believe it is nine days in each of three years, and, so far as my experience went, the drill amounted to practically nothing as regards training for active service.

Another feature that I should like to mention in this connection is that, undoubtedly, quite a percentage of those men who enlist as volunteers would, if they were called on active service, be found to be physically unfit, because there are boys who look fairly well, who will enlist for annual drill without undergoing medical examination, but who would be physically unfit to go on active service. Let me illustrate that in this way. I have two boys who both look equally vigorous and strong and who are apparently equally capable of becoming soldiers. One, who enlisted as a flier, passed his examination and went through his training, physically strong and all right. The other one, who appeared to me, his father, to be equally strong and to look just as well as a soldier, was turned down as physically unfit when he offered himself for military service and was put under medical examination. The boy who was turned down as being physically unfit would have made an ideal volunteer to go out for annual drill. I am, therefore, convinced that a great number of the boys who sign up for annual drill would be found to be physically unfit to go on active service, and that the time and money spent in drilling them would be wasted.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend know that the regulation which is in force to determine who shall attend a camp of instruction is absolutely the same, as respects fitness, as the one in regard to who should enter the Canadian Expeditionary Force?

Mr. WOODS: I beg the hon. member's pardon. I did not know that; but I know that years ago, when I enlisted as a volunteer, I was put under no medical examination whatever, nor were any of the boys in the locality in which I lived.

Mr. VIEN: There has been a change since then.

Mr. WOODS: We were asked to enlist as volunteers, and we were enlisted whether we were physically fit or not. If we looked fairly well, we were enlisted and we served our three years as volunteers.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not the case now.

Mr. WOODS: Another feature that I should like to mention is this. When the great war was in progress and everything looked as though we were up against it very hard, a draft was called up, I think in 1917, of boys from 19 to 23 years of age. Had the age limit of that draft been extended to 35, possibly some of them might have had former training as volunteers; but I cannot imagine that many boys between 19 and 23 years of age could have had any such previous military training.

I do not wish to take up the time of the House in discussing this question, but I should like to bring this further matter to the attention of hon. members. It was

stated by hon. gentlemen the other evening that the military spirit of the young men of this country would be smothered out or killed on account of lack of annual drill. What was it that plunged this country and Europe into that terrible war, one of the worst, if not the worst, war that ever took place in modern history? Was it not that very thing, namely, the military spirit that was built up in Germany by training the boys and young men of that country to be soldiers? That military spirit, which existed in Germany, got such a grip on the people of that nation that they plunged the world into the great European war.

In my opinion, we want to build up good, straight, honest, citizens in this country, to train them on christian principles and not to instill in them the spirit of militarism in order that great armies may be established to go out and fight people of other countries. If the purpose of this appropriation is to build up a military spirit amongst the boys and young men of this country, I would oppose annual drill for that if for no other reason. That is all I am going to say on this question, but I am glad the minister has seen fit to cut down his estimates, especially as regards annual drill.

Mr. HOCKEN: Has the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Woods) any fear, or does he anticipate, that by this annual drill a militaristic spirit shall be produced in Canada equal to that which existed in Germany? Does he think there is any danger of that?

Mr. WOODS: Military drill was never carried on to the same extent in Canada as in Germany; but, possibly, if it was carried on to the same extent in Canada, it might have exactly the same result.

Mr. RINFRET: When these estimates were last considered by the committee, I congratulated the minister on having offered, in the general estimates of his department, a reduction amounting to over $1,000,000 for this year, and I also took consideration of the fact that he had to meet, in some branch of his department, an additional amount of some $500,000 on account of statutory increases in salaries, which increases were not actually shown in the estimates before the committee. I also took the stand that in no other department of the public service could economy be practised to the better liking of the Canadian people than in the Department of Militia or the Department of the Naval Service, and I asked the Government to consider if it were not possible to grant a further reduction in the item that was before the committee. A similar demand has been made by other members of the committee either on this side or in the Progressive wing, but it has been very strongly opposed by members of the official Opposition. May I admit frankly that the fact of that opposition only strengthened my purpose in asking that the reduction be granted? I may be permitted, perhaps, to take exception to some of the comments that were offered in the press of the country on that demand for a reduction which was made by certain members of the Liberal and Progressive wings in this House; and as there is an amendment to the amendment, I shall possibly be pardoned if I also devote a few moments to the consideration of those comments that have appeared in the newspapers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is a remarkable fact that the newspapers that assert that Parliament lacks independence are the very newspapers that always fail to pay tribute to independence when it is shown in Parliament, and, instead, always look for some ulterior motive that may prompt the action of those who take an independent stand on these occasions. The day after that suggestion was made in the House we were astonished to read in the Montreal Star that a real revolution had taken place in this country. On April 26 the Parliamentary letter published in that newspaper bore this caption:

Radicals Make Attack On Canada's Defenders In Debate On Militia

The letter recalled the fact that some five years ago the Canadian army had recaptured Messines Ridge in Flanders, and had performed other military achievements around the channel ports; and the writer went on to draw the parallel between those glorious achievements,—to which undoubtedly we were all happy to pay tribute—and the attitude which some hon. members had taken in this House. There was also an editorial published on the same day entitled: "Have We Forgotten Our Dead in Four Years?" That is a very serious question; and the editorial, occupying two full colums, concluded:

> The country might learn from the present exhibition of levity or ignorance that it is exceedingly dangerous to send to Parliament men of such limited knowledge of world affairs as those who have known no better than to

imagine the present time to be a fitting moment in which to slander our soldiers and seek to strike from their hands such arms as they bear.

If I were disposed to seek an answer to that editorial, which ascribes levity and ignorance to some of us on this side, as well as to hon. members across the way, who must share with us the imputation conveyed, I should need but turn to the same newspaper of the very next day, April 27, in which there was published another editorial under the heading: "We had a War". When I read that title, I must confess that I was under the impression that it would introduce me to another column or so of comments similar to those that had been published in the previous day's issue. But not at all. Only the day following the publication of that editorial that implied that we were forgetting our dead, the Star wanted to convey—you can hardly imagine it—that the people of this country were overlooking the

4 p.m. fact that we had had a war as a result of which we had a national debt of $2,384,996,391; an interest obligation for last year of $130,912,905; and a railway burden which was running the country behind annually to the tune of $100,000,000. These are the things which, says the Star, the people of Canada are forgetting. It says:

> Somebody should take certain selected leaders—

Selected leaders, which, of course, cannot mean men who display levity and ignorance.

> Somebody should take certain selected—and largely self-appointed—leaders of opinion in this country to one side, and whisper quietly but distinctly in their ears a piece of news which they do not seem to have heard, viz: "There has been a war".

Further on there is the following:

> We are living off the money-lenders. We have just borrowed a hundred million in New York at a cost to this country of two and a half millions commission . . . . In the meantime, the Canadians who are here must pay, pay, pay; and yet run deeper into debt every day.

That is what the Star had to say in regard to the national debt of the country and the necessity for retrenchment, taking their argument from the very war and the burdens which it had imposed upon the people. The very next day after they had charged certain hon. members of this House with having shown levity and ignorance, because we had asked that there should be a little more economy in militia estimates, this journal could turn round and point out the enormous responsibility which the war has placed upon us. Another newspaper, the Ottawa Journal, took another stand. It said that the members who urged economy were not anxious at all to have the militia estimates reduced; they only wanted to get back their patronage—they did not care about the militia estimates if the Government would properly deal with the Civil Service Commission or otherwise satisfy them. If that were done they would let the estimates through. Let me quote from that newspaper:

> It is understood that this is offered to pacify the Quebec members who are opposing the militia estimates, in the hope that it will result in a saw-off—the militia estimates being allowed to go through, and Quebec members being given freedom in the matter of patronage.

As the only Quebec members who took a stand on the question are my hon. friend from Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctot), the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power), and myself, I think I should attribute to myself, at least, one-third of the comments that are offered by this newspaper. Personally, not referring to the other two hon. gentlemen in the matter, I believe that to the extent that we are free from patronage we can give to the consideration of matters of legislation or of estimates in this House the better care and attention. But as it seems that the saw-off has gone the other way; since the minister has decided, together with the Government, further to reduce the militia estimates, I presume that my hon. friends will have to abandon their patronage hopes, if the Journal is correct.

There were other comments by other newspapers. I take it that they must have been Toronto papers. They said that our only object in the matter was to raise prejudice—the old prejudice in Quebec in regard to militia and naval affairs. Let me say frankly that I believe it to be the duty of every member in this House to express as sincerely and as clearly as he can the feelings of the people whom he represents. I do know that the people who elected me are in favour of a reduction in militia estimates; and I know, as well, that they are not prejudiced, I can say that they are quite willing to yield to the sentiment of the majority. But what makes our claim very strong to-day is the feeling that not only in a certain part of the country, but throughout the Dominion, there is a steady and increasing demand for a reduction in militia expenditures. If a vote were taken a few hours hence and it showed that the representa-

tives of the people, by a majority, reflected the desire of their constituents that there should be no decrease in the estimates, then I would trust myself to go before my people and tell them that the majority in this country stood for those expenditures. But I do not believe that such is the general desire; and so far as I am personally concerned, I conceive it to be my clear and bounden duty, apart altogether from any question of prejudice, of which I hold none, to state on the floor of the House, with frankness and sincerity, the wish of the people whom I represent.

In expressing that wish I am by no means voicing any want of confidence in the Government; certainly not in the minister. I may say without the slightest fear of contradiction that there is no member on this side of the House who has not the utmost confidence in the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham). And may I be permitted to add that in so far as the minister, in dealing with the matters of his department, is inspired by his personal recollections and associations in the war, which were of the loftiest and noblest character, there is not a member who would not admit that any statement he might make would command at once the respect and confidence of all. But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter of want of confidence. We are sitting in committee on these estimates. We have had during this very session the rejection by the House of a report from the Committee on Agriculture; yet the Government did not feel that the House had lost confidence in its policy. We have seen a bill recommended to the House by the Railway Committee meet with an adverse vote on the part of the Prime Minister as well as on the part of the chairman of that committee; yet it was not pretended that the House had lost confidence in the Government so far as that committee was concerned. The other day the Prime Minister made it very clear that the Government did not wish to impose its policy on Parliament, but rather was coming to Parliament to consult it and to be advised as to what its policy should be. I quote the words of the Prime Minister as found on page 1490 of unrevised Hansard of this year:

> Now, I desire to say, and to say more particularly to my western friends,—who have been saying a good deal in their public speeches, that in my view of responsible government, the House of Commons, the rights of members of Parliament and the rights of the people should be regarded as all-important, and that the Cabinet should consider itself as a committee of Parliament and not as a body of supermen—I have taken the position that this Government would so regard itself, and that on these controversial questions, so far as it was possible to do so, the Government would seek to ascertain the will and wish of Parliament in a reasonable way and give expression to it in legislation.

If that does apply, Mr. Chairman, to legislation, certainly it applies to the estimates. I will take no notice of comments such as appeared in the Montreal Gazette, for instance, of April 27, which ventured the kind opinion that "the member for St. James should have been disciplined .. . ." or the comment of the Star of a later date, April 29, recommending

> —the rule with an iron hand and more or less of the big stick. If Mr. King were able to hand a few wallops to the refractory. . . . his position and that of the Government would be stronger.

Let me say that the "wallop" and the "big stick" have never been part of the Liberal programme, and that they are not to-day. I am only too glad that, not by way of reply to these suggestions, but rather as a general declaration of policy, the Prime Minister has enunciated the principle that we are not sent here as mere mannikins to lift our hands when required to do so, but we are sent here to discuss the estimates which are put before the House and to offer suggestions on our earnest conviction and that of our constituents. The Government is moving over three hundred items of estimates this year in the departments; will any one take the position that because we sit on ministerial benches we may not even be allowed to stand up and say what we think of them? I am pleased to say that while the Liberal papers—and they felt very sensitive on the matter—while some Liberal papers actually approved of our conduct, it was the good old Tory papers like the Gazette and the Star which suggested the "wallop" and the "big stick." If you are looking for the wallop or the big stick you are always sure to find it where a Tory paper is printed. It may be objected that it is not according to tradition or to parliamentary authorities that we should discuss the estimates, and that in placing an amendment before the committee we are actually expressing want of confidence in the Government. If that has been the rule in the past, I do suggest that it is time to change it. I know that we must, in a way, be guided by tradition, but I do not think that tradition should become a chain to impede our least action.

We revere the memory of Bourinot and all those parliamentary authors who died a long time ago, but representing, as I do, twenty thousand living people, I shall never allow myself to be governed in this House by the spirit of a dead book.

No, Mr. Chairman; none of the motives that have been imputed to us have any existence. Only one reason moved us in the action we took, and it is a most logical and simple one: we asked for a reduction in the militia estimates because we wanted a reduction in the militia estimates. That is very plain and understandable. I have figures before me, but I do not think I need place them on Hansard—they have been placed there before—showing that the militia expenditure was at a certain figure in 1911; that it increased wonderfully in the days of the "big stick" and "walloping" under Tory rule, and that it had been practically abandoned after the war when we were busy with demobilization. The question confronting the country now is whether we should revert to Tory rule in the matter of militia expenditure and spend some $11,000,000 or $12,000,000 a year, or whether we should go back to Liberal tradition and cut down those estimates. I give to the minister and to the Government credit for reducing these estimates by a large amount, particularly in view of the fact that they found an established state of affairs existing when they came into power and had only a few months to work on the estimates. I feel very grateful indeed, and most of the members behind me—certainly a great number of those facing me, and, what is more important, the country at large,—feel grateful to hear that the minister, broad-minded as he is, is able to tell the committee to-day that he will pledge himself further to reduce the estimates; in fact, he proposes to reduce this item by $400,000 and the rest of the items by an additional $300,000. It may be a little less than what was asked, though personally I never committed myself to an amount. I did, however, commit myself to the principle that we could discuss the estimates in this committee, and I held the view that they should be further reduced. As they have been reduced by this further amount I think that we should feel gratified; it is ample proof that the Government are in favour of the principle of decreasing these estimates. As a matter of fact, they are decreasing them in the whole Department of Militia and Defence by nearly $4,000,000, in round figures, this year. I will not commit myself for next year—I will again come and represent the same twenty thousand living people who think that we should not spend too much on militia. But it is only fair to acknowledge that the Government has done its very best to meet that desire this year, and I will certainly support the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, during this session I have enjoyed myself chiefly in listening to the debates going on in the House. I have been rather interested in these estimates because some days ago we were informd that they had been whittled down to the finest possible point and that any further reductions would interfere with training throughout the country. Now, I am not going to criticise any portion of the people, but I will endeavour to show that military training is, to a certain extent, necessary and that militarism is not part of our ordinary military training. In the first place, history shows that since 1759, which is not a very long period of history, this country has on nine occasions stood shoulder to shoulder with the troops of the Motherland in the defence of this and other parts of the British Empire. That is an average interval of only eighteen years between the periods of calling out the militia for service.

Following the advice of the minister the other night, that we should take our place in the Empire and comparing our expenditure with that of other parts of the British Empire, I find the facts obtainable very interesting. Australia and Canada are two of the strongest links in the Empire, and in looking over the debates in Australia I was struck with their similarity to the debates in this House. There was one member, Mr. Blackeby, calling out "Brass hats, brass hats." Another member derided "Form fours," and said the soldiers had never formed fours in the trenches. Another hon. member said that the boys had gone into training on the old white mare that had been in camp for years. All these things are very interesting and show how similar is the discussion over there to that which takes place in this country. As one who each year since 1889 has been in one camp or another in this country, I may say that I never saw a brass hat at any of these camps. I may have seen boys riding on "the old white mare," but I knew these horses would never go into active service. I knew that that boy was simply being trained to handle a horse and to move in unison with the rest of the unit. I

knew from my experience in two wars that the soldiers would not form fours in the trenches, or in the front line, because it was absolutely unnecessary, this being only part of the initial training of the men in obeying orders, in moving in unison and arriving at a point in the shortest space of time and with the best possible results.

What has Australia been doing before the war and since? I find that Australia is expending both on military and naval training some £5,000,000, approximately $24,000,000, while Canada with almost double the population is expending only $13,490,000. What is South Africa doing? Is that country that was conquered only a few years ago, and against which many of us fought, turning to the point of view that military training is unnecessary and a useless expense? I find that such is not the case. South Africa has her own unique system of defence. She has the first, second and third lines of defence, and upon them she is expending the amount of £1,500,000, almost equal to what we are expending at the present time. Therefore, a comparison with these other parts of the Empire shows that their viewpoint is not any different from ours in regard to military training.

What is the objection in this House to military training? I have tried to note down the objections as the discussion has proceeded and I find—I am not making any personal criticisms, but only trying to make my point clear; I have served from a private up to my present rank and have secured all my promotions on active service, not in the militia—I find that: first, the man who has an abhorrence of military training. He sees something to be avoided in what he calls the "brass hat" and "trimmings." None of that annoys us who take up the training. Then there is the uplifter, the man who leans to the idea of the brotherhood of man and forgets that even brothers fall out and fight. Then there are those who talk of what is called the "melting pot," who think we can bring into this country immigrants of all colours and creeds and classes, and put them into a melting pot that will make all men equal. You cannot do that any more than you could take a cart horse, as Stoddart says, and make him a hunter by putting him in a little better stable. Then there are those who see signs of peace and point to the Washington conference and say there will be no more war.

There are also those who say that the first contingent consisted of untrained men.

[Mr. A. E. Ross.]

One has only to turn up the list of officers who commanded the units of the first contingent, beginning with the First battalion and going through the list, to find such names as Colonel Rennie, Colonel Watson, Colonel Hill, Colonel Burchell, Colonel Boyle, Colonel Lipsett, Hart McHarg, Loomis, Meighen, Currie, Leckie and other such names. Where did we get these men? These men were selected from the militia on account of their training. All the officers of the first contingent, which I was with from the first day to the last, were trained men from our militia, which just illustrates the benefit of training. So all these objections that are made are really very slight.

What have we gained, or rather, what have we lost, through men taking the position we find taken by some in this House? History shows that after all great wars this same spirit of antagonism to training has prevailed. After every war there have been men who have endeavoured to lull the people to sleep by saying "We have had the last great war; never again will there be another." I can speak best of the effects which this attitude has had on the medical service. Take, for instance, the Crimean war, from 1854 on. We have all read of the terrible conditions prevailing in the hospitals and in the transports that carried the sick and the wounded. A great cry was raised that this was cruelty and conditions were changed for the better. Following that war, men said: "There will never be another, and therefore we can disband all these units." But the South African war came on, and again our medical service fell down through lack of training and experience, and the toll of deaths from typhoid fever in that war was something tremendous. After that war too, it was said: "There will never be another big war, and therefore you can quit training and lose all that you have gained by experience." Had it not been for one of the kindest men who ever commanded an army, Lord Roberts, we would have again experienced the same conditions in the last great war. But thanks to this kindly man, who never thought of killing, who never wanted disturbance, we were prepared to a certain extent, and so we avoided the lull that resulted after the other great wars.

What does training accomplish? In any walk of life you will find that training is absolutely necessary; and perhaps it may touch the hearts of some men here when I say that training is necessary even

in the case of your favorite horse winning a race—no man puts an untrained horse out on the track. Training is necessary to our boys in their baseball matches, their tugs of war, their rowing matches, and their football competitions. Training is absolutely necessary in all these games, and it is imperative in all emergencies. Military training is useful in case of fires, it is useful to men who have to handle disastrous accidents—in all these cases military training benefits the man who has taken part in it. People have sneered at all the things connected with this military training. But we have reason to take pride in the fact that we have derived great benefit from it. I well remember the letter I received in France from a very good friend, a very well known lawyer, who, during nearly all his life, laughed and jeered at those of us who went to camp. He would ask "What good will this do you? What are you going to derive from it?" and he would say "You are a little off in the upper story spending your time on such things." That letter I have retained because his words are these:

> I have never regretted so much any words in my past life as I do to-day that I sneered at the men who went to camp. And here am I now in my age, when I am past the time when I can take training and be of service at this critical time, and my only service is this—to provide and give my money to those who have taken the training and made themselves useful in this great crisis.

Now, what was gained in this war by training? I pointed out the losses in the other great wars by lack of training. What did we gain in this war—and again I must speak of the medical service because I can give you some instances indicating competent work performed because of, and successful results derived from it. And I would like just here to say that the training in the camps before the great war was very different from the training which went on in the camps referred to by my friend from Dufferin. In camps, just before the war, the men were examined by a medical officer who had to give a certificate as to their condition. If one man was unfit he was the man who fell down in the training. Now what did we gain in this war by our medical training? We went into our trenches and we struck a disease that was very little known, in fact had previously never been heard of, namely, trench feet. No man other than those who have suffered from trench feet, or who have seen those who have suffered from it, can tell anything about it. But let me relate this experience: On one small march made by our militia in the month of February in Canada I accepted the position of medical officer. The month of February was chosen in order to demonstrate that you could train men and do some work with them in this country in the winter. During that time, for about a week, we had experience with the men's feet; and it was from that small training, a week's training in that winter campaign, that I was able to put on a routine in France which practically wiped out trench feet in the first division of the Canadian forces. After the first year we went out practically without a case in the first division. Some person may say that might be due to occupying different trenches, or better trenches. Well, I will give one comparison which will illustrate my contention. In the winter of 1916-17 we relieved one division which had had 950 cases of trench feet a week. The first Canadian division went into the very same trenches, and under the very same conditions, but by steadfast adherence to our routine we came out in June without one case of trench feet. I might again refer to the benefit of training as regards typhoid fever. During the Boer War 250,000 men landed on the shores of South Africa, and there were left behind in that country 53,000 men who had died from typhoid fever. During the great war the Canadian medical service ministered to 250,000 Canadian troops on our front alone, and not one white cross was erected in France or Flanders to mark the grave of a man of that number who had died from typhoid fever. So you see in these cases the result of training.

In the same way the benefit comes to the men who are doing the actual work. There is a benefit, and no person can say what the value of it is. We owe something to the men who have trained and have served this country; let us not make a mistake and lose the benefit of their services. Throughout the whole history of the world you will find that countries have been saved by small bodies of trained men. You can go back in history as far as you like. Take the Grecian wars and you have the stand of Leonidas and his 300 men in the Pass of Thermopylae; you have Miltiades and his 4,000 Greeks against the large force of Persians; you have small bodies of the trained Roman legions contending against the forces of Hannibal on the one hand and Attila on the other; you have Charlemagne with his small force contending against the Saracens and the Huns, and the Goths from

the North. In our own country you have had the example of achievements of small bodies of men trained locally—the men under Sir Isaac Brock at Niagara, and the men who fought at Chateauguay in Quebec. These were small bodies of trained men. They did their work and they did it nobly, and they showed the result of military training.

Look at the map of the world to-day and we shall see no sign of peace. The nations of Europe are broken up into small states, offering rich possibilities to amalgamations and combinations which must lead to jealousies and, I fear, to war. We had a discussion in this House only yesterday showing the menace to our white population from the yellow races. Asia to-day is overpopulated and the tide is bursting through in some places. Although the dykes are up against the inundation they are not efficient and they are not unbreakable. These are facts pointing to the conclusion that peace is not at all as assured as some people believe it is. There is also a report which has just lately been published in regard to an agreement between Germany and Russia. Perhaps very few have thought of it, but yet it is a fact. The report stated that a Russian-German military agreement had been signed at Berlin recently which provided that the Soviet government should give Germany 20 warships and maintain a certain number of troops opposite the Polish frontier. Germany was to deliver to Russia arms, munitions, equipment, aeroplanes, wireless equipment, and so on. In addition to that there was another report side by side with it, which stated that it had been learned from reliable sources that France was preparing for the immediate mobilization of the 1918 army, and reserves, numbering about 150,000 men, and this was with a view of enforcing payment of the reparations. These are two very important statements which have appeared in your press and they should cause us to think. I have pointed out to you, Mr. Chairman, the benefit of training. Wipe out military training, cadet training and training of all kinds, and what will be the effect on our boys? We will produce a class of sissy boys. We will produce a class of fanatics and dancers, and will not produce the good old athletic boys who have made this British Empire what it is.

Mr. SHAW: I say at the outset that I yield to no man in my pride in the achievements of the Canadian corps overseas. I also say to my fellow members from Quebec that, of all the units in that grand army which represented Canada overseas, in my humble judgment there was none which surpassed in its record of achievement that famous regiment from Quebec, the 22nd battalion. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that I yield to no man in what I conceive to be my patriotic duty to the country of my birth. But I think that, forgetting these considerations, and looking at this question in the light of real facts, and in the light of reason, we can determine for ourselves whether or not in this particular vote the recommendation proposed by the minister shall be given effect to by this committee. According to my way of thinking, the militia has two services to perform. First, it may be called upon to preserve order in this country, a function which, I am happy to say—and I think most hon. members will agree with me—the militia has seldom been called upon to perform; in fact, I know of very few instances indeed in which it has performed that duty. And, second, it may serve as a training preparation for war. There are, of course, two varieties of training the militia may furnish for war purposes, and I would like to examine just momentarily these two varieties, in order that we may ascertain whether or not the militia functions for either purpose. There is, first, the physical training, which it is suggested one gets from the militia training and, second, what one might call the training in the tactics of war. I accept without reservation the statement made by the former Minister of Militia that it took six months, to train a man for overseas service in France. I accept without reservation his statement that over 90 per cent of the men of the first division were members of the militia units prior to their enlistment. I take it—and it cannot be questioned—that a very large percentage of the men who served in the subsequent units which went overseas were not previously members of the militia at all. Let us deal with that. The first Canadian division landed in France on the 15th day of February, 1915, substantially six months from the time that unit was enlisted in this country. With a possible exception of the Princess Patricia Light Infantry, which, I believe, went into the trenches on Christmas day, 1914, not a single unit in the first Canadian division was even in a position to perform active service within a period of six months. That, to my mind, indicates very clearly that, perhaps, the militia

training did not serve effectually and effectively for the purposes which it is alleged here to-day it did serve, because, as a matter of fact, the men in the first Canadian division did not see active service in a shorter period from the time of their enlistment than did the men who had no militia experience at all. One must realize that the primal necessity in training is the physical training in order to prepare the man to withstand the hardships and privations incident to war service. Surely no man is going to suggest that by yearly militia training of, at most, sixteen days a man can be fitted for war services. The situation is simply this: that the six months' experience is largely, if not entirely, needed for putting a man into physical condition, in order that he may endure the conditions he will have to undergo. As a matter of fact, in addition, the training in tactics may be done in a comparatively short period of time. I saw the statement—and I think perhaps there may be considerable of truth in it—that three weeks of intensive training will train a man sufficiently to enable him to take his place in the ranks. I do not know whether that is absolutely correct or not, but I am quite satisfied in my own mind that so far as training in tactics is concerned, a period of much less than six months is required.

It is frequently urged, and has been urged, that we should support and develop the militia in preparedness for possible war service. I am frank to say that I, for one, feel greatly disappointed in the view which has been taken in connection with that matter. We all realize, we know now, if we never knew before, that the theory about preserving peace by preparing for war is one of the most fallacious arguments which has ever been presented. All I have to suggest to this committee is that no nation was more prepared for war than Germany and the Austro-Hungarian empire, and yet to-day Germany and Austro-Hungary are in ruins, as a result of their preparations for war; and not only that, but they lost the war despite their previous preparations. I say to you, without the slightest hesitation, that history has proven that war is a gigantic and dismal failure, and that the Armageddon of the nations which, happily is now past, has simply had the result of leaving the world in ruin, and in despair. I will quote from an article which appeared in the Free Press of Winnipeg a short time ago—and I think this House can endorse every word it uttered:

> There is no profit in war; the loser loses, the victor loses, the neutral loses, everybody loses. The last war exposed and exploded all the arguments urged on behalf of war—they were all seen to be false. Nobody gained, everybody suffered, vast numbers are suffering still; war was failure, total and ghastly; it was left without argument or apology, something which was demonstrably a total loss to the human species.

With every word of that statement I agree. There is only one other thought that I have to utter. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made the other day by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark), a gentleman who, I am told, served his country faithfully overseas. I quote a portion of his remarks on that occasion. He said:

> The people who talk most to-day about being sick of war are those who are sick of their shame at not having done their duty in the past.

I confess that I for one am heartily sick of war, and if the rest necessarily follows, then I must plead guilty to the indictment of the hon. member for Burrard. But I want to suggest to that hon. member that, while it is true that a comparatively large number of men served their country overseas faithfully and well, and nobody gives them credit more than I do, we must not forget that, on this side of the Atlantic, there were thousands, yea, there were hundreds of thousands who served their country just as faithfully and well. Perhaps they did not endure the physical suffering and agony which may be incident to active service; but they endured what, to my mind, in many instances at least, was a far greater and more difficult trial and sacrifice. During the last campaign, although it was my fortune to be opposed by a gentleman representing the Liberal side of this House, I had occasion, in answer to a criticism made by a representative of hon. gentlemen to my right in connection with the war service of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) of this country, to say that, in my humble opinion, the present Prime Minister of this country had served Canada faithfully and well during the war period, and not only that, but that he had served Canada more faithfully and more effectively than he possibly could have served her if he had gone overseas in any capacity whatsoever. I have no hesitation in stating also that I am convinced that it would have been nothing short of a public calamity if the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) had, at that time, thrown

down the reins of office and gone over to France to serve in any capacity whatsoever. Furthermore, what is true of those distinguished gentlemen is true of the men who worked in every capacity, the workers, the people engaged in transportation service, and the men engaged in working in the mines or in the forests. All these men contributed in great measure to the victory which could not have been achieved except for their splendid service. And I for one, having served overseas, am prepared to pay tribute to the people who stayed in Canada and did their duty here so faithfully and so well.

Canada is a young country, and so far as we know, we have no fear for either the immediate or the distant future. We are very fortunate, situated as we are on the northern half of this continent, in having, as our only immediate neighbour, a country with which we have lived in peace for a hundred years. I think it would be a very becoming and splendid thing if this young country, inspired by new ideals and a desire to set a standard to the rest of the world, could say that we, at least, are prepared to disarm to the uttermost. If we did that, I am satisfied that our action would constitute not only a challenge but an inspiration to peoples in other parts of the world, less fortunately situated than ourselves.

I do not propose to say anything further than this, that I had hoped that the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham) would, have reduced his estimates considerably more than he has. I have every confidence in the minister; I am satisfied that he is not a militarist and never can be one, because he is not constitutionally made that way. While I regret that he has not seen fit to reduce his estimates more, I desire to say that, in view of the fact that he had but slight opportunity to go into the matter, I shall not object to the reduction which he proposed this year. But, unless some more substantial reduction is made next year, I shall certainly feel then that it is my duty, not only to my constituents and to the country generally, but to myself, to submit to this tribunal of the people that he has failed to measure up to the responsibility which is his.

Mr. CLARK: Did the hon. member actually attend any of the training camps prior to the outbreak of war, and if so, in what years?

[Mr. Shaw.]

Mr. SHAW: I am frank to tell the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) that I am proud to call myself one of the citizen soldiers. I never had any service in any camp prior to the outbreak of war, and, prior to that time I had no connection with the militia.

Mr. CLARK: Or since the war? I quite understand the hon. member was overseas and that he has a very good record.

Mr. SHAW: I understand the hon. member to ask whether or not I have any connection at this time with the militia. I am frank to tell the hon. member that I really do not know. I do not know whether an officer or a person who has been discharged as an officer has severed his connection completely with the militia. I understand there is some system by which he is retained on the force, somehow or another.

Mr. GRAHAM: The hon. member is on my reserve of officers, I think.

Mr. CLARK: In what capacity did the hon. member serve when overseas?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CLARK: I know I am out of order, but I wish to put myself in a position to be able to deal with the arguments which have been advanced.

Mr. SPENCE: I did not intend to take any active part in this debate, but I cannot let this opportunity go without saying a word or two. It is regrettable that so much time has been taken up in this House in criticising a body of men who have rendered so much service to this country before war, during war and since war. It is regrettable also that some hon. gentlemen see fit to criticise such a body and to forget it so soon after the war. I had hoped that the estimates of the minister would go through when the committee sat on the 25th of last month, without any criticism. I was so pleased with the minister's presentation of his estimates that I felt it incumbent upon me to congratulate him. I am sorry he has come back now, evidently because of having pledged himself to a compromise to appease a certain element in his own party or possibly in the Progressive body. I have no wish to be over-critical, but I feel that the militia has not in the past been given the consideration which it ought to have had; and with the present cheeseparing policy it certainly cannot hope to be efficient. The minister the other night

was asked whether, with the reduction of $100,000 or, for that matter, of less, there could be efficiency, and he answered positively, no. I regret that he has seen fit to change his mind. If he was right then, he must be wrong now.

I want to correct some statements made by my hon. friend. I am interested in militia matters myself, and I do not want any misapprehension to exist in any respect regarding the militia. The hon. member made the statement that very few men were available for overseas service out of the old militia. Let me tell him that in the city of Toronto 75 per cent of the militia composed a force of 36,000 that went overseas, and those who were unable to go overseas were prepared to take their share of responsibility in training the younger element. It was because of the existence of the militia that the first contingent was able to go overseas so expeditiously. Many hon. gentlemen talk of the badges and frills in connection with the militia. Well, to any extent that there are badges and frills, the cost is borne by the officers and not by the country. Many thousands of dollars have been contributed by the officers, in the city of Toronto and throughout the country, towards the upkeep of the militia, and it is not for anybody to criticise any of the red tape or "brass hats" or anything else of that kind, because the only thing that the Government pays for is the pure khaki. I noticed that when a few badges and frills were introduced into the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture the other evening, when there was an increase of $45,000 made for the purpose of killing pests and bugs, there was not an hon. member opposed to the expenditure. But anything appertaining to the militia and law and order finds opposition. I am sorry that conditions are as they exist today in connection with the militia, and I hope that the minister will see to it that he gets every dollar he asks for, and that he will give to the militia the fair consideration and treatment which it has not had and which, I fear, if one is to judge by the expressions of opinion that have fallen from hon. members, it will not be given at the present time.

Mr. CRERAR: Notwithstanding the rather warlike speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Spence), I rise to support the reduction made by the minister in the item under consideration. I have no hesitation in saying that I should have been gratified if the reduction were greater than it is. If we compare the amount we are spending on military training in Canada to-day with what it was ten years ago, we find that there has been a very great increase indeed. I rather object to the criticism that is indulged in by some hon. gentlemen in this House, of those who wish to reduce expenses, that they are animated solely by antagonism to the militia and have no respect whatever for it. That is not the case. We can surely consider the estimates and discuss the question of reducing them without having levelled at us these suggestions in the way of criticism. So far as this particular item is concerned, let me repeat, I support very heartily the suggestion made by the minister to reduce the amount by $400,000, and my only regret is that he was unable to go a little further. Before I resume my seat I want to say a word in respect to the remark offered by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) with reference to my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw). My hon. friend from West Calgary made, I think, a very excellent speech this afternoon. He is a modest gentleman, and in order to remove any wrong impression that may exist in the mind of my hon. friend from Burrard, who also saw distinguished service overseas, let me tell the committee that the hon. member for West Calgary served for over two years in France with such distinction that he was awarded the military cross.

Mr. d'ANJOU (Translation): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a few words before these estimates are voted, so as to properly explain my position. Ever since I have had the honour to occupy a seat in this House, I have at each session joined with the members of the Opposition of the time in requesting that the Government reduce the militia estimates as much as possible. I have not changed my views, neither have I altered my principles, because of the fact that I now occupy a seat on the government side of the House; yet, I must say that I am pleased with the decision taken by the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) to further reduce his appropriations this year. At the beginning of the session, when I spoke on the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I congratulated the Government on having decided to make a considerable reduction in the militia estimates. I would surely like this reduction to be greater still, and I hope that next year when my hon. friend the minister comes again before this Parliament, we shall have a far more substantial reduc-

tion. As I stated, this is for me a question of principle, not a question of figures. I may state that I am entirely satisfied with the reduction now made by the hon. minister. If we add the reductions which he intends to make, we find that the militia estimates alone are less by about two million dollars, and we are also aware that the Government intends to reduce the estimates of the "fighting navy" if I may use that expression, by more than a million dollars which brings the total reduction close to three million dollars divided between the Militia and Naval Service Departments. I sincerely congratulate the Government and I express the hope that if they do not decide to sink the five old tubs, a gift of the British Government, they will at least decide to put them up for auction within the shortest delay possible.

Both in and out of this House, I have always proclaimed myself energetically an anti-militarist and against this imperialistic policy, and I have not changed my views on the subject. The more we reduce these militia estimates, the sooner we sink the navy, the less we become imperialists and militarists.

I am aware of the difficulty that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) may have had this year in further reducing these estimates. The Government which at present directs the affairs of this country has hardly been in office four months. It stands to reason that all the ministers have not had time to become well acquainted with their departments and master all the details. Consequently, it seems to me that one may be an anti-imperialist, stick to his principles and support the Government in such circumstances. As it was said during the course of this debate, not only a part but the whole country is tired of militarism, tired of listening to war talk. Everywhere disarmament is advocated, considerable expenditure is incurred for that purpose, our own Government has been called upon to expend quite large amounts to take part in these conferences on disarmament. Certainly it would not be putting into practice what has been decided in these conferences if we were bent on increasing the militia estimates in Canada.

The Government has done the proper thing, it has taken the right means and I trust that it will continue doing so. The late war was sent to abolish militarism in this world, to destroy this infernal German machine, and it strikes me that it is time we should return to common sense. A

[Mr. d'Anjou.]

wave of unrest overran this country during the war; it is time that people should understand that we must come back to peace conditions, if we wish our country to return to its past prosperity. In the course of the present session, when the estimates on agriculture came up, we spoke of reducing the grants to agricultural fairs. I believe that the reductions which we are making to the militia estimates should go to increase the agricultural budget, or else, for instance, to endow with pensions the widows and children of those who were killed overseas.

Mr. Chairman, we have in this House listened to members advocating militarism; they would like to see the whole of Canada turned into a military camp. Most of these gentlemen are so-called drawing room officers, peacocks that have paraded here during the war, paraded the streets of Montreal, Ottawa and elsewhere, while the sons of farmers and workmen were being killed in Flanders. We are not to be lectured by them. I represent a county which is absolutely against militarism and I hold the same views, even though I now sit on the Government benches.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The item under discussion is the item for annual drill which was presented by the Minister of Militia and by the Government to the House and which stood at the figure of $1,400,000 when the item was under discussion just about two weeks ago to-day. The proposal of the minister or of his colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), now is that the amount of $1,400,000 for annual drill shall be reduced by $400,000. Some wonderful transformation has taken place in the intervening two weeks. As I recall the scene in this House about ten o'clock on the evening of the 25th of April, the minister was in a fairly safe as well as triumphant position. It is true that one of the supporters of the Government had moved to reduce the item by some $1,100,000, but the minister certainly rose to the occasion. In answer to the motion of the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) for a substantial reduction in this vote, the minister demonstrated to the intelligence of the House that he was on solid ground. He had the support of the vast majority on one side of the House; he had the unanimous support of the fifty members sitting in the group of Oppositionists in this corner of the House. That, surely, was his moment for action; that was the moment he should not have let pass. That

is when he should have tested the feeling of the House. He was on firm ground. He and his Government had considered the matter carefully before submitting it to the House; they believed they were right, and the majority of the House of Commons believed it also. But for some reason best known to himself, he let the moment pass, and then some of his own supporters began the process of belabouring and using the big stick. The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) complains that the newspapers in some parts of Canada have expressed the view that his leader should belabour them and use the big stick on them. But he has no reason to complain; why, he and his friends have used the big stick on the minister in the interval. They have taken him by the throat, practically; they have dragged him into the caucus; they have told him that he either had to cut down, to trim, or they would put him out.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE: And to-day, in spite of the laughter that comes from the other side, we have evidence of the truth of what I state when the minister comes to Parliament and puts himself in the humiliating position of saying: My own followers will not support me; I will have to ask the House to reduce our appropriation for annual drill by $400,000.

Mr. CARROLL: That is democracy.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend says that is democracy; I say it is the result of the use of the big stick, of the belabouring methods which have been employed by certain hon. members from the Quebec section of this House. That is the result; it is humiliating; it cannot be a pleasant thing for the minister himself. How are estimates laid before this House? The minister is advised by his staff as to the requirements of the department. Very capable men surround him for that purpose; he himself has paid high and well deserved tribute to these men during the present session. They are competent men to advise him, men of very great experience. On the basis of this information he prepares his statement and presents it to his colleagues in council as the requirements for annual drill for this year. He has to convince his colleagues that he is right. They agree. The matter then goes before His Excellency the Governor General. He, in turn, agrees. Then, it is brought before Parliament as the considered opinion of the Government and of the minister. In introducing the militia estimates, the minister said, page 1177 of unrevised Hansard:

> The militia estimates, I might say, have been pared down to a point as low as is compatible with national safety.

That is a very strong declaration; a very significant statement. The estimates were not brought together in haphazard fashion. They are not ill-considered. They were gone over carefully. And they were, according to the minister's statement, pared down to the lowest point consistent with safety. The House, of course, took the minister at his word when he made that statement, and a great many hon. members of the House knew to be absolutely correct. The minister meant it; this Government meant it; it was based upon fact and founded on the advice of the men whom this country pays to advise him. But, alas, the debate had not proceeded very far when certain elements among his own supporters began to show what they could do with estimates and proposals by the Government. My hon. friend from St. James seems to overlook this in his argument. Under the parliamentary practice of this country and of the Motherland, under the constitution of this country, no private member can come here and propose a money vote. All financial proposals must be made by the government itself and must first be submitted to and have the approval of His Excellency the Governor General. It is the government that is specially charged with financial administration; no matter how brilliant may be the private member of this House, he cannot introduce a money bill. Consequently, it has always been considered good parliamentary practice—

Mr. LAPOINTE: Cannot he propose a reduction?

Mr. GUTHRIE: A reduction can be proposed.

Mr. LAPOINTE: That is what we did.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am talking of the original proposal. It has always been considered good parliamentary practice that when a government solemnly brings forward a financial proposal—and it is the only party that can bring it forward—it stands or falls by the fate of that proposal. I do not know that there is any positive written law to say that a government must fall if its proposal falls. I know there have been instances in history where governments have withdrawn fin-

ancial proposals after they have been fully considered in the House, but I do not think there has been a single case where a government has been belaboured by its own followers into the reduction of a proposal, to its own humiliation, and has still said: We will retain office and accept the belabouring which our supporters have given us. That is the position of the minister to-day. Upon the original estimate the minister was on sound ground, as I said, but he is not on as sound ground to-day as he was two weeks ago.

I listened with the greatest interest and attention to the remarks of the hon. member for West Calgary. He has a very clear and convincing way of presenting a matter to this House. I listened with the greatest respect to what he had to say to-day, but I noticed at the end of his remarks he said: I am prepared to support this reduction, but I will not be satisfied with this item next year; I shall want a bigger reduction than $400,000 in this vote then.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: "Hear, hear," resounds from a large portion of the Government benches. If it is the attitude of hon. gentlemen, that more should be cut from this vote next year, why not make a job of it to-day? There is no question as to what hon. members want who shouted "Hear, hear," just now. They want to cut annual drill to the vanishing point. In my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, we have it practically to the vanishing point now, if we mean annual drill that is to be of any real service, and I know that is the opinion of the minister himself. You can cut down your vote for annual drill to a certain point, but there comes a point to go below which is a pure waste of money. Have we reached that point now? I fear we have. The vote was for only $1,400,000 in the first place. It is now proposed to reduce it by $400,000, about thirty per cent of the whole. It could only have provided for partial training of a number of the units for a limited number of days in any event; it is now to be cut down by thirty per cent. It is a serious question whether the training that can be given on the balance will be of any practical advantage to the Dominion. My hon. friend from West Calgary has warned the minister that the vote must be cut still further next year, and his warning was heartily applauded by hon. members from the province of Quebec sitting opposite.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. LAPOINTE: Why should my hon. friend always refer to the members from the province of Quebec? There are members from other provinces on this side of the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I referred to hon. members whom I saw applauding.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You have not very good eyesight.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think it is fairly good. I made my remark in consequence of what I saw—

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am sick of that.

Mr. GUTHRIE:—whether my hon. friend is sick of it or not. I notice he was the minister selected to move this reduction of $400,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: I tried to do it myself.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If the matter were to stop here, although the vote as it is proposed to reduce it is far too low, it might go through, but when warning is served from an important section of this House this this reduction is only a makeshift for the present year and that next year the vote must be still further reduced, it becomes a question whether you should not do it this year rather than waste the money in the interval. What I propose to do, and what I believe a considerable portion of this House is going to do, is to stand by the position which the minister took two weeks ago. He was right then, and the Government knows he was right, and a majority of the members of this House know he was right, and I believe they will stand by him. This is a case where we are going to save the minister from himself, or, rather, I should have said, save him from his friends, and not permit him to be humiliated or "belaboured," or "big-sticked," or whatever you like to call it. When you know you are on solid ground, when you know the proposal is right, when you know the expenditure is warranted and cannot safely be reduced, when the Government has committed itself upon the question, my judgment is that you should support the proposal made by the minister at first, and I certainly intend in my humble way to support it.

My hon. friend and colleague, the member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), a member who has very much greater experience in military matters than almost any man in this House, in his speech this afternoon pointed out certain ways in which

money could be saved, not in actual training, but in administration, and it is possible there was a great deal in what he had to say. He based his argument upon this: Go ahead with your proposal as it stood two weeks ago; do not reduce it; persevere; go ahead; we will support you; you will find places in these estimates this year where, by reorganization and a change in administration, you can save large amounts of money, which you now propose to save by reducing the estimates before us by $700,000. In my humble judgment, and I speak only from what I have learned after two years in the department, it is far more important to pass this vote for annual training and annual drill than it is to maintain the Dominion arsenals at this particular moment. Looking over the estimates I find that the Government is practically closing up the Ontario arsenal this year, asking for only $25,000, which practically means only looking after the material and keeping the staff there; but $425,000 is being appropriated for the Quebec arsenal. Here is a suggestion for the minister: Close the Quebec arsenal; reduce the vote to $25,000, the same as for the Ontario arsenal, and thereby save $400,000. Then you would be able to have your annual training, which is a matter of the utmost consequence, and we would take a chance on the arsenal supplies for the future. I know the supply at Lindsay arsenal is away below the required reserve. Still, the minister does not hesitate to close that arsenal. I believe the arsenal at Quebec could be closed just as well, and $400,000 saved this year, provided the minister will apply that saving to the annual drill and training. Then the saving sought by the minister in moving to reduce this item for annual drill will be achieved, and if war does not take place I suppose no great injury will be done. We will have carried at least this point, that the men will receive the normal amount of training this present summer.

Mr. HALBERT: I had not intended speaking on this question to-day, as I spoke when these estimates were up a week or so ago. I think I had better tell the committee at once that I am from Ontario, not from Quebec. I congratulate the minister upon his proposed reduction of these estimates, and I want to tell him that I believe ninety per cent of the people of Ontario will be pleased with his reduction. The people of Quebec are not alone in demanding that these estimates be reduced; I think the rank and file of the people of the Dominion are looking for a reduction in the militia estimates. The military sentiment is still alive in this country. I well remember—and other members who were here last session or the session before will recall—that Mr. Mowat of Toronto, a supporter of the late government, introduced a resolution here asking practically for the compulsory military training of all young men in Canada between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five. They were all to be compelled to devote four weeks a year, for seven years, to military or physical training, the latter to all intents and purposes being the same as military drill. Now, military training did not raise the standard of morality in Europe, and it will not do so in Canada. A stream will rise no higher than its source, a nation is no stronger than its national homes; and one of the greatest assets in Canada to-day is the free and loyal patriotism to be found in every Canadian home. That was demonstrated during the war. A great deal has been said, and rightly said, in the way of compliment to the men of the militia who went overseas; but I want to assert that a great deal of commendation is due to those men who went overseas who never were in the militia at all. The long military training did not make the Germans more efficient on the battlefield. Our boys with their short military training proved themselves to be more than the equal of the Germans, and I am absolutely within the mark when I say this.

Now it has been insinuated that we who are in favour of this reduction of the estimates are not loyal people, that we want to do away with the militia. So far as I am concerned—and I think I can speak also for most of those who sit around me in this group—I assert that we are just as loyal as any other members in the House. But I have this to say further: We have more than the trained military men to be loyal to. We have a body of men who went overseas, did their bit in the trenches, came back home and went back to the farm and into other occupations. They require to be considered to-day. We must not forget also the women who sat up at night and worked just as loyally and faithfully in the interest of winning the war as the men who went overseas. These classes, whose interest I am afraid we are forgetting at the present

time, need to have their interests looked after just as much as the men who served in the militia.

It has been said that the arsenal at Lindsay has been closed. I am informed, and I think the statement is right, that no munitions were ever shipped from that institution although we have always voted money for it as long as I have been sitting here. I think therefore it is right to get rid of this building and not incur the expense of paying somebody to take care of it. I rose simply to endorse the action of the minister and to tell him that he has my hearty support in reducing this estimate. I also believe he will have the support of the loyal people of Ontario and as well, perhaps, the support of the people of Quebec.

Mr. PUTNAM: Did my hon. friend use a big stick on the minister?

Mr. HALBERT: There must have been a lot of big sticks left on that side when the Government moved over this way. I did not see any big sticks, and I did not use any—I am not that type of man.

Mr. MANION: I regret that in the discussion of this question—in which I have taken no part previously—there has been too much of a tendency, as there usually is when we differ from the government, to cry from the ministerial side "Tory, tory," and from the Progressive side—as my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) has just illustrated—to shout "Militarism, militarism." Matters seem to have reached the stage in this House that if any hon. gentlemen sitting in this corner differ with either of the other parties they are denounced as a "Tory group" and in cases like the present as "a group of militarists."

Mr. LAPOINTE: And on this side from Quebec.

Mr. MANION: Well my hon. friend will not accuse me of ever saying anything against Quebec—

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I admit that.

Mr. MANION: —but as a matter of fact my hon. friend will admit that on this occasion it was the members from Quebec, sitting opposite, who opposed this vote.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I beg my hon. friend's pardon; members from all the provinces spoke.

Mr. MANION: I admit that, but it was the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) who moved to cut down the vote and he was supported by the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), the member for Laprairie, and various others; and to mention that the hon. members from Quebec are opposing this vote is not necessarily to be regarded as saying anything derogatory towards the people of Quebec.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend object to calling the members sitting around him Tories?

Mr. MANION: Well, personally I object to being called a Tory—

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Why do you remain there then?

Mr. MANION: Because, Mr. Chairman, I am not in a Tory party.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: That is why I remain here. I do not wish to go off into history but there was a time, a hundred years ago, when there were Tories; there are very few members of this House who accuse themselves of being Tories to-day. And if there are a few who do so that is their privilege; I do not say that myself; I repeat, I am not a Tory. And I say further, as regards the hon. members sitting around me, I do not consider that very many, if any, of them are Tories.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Name them.

Mr. MANION: To get back to the question I was discussing, which was militarism and the item before the committee. Because some of us in this corner have taken the position that this vote should go through, we are accused of being militarists by my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat and of being Tories by my hon. friend from St. James and his colleagues. Well, we are in the same position as the Minister of Militia who brought in these estimates, and he as my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) has said, made a very fine speech in defence of his estimates the other night. I can say very frankly that it is the best speech by long odds that I have heard him make in this House.

But when my hon. friend from St. James makes the statement that he is voicing the views of the whole of Canada I think he is making rather a large statement; and when my hon. friend from North Ontario states that he is speaking for ninety per cent of the people of this country I think he is making a statement at least eighty

per cent too large. He was elected to represent one constituency and probably has a perfect right to speak for himself and for the people of that constituency; but I doubt whether he has any right to speak for my constituents on a question such as this. Now I am not a militarist and I never have been one. In many ways I agree with the people who do not wish to spend too much money on militarism in this country, and personally I have always taken that attitude. However, in looking up the estimates which are before the committee I find in reply to a question by my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Church) that the expenditures in 1912-13 reached practically the same amount as the estimates which the Minister of Militia brought in for this year. Therefore if you consider that the value of a dollar to-day is worth perhaps sixty per cent of what it was in 1912, the estimates of the Minister of Militia to-day are really about forty per cent less in total than the estimates of the Militia Department in 1912.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): But is the financial condition of the country to-day the same as it was in 1912?

Mr. MANION: No, I will admit the financial position of the country to-day is not the same as it was in 1912-13. But I would like to ask my hon. friend if the peace conditions of the world to-day are the same as they were in 1912-13. I have recently read—and I am sure my hon. friend has read it also—the statement made by Mr. J. H. Thomas, the Labour leader in England whom we all know, in which he says that we are as much upon the verge of war to-day in Europe as we were in the early days of 1914.

Mr. RINFRET: Does he not say in that statement that if there were a war England should not participate?

Mr. MANION: Yes, he does, but a labour leader, John Burns, resigned from the cabinet in England in 1914, on the ground that England should not participate in the war, but she did participate; and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman from St. James (Mr. Rinfret), who is a very intelligent member of this House, will agree with me when I say that, in a war to-day, carried on in any part of this world, no one knows who will or will not participate until the war is over. The world is so close together, the transportation systems of the world are so well developed, the several nationalities of the world are so highly developed to-day and so closely associated, that no one can tell who is going to take part in any war, and certainly the position of the Mother Country, and of the ancestors of my hon. friend in France, the mother country of most of the members from Quebec—

Mr. RINFRET: Every one of them.

Mr. MANION: No, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) would hardly say that. It is true that France has taken a militaristic attitude, and I am not criticizing her for so doing, because she suffered severely in this war. In this country we do not know what is going to happen, if a war occurs. I sincerely hope, as everybody in this House hopes, that we will not have a war in the near future in which Canada will have to take part, but, while I deny absolutely the cry of militarism as applied to any of the members in this corner of the Chamber—and I deny it as regards myself because I am opposed to militarism—yet I do not believe in being so much of a peace-lover that I turn the other cheek to everybody who chooses to assail me. In the world to-day we do not know when we may require men who are trained in military affairs. It has been mentioned by hon. members on both sides of the House that many good soldiers who went overseas and made good records, including my hon. friend from West Calgary (Mr. Shaw), were not in the militia. That is true, but I desire to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that the thing which saved Paris from German invasion in 1914, and the thing which saved the allied ports about that time, was the fact that there was in England a certain standing army, and because there was in France a very large standing army of trained men. If England and France had taken the attitude which is being taken to-day by a large number of members of this House, that we should have practically no military training at all in this country—because that is the attitude most of them take, judging by their applause to the remarks of the hon. gentleman from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie)—if they had taken that attitude back in 1912 and 1913, and thereabouts, there would have been nothing in the world to prevent Germany capturing Paris and conquering the world. I do not agree with the peace at any price attitude which our friend the former President of the United States assumed, which was a very noble idea, but he was not supported in his own country at the next elec-

tion, and he was not able to live up to that ideal throughout the war, because the United States found ultimately they had to take part in the war to help save civilization against the Germans.

I rose to make a few remarks against the cry of Toryism and militarism by men who happen to differ with other hon. members in this House. I am not a militarist, and yet when the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) brought in his original estimates, we agreed with him, and I think he should have stood by them. I do not like to tell an old trained politician what he should do, but it seems to me, if I were a minister, and brought in my estimates and made a strong speech, as the hon. gentleman did, in favour of them, and then was turned down by my own party I should feel it my duty to resign.

Mr. FOURNIER: He did not have to resign.

Mr. MANION: No, he retired. There are trained men in the leadership of the militia of every country who come to the front when war calls them to the front to fight; and, while it is true that a large proportion of the men who went from Canada were untrained men, the men who led them, in the large proportion of cases, were in the militia of Canada previously. I say that, although I served in France, and was never in the militia of Canada. The men who led the Canadian army, from Sir Arthur Currie down, were men who had served in the militia of Canada and had taken part in these camps. And my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Ross), who made such an eloquent speech this afternoon, was one of them. I have no reason for quarreling with the Minister of Militia for retiring from his position, but I think he took the proper position the other day, and I should have had a strong admiration for him if he had stood by his guns, instead of making a noble retreat as one of my hon. friends on the other side termed it.

Mr. GOULD: I do not think it is necessary to take up much of the time of the House in arguing in favour of the amendment to the amendment, simply because it seems to me the consensus of opinion of the House at the present time is very nearly unanimous in favour of it. I desire to make one or two comments on the statements made by the two hon. gentlemen who spoke this afternoon, and particularly on the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Fort William (Mr. Manion). It seems to me that the hon. gentleman can scarcely define what the name of his party should be, or at least, he objects to the party being termed Tory. The thought occurs to me that we might term it the prehistoric party of Canada. That might apply to it all right. Of course, if that is not acceptable, they do not have to accept it.

Mr. RINFRET: The antediluvian party.

Mr. GOULD: I will refer to a few of the remarks made by the hon. ex-minister of militia (Mr. Guthrie). It seems to me, in watching the debates in this House, that when the question of the militia estimates comes up, the real solid support for the retention of the maximum vote that can be put through this House comes from the party down in the corner. The hon. ex-minister of militia last year, and the year before, made positive assertion that the minimum amount of expenditure had been reached in the estimates that he had submitted to this House. To-day again he stresses the point that, if these material reductions have been made by the present Minister of Militia and Defence, we have now reached the danger point and dare not go lower. I have tried to make myself give credit to the hon. ex-minister of militia, while he was Minister of Militia and Defence, in that he did and should know more of the circumstances attending the militia of Canada than I could possibly know, but when I see him, as an individual, waver, as is shown by the recital I have given the House, likewise my faith in him must waver. It seems to me we have to form our own conclusions, and, in doing so, to bear in mind that we are here to do the will and the bidding of the people who sent us here. It seems to me that the militarist, if there be such a thing in Canada today—and I do not wish to make a specific charge that there are such people, although evidence has been submitted as to their existence in Canada—the militarist, as such, has had his day. Surely in the last five or six years his appetite for militarism should be satiated, and at the present time the lovers of peace throughout the country should have a little to say. The peace-loving people of Canada have not had an opportunity of expressing their opinion; they have not had an opportunity of showing to Canada and to the rest of the world what peace can do in the world, and I honestly believe the time has arrived when

they, at least, should be heard in the councils of the nation, and an attempt be made to give effect to the wishes of those people back home who find the sinews of war, the money with which to keep the machine going.

We will all admit the need of militia from time to time. For the benefit of the newspapers of Canada which have repeatedly attacked and denounced hon. members of the Progressive group who, conscientiously and with honest intent, have asked for reductions in these estimates, we should explain to this House and to the press of the country that, during the last three years not one sentiment has been expressed from this Progressive group that gives them cause to believe that we do not approve of militia. We have repeatedly stated throughout Canada that we do not believe in extravagant expenditures, and during the past three years that I have been in this House positive proof has, on many occasions, been given in this Chamber of instances in which moneys have not been dispensed equitably, justly or for the purpose of militia and defence. One of the great factors that remain in the minds of the people is that moneys that we are supposed to be voting for militia and defence are being used, not for militia and defence, but just to maintain an aristocracy in this country.

As the House seems to be in favour of the proposed reduction, it is unnecessary to place upon Hansard the figures which I have compiled; but I desire to refer to a statement made by the ex-Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) with regard to the course that the minister takes before he presents his estimates to the House. He said that the minister's advisers will come and tell him what amount of money is required; that his advisers are capable men. We admit that they are capable men; but again I ask this pertinent question: Have the advisers to the minister, not alone in the Department of Militia, but in every other department, had an eye single as well to the individual who finds the money, who has to pay these obligations, as to the ways of expending that money? Are they as scientific in the matter of finding the money as they are in the methods of expending it? That is a thought that should remain in the minds of all ministers of the Crown. The ex-minister stated that the minister will be advised by his officials; that then he will submit his estimates to the Governor General, and that he will come back to this House with the figures. When the ex-minister was making that statement, the thought occurred to me that, right at the moment when the minister presented his estimates to this House, somebody should rise and speak on behalf of the people because, in no instance in the remarks made by the ex-Minister of Militia, did he mention the cause of the people back home who provide the money. I am speaking for the people, and I am prepared to support the sentiment, as expressed by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert), that ninety per cent of the people of Canada disapprove the huge expenditures that have taken place in Canada in the Department of Militia and Defence.

I have compiled a list of figures which shows that the officers in certain districts are in the proportion of one officer for every 2.3 men. I have talked with officers right in the city of Ottawa; I have met them in this very Chamber, and I have been told by honourable and gallant members of this House that they are supporting this reduction in the estimates; likewise, by gallant men in the city of Ottawa and throughout Canada that they approve our request for a reduction, as they say at once that the money is not being equitably expended; that it is being used to pay officers' salaries; that we are over-staffed and under-manned; that in these vast areas it will take three days to bring the men in and to give them their equipment so that they may undergo training, and it takes the same time to take them home again. Is that militia? No, it is not militia, and I can show where, in a certain district of Canada, the officers themselves received between $6,000 and $7,000 more in salaries and allowances than the total expenditure on men, equipment, travelling expenses and everything else. It is that to which the people of Canada object and not to the false interpretation that is placed on our attitude here that we object to militia.

When the sentiment is expressed that we object to militia, attached to that is the sentiment that we are unpatriotic. That is not the case; but we have been taught to know the value of 100 cents, and that is what we have come here to plead for. We want those who receive the money to understand the value of 100 cents to-day. That is what I am pleading for, and that is why I ask for equitable treatment and equitable expenditure, not to cultivate any spirit of antagonism to national defence or to create the impression that we want to

defeat any defence party in Canada. When we have, in any district, officers in the ratio of one officer to 2.3 men whom the officers are supposed to train, we are not getting what we are supposed to have appropriated this money for. I ask some hon. members if the same thing was true in other districts and I was given to understand that the same condition obtained. I have another little complaint to make. I wish to state that the militaristic spirit seems to actuate the minds of some of those who get into authority. They have the conception that military law over-rides civil law, and it is the spirit of the Hun that prompts them to think and to speak in these terms and in this manner. It is only a matter of about two weeks ago that we had such an occurrence in Ontario. Liquor was supposed to be seized in a canteen and one of the excuses offered was that military law over-rides civil law. Let us come down to plain facts and be men, side by side, and I am sure the people of Canada will approve whatever we do in equity.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to some matters in connection with Military District No. 12, in which we have a certain condition that apparently does not obtain in any other military district in Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: What is the headquarters?

Mr. GOULD: Regina. I notice, in the Auditor General's report, an item in connection with Military District No. 12, which, in my humble opinion, indicates that those who participate in these things seem to have very little regard for the people generally. I see an item here called "staff rides", and it is only in Military District No. 12 that this seems to be provided for. I notice that they have rented a hall at $5, and that they charge the Government up with $32 worth of theatre tickets. That is another conception of mind of the militarist, and I cannot understand why these people in that young military district should conceive the idea that they have a right to charge this country up with theatre tickets, while they are racing around the country. If one considers the amount of money that is set opposite each individual name, surely they can afford to purchase their theatre tickets. And the poor individual who has provided a hall receives a paltry $5 for his investment. As I think it is in the interests of a proper consideration of the estimates. I shall read these items in order to place them on Hansard. They are:

Staff Rides: Prince Albert, Sept. 10, auto hire, $90, hotel expenses, $4.50; Saskatoon, Sept. 22-23, auto hire, $29; hotel expenses, $85.10; theatre tickets, $32; Regina, Sept. 29-30, auto hire, $119.50; hotel expenses, $79.15; rent of hall $5; North Battleford, Oct. 13-14, auto hire, $34.60; hotel expenses $27.75; Estevan, Oct. 26, hotel expenses, $13.40; auto hire, $3.50.

And by the way, $17 or $18 is the only money that has been spent in Assiniboia, although we furnished the money and in all ways taxed them. That is all the return we have for the huge amount of money taken from us in the way of appropriation. To proceed:

Moosomin, Oct. 28, hotel expenses, $20, auto hire, $42; blue prints, etc., for rides, $24.69.

These are items which, I think, cannot be justified at all, and as I pointed out before, it appears that we have generals and staffs going around the country with presumption enough to charge these things against the country, when, from the sums of money placed opposite their names, we have at least the right to think they have been lavishly provided with funds of the people.

At six o'clock the House resumed and then took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

ESQUIMALT AND NANAIMO RAILWAY COMPANY

House again in committee on Bill No. 6, respecting the Esquimalt & Nanaimo Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie)—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment has been moved by Mr. Neill, that clause 1 of the said bill be amended by striking out all the words after the word "railway" in line 17 thereof. Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. NEILL: I may remind the committee that the explanation of this amendment is that it brings this bill under the operation of the Railway Act of Canada. That is the whole sum and substance of it. An hon. member said the other night it was hardly necessary to do this because the company was on a different footing from that of any other company. But that is not so; this company is to be treated by this legislature, I hope, as any other railway

company would be treated, and I have a precedent for that. In 1914 this charter was renewed for, I think, the fourth time; this is the seventh time renewal has been sought. But in the act of 1914 this sentence occurs:

—and shall within the two years expend thereof an amount equal to fifteen per cent of the capital stock.

That is precisely the clause that will operate under the Railway Act if my amendment passes; so that we have actually a precedent, not only as regards other railways, but as regards this railway, for the insertion of such a clause. All I am asking is that now, eight years after that was put in, the clause be once more inserted.

Mr. DICKIE: I come from the country affected by this railway. I have my good neighbour from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) on the north and the member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) on the south, and naturally I wish to remain on good terms with both. However, as we look down towards the south, following the laws of gravity, I naturally incline towards the hon. member for Victoria City on this subject. I know the country very well indeed through which this railway goes. Now, my good friend from Comox-Alberni has a faculty for painting word pictures which appeal to people—pictures to suit his own imagination, to a great extent. In this instance he is painting what to me is a cubist picture which I cannot understand. He has told the House at length that even if this bill is passed the Canadian Pacific will not build this line—even if they have one year or two years within which to commence. I quite agree that such may be the case. My hon. friend has told us of immense water-powers.

Mr. NEILL: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member is out of order. We are not discussing the length of time, or the building or the not building; we are discussing an amendment which provides that the company shall spend fifteen per cent of the cost of construction within the time authorized.

Mr. DICKIE: If I am out of order, Mr. Chairman, I will bow to your decision. I have not taken up much time with respect to this matter. I am dealing with the principle of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is discussing the first clause of the bill. In my opinion he is in order.

Mr. DICKIE: As I say, I know this country, and to show you that my hon. friend is painting a cubist picture I would point out that he said the other night that this question had a bearing upon the immigration problem of Canada. The district through which this road will eventually go is a small valley and we have plenty of people in our country to occupy that valley should we desire to do so. The valley has been logged over and agricultural possibilities are not quite as we would wish them, but there will be settlement in that district. To-day it would not pay the Canadian Pacific to build a road in there; it would not pay any company to do it. If that were not the case I would quite understand the reasonableness of bringing some pressure to bear on the Canadian Pacific to build the line.

Now, although we on this side have little reason for having any great affection for the Canadian Pacific, I do think that when it can be shown that the building of this road will be a profitable undertaking the Canadian Pacific will extend a line into that country.

The member for Comox-Alberni has said that there are radium mines in there. We all know what radium is; there are about eight ounces of it in the world, so that it would not furnish much tonnage. I have made some investigations on an island known as Valley island looking for other minerals, and I know it is claimed by prospectors to contain rock which shows radio-activity, which means that there is some radium in it. The member for Comox-Alberni told us the other night that this was the only radium mine in America. I may say that Gilpin County, Colorado, has contributed very materially towards the radium product of the world to-day, the ore being in the form of pitchblende or carnotite which furnishes the radium. The radium field, if there is one there, would not be affected in any way by this railroad. There is a first class road on Vancouver island which is traversed by hundreds in automobiles, a method of travelling much more pleasant than by train. This highway goes to a point just south of the mouth of the Campbell river, and this railway would pretty well parallel it. At present there is no great demand for a railway there to take timber from that country; the road so nearly conforms to the contour of the coast line that the timber naturally goes down into the salt water. Duncan's bay, to which this road is going to run, is just at the end of this magnificent automobile road on Vancouver island.

There are some settlers, very good men, engaged on little farms, but we all know that it takes more than a few scattered settlers to justify the building of a railway. If any other railway company in Canada was prepared to build in that territory, or if the road could be hastened in any way, I would not be on my feet to-night, but such is not the case. There are immense water-powers there. It is estimated in official reports that 200,000 horse power could be developed. There is also in that country a large iron deposit, which I have visited. It is a very promising deposit, but it requires considerably more work to demonstrate whether it is commercially valuable or not. When they start to develop these water-powers and this large iron deposit, we may expect this road to be extended, but at present, as an hon. gentleman said earlier in the session, it seems to me that the hon. member for Comox-Alberni is making "much ado about nothing."

Mr. TOLMIE: The amendment which is proposed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) will, as he has stated, have the effect of bringing this railway under the Railway Act, clause 161. Now the intention of that particular clause was to prevent charter-mongering by irresponsible railway companies. I think that neither the Canadian Pacific nor the Canadian National roads can be included in that category, and therefore these restrictions are not necessary under the circumstances.

In the act passed in 1919, I think, incorporating the Canadian National Railways, a provision was inserted extending the charter powers of a number of railways included in that system, which had been previously authorized both by the federal government and provincial legislatures. In this connection certain privileges were granted to these roads. The provision in the act was as follows:

> The times for the commencement and completion of the construction of the lines of railway specified in the second schedule to this act, which certain of the companies comprised in the Canadian Northern system were authorized to construct, are hereby extended for two years and five years after the passing of this act.

In the following year the Canadian Pacific Railway introduced a number of bills covering new branches and extensions of its lines, and the question was raised in the Railway Committee as to whether clause 161 of the Railway Act should be applied to these roads. It was pointed out to the committee, however, that the Canadian Pacific was entitled to the same treatment in this matter as the Canadian National Railways had received the year before. The committee agreed with this view and granted the request of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Strange to say, included amongst these bills was one relating to this very line of railway under discussion to-night. There was no difficulty over the acts passed in reference to the Canadian Pacific in the following year, 1921. The same privileges were extended. In this particular case I can see no reason why an exception should be made, particularly as this bill has been submitted to the Railway Committee and has been accepted by them.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni the other evening referred to the Canadian Pacific securing an extension of their charter, and thereby possibly preventing other railways from constructing in that territory. I think that can hardly be the case because from 1916 down to 1920 the Canadian Pacific allowed their charter for this particular road to lapse and not a single railway company applied to build that piece of railway. In fact, located as it is, it is simply an extension of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway, and with no other railway on that end of Vancouver island no other company would build in that territory because they would have no road to link up with.

When the extension was applied for before the Railway Committee in 1920, Mr. McLeod, who is connected with the Canadian National Railways, was in attendance in connection with some Canadian National business, and he was asked by the committee if he had any desire to build a line of railway on the route laid out by the Canadian Pacific to Duncan's bay, and he informed the committee that he had no desire to build any railway or extend the Canadian National railway system to that section of British Columbia.

It has also been stated that it would be a great hardship to settlers if this railway was not built. As I have pointed out on a previous occasion, this railway runs almost parallel to the east coast of Vancouver island, and is located at no great distance from that coast, which is well supplied with a good steamer service. Moreover, the roads in that section, and in fact all over Vancouver island, are a very high class, so the farmer will suffer very little interference by deferring the construction of this railway.

I have pointed out already that to have the time for commencement and completion cut down to one year and three years, instead of two years and five years res-

pectively, would be out of harmony with the rule adopted for the Canadian National Railways. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, it will require a good deal of time to make arrangements to get the road under way, and if only one year was granted within which to commence construction, practically the whole of that year would be taken up in getting ready, and the railway company would probably have to apply for an extension of their charter inside of twelve months.

Under the present uncertain financial conditions, new railways can only be built after a very careful survey of the situation has been made, and there is reason to expect good results from the money expended. It is the hope and desire of this company to extend this road just as soon as their financial experts think there is a possibility of getting a reasonable return. Surveys have been already made and plans prepared.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni referred the other evening to the building of logging roads in that section of British Columbia. That was hardly a fair comparison, because it is well known that these logging railways are not built in such a way that they would be accepted by the Railway Commission for either passenger or freight service.

In connection with the failure to renew bonding privileges, I may say that the committee's attention was called to the fact by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that this course was adopted for the reason that the railway company had no intention of building the road. In the 1920 act, this privilege was secured to the company, and therefore it is unnecessary to renew bonding privileges. It is quite true that the Canadian Pacific Bill No. 5, which is also before the committee at the present time, does make provision for bonding powers, but I am informed that the reason for that is that for one of these lines the charter has lapsed, and it became necessary on that ground to renew the bonding privilege. Railway construction costs at the present time are about fifty per cent higher than in 1913. Many of the materials entering into railway construction are about double in price or a little higher; rails are double what they were in 1913, ties are thirty to forty per cent higher. Taking materials generally, they cost much more than in 1913, and most likely very much higher than they will in a short time. I think that under these conditions, taking into consideration the fact that this is the largest railway corporation in the world and one that has done a great deal for the development of this country, it is only fair to grant to that company the same privilege that has been granted to other railways in Canada and trust in the bona fides of the company to build this road as soon as conditions justify them in doing so. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the bill should be allowed to pass the committee; I do not see that the objections raised to it are of a very serious nature.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Dickie) was entirely out of order throughout his remarks and therefore I need not waste much time in dealing with them. The amendment before the committee is one relating to bringing this railway under the Railway Act, so that the company will have to spend fifteen per cent of the cost of construction. Has that anything whatever to do with the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo which dealt with the merits of the question of building or not building the railway? He drew attention to some of the remarks that I had made in that connection on a previous occasion and endeavoured to dissipate the effect of them. But I notice that in spite of all his attempts to do so he admitted the following facts: First, that there was a radium mine in the vicinity of the proposed railway; secondly, that there was water-power capable of producing 200,000 horse-power and, third, that there was a large iron deposit in the neighbourhood. Did I mention the iron deposit? No, I did not. But the hon. member has reminded me of it. So that the facts are that there is a water-power capable of producing 200,000 horse-power which can be easily harnessed; there is an iron deposit of the magnitude that he has indicated; and radium is present in the vicinity.

I think these are good enough reasons to require the completion of the railway; but as I do not want to be out of order, and as we are not dealing with these questions at the present time, I shall not refer further to the hon. member's remarks but go on and deal with the observations of the member for Victoria (Mr. Tolmie). The latter dealt with the subject of the amendment in the early part of his remarks but wandered off the subject like my hon. friend from Nanaimo later on. He said that the construction referred to in the Railway Act as regards the expenditure of fifteen per cent was not intended to

apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. If that is the case why was it not so stated in the Railway Act, and then there would have been no trouble at all? If it was not intended to make the Railway Act apply to one railway in particular, it should have been so stated in the act and then there would have been no confusion.

My hon. friend had to fall back on time honoured precedent and say that it had been done before. Well, one precedent is as good as another. I have quoted to you one precedent of the year 1914 when that identical clause was put into the Canadian Pacific Railway Bill. My hon. friend cited a case later on when it was not put in. We therefore have a choice between a precedent in one way, and another precedent in the other direction. But in view of the conflicting precedents let us go back again to the Railway Act of Canada which says this provision shall be observed. As regards the logging road he talked about, while I am out of order in referring to it I think I should be allowed the same latitude that was allowed my hon. friend. I have travelled over the logging road in question. It is forty miles long, is well ballasted, and the curves are good. The company who built it did not receive a subsidy of $6,000 a mile to construct it, nor did they hold the project back for twenty-two years by means of extensions of the charter.

Amendment (Mr. Neill) negatived; Yeas 39, Nays 76.

Section agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: There is another amendment of which Mr. Neill has given notice.

Mr. NEILL: That amendment would have no force seeing that the previous one has been lost. I would therefore ask leave to withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN: Dropped.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY

House in committee on Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Knox.

On section 1—Extension of time for construction:

[Mr. Neill.]

Mr. CARMICHAEL: I served notice of an amendment to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN: It is moved in amendment by Mr. Carmichael to strike out in clause 1 all the words after the word "railway" in line 22, page 2, of the said bill.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: It looks almost futile to say anything in regard to this amendment, after the decision of the House on the amendment proposed to Bill No. 6, because this amendment is similar. It appears to me that this is a matter between a wealthy corporation and the supporters which it has, and the common people of Canada and the supporters which they have. I have no antagonism against the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is not with any feeling of hostility that I move this amendment. I have every respect for that great corporation that, 37 years ago, commenced operations in Canada and to-day holds the position it does financially and as a service to the public. But, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to making a choice between a wealthy corporation and the common people of Canada, I am on the side of the common people of Canada.

I am particularly interested in subsections (c) and (d) of this clause, because the extensions proposed in those two subsections run through the constituency which I represent. Some time ago the Canadian Pacific Railway got a charter to build two extensions through this portion of the constituency. It may be in the minds of some hon. gentlemen that my constituency is in very bad shape, and has not any need of any railway extension, but I wish to remind the House that the constituency is a very large one. It extends about 150 miles east and west, and between 75 and 80 miles north and south. While the southern portion of the constituency is hard hit financially, the northern portion is in good shape. The farmers are doing fairly well, the district is well settled, and the settlers have been in there for some 15 years. The land is productive, and has been producing for a number of years large quantities of grain. This district which is supposed to be served by these railway extensions is about 50 miles east and west, by about 35 miles north and south. You will readily understand that some of these settlers are from 20 to 25 miles from a railway point, and any person who has been raised on a farm can understand what that means in the

hauling of grain. The large quantities of grain produced in this district have to be hauled a great distance, which goes a long way in reducing the profits which should go to the farmers. I have not proposed any amendment in regard to the time for building these extensions. This bill provides two years for commencing and five years for completing the work. I do not propose to make any change in the time. The amendment provides for the deletion of the words in the latter part of clause 1, which reads:

> And if within the said periods respectively the said lines are not commenced, or are not completed, and put into operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said line as shall then remain uncompleted.

On a cursory examination it would appear that it did not make much difference whether these words were in the bill or out of it, but, while I am not a lawyer, and never expect to be one, yet in my opinion the fact of these words being in the bill makes a great difference in the operation of it, because when these words are in the bill, construction on these branch lines comes under the provision of this bill and is outside the provisions of the Railway Act of Canada, but when these words are eliminated from the bill, the construction of these branch lines comes under the provisions of the Railway Act of Canada. In section 3 of the Railway Act I find subsection (b), which reads:

> Where the provisions of this act and of any special act passed by the parliament of Canada relate to the same subject matter the provisions of the special act shall, in so far as is necessary to give effect to such special act, be taken to over-ride the provisions of this act.

That is exactly the provision which the Canadian Pacific Railway gets the advantage of if these words are included in this special act. The object of the amendment is to delete these words and bring the construction under the Railway Act of Canada.

Section 161 of the Railway Act reads:

> If the construction of the railway is not commenced and fifteen per centum of the amount of the capital stock is not expended thereon in survey, purchase of right of way, and actual construction work, or, in the case of a branch or extension of the railway, if fifteen per centum of the bond issue authorized therefor is not expended thereon in actual construction work, within two years after the passing of the act authorizing the construction of such railway, branch, or extension, as the case may be, or, where the Parliament of Canada grants an extension of the time for commencing such construction, within the time so granted; or, if the railway or branch, or extension, as the case may be, is not completed and put in operation within five years from the passing of such act, or, where the Parliament of Canada grants an extension of time for completion, within the time so granted; then the powers granted by such act or by this act shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the railway or branch or extension, as the case may be, as then remains uncompleted.

You will notice section 161 makes special provision for the expenditure of 15 per cent of the bond issue within the first two years, in order to enable the railway company to say they have commenced construction. That means something in Bill No. 5, because it is intended to build those two lines. The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), in speaking to Bill No. 6, stated that it was not necessary to have restriction for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, because they did not intend to build the line anyway, and he further stated that there was no provision for bonds in Bill No. 6. In Bill No. 5 provision is made for the issue of bonds or debentures to the extent of $40,000 per mile. If the construction of these branch lines is brought under the Railway Act of Canada, the railway company is compelled to expend 15 per cent of their $40,000 per mile within the first two years, in order to show that they intend to build these lines. That is just a mere matter of $6,000 per mile to be expended within the first two years, to show their good faith. Otherwise, if this provision of the Railway Act is not adhered to, the railway company might send a man out with a spade and throw up a little mound of earth within the first two years, and they would be clear, under the provisions of their own bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this amendment is a very vital one and deeply concerns the people whom I represent.

With regard to a company which is able to make such immense earnings, as the Canadian Pacific Railway has done in spite of hard times, financial distress amongst the farmers and business depression amongst our companies, a company that is able to pile up the large profits that the Canadian Pacific has done, that has been able in the past year to declare a 10 per cent dividend, and the bulk of whose stock is held outside Canada, so that the large proportion of its earnings is going outside of Canada, it seems to me it is not unreasonable to ask that such a corporation shall expend at least some of that money amongst the people who have helped to

contribute towards those dividends which the Canadian Pacific has declared. Therefore, I have pleasure in moving this amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I have pleasure in seconding the amendment; and while I am particularly interested in sub-clause (b), I should like to bring to the attention of the committee the wishes of the people of my part of the country for a railroad. This railroad was first proposed some years ago, and it should have been built, perhaps, before the war. The first survey through this part of the country was run by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and the bonds were at that time guaranteed by the Saskatchewan government. Through stress of the times, however, the charter was allowed to lapse until about two years ago when the Canadian Pacific obtained a charter for this road. No work has ever been done on it; and although people went into that part of the country from twelve to thirteen years ago with the expectation that the railroad would be built immediately, they are in dire need now for transportation facilities in order to market their produce.

This is not at all a line to be built with the prospect of the country being settled in the near or distant future; the country is settled all the way through from one end to the other. I know for a fact that, as regards some of the townships in that district, three-quarters of them are under cultivation, and the farms are as well established as in any other part of the country. The settlers who went in there first were mostly Ontario men and women, and besides raising grain, they have now herds of cattle. The position of the settlers in this district, although they are not as far from a railway as some people throughout the West are to-day, is a very difficult one. To the south of them it is impossible to reach the present Canadian Pacific line, the Pheasant hills branch, owing to the crossing of the Eagle hills. They are compelled to go north to the main line of the Canadian National Railways in order to market their crops. To do this they have to cross the river, and this is where the great problem comes in. When I was crossing there myself two years ago with a light rig, we first of all got on to one of the ferries which took us out into the middle of the bed of the river, and there we landed on a sand bank. After shifting up and down on that sand bank and getting into line with the cables, we got upon another ferry which landed us further out on another sand bank, from which we had to make the best of our way to the shore. That day I met men with teams drawing about thirty bushels of wheat, and I wondered why they did not load their wagons. But the fact of the matter was that, if they could keep going over the bed of the river on these sand banks, they might get through; but if they once got down there was nothing for them to do but to unload. In the winter time it is impossible to go south owing to the Eagle hills which extend over a great deal of that country. Then to go north, several of them have to go together and put all the teams possible on to one load in order to get up out of the river bed. The shifting sand bars in the river, in the summer time or in the early fall, make ferry service very difficult, and sometimes these people have been even a whole month at a time without getting their mail from the post offices.

The marketing of their produce is the great handicap. When I went through there during the campaign of last fall, I found that most of these people were living in log houses; they were all postponing the building of better houses until the railway was in sight. They informed me that if the railway were at all in sight during the next year or so, they would settle down and make permanent homes; otherwise they would go back to where they came from and abandon the country. This is a well-settled district which is calculated to pay dividends on any railway that may be built at any time, and the Canadian Pacific is quite able at the present time to build this line. The Canadian Pacific has had for some years now a short spur out from Asquith to what is known as the gravel pit. If another twenty-five miles were constructed from the end of that line, such a railway would serve that country, and perhaps, it would relieve those settlers of many of the difficulties they are now under. The country is settled all the way through from Saskatoon to Cloan, and I think this Parliament should give these settlers, isolated as they are, the greatest consideration.

Mr. SPENCER: I wish to speak for a few minutes in support of the amendment. This suggested railway runs through a part of my constituency, and the people living along the route that the rails will follow have sent quantities of letters to me asking me to work against any further postponement of the building of this railway. Hundreds of these people are hauling their grain from twenty to twenty-five

miles, and no one who has not hauled produce for twenty to twenty-five miles over a rough trail can have any appreciation of what sort of a task that is. It means not only a great waste of time in the summer when farmers should be spending all the time they have on field work, but a great hardship, particularly so in the winter time when most of their grain is hauled. These people have been in that part of the country for a good many years; they went there on the promise of the railway being built, and if that promise had not been made, the country would not have been settled. It is because promises have been made that railways would be built in so many parts of western Canada that we have to-day settlers living such distances from present-day railways, and this is unfair to these people.

We have heard a great deal about the necessity for bringing a large number of immigrants into the country, but I for one think it would pay us more to emphasize the need of providing the means by which to keep the present settlers that we already have. Because of promises that have been made in the past and not fulfilled, because of assurances in years gone by that railways would be built in this place and the other, while no attempt was made to carry out these undertakings, we are now losing our population. It does not matter how many settlers we bring into the country, or where they come from, when they live fifteen, twenty, twenty-five and thirty miles from a railway, they will not remain on the land. If settlers come into the country with the idea of building homes and being successful within a short number of years, we cannot hope at all to keep them if we do not carry out the promises we make. It is well known that in Alberta, where they do not get a crop every year, it requires on an average one crop in every three to pay for landing the produce at the seaboard. So that if you do not provide transportation facilities to farmers who are now living between twenty and thirty miles from a railway, you are only adding to the expense of growing grain; and besides that you are increasing the discontent of those who are already dissatisfied. No matter how much advertising you may do through Government agencies, so long as we have dissatisfied people at home who cannot make a success of their business because of the lack of transportation facilities, we cannot hope to secure new settlers, because those who are already on the land here will do their level best to keep their friends, their relations and their acquaintances in different parts of the world from coming and settling in this country.

A questionnaire is in circulation in the neighbourhood through which this railway is supposed to be built, and in it questions are asked as to how many years ago a railway was promised, what was the amount of produce and stock raised in that part of the country, the number of miles people have to travel to get to the railway, and the cost per bushel for hauling produce that distance. And one rather interesting question is as to the number of people who have left in the last ten years because the railway had not been built through this part of the country. I would call that last question particularly to the attention of hon. members, because it is one that should be seriously considered. If we are going to give the railway company the right to postpone indefinitely the building of this railway, then we are simply deferring the time when we shall be able to induce present settlers to stay on their farms. If we do not guarantee them transportation, and that within a reasonable time, we can expect to see settlers in the next ten years leaving in greater numbers than they have left in the past decade.

Mr. McCONICA: The amendment pending affects the extension of the charters of two roads in the constituency I have the honour to represent—charters that have been in existence for some time. A considerable portion of one of these roads has been constructed, and beyond the construction in both cases there are people who have long been in need of a railway for which they are still anxiously waiting. I have much sympathy with some things that have been said about the railway situation in Canada; but I am of those who are convinced that the railways in this country are worth to-day far more than they cost. These railways have served the country in time of great need and have vindicated themselves, and they are well worth a place in the history of the country. They did much during the Great War to carry to the front those things without which we could not have accomplished what we did; and I for one do not think that Canada has come to the time when we should quit and declare that we are bankrupt and shall go no further. I do not think it is time yet for us to say that we are "broke", and that we are going to lie down and wait for the sheriff.

This is going to be a great country, and the sooner we realize that and begin to get busy and start the wheels of industry the sooner we shall accomplish something. We need branch lines in order that we may feed and bring tonnage to the trunk lines that we have constructed. When we get those branch lines we shall increase business and population as well, and take care of those immigrants whom we say we ought to secure. Now here is a proposition to extend certain charters. Under the terms of the proposal that is presented to us we say we will extend them for five years if these people throw a shovelful or two of dirt on each road within two years. I think that the amendment proposed is a reasonable one. It requires that within two years substantial progress shall be made and within five years these lines shall be completed. I hope hon. gentlemen will see the reasonableness of that proposition. The railways should mean something when they ask for an extension for five years; otherwise—

9 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. I must direct the hon. member's attention to the fact that it is nine o'clock.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE

Militia and Defence—annual drill, $1,400,000.

The CHAIRMAN: When the committee rose this item was under consideration, with an amendment by Mr. Power and an amendment to the amendment by Mr. Lapointe.

Mr. GOULD: When the committee rose at six o'clock I was pointing out that we of the Progressive party were not opposed to a militia in Canada, though that erroneous impression had been sent broadcast throughout the country. We feel, however, that we are justified in the attitude we have taken, not only this year but in past years; and that the persistent fight which is being carried on in support of that attitude will ultimately result in some recognition of it. We believe we are fighting the battle of the plain people. Perhaps we may all take that credit to ourselves, each from a different point of view, but it seems to me that some hon. members who have been in this House have not always had a single eye for the interests of the plain people.

[Mr. McConica.]

I was also endeavouring to show that the spending of money is not a necessary condition of loyalty; that a large vote for militia and defence does not in itself constitute loyalty to our country,—does not mean that those who propose it are any more loyal than those who seek to have it reduced. If we have established that—and I believe we have; if not in the minds of all members of the House, at any rate in the minds of the people who read the press—then I think we have performed a great mission here. We believe in the equitable spending of money, but evidence enough has been produced on the floor of the House to prove that a portion of the moneys voted in the past—and this may apply to some of the moneys now asked to be voted—have not been spent as they should have been. That is the sore spot in the minds of the people of Canada. It is not that they object to a militia or that they object to defence; it is that under the guise of defence we have been paying for some things we have not been receiving.

A few nights ago the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) pointed out that 56,000,000 pounds of butter had been sent to Belgium, a large exporting country of butter and dairy products. It was stated that Belgium was to have twenty years within which to pay for this 56,000,000 pounds of butter which it became necessary for her to import as the result of the ravages of war. Can you wonder, therefore, that agriculture throughout Canada and other countries protests so strongly against all the things which lead to war? In that respect we are not alone; other parliaments and other governments are taking the same attitude. I have before me a clipping with reference to the Diet of Japan which I will read for the benefit of the committee. It says:

> As Prince Yamagata lay dying, the elected house of the Imperial Diet was the scene of an agitation for the reduction by 50 per cent of the army which gave Yamagata his career and which his powerful leadership made the most masterful element in the Japanese state. The contrast is symbolical, for though the Diet agitation will fail, it is the sign of a movement which has time on its side. The old age is dying and the new is knocking at the door.

I think there is a lesson in that last sentence for hon. members of this House: "The old age is dying, and the new is knocking at the door." It is demanding admission and an opportunity of demonstrating whether the theories advocated with sincerity now as in years past are not better than those followed by adminis-

trators more or less up to the present time. I have on former occasions in this House directed the attention of hon. members to these circumstances: Should a war again occur—and that is problematical, of course; we all admit that—your trained militia would not be effective. The next war will be fought in the air. The next war will be fought in such a way that the civilian will be in the heart of the warfare. It is my prediction, and it is the prediction of men and women who are paying attention to this question, that the civilian thousands of miles from the scene of action will be the recipient of blows and subjected to the dangers incidental to warfare. Science will make such progress that even crops far from the theatre of war will be destroyed and civilians will suffer as many hardships as the men who fight at the front. In view of these facts, therefore, it is all folly for us at the present time to proceed on the basis of a poor, narrow conception that the militia is the defence to which we shall resort in the case of war occurring again. It is a conception of the past; he is a reactionary who thinks that this will be our chief method of defending ourselves in future warfare.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay a compliment to the Minister of Militia. I have more than ordinary respect for his attitude. I appreciate the high altitude to which he rose when the estimates were last before the House. As to the strong plea he made on that occasion with respect to the estimates brought down, no one would on that account accuse the minister of being militaristic in his views. Our endorsing his proposals would not have been an intimation on our part that we considered him militaristic while we were not. But the minister will appreciate that in the course which we have taken in all sincerity we are trying to carry out the wishes of the people who sent us here; and as I have said many times before, that is something which many hon. members forget to do when they reach this Chamber.

Mr. POWER: Since this discussion began some two weeks ago I submit we have wandered far from the original subject. This afternoon we heard from all sides of the House accusations that one party was militaristic and that another was Tory; we have heard it stated that still another was the party of the plain people. Some hon. members expressed themselves as willing to cut out the arsenals; others wished to abolish the staff; some wished to cut the militia estimates as a whole, and throughout the whole discussion we wandered from the subject generally. But the question before the committee is simply this: the estimate brought down originally by the Government was for $1,400,000 for annual drill. A certain number on this side favoured the elimination altogether of the annual training and with the idea of bringing this about it was moved that the item be reduced by $1,100,000. Now, I understand —I was not in the House at the time— that it has been moved by a member of the Government that the item be reduced by $400,000 only. The minister has declared, in effect, that if we reduce his estimate by $400,000 we are doing away with annual camps. Because $1,400,000 is too much, he asks that we cut out $400,000 from the annual training and cut out certain other items. The argument, then, is that annual drill is not as good as it was two weeks ago, but it will be quite good if we cut off a million from something else. The point before the House is whether or not annual training is what we wish to have in this country at the present time. To reduce this vote by $400,000 simply means this, that we lose a great part of the efficiency of these camps, if they even were efficient, and we do not help in any way the militia of Canada.

Since this question was brought before the House those of us who do not agree with the minister have had attributed to us various motives. Some of our friends, and some of those who are not our friends, have suggested that certain members on this side of the House were actuated by ambition, others that we were prompted by jealousy, and still others that we were moving for reductions purely for the sake of petulant criticism. May I say that so far as I am concerned, and I think so far as the few on this side of the House who will vote with me are concerned, we have no other motive except that of attempting to be consistent with ourselves on matters of public policy. Last year the Liberal opposition moved that the annual training vote be reduced by $750,000. May I call the attention of hon. members to the fact that this year when we have a Liberal party in power, a party elected in a large measure on an anti-militarist platform, and pledged to retrenchment and reform, they move to reduce the vote by only $400,000. I think we ought at least

to be consistent with ourselves and move for a reduction of this vote by $750,000. My idea two weeks ago was that annual training was the easiest thing for us to do away with at this stage of our country's finances. I have not changed since then. I believe still that we can easily do away with annual training, that it is not necessary, and that it is costly.

I have listened to hon. members giving us in a more or less amiable tone of voice their reasons in favour of annual training, or rather, in favour of this estimate. We have been told that if we were to take a military holiday and do away with annual training camps this year, it would be disastrous to the country generally, and that it would be no longer possible to have any such camps for the rest of the Dominion's existence. I submit that a great many of us believe that perhaps these camps never were any good, and never will be any good. More of us are of the opinion that if for this year the troops do not go to these country camps, no great harm could come to the country. Others have stated that if we do not have these annual training camps we shall cease to develop a military spirit in this country. I do not know whether this military spirit will cease to exist, but should that be so, I for one would be delighted and think that this country had made a long step towards progress and prosperity.

It has been stated by hon. members who are opposed to this estimate that it was unnecessary because we had in Canada at the present moment 400,000 of the best trained troops in any country in the world, that these troops would be prepared at any time to join the colours and to go through the same four years of hell, as was adequately said by one hon. gentleman opposite, that they have already been through. To that argument let me answer this: I am firmly convinced that if war should break out, these same men will be willing at any moment to rejoin the colours. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we should not ask them to rejoin the colours, but whether we like it or not, the first to join the colours in the event of war would be those who have already served. You would find it easier for them to join the colours if the governments both past and present had treated them as they should have been treated in the past, and treat them as they should be treated now. If you treat the returned soldiers decently and properly, you will find them the most reputable and hard-working citizens of this country. They, I think, feel that before you start preparing for another war you should repair the wounds of the last war. I am speaking only for myself when I make this statement.

I have within the last few days consulted some men whom I respect highly, two of them Tories and one a Liberal. All three served with great distinction during the war, and all three became generals. I would be only too glad to give their names in confidence to any member of the House, but for reasons which all will respect I think it is perhaps better to withhold their names at the present moment. These three, all of whom had served in the militia and had served with distinction overseas, stated that a reduction in the vote for annual training at this time would be just what was needed in this country, that it would save the country considerable money where it could be saved most easily, and would in no way impair the efficiency of the Canadian forces.

I had intended—perhaps I may as well say it—to criticise the attitude of some hon. gentlemen who stated that at Valcartier, ninety per cent of the troops were old militia men. That may be true, but I would like to know where they got their figures, and would like to be allowed to criticise them. I do know this, that in 1918 when the troops were coming back from the front, we repeatedly asked questions from the Minister of Militia, now the hon. member for East Hamilton, as to what was the war service of every member of the militia headquarters' staffs in Canada. In so far as one staff was concerned, seventy-five per cent of the pay was being given to troops who had served in the militia with high rank, but had never served overseas, whilst at the very same time a large number of returned soldiers were walking the streets looking for a job.

Before concluding, may I say this? It is with very deep regret that owing to force of circumstances I shall to-night be in the unfortunate position of voting with the Tory party—if the hon. gentleman who spoke about the Tory party this afternoon will pardon my calling him a Tory. I have been a Liberal all my life, a Liberal by birth, education, and conviction, and I still intend to remain a Liberal. Owing to circumstances here to-night, owing to the fact that a certain number of hon. gentlemen opposite oppose the Government for reasons widely different from ours, I shall probably be in the most embarrassing position of

having to vote with them. Nevertheless, I intend to remain true to the principles I have advocated, and I intend not to withdraw my motion. It is with great regret that I do so. I have every respect for the Minister of Militia and for the leaders of the Liberal party, but respect must end when we come to conviction.

Mr. CHURCH: I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Quebec South (Mr. Power), who is a good soldier and a good citizen. Since these estimates were last before the House I have had the opportunity of consulting many leading military men in Ontario. I saw a number of the most eminent Canadian generals during the last week, and some of the ablest non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent force and militia of Ontario and they did not agree with the views expressed by my hon. friend from Quebec. I conferred with these officers and men during the last week end in the city of Toronto which sent 60,000 men to the war. Other parts of Canada, of course, did equally well in that regard; I am not speaking about what Toronto did because all parts of Canada did well in the furnishing of troops. But I assert here to-night that we always had a militia in Canada from the days of General Wolfe. As the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross) said to-day, we have had to engage in war almost every eighteen years since Wolfe conquered Quebec. At frequent intervals during that period we have participated in wars of one kind or another, and our militia have constantly been called upon to defend our land in many quarters of Canada.

I say God forbid that the time should ever come in Canada when we shall not have a militia, because not only in the late war, but also in the days of General Brock, if we had not had a militia the British flag would not be flying over this country to-day. In the war of 1812 General Brock had to face the same criticism by the legislature sitting in the town of Newark, now Niagara. The legislature in 1810-11 would not give him the money needed to maintain the necessary defence force. There were many farmers and others, many prominent men, who said "We will not give you the money, we cannot afford it; there is no emergency." That was the attitude adopted by a great many men in the legislature in 1810 and 1811, and General Brock was greatly disturbed in consequence. He almost asked to be recalled; but he decided to stay and the war was won, and Canada was saved by the successful battle waged in the Niagara district as a result of having a brave militia force. Under General Brock were the York volunteers from the constituency of the Prime Minister, and other noble regiments. These men saved the province of Ontario from invasion at Niagara and at other points.

The same thing occurred in the Rebellion of 1837, in the Fenian Raid of 1867, in the Northwest rebellion of 1885, also in the South African war, and in the recent great struggle. Does anyone contend for a moment that if the militia of Canada had not had training this Dominion would have been able in the great war to make the showing it did?

My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) spoke the other day about a "belted aristocracy." I was sorry to hear such a term applied to our officers. I do not believe that our military officers can be so characterized. I also heard the same hon. member express his belief that the men who composed the Canadian contingents despatched overseas did not have military training. Well, I asked for a return showing the composition of the first Canadian contingent the other day and this return when brought down by the Minister of Militia disclosed that of the 30,000 troops who composed that force, ninety-two per cent had military training. Take the 6,000 men of the first Canadian contingent who went from the city of Toronto; I refer to the third battalion, the 15th battalion, the engineers, the medical corps, and the rest of the units. Ninety-nine per cent of these men had received military training in the militia. I think the same thing is true of the men in the rest of the contingents. I contend that if it had not been for their military training the men from Canada would not have been able to make the showing they did overseas.

My hon. friends opposite were wont to boast in olden days—I refer to the period from 1896 to 1911—that their party had made Canada a nation. I am not going to express any opinion on that point further than to say that Canada had in striking manner demonstrated its virility and its military prowess long before that. If we are a nation why not have a militia and a proper one and not go back 150 years to become a Crown colony and depend on the army of the Mother Country to defend Canada?

The other day the Minister of Militia quoted General MacBrien, and other experts, to show that further reductions should not be made in the militia estimates. General MacBrien said in effect: Reduce these estimates for military camps, reduce the grants to cadet corps, and you apply the axe to the militia tree in Canada and impair the high efficiency of our militia. I concur in his views as to the probable effect of such action upon the militia and upon the cadet corps. I regard the cadet corps as the back-bone of the militia to-day. The units which came from the county of York belonged originally to cadet corps. The cadet movement in the separate and public schools and the high schools of that county serves to keep up the strength and efficiency of the militia. When General MacBrien declared that a further reduction in the militia estimates would greatly impair the efficiency of the militia I believe he spoke in a very sensible manner. The people of Canada have been sponging on the Mother Country long enough for maritime defence purposes. Had it not been for the British fleet the old city of Quebec would have witnessed the horrors of war, and even the cities of Montreal, Toronto, and Hamilton would not have been spared from the German peril and visitation. We have been sponging long enough on the hard-pressed taxpayer of the Motherland. To-day bread and tea, and other necessaries of life, are taxed in England to provide a fleet to protect our shores. We have been sponging long enough in a maritime sense without doing further sponging for a military force on land as well to protect Canada's soil. If we go on in this way, instead of Canada becoming a nation we will be back to where we were in the American war of the Revolution when we had to depend upon Imperial forces to fight our battles. Does Canada want to go back to the old Crown colony days?

Compare the militia estimates with what they were in 1896 and you will see very little increase in them. When the Liberals left office in 1911 pretty nearly $8,000,000 was spent for this purpose. In those days there were debates in the House on militia expenditure and Sir Frederick Borden took very strong ground in favour of its maintenance. The proposition was made to increase the pay of the militia who went to camp from 50 cents to $1 per day. That increase was granted after the war, and it accounts very largely for the growth of the expenditure. If you will look over the various items in the militia estimates to-day you will see they have been cut down to such an extent that very little further reduction is possible.

This afternoon the hon. member from Kingston (Mr. Ross) explained what had taken place in Australia in regard to this matter. The debate to-day is very largely a repetition of what happened there in the Commonwealth parliament. There the opposition to the militia estimates was raised by what is called the "Country Party". They were very vigorously resisted by the Prime Minister Rt. Hon. W. M. Hughes, and let me say that I am very sorry our Minister of Militia did not adhere to his original attitude. I believe had he persisted he would have received sufficient support in this House on his militia estimates from this side—many Liberals and Progressives as to have carried the day.

When I read the debate which took place in the Australian parliament it seems almost a repetition of what happened here the other day and this afternoon. Mr. Hughes, the Australian premier, took very strong ground against reduction: He said the government of the day was responsible for the militia. He declared that the government was responsible for the defense of the country and if there was any reduction he declined to be responsible —the "Country Party" would have to be responsible for it. Mr. Hughes declared that although the war was over an emergency still existed; that while he was, and always had been, in favour of peace and would like to see the Empire have peace for the balance of its days, still there was yet an emergency. There were battles and wars in the days of our Lord and there would be battles as long as time lasted. That was the gist of his argument. The Country Party put up a strong fight but the Prime Minister of Australia stood by his guns, and the Commonwealth parliament backed the Hughes government up—they having like Canada done some pruning—they were prepared to wait until such time as it should be made manifest where Australia was by reason of the conference at Washington, the conference at Genoa, and other gatherings seeking to inaugurate a permanent peace. I admit that economy is a very good thing in its way. The working man has to live with rigid economy and we in this Parliament should practise economy in the conduct of the country's business. Parliament is the nation's housekeeper; we should observe economy and the oftener the better. At the

same time I have been very much surprised at the Liberals and Progressive parties allowing large appropriations to pass in other departments without protest in the last few days, whereas they now call very strongly for a reduction of several hundred thousand of dollars in the militia estimates.

How is it this is the only department singled out, to be made the goat, to use a phrase of the street? How is it that this is the only department the public services singled out for attack? Why is it they attack the cadet camps? Is this the only department where no economy has been exercised? This department has been cut down in many ways. There are no capital charges in this department. Maintenance charges have been reduced all along the line, as the hon. gentleman from Kingston (Mr. Ross) has said. Australia, a country of five and a half million, is spending $25,000,000 in 1921-22 for naval and land defence, and Canada, with nearly double the population, is asked to spend not quite $11,000,000, and if the $700,000 is cut off it will be still less.

The minister has effected great economy. At the present time transportation is dearer, food and camp expenses are away up, and the pay of the men is increased from 50 cents to one dollar. They have cadet camps now, whereas in 1910-11 they had no such camps. The cadet movement was the backbone of the militia in the war, and is still the backbone of the militia to-day. There was a cry in Ontario to close the bar and save the boy, but when they closed the bar they forgot all about the boy. Parliament voted a million and a half the other night for live stock—cattle, cows, pigs, etc.—which is a necessary industry, which everybody will support. Then the Minister of Health (Mr. Béland) brought down his estimates. I looked over them, and I understand there was a recommendation that something should be expended to save the boy. I may say that the scout movement is purely a cadet movement. I visited the cadet camp some time ago. We have nearly 100,000 children in public schools in Toronto and 15,000 in separate schools. Premier Hughes, of Australia, and former President Roosevelt, have said that they do not know any agency in the country which stimulates patriotism, develops youth, or makes for better citizenship than the cadet movement.

The hon. member for Hamilton (Hon. Mr. Mewburn) made a similar statement the other day. We should do something to build up the rising generation. The cadet movement cannot get along with the $100,000 reduction. I saw a number of these cadet units at the Niagara Camp. They were doing splendid work. Many of them came from the poorer districts of the city and were brought to camp. I call it an act of religion on the part of the Minister of Militia to support such work as the cadet movement, which was started by General Mewburn a few years ago. I look on the cadet and scout movement work as an act of religion for the good it does the youth of the land in many ways. A great many of these cadet units came from the rural schools of Ontario, and they did splendid work, not only in the Niagara camp, but at London and Kingston.

I am very much surprised to hear the criticism to-night. It is all very well to talk about economy, but the Militia Department experts say it is not economy at all. You may whittle the estimates down by $700,000 to-night, but in three or four years from now you may pay in millions for what you are striking out to-night. You will disorganize the whole militia of Canada. I have here a return, brought in by the minister, of the units that went from the province of Ontario in 1921 to the militia training camps, and 90 per cent of them are rural units. I heard the hon. gentleman from North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) speaking to-day. I venture to say that if he had taken the platform in the capital town of his riding, Beaverton, in the last election, and made the same speech which he has made in this Chamber to-day, he would not be in Parliament now. That constituency sent a great many men to the war, and sent one of the best units to the Niagara camp last summer. I saw the old 34th battalion in camp, and it is one of the pioneer corps of Ontario. The hon. member said he represented 90 per cent of the people of Ontario in his opposition to this vote. He does not represent 90 per cent of his own riding or of the county of Ontario, let alone the province.

Since the late war, Toronto, McGill and other universities in Canada, have been taking up the question of physical drill. An ordinance has been passed by the large universities in the United States, as a result of the war, to enforce compulsory military training in all those universities. That is the law of the large universities in the States to-day. It has spread to this country, and the University of Toronto has passed a law by which every student who goes to that university must

take some form of physical exercise and drill and before long it will be the law of all the large universities.

The Government is responsible for the defence of Canada. If this reduction is made, on the shoulders of the Prime Minister and the Government will lie the responsibility to see that nothing shall be done to injure the defence forces of Canada. I say it is a responsibility and the responsibility is theirs as long as they are there.

It is all very well to talk about the League of Nations. In the United States President Harding was opposed to the League of Nations. He did not believe in it, and he and the Republican party fought against it, but when he came into office public opinion forced him to call a meeting, and the meeting was called. The Washington Conference did their work, but I have my doubts as to the results of their work, in view of the conference which is being held in Europe at Genoa at the present time. There will be wars as long as the world lasts.

I heard some criticism in this House, and I read some criticism in Hansard to-day of the militia. Away back in 1910 there was some carping criticism about the summer camps and drill and many other items on the programme of the Militia Department. I looked over the 1913 Hansard, and I found some members in the House said there was no emergency, that there was not going to be a war, and they raised similar objections to those which my hon. friends opposite have raised to-night.

This motion strikes at the very back bone and root of the militia. If this amendment carries, it is going to be "good-day" to the militia of Canada, and the Militia Department might as well put up the shutters. I have consulted men who have been in charge of Niagara and other camps, and I say advisedly that when you cut down the items in this way you cannot have efficiency, and the balance of the money might as well be thrown into the Ottawa river. You cannot obtain efficiency with the amount of money which will be left, and you are going to tie the hands of the department forever.

I was talking to a recruiting officer of the old 12th York battalion and he told me he found a great deal of difficulty in getting men and in training his battalion, and why? The Government would not give them a permanent home. They have no drill hall in Toronto for this unit. The city of Toronto had to come along and give them assistance and an armoury free. He said he was not allowed enough money to provide for recruiting, stores and equipment. It was necessary to employ stenographers and send out letters, and he had to pay for it out of his own pocket. Every unit has to pass around the hat to-day. I was asked about it, and we had to try and get the city to help them out. Then in the case of the 36th battalion in Peel county, the city had to come along and give them armoury accommodation and a grant also. They are without a home, and the city gave this unit an armounry in the Junction, and another unit, the 110th, in St. Lawrence market. These armouries are now heated, lighted and a caretaker provided by the city. If the Government are so hard up that they cannot assist these battalions, they should abolish the Militia Department altogether. They should have a proper official militia, or we do not want a militia department at all.

If the same state of affairs had existed in Canada in 1912 and 1913, we would not have been able to take the part in the Great War which we did. What are these experts in the Department of Militia for? They mobilized the first contingent at Valcartier, and the various other contingents. We took their advice during the war, so why should we not do so now? They say that if this appropriation is reduced, it will sound the death knell of the militia, and I believe General MacBrien is speaking the truth when he makes that statement.

I do not wish to detain the House very much longer. You have the experience of Australia, and the experience of South Africa. General Smuts, who is not a militarist by any means, said the other day:

> Warfare has become so horrible because of the advance in chemical science—that this very advance will bring it to an end. All long for the day that nations and men achieve a standard of reason and common sense that war shall be no more—but it is a long way off yet I fear.

That is all very well in its way, but people had the same ideas in the days of our Lord and in the days of the Romans and Persians. They had a league of nations then; we have a league of nations now; but the only league of nations that I have ever known that has protected civilization is the British fleet. If the British fleet is dismantled, good-bye to the League of Nations. If there is ever formed a league of nations that can make as good a showing during the next four centuries on the land as the British fleet has made on the seas in the last four centuries dur-

ing the days of Philip of Spain, Louis XIV, Napoleon and the Kaiser, it will be doing a good work for civilization and there will be some need of a league of nations.

This proposed reduction in the militia estimates is false economy; I do not believe it is economy at all. As General MacBrien has said, "Later on you will suffer for it." We have a pretty state of affairs in this country. We should have responsible government, but I am beginning to doubt whether we have that or not. This is the first time that we have had the group system in this House, and I do not believe it is responsible government for a government to submit, to a party caucus, the country's estimates of expenditure, a matter which should be run on a business basis. This is a national matter, a defence matter, a patriotic matter for the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham) and it is one in regard to which the people in all the provinces will stand by the minister. If the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Halbert) would resign his seat and appeal to his constituents on the speech which he made in this House this afternoon, I believe he would be defeated.

I do not believe any one wants war again, but it is a pretty hard thing to prevent war. I have consulted many people about this question; I have consulted many financial men, men who have great stakes in the country, men who pay heavy taxes; I have consulted labour men, military men, municipal officers, and they all believe that no reduction should be made in these estimates. In conclusion, therefore, I hope that this amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HALBERT: I should just like to answer the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church). I used those words on almost every platform in the riding which I represent.

Mr. IRVINE: We have an amendment, and an amendment to the amendment, both providing for substantial reductions in the estimates. The amendment, if I am correct, calls for a reduction of $1,100,000. The amendment to the amendment calls for a reduction of $400,000 on one item, and $700,000 on the estimate as a whole. Inasmuch as they both call for a reduction, it is necessary for me to explain that I shall vote against the smaller reduction in order to have an opportunity of voting for the larger reduction.

This discussion has disclosed a rather singular situation. We have witnessed the Opposition not only defending the estimates of the Government, but pleading that their estimates might be increased. That is not, I believe, the ordinary practice; they usually criticise because the estimates are supposed to be too high. I do not know, however, if this situation is a dangerous one, or if it augurs badly for the future. Perhaps it is an evidence of that democracy which we have heard talked about so much of late.

It has been suggested, however, in connection with this estimate that simply because the Minister of Militia saw fit to change his mind with regard to his original estimate, he should resign. As a matter of fact, I think it will be proved from any angle whatsoever that the fact of his change of mind on this item will simply establish his fitness for the position. It has made clear this point at least, that some measure of parliamentary power is being allowed by the Government, instead of our having the old machine government which we have known so much about in Canada. I believe the spirit of the Prime Minister's campaign during the recent election was to let the people rule, to give Parliament back the power which it originally had, and I am rather surprised that the Opposition, which sought a vote of censure a short time ago because this Government had forgotten about its promises, should be so anxious to criticise that Government now for having carried out the spirit of its promises in consulting Parliament as well as its own supporters before passing estimates.

It has been shown, I think, conclusively by those who have already spoken on this issue, that the reduction of the estimates proposed, or, better still, the reduction that is moved in the amendment, is warranted, first because of the urgent necessity for financial retrenchment. That has been sufficiently dealt with during the debate, and I merely refer to it in recapitulating the outstanding points which have been made in the discussion. Second, it has been shown that training, in the manner in which it is provided under our militia regulations, is futile. I refer you, in connection with that point, to the excellent argument put forward by the hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) this afternoon, and it would be presumptuous for me to attempt to improve upon that.

I want, however, to mention one or two other matters, in order to express the point of view of the Labour group which I have the honour to represent. We need this money urgently, to re-establish our soldiers

who have already done some fighting. We have widespread demands throughout Canada to-day for some measure of a soldier's bonus. Some of our returned men are asking to be better re-established on the land, while others who have no intention of going on the land want to have some aid in being re-established in other walks of life. While the $11,000,000, if we should give the whole of it to the re-establishment of our returned soldiers, would not be sufficient, yet that would be a better investment of the money than that in which we are going to invest it. Not only so, but we would discover that an investment along that line, if it is going to be necessary to continue war, would be of greater value than an investment in the kind of training in which we are going to invest our money.

The spirit of an army is equal at least to the training of that army; and when we look around us and see how the men who have fought have been treated for their fighting, there is no great incentive for men to join the army if we were to have a war immediately. In fact, the treatment of the men would discourage very materially any re-enlisting; whereas, if we had treated the soldiers better, the rising generation would be more ready to shoulder arms, if we were thrown into another war. As it is, under present circumstances, even if young men could feel assured that they were not going to give up their lives on the battlefield, they would hesitate before going into the army in view of our poor treatment of those who have already been there.

I should like to spend the entire estimate for the next ten years in the re-establishment of returned soldiers. But that, perhaps, might be considered a little too drastic, and so I shall not move an amendment to the amendment to the amendment. I shall rather speak on the amendment. I am not so particular about the actual amount of the reduction as I am about the principle involved. We are really making a choice of principle that will shape the national character of this country for the future.

Two tendencies have been evident since the Great War. One of these is the tendency towards the re-birth of German militarism in the countries that have been called victors; the second is the tendency to challenge the whole barbaric system of human murder which has been adopted even by civilisation as a means of settling international disputes. I should like to see

manifested, even in the discussion of these estimates and in the decision thereon, Canada's attitude towards the future in this regard; and I should like to see her take a position strongly upon the latter principle, that she is going to discard the military means of settling disputes between nations and find some other method more satisfactory and more in keeping with the intelligence of the times in which we are living.

This is indeed Canada's opportunity; Canada can do it perhaps better than any other nation. First of all, as has already been pointed out in the debate, Canada is a young nation which has not yet been bound by the military fetters that bind other countries. She has no military traditions to live down; she is practically starting afresh. Moreover, her population is drawn from many nations; and she has succeeded so far, and I trust that in the future she will be even more successful, in welding these peoples from many nations into one national unity. If therefore she has succeeded in forming a unity out of these various elements, it is only natural that she should take the leadership in seeking to weld together, at least in the principle of co-operation, these nations from which her own population has been derived. So that we are looking to Canada to take the initiative on this new principle. We expect her to lead the way from militarism towards justice and humanity.

The desire to seek safety in military preparation is a static desire; that is, it deals only with effects. It makes no attempt whatever to deal with the causes of war, and we cannot expect to have anything else but war if we permit the causes to run rampant. Now I admit that we should still be dealing with the effects merely if we attempted to stop entirely at disarmament. We ought to be able to give some real constructive, dynamic lead and follow that lead, with our own confidence, by disarming. Wars have economic causes, that is the philosophy of the labor movement; and if wars are caused chiefly by economic conditions, they can be stopped only by economic solutions. And so, if we are really desirous of promoting the safety of Canada, against the attack of nations, we would be much more to the point in spending $11,000,000 in trying to set before the world a better method of economics than in merely training a few men or giving them a holiday for a couple of weeks every year and spending money on rifles, and so forth.

Moreover, it has been well established that the great war from which we have just emerged, as well as other great wars in history, have been caused largely through the competition of the nations of the world for the limited markets at their disposal in which to sell their supposed surplus goods; and if we are anxious to remove ourselves from the danger of conflict with other nations we should begin by adopting a sane system within our own country, so that we might be able to develop our own home markets, and not scramble with other people for a market that does not belong to us. I do not mean at all that we should isolate ourselves in the fair and necessary exchange of trade, but I do mean to say, as I pointed out before, that as we are now producing more than we are allowed to consume, if we can find some means of permitting our people to consume what they produce, it is possible we shall not want to fight with any foreigners for markets for our goods.

War is the world's most dismal failure. Politics may be a failure, if you like; and party government has no doubt dismally failed, at least in the past few years. But I do not know of any more dismal failure in the world's history than war, the very thing we are going to spend over $10,000,000 of Canada's money at this time to keep alive. If war, then, is the greatest failure, would it not be well to look for some other way of settling international disputes? The last war was the greatest of all failures; it proved, more conclusively than any other war has done, that resort to arms is an utter futility as a means of settling anything. Its greatest demonstration of this truth lies in the fact that the victor has become the vanquished. We have not been able to defeat the German sentiment for we see it bubbling around us every day. The sentiment of military preparedness, as I said at the outset, has been re-born in many great nations, and we have had this sentiment echoed on the floor of this House to-day. We have not therefore killed the sentiment nor the philosophy of war. Nor have we been able to conquer Germany in the sense of having made her pay for the war. If we made her pay for the war, even supposing that she were financially able to do so, we would ruin the industrial institutions of Great Britain, France and the United States. So that having won the war, and having attained the position of being able to compel Germany to pay for it, we dare not exercise that compulsion because we would destroy our own country thereby.

That is the fiasco of the Great War. War is a complete failure from the point of view of a settlement of disputes as between different nations. It is philosophically false; it is inhuman; it is un-economic; and worse than all, the peace based on that colossal failure is going to be the basis of subsequent wars. I presume that is why some of our people are so anxious to have more preparation.

10 p.m.

Carrying out this tendency to get away from war as a colossal failure in settling human affairs, we have had such things as the League of Nations and the Disarmament Conference. In view therefore of the fact that war is indeed a dismal failure and that it is necessary that there should be some better method of settling disputes; and in view of our hope that Canada will take the lead in finding that better method I think it will be agreed that we cannot afford to spend this money at this time on further preparation for war. Even if we could afford to spend this amount it could be better devoted to rehabilitating returned men and also taking care of many of our unemployed and trying to find better means of employing those who are unemployed, as well as in building better homes in Canada in order to make the country a better place to live in. This kind of military training is futile, not only because of its inefficiency, but because of the fact that war is just as progressive as human ingenuity is: when you have trained your men in what are supposed to be modern tactics of warfare, you very soon find out they are not modern at all; you have to train your men on the spot in order to keep pace with the development of modern warfare.

For these reasons, and also for the reason that economics are at the base of world politics and that if we are to tackle this problem seriously we must tackle it on the economic ground, I am opposed to this estimate. I am in sympathy with the expressed opinion of organized labour, not only in this country, but in the United Kingdom, when I say that we look forward to complete disarmament and will take every step possible to achieve that end. Whenever I have an opportunity as a representative of labour to vote for the reduction of armaments, I must vote for the largest possible reduction; therefore I shall vote for the amendment in this case. I am glad, however, to notice that the present Government has made some reduction; I hope it will be greater next year. I am glad for that larger measure of

democracy which the Government has exhibited, and I am only sorry that I have to vote against the reduction which it proposes in order that I may be able to vote for the amendment which would reduce the estimate by the larger amount.

I conclude with the hope, Mr. Chairman, that our action on this issue will be Canada's first step toward a great, new social order that is approaching; that Canada's action will be a first example and a lead to the nations of the world in the discovery of a new method and a new principle of settling national disputes; that we will thus give out to the world the intimation that in spirit and in sentiment we stand for the enthronement of human rights as the dominating principle in world politics.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, I am not able to give the committee any opinion of real value as to what is the best military organization or how best to spend a given amount of money for the maximum military effect. Nor can I say anything as to how future wars are to be fought—nothing, at least, that the committee would be justified in listening to. I have not had the actual war experience of other hon. members in this House, including the hon. member from Quebec (Mr. Power), sufficient to enable me to measure just what is the value of annual military training for purposes of war. And I have no vision of the future, no such prophetic power as, evidently, is possessed by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) and some others to enable me to define just in what portion of the great universe on earth in air or sea the future conflicts of mankind are to take place. I would like to say something, though, as to what appear from the story of the past, from the ordinary layman's reading of history, as being sound principles that a country like this should follow in determining what should be the measure, of its military organization.

If I held to the principles just enunciated by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Irvine) and, indeed, also by the member for Assiniboia, if the line of argument followed by the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Woods) appealed to me in the least degree—that is to say, if I felt it good as demanding the reduction by a single dollar of these estimates—I would consider it absolutely good, and, indeed, inescapable, for the wiping out of the whole appropriation. If we are going to march toward what my hon. friend calls a "great, new social order" merely by cutting out our defence; if we are going, as he says, to put Canada in the lead at this great climacteric in our history—put Canada in the lead in ushering in a new and better order in this world by the easy process of dropping the military estimates—why, then, I would want to drop them all; I would not tolerate a dollar. But I have not observed that, in the past or to-day, nations that did not gird on their armour and play the part of men in the world, but rather lolled back in self-indulgence, have been leaders either toward a new social order or toward any other order.

I do not know in what sense the word "militarist" has been used so often in the course of this debate. I would say that a militarist nation is a nation that hopes to gain by conquest, either for purposes of revenge or for mere purposes of acquisition; and that a citizen of a nation who believes in that course would be a militarist. But surely it is an abuse of words to say that a citizen of a nation whose purpose is only to be in a position to defend itself, to get reasonably ready for defence in case some militarist nation takes it into its head to act aggressively toward it, is a militarist. If that is the case, the whole world has been militaristic since the birth of creation; and though I do not like to speak of the future, I am afraid it is going to be militaristic forever. A nation, if it is to be a nation at all, must just the same as an individual be in a position to take care of itself—both internally against disorder and revolutionary insolence and externally against aggression. I do not say that it can insure itself against all possibility of harm, but, that it should under all circumstances that surround it, become reasonably ready to guard against being wiped out of existence or losing its hold on its own properties before the assistance of an awakened and enlightened world can come to its defence. Now, if by having a military organization we are only getting ready for war; if we are only taking a step to precipitate another conflict such as the war from which we have emerged, then let us stand for none at all; let us have nothing whatsoever. But while every one hopes—at least every one would like, though he may not dare to hope—that there would be no more great wars, I do not think the sensible people of the world are of opinion that the British Empire and other nations of like character are going to hasten that time merely by themselves disarming, throwing away all means of self-defence.

Surely it has been made manifest in recent years that some at least of the greater nations of the world, and undoubtedly the leading statesmen of those nations, have exerted—yes, exhausted—every imaginable effort to ensure, so far as they can ensure, that great conflicts are past. I do not know anything that Great Britain has failed to do that could have been done. I believe that the United States, using its best judgment, though we may differ from that judgment, has exerted itself to the same end.

If we are to get past the time of war, to my mind there is only one path we can tread that is likely to get us there. It is for those nations that undoubtedly have no militaristic purposes, that undoubtedly are not animated by sentiments of revenge or by ambitions of conquest, to stand together, stand together in a world policy, endeavour to bring other nations into line with themselves, and all as one group be in a position to make their policy and their pacific purposes reign. That is what they are trying to do now. I do not need to name the nations that are of that temperament, that call themselves peace-loving people, that undoubtedly are peace-loving people, but I have not the least hesitation in naming two, and I name the United States of America, and the British Empire, inclusive of all its dominions. Those are to the extent they are able to hold together—and I would not for one minute exclude others, but I am undoubtedly within the unanimous opinion of this assembly when I bring those two into that category—to the extent they are able to stand together, to the extent they are able to support their opinion by that reserve of force which alone in world politics creates influence and supports opinions, they are the real contributors to the peace of nations.

There is nobody in the British Empire, there is nobody in the United States, there is no considerable, respectable body of opinion in either of these great countries which believes for one minute that even though they stand together, they can get anywhere unless they have very considerable forces behind their opinion. The British Empire has to have such force. Who is there who has any feeling for that Empire at all who would dare to suggest at this hour that Great Britain throw down her arms and place herself in the position where her word in the councils of Europe and in the councils of the world would mean nothing at all? Who is there who would suggest that the United States do the same thing? We know they cannot do it. Much as they love peace, however devotedly, however unitedly all their efforts are concentrated to secure peace, we know they cannot adopt such a policy as that. Such being the case surely it follows that we, as an integral part of the British Empire, must maintain a fair share and proportion of that means of defence which all the Empire must sustain. Surely that follows. Surely that is incumbent upon us out of regard for our self respect, out of regard for the very manhood of our people.

Then the question is, how far can you go? Where should you stop and be sure that you have not gone too far, but that you have reached, the right line? Well, it is a difficult matter; it is a very difficult matter to decide. Opinions differ as to the state of the world; opinions differ as to the share incumbent on the different peace-seeking countries of the world; opinions differ as to the share of the various nations of the Empire. Some say that the late war so exhausted humanity that even if it would, through the perversity of human nature, it cannot wage a conflict for many years to come. I fear, though, that the state of the nations to-day affords not quite so good ground for the optimism of that class of people as it did even a few months ago. I do not think we can look to the horizon in the direction of Europe and be quite so sanguine, so certain, that the world is very far from war. I am not an alarmist by any means. I am sure that recent events have taught us this, that though the heart of one great nation, is doubtless more determinedly bent on peace, more poignantly so than it ever was, that great nation is certainly not more hopeful than it was two years ago. In Europe at this hour there is strain and stress, there is cloud and sign of storm in every direction. One nation struggles to have its way; another battles for a more excellent way—antagonism and schism result. One seems animated by revenge. Another seems to harbour perilous hopes but to cry for help against revenge. Another appears to have no purpose save to make it impossible for those nations that it describes as of the old order to live in peace at all. In a word, there is just about the antithesis of harmony in the whole European atmosphere at this hour. Very well, that is the condition, deplore it as we will, struggle against it as we will—and I am sure the Empire of

which we are part does not despair—struggle against it as we will, nevertheless, that is the condition that confronts us.

There are those who say—or think if they do not say: "Ah, we are here on the North American continent; we are far from any eastern menace, we are far from any western menace, if menace there is east or west; we are along the boundary of the great United States; the Monroe doctrine has sheltered this continent for nigh a hundred years." Let me express my sentiments:—In the fold of this Empire we have more safety than in any shelter of geography or in any doctrine of a foreign land. But let us never forget that if any portion of the Empire of which we are part is in peril, it cannot be long before that peril is equally real right here in Canada. Surely the Great War, if it taught us anything, taught us this, that any considerable war of the future will be such that no nation knows whether it will be possible for it to withhold its hand and its part in that war. Surely it taught us, if it taught us anything, that the British Empire can be maintained only to the extent it stands united, and that we are secure here as a part of that Empire only to the extent that the whole Empire is secure. If any one doubts that, let him get up and say so. For myself, my reason cannot bring me to the conviction that there is any security at all for us save in the security of the Empire of Britain.

We are asked, where is the foe? Where is the enemy that is going to attack us? Let me put the answer this way. Was there ever a time, no matter how close war actually turned out to be, when any government of a civilized country if asked across the floor of its parliament where the enemy was that was going to attack, would be in a position to rise and point out the enemy? That cannot be done. First, we do not know; next, if we did know, it would be impossible public policy, unspeakable public policy, to make the declaration. We are told we have no foe. Had Canada any foe in 1913? But foes came. The world is smaller to-day than it was two or three hundred years ago, and as time goes on the relations of continents and nations become closer, the dependence becomes closer, and the security of the one depends more and more on the security of the other; the peace of each depends more and more upon the peace of all.

We are told: We are here on the North American continent; the United States of America is a great and powerful republic,

and any attack on our shores would be resisted by them. Well, if we really rest in that belief, if we really lull ourselves into a measure of indulgence because of that consideration surely it behooves us to take the same part of the burden of such security proportionate to our numbers, proportionate to our wealth and resources, that the United States takes. But we are not taking that part to-day. The United States of America to-day is devoting 19.1 per cent of its entire expenditure to the purposes of defence; we are spending about 3¼ per cent of ours for the purpose of defence. Theirs amounts to about $13.13 per head of their people. Ours amounts to about $1.69 per head of our people. I could compare similarly with Australia, with New Zealand, with Great Britain, with other parts of our Empire. Relatively to them all we are by far the lowest, and relatively to every other nation in the world we are the lowest. So from the argument of comparison it cannot be said that we have been led by militarists and by brass caps in this country. Our governments have rather sought to keep our expenditure on defence as low as it could be kept, consistent with national self respect and a reasonable degree of security.

Now the question comes: These estimates that are brought down, do they do more than meet that requirement? For myself, no one is more anxious, I think, than I am to hold expenditure on defence down to the lowest point consistent with national self-respect, consistent with reasonable security. We are told the militia is a non-productive body and that we have a large debt to-day; that we have a tremendous interest burden to carry year after year, and that consequently we should cut down the militia. That argument proceeds upon the hypothesis that the militia, the defence force, is a mere luxury—that the reason it is maintained by a nation is because that nation has some money to throw away. The militia organization is maintained not for luxury, not in any sense merely to appease the parading ambitions of any class of people. It is maintained by a nation first to preserve law and order within the country; and second, to be a nucleus around which the national forces can gather if danger comes from without. Those who preach that we ought to cut down because our debt has grown have a wrong conception of what the militia is for. We ought to maintain—and I admit it is very difficult to tell just where the line should be

drawn—we ought to maintain a militia not proportionate inversely to our debt, but proportionate directly to the need for the militia itself, proportionate to the size of the purposes the militia is to meet.

Now, then, I come to inquire whether or not the estimates that are before us in the form presented are more than sufficient for that need. First, I find that these estimates, as originally presented, are about $1,100,000 less than last year's estimates. Last year's estimates were designed and prepared to meet the requirements that I defined a few minutes ago, the purposes the Minister of Militia defined in his address of April 25, and to do no more than meet those purposes. The present estimates were designed to the same ends and to no other; and the minister's statement to this House was such as to show that, in his judgment, they were no more than sufficient to meet the needs of law and order, to meet any contingency that might arise out of a breaking of law and order at home, and also to be the nucleus of an organization of trained men who, at least, could offer some show of resistance at first in the event of war, and who would constitute the personnel to train in time of peril the other young men of our country. They would be the advance guard that the others could follow and thereby, if trouble comes, make some sort of a showing on behalf of this nation. Are they more than sufficient for that purpose? They are $1,100,000 less than last year. I do not think this is any more than could reasonably be expected to be saved because of reductions of costs. I do not think it is claimed by the minister that it is more than that. Certainly in respect of this item the minister made no other claim than that the amount taken off was about sufficient to take care of reductions of costs of supplies and the like that could be made this year as against last year. Very well then, the minister's duty was to ascertain whether or not last year we went too far. After investigation the minister came to the conclusion we did not; that we only apportioned such an amount as was required for the purpose of this military training.

There are those who say "Yes, we should have a military organization"—I am referring particularly to the hon. member for Quebec South (Mr. Power)—"but we do not need any military training." My hon. friend ought to be a better judge of that than I am, but may I appeal to the hon. member—

Mr. POWER: If the hon. member will pardon me I said "yes, we should have militia but we should not have annual training for a militia camp". We should have permanent militia and in that I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I intended to represent my hon. friend as saying: We should have militia but we do not require this annual training.

Mr. POWER: We should have a permanent militia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A permanent militia but no annual camp training. If it was merely a case of deciding between my opinion on this subject and that of the hon. member for Quebec South his opinion would certainly be better than mine—he has had something to do with the militia, I have not. But I am here representing the people of Canada, representing a constituency of this country. Am I to take the judgment of the hon. member for Quebec South? If so what reason should I have for not taking it as against his judgment, the judgment of the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) that of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Ross), that of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion) or of others over here who have had equal military experience with my hon. friend's. They one and all are opposed to the view of my friend from Quebec. Then, what is the course I should pursue? First of all I look to other countries; I look to the Mother Country, I look to the other Dominions. If to do so does not suit the hon. member—I am not at all intimating that it would not—then I look to France, I look to the United States of America. I find that in all these countries they consider annual military training of this character to be essential for the upkeep and for the continuance of the organization and the spirit of their militias. That appears to me to be a stronger reason than the mere opinion of any hon. member however respectable that opinion is. But furthermore I come to our own country and I find that there has grown up here within this Dominion a militia organization composed of men who are chosen because of their capacity to advise Parliament and to advise the minister in this matter, who have shown their capacity under the severest tests, whose methods have been shown to stand the strain of the severest trials the world has ever witnessed, and we have their unanimous opinion that annual military

training is essential. I find that he especially upon whom the minister most relies for advice, considers that to abandon such training would be disastrous to the militia of this country. In the face of that judgment —that united judgment supported by the judgment of the minister, supported by the judgment of every previous minister who ever sat in office in Canada—supported by the experience of centuries and the universal practice of to-day—I feel that I cannot give reliance to the opinion of the hon. member for Quebec South. Consequently I come to the conclusion that annual military training is an essential part of our militia organization. Very well, if it is, the sum of $1,400,000 is required and the hon. member for Quebec South agrees. In the face of that opinion of the hon. member that if we have annual drill this money is required, it seems to me it is the duty of hon. members to support the vote as it stood—that vote which in the opinion of my hon. friend himself is essential if annual training is to be continued and to be of any use at all. But, I have a better opinion—I should not say better,—I have another opinion besides that of the hon. gentleman from Quebec South (Mr. Power), besides that of the officers of this Government, besides that of previous ministers of militia and the officers of previous governments, I have the opinion of the hon. Minister of Militia who sits in this House, expressed in the most unequivocal terms. Upon such opinion I relied two weeks ago. Upon such opinion I rely to-night. We want reductions of estimates wherever reductions can be made compatibly with the purpose for which the estimates are introduced; wherever we can see that some money can be taken off without the sacrifice of efficiency for essential purposes, let us do it. But we do not on this side of the House at all events, and I do not think anywhere, at least openly, stand up and say that we want estimates cut down at the expense of efficiency and of essential services. In approaching this matter let me say that there is a very great distinction between a mere reduction in a matter of administration, the lopping off of officials whose duties in the course of time, prove unnecessary, reductions by virtue of an improved organization such as suggested by the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), there is a very great difference between reductions of that kind and reductions that go to the root of policy, reductions that go to the root of essential purposes for which the expenditure is undertaken. A government usually considers its estimates, finds out if there cannot be betterments in organization and in administration, and brings into Parliament what it believes is the minimum. This Government it is true has not done so this session. On numerous occasions it has admitted that it could get on with less. That may be evidence of some neglect. I do not say it is a very serious matter—not at all. That, however, is one thing, but for a government to determine that a certain scale of organization and expenditure is and that certain services are essential for the vital purposes for which the department exists, and then to recede from the inevitable consequences of that decision, is another thing, and that is what we have witnessed in this House to-night. What have we witnessed? In order to make myself clear, let me quote from the address delivered by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Graham) on the 25th April last, when these estimates were brought down by the Government, and sponsored by himself. At page 1178 of Hansard he says:

> But at the present time our permanent force is not of sufficient strength to preserve internal order. That is an absolute fact.

Again he says:

> Could we, Mr. Chairman, let it be known throughout the entire world that Canada is a country where the militia is ineffective, where the mounted police is to be reduced almost to the vanishing point, where the naval service is to be of little account, and where the flying force is not to function? We would become the mecca of a class of people that would not be desirable in the best interests of the country. It is our duty, even though the militia be not productive, to maintain it at sufficient strength to preserve order and good government within the Dominion.

Further on he says:

> We have not only a tradition to carry on, we have a duty to ourselves to perform, and the militia must be maintained at a point where it will be able to protect us from internal disorder, as well as from external aggression.

And again he drew attention to the comparison between the estimates of to-day and the estimates of years ago, and I quote his words in two or three places on that subject. At page 1179 he compared our estimates with the estimates of 1911-1912. I submit in all respect to the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) whose righteous wrath at the newspapers of Montreal got sufficient vent I hope this afternoon, that these estimates the minister was comparing with the present esti-

mates were not that awful thing—so hideous to him—Tory estimates. They were estimates of a Liberal government—of a Liberal government that was declaring in the same breath that there was not a cloud in the sky, nothing but peace ahead, that the talk of an emergency was all moonshine, the vapourings of March hares and April fools. The minister said this:

> If you take into account the present purchasing power of the dollar as compared with 1911-1912 I submit the estimates presented to-day are less than they were that year.

Was Toryism in the saddle then under the guise of Liberalism? Is that the opinion of the hon. gentleman from St. James (Mr. Rinfret)? But that was not all he said on this subject. He said later on, at page 1193 on question by the hon. gentleman from Laprairie (Mr. Lanctôt)—

> What were the estimates in 1910, when there was a Liberal party in power with a good government?

The hon. minister answered:

> The last I have are the estimates for 1910-11, but I may point out that, although brought down by the succeeding government, they were the estimates of their predecessors.

The minister was wrong there. They were both the estimates of the predecessor and brought down by the predecessor, the estimates of 1910-11.

Mr. GRAHAM: The estimates I referred to are those of 1912-13.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the hon minister referred to the estimates of 1910-11, which were the estimates of the previous government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I must have mis-spoken myself or been mis-reported.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister was thinking of the estimates of 1912-13, but he was talking of the estimates of 1910-11. He said:

> The expenditure of 1910-11 was $7,067,000.

That is the expenditure. The estimate was more. He continues:

> That was practically equal to the estimates of to-day,—

The expenditure of 1910-11 was practically equal to the estimates of to-day. He continues:

> —if indeed it was not more, considering what the dollar could buy then as compared with now. Clothing for the troops now costs 50 per cent, 75 per cent and sometimes 100 per cent more, and so does maintenance. The salaries paid to all officers since the war have been higher because of the increase in cost of living as recognized by every business man in the country.

Then he goes on to explain the higher salaries, stating definitely to the House that the estimate for the year was less or at least no more than equal to the actual expenditure for the year 1910-11. In the year 1910-11 we had a population of less than seven and a quarter million. To-day we have a population of more than eight and three quarter millions. The government that brought down the estimates in that year brought them down on the avowed principle that they expressed the minimum necessary to maintain that force, essential to the preservation of law and order at home and to form the nucleus of defence, the advance guard of defence, and all at a time when, in the undoubted opinion of that government, there was no visible danger from without, no cloud in the sky, no sign of aggression, no special cause of alarm. Such was the attitude the minister took. But that was not all. The minister said more; he said at page 1221:

> I venture the assertion that there has been more economy in the cutting of these estimates than has been exercised by any business man in the House in connection with his annual expenditure during the past year.

And on the next page he said:

> Other countries are disarming—

I ask the committee to give particular attention to this quotation:

> Other countries are disarming to a certain extent, but not any more in proportion than we in Canada are, not any more than we are doing in these estimates.

Other countries are disarming, but not any more proportionately than we are doing in respect of the estimates that the minister then brought down. We in Canada, before he brought down those estimates, had by far the smallest military organization per capita of any country in the world, and there was then he said a reduction as much as or more in proportion than that of any other country in the world. In this connection, though the reference is not just appropriate, let it be recalled that, although the influence of many great men and great nations was centred in the recent Disarmament Conference to secure a reduction of armaments by land and sea, they were able, by the greatest effort, only to effect an arrangement for a reduction on sea; they were not able to make any arrangement whatever for reduction on land. I am going to quote just one sentence more from the minister's address. At page 1177, he used this language, evidently language deliberated long, because it was the language with which he opened his address:

The Militia Estimates, I might say, have been pared down to a point as low as is compatible with national safety.

There could not be a more unequivocal, nor a more relevant sentence, a sentence more directly bearing upon the very heart of the issue that is before the committee in this discussion. In the judgment of the minister, the militia estimates had been pared down to a point as low as was compatible with national safety. This was the judgment of the minister after taking the advice of the trained and experienced men of his department. And let it be remembered, this was not the judgment of a minister who came into his department anxious to maintain the militia estimates on the level they had been on before or on anything like that level, but anxious if he dared, to go below those estimates, the judgment of a government and of a minister who believed that they had political advantage to gain, by slashing the estimates for defence, by bringing those estimates down to the point of peril itself, to the point of demoralization and disorganization of the militia. That was the tendency of ministers, I affirm, when they came into office. In the face of that and resisting that, and rightly so, they came to this parliament and said "Thus far can we go and no farther, compatibly with the safety of this nation."

But where are we to-night? We are now asked to take $400,000 off the appropriation for annual drill, to reduce it by 30 per cent and to take corresponding amounts off various other essential services, services deemed essential, not only by the expert advisers of this country, but by the Minister of Militia, by the Government itself. We are asked to take $400,000 off a vote which the minister declared was indispensable to the safety of this country, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe), seated at the council table, agreed was the very lowest that the Government could reach compatibly with the safety of our people, which the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) agreed was the lowest that they could justify the presentation of to Parliament. Remember this is not a matter merely of organization, nor a matter merely of saving a few dollars in administration; this is a matter of the fundamental defence services of this country, services which, the minister declared and believes to-day vital to the security of the nation of which he and the Government are trustees. They are cutting those services down to 66 or 70 per cent of the figure which they asserted was the point of safety. That is the position which the Government has taken to-night. Why has it taken that position? Because there was disagreement behind; partly that, partly because there was agreement here. I wonder which it really was. The hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret) says that he is all the more determined to cut these estimates down because we support them. Fine public spirit! He attacks us as Tories trying to hold to the old Tory policy. A bitter, long deliberated virulent attack he made on us this afternoon, and all for what? Pray, what was our offence? Our offence was supporting the minister whom he was elected to support. And as usual he feels that he has clinched his argument when he denominates us Tories. That appellation ends the discussion in the mind of the hon. member. I never put very much store by names; I put far more store by deeds and records, and I would rather belong to a party under any name on earth, a party that stands to its principles through storm and through sunshine, through adversity and through prosperity, in power and out of power, and that applies those principles in progressive legislation to meet the needs of the hour as the hours advance, than belong to a party which, though called in honour of the angels of heaven, cannot describe its principles for the life of it, can only sermonize in language of evasion and of mystery and cannot adhere to any policy for a single session or even from week to week.

The minister advised us that these were the minimum estimates that he could get on with, consistent with the public safety. What has transpired? There was a threat from the hon. member for St. James; there was rebellion in the heart and on the lips of the hon. member for South Quebec (Mr. Power), supported by the determined and dogmatic pacifism of the hon. member for Laprairie and Napierville (Mr. Lanctôt)—and now he nods assent. Apparently there is mutiny still in his heart to-night. Consequently, these estimates were postponed in order to give the Government sufficient time to change its policy and its principles. They did not need to be postponed very long. All were gathered into the composing room and the operation proceeded. The hon. member for South Quebec, and the hon. members for St. James and for Laprairie and Napierville came out more than conquerors, because they forced and coerced the Government into reducing the estimates below the line that it had

declared to this House to be the line of safety for the country. We have heard of government by conviction; we ought really to have government by conviction; but what have we now? We have government by listening. The Prime Minister bereft of opinions himself listens sometimes at an angle of 45 degrees, sometimes at an angle of 90 degrees, listens for the whispers of the corridor, listens for the threats and the growls around, and then all these noises are gathered together, fused into one and the conglomerate emission becomes the tune that he calls the Government policy. Why did the minister not come back with his estimates intact? He might have reduced where it was merely a matter of administration; but he has reduced them at what he himself has declared to be the very root and heart of policy. If there is one function of a government that is primary, that is major, that is first and above all others, it is to take care properly of the national defence. The similar obligation is the first duty of an individual. It is the first law of nature; it is the first trust of government. How has this Government discharged that trust? It has done so by coming to Parliament and saying: "So much is necessary for self-preservation; so much is necessary for national defence; so much is necessary for the general safety: but we ask you to vote a great deal less because of the importunities of our followers". Such is the administration that is in office now; and that sort of conduct forsooth, is described as "democracy". Some hon. member—I forget who he was, but I believe he was an hon. gentleman to the left—gave the Government credit for living true to one of its preachings in the late campaign, —namely that the Government was going to be a committee of Parliament; the Government was going to find out the will of Parliament and then put it into effect. Well, if the Government is merely going to come to Parliament and ask Parliament what shall be the policy of Canada, if Parliament is to take the initiative and dictate a programme item by item to the Government, then in all respect, I do suggest, to hon. ministers, that they might reduce their salaries. What is there for them to do? The deputies gathered together could do their work. We could get men off the street at $1,000 a year, and perhaps a little war bonus occasionally, to go to the deputies and carry the instructions of Parliament and ask them to implement the policies initiated here. Is that responsible government? Is that the character of government that commands the respect of this country? Is that the sort of government that they have or have ever had in Great Britain? Is that traditional British government? If it is, then I do not know what British government is. It is not "democracy", surely not, to come here with a policy and, upon hearing someone rebuke from behind, get up and say, "very well, this is the course we decided on, but if you don't like it we will go back and fix up something else". This is a guess-work government. They canvass how many votes they can get by one line of action, and if they find by a counting process that they are wrong, they go back and guess again; and if they discover that they are still wrong they withdraw for cogitation and for caucus and then make another attempt.

An hon. MEMBER: Order.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Some hon. member says that is out of order. Well, it is certainly out of order in other British countries. No! wobbling of that kind is not "democracy," Do not let us besmirch the name of "democracy" by describing that sort of thing as democracy. It is impotency; it is helplessness; it is drift, sterility and inefficiency.

How should hon. members vote? The minister comes before Parliament now, and no one can doubt what was really in his mind and heart when he introduced these new estimates this afternoon. It was written all over his countenance, sounded in every word he uttered, that he himself did not believe that these figures were the proper estimates that should be submitted to this committee. He said: "I am told that this cut can be made and not destroy the whole militia." Those, in effect, were his words. And consequently, because this reduction can be made and not utterly destroy the militia, he comes to Parliament and commends it. I think the minister really believes at this moment that he would be doing better by the country as Minister of Militia to stand by the estimates he first proposed. I believe he wants to do right by the country—if he had the strength essential to his office. But he should have courage as strong as his desire is pure. Instead, he now returns coerced by his followers, driven and bludgeoned by them; for nothing else can explain his course. For my part I prefer to take the judgment of the minister, pronounced in the clear light

of his conscience and of his knowledge of the actual necessities as revealed to him in office, I prefer to rest on his opinion, uncoerced, unbelaboured, unbludgeoned as expressed to us only a fortnight ago—I prefer that course to accepting as the basis of my conduct a line of action forced on the Government by the exigencies of politics and the mutinous threats of caucus. I stand by the estimates as they are.

Mr. McMASTER: The leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has had bestowed on him by nature a fine vituperative style. Art has developed it, and constant practice brought it to a high state of perfection. He is the master of flouts and jeers and gibes. If flouts could have settled our tariff question it would long since have been settled; had jeers been able to settle our immigration policy that too would have been settled to the satisfaction of all; and his gibes would no doubt have settled our transportation problems and cheap freight rates would now be enjoyed by all.

I might divide his remarks into two parts: First, the observations of a statesman; and the last the nightly exercise of one who cannot seek well-merited repose without having endeavoured to hold this Government up to ridicule. Why is the Government held up to ridicule? Because forsooth it has listened to the voice of the people's representatives. Because counsel has been given to the minister from his own side, those who gave that counsel are qualified as rebels. Why, the Liberal party, when they have stood for the rights of the people for the last hundred years, have always been denounced as rebels, from the time of Louis Joseph Papineau and his colleagues in Ontario until now. The right hon. gentleman has told us that this is a listening government, because they have listened to those situated at an angle of 45 degrees opposite.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Better than zero.

Mr. McMASTER: Personally, I have no objection if the Government listen often to advice from that direction; but I will protest if they bend forward both ears in a direction exactly opposite. Now, the first part of the address of my hon. friend was that of a statesman. He approached in a serious mood the fundamentals that lie at the basis of this great question. The question of military expenditures is one of the most difficult with which civilized nations are faced. Civilized nations do not wish to bank too much on the millenium. But then, if they develop military and naval forces they find, alas! that those very forces created to preserve peace are so often the real provocators of war. That is the difficulty of the question. Now let me just briefly endeavour to answer some of the arguments and the assertions made by the leader of the Opposition.

First of all, he tries to define militarism; Bernard Shaw, I think, has given us the best definition of a militarist that we can find in modern literature. He says: "A militarist is one that believes that the only force is military force and that God is always with the big battalions." It is the Napoleonic idea; it is the idea which has been responsible for more tears and more blood and more suffering on the part of humanity than possibly any other idea that mankind ever cherished. The hon. gentleman says that world peace depends upon those nations which are not militaristic gathering themselves together. Well, what nations ever admitted that they were militaristic? Why, the whole claim of those who have been responsible for military expenditure in all countries has been this: military forces are merely preservers of peace, a sort of insurance "Give us," said the German generals to the German people, before the great war; "give us another army corps and the Fatherland will be safe." "Give us eight dreadnoughts," said the British naval people, "and the seas will be free from all danger." But was the result of that policy peace, or was it war? I know how difficult it is, when one nation sets the pace, for other nations not to keep more or less in step. But thank God, that nation that did set the pace toward military expenditure is in the dust and those nations who said that they fought the great war to end war are the victors. Let not the victors lose the result of victory by adopting the sentiments and the policies of the vanquished.

My right hon. friend says that peace or war depends on a defensive alliance between the United Kingdom and the United States. These are not his exact words, but that I think, was the thought that underlay them. But he goes on to say that these two great nations must have very considerable forces behind this policy if it is to be of any avail. Now, it does strike me, Mr. Chairman, that if Great Britain and the United States, more especially the former, would abandon militaristic adventures here and there and everywhere all over the world, the amount of force which they

would be obliged to maintain would be very much less than it is now. I was profoundly saddened by the statement made by the leader of the Opposition that in Europe things looked as if they were not very far from war; that war was not as far away as we would like. I give him full credit for desiring peace as I desire it myself. But he painted a gloomy picture of Europe. He said the outlook was not as hopeful as it was two years ago. Now, I disagree with him. His knowledge of European politics may be much greater than mine, but I say that there is one great outstanding feature in the present European situation which bids us hope, and that is, that those two great nations which have been ostracised from European society ever since the war now have their representatives at the council table at Genoa, because there could be no real European accommodation and, therefore, no real world accommodation as long as Germany and Russia were kept out of the society of nations. They have returned, and we watch the conference at Genoa with hope. Let us hope and trust that Providence will look down on the suffering children of men and that good will come out of this conference.

Then, the world situation is better than it was two years ago, because at that time there was a danger of naval competition between the United States and Great Britain. That is a thing of the past, and I wish to give full meed of credit to the leader of the Opposition for the part he played in bringing about the understanding which was arrived at between Great Britain and the United States. That, I believe, we have the right to hope.

Now, the late Prime Minister—I should say the former Prime Minister, because "late" should only be used in referring to those who have ceased to live, and I know that the leader of the Opposition is fully alive yet and will be for many years to come—he says that Canada is in a happy position. So we are: geographically we are in a happy position. We fear no enemy from the north; we fear no enemy from the south, because by prudence and wisdom we and the inhabitants of the great republic have organized what is really the first international court which has been functioning for years to the satisfaction of the litigants before it, that is, the International Joint Commission. That body has the right to decide not only all questions pertaining to international boundary waters on its own motion, but has the right to sit as a court to consider all questions which may arise between the United States and ourselves. We have the right, I say, to take full advantage of our geographical position and our happy political position. It is due to Providence to a certain extent but also to the wisdom of ourselves and our forefathers.

But, says the leader of the Opposition, some other part of the Empire may get into trouble and that may bring trouble home to us. Now, I disagree most heartily with that interpretation of the responsibilities of Canada. The leader of the Opposition at the conference in London apparently committed this country, to a certain extent at least, to a different attitude, but so far as he did so he departed from the traditional attitude which Sir Wilfrid Laurier led this country to adopt, namely, that as long as we fly the flag we are liable to attack, but that so far as participation in war is concerned, that is a matter for the Canadian people to decide through their elected representatives.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. gentleman will permit me I must ask him when he attributes to me any stand at the Imperial Conference, to support it by quotation from the document filed. So far as I am concerned, any other document relating to that conference can be filed, but while this is the only one on file it is a duty of hon. members to confine themselves to it and it alone.

Mr. McMASTER: Here is a resolution which was passed at the Imperial Conference of 1921:

> Having regard to the constitutional development since 1917, no advantage is to be gained by holding a constitutional conference;

Mr. Lloyd George, in the course of his speech in the House of Commons on the 14th of December, 1921, referring to the dominions, spoke as follows—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, my suggestion to the hon. member was this, and I appeal to his fairness. In attributing to me anything, he has no right to quote from what any member of the Conference said elsewhere. If it is not embodied in the report filed in this House and the British House, the hon. member has no right to quote it. If there is any fuller report, then so far as I am concerned I would like to see it tabled. If Mr. Lloyd George is to make reports of his own, a similar right pertains to all concerned to make reports of their own, and the whole confidential character of the Conference is gone.

Mr. McMASTER: I think my hon. friend will admit I would have no desire to be unfair to him in any way, but—

Mr. STEVENS: What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. McMASTER: I am reading from the report of a speech delivered by Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons of Great Britain on the 14th of December, 1921.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it a newspaper report of his speech?

Mr. McMASTER: It is a report of his speech which I think is to be found in the printed memorandum which was circulated among members of this House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: From the way it started, I think it is not. If the hon. member will read from that printed memorandum, I will make no complaint at all. Read from the memorandum.

Mr. McMASTER: I am in the hands of the Chair. I do not wish to be unfair in any way to my hon. friend, but I would submit to all hon. members here that after an Imperial conference sits and the Prime Minister of Great Britain gives in a speech in the House of Commons at Westminster an account of what happened at that Imperial conference and the results of its deliberations, surely no one should object unless he is prepared to take the ground that the words of the Prime Minister of Great Britain incorrectly represent what happened there. Under these circumstances, I trust that my right hon. friend will allow me to continue to read what Mr. Lloyd George said as to what was the result of the Conference in which my right hon. friend took a leading part.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest just one thing to my hon. friend. I cannot, of course, hinder him reading anything he likes from Mr. Lloyd George; I do not suggest I can. I have only suggested to him that it is unfair to attribute to me something not contained in the official report which Mr. Lloyd George filed and which has been laid on the Table of this House. That is the only report that any member of the Conference had the right to make with the consent of the Conference.

Mr. McMASTER: I think I will proceed in this fashion, which will be eminently fair to my hon. friend. I will read what Mr. Lloyd George says, and then if it is not a correct representation of the facts, my hon. friend will say that it is not. The point I wish to make is that according to what Mr. Lloyd George says, there grew out of this Imperial Conference a solidarity of responsibility which before that time had not been admitted. Let me read the report, and I think hon. members will agree with me after they have listened to it, that my interpretation is correct. Referring to the Dominions he spoke as follows:

> They said: "You are putting us in this position—either we have to support you in a policy which we might or might not approve, or we have to desert the old country in the time of trouble. That is a dilemma in which you ought never to put us. Therefore in future you must consult us before the event." That was right; that was just. That was advantageous to both parties. We acceded to it gladly.
>
> The machinery is the machinery of the British Government—the Foreign Office, the Ambassadors. The machinery must remain here. It is impossible that it could be otherwise, unless you had a Council of Empire, with representatives elected for the purpose. Apart from that, you must act through one instrument. The instrument of the foreign policy of the Empire is the British Foreign Office. That has been accepted by all the Dominions as inevitable. But they claim a voice in determining the lines of our future policy. At the last Imperial Conference they were there discussing our policy in Germany, our policy in Egypt, our policy in America, our policy all over the world, and we are now acting upon the mature, general decisions arrived at with the common consent of the whole Empire. The sole control of Britain over foreign policy is now vested in the Empire as a whole. That is a new fact, and I would point out what bearing it has upon the Irish controversy.
>
> The advantage to us is that joint control means joint responsibility, when the burden of Empire has become so vast it is well that we should have the shoulders of these young giants under the burden to help us along.

Now is there anything unfair in my deduction from that, that if a part of the Empire would get into war, under this joint responsibility the other parts would have to come to their assistance. I think that is a fair deduction, and I think it is a very unwise and dangerous policy for Canada to follow.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member suggest that at previous conferences, under Liberal governments, there were no joint councils and discussions on matters of foreign policy of the Empire?

Mr. McMASTER: I say there was not. I say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier took the position that he would not be informed as to the foreign policy of Great Britain, because if he was given information there might be an implication of honour that having received the information, and not having protested, he would be liable to

support the foreign policy which might eventuate from those facts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. member suggest that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not take part in the discusions leading to the Anglo-Japanese alliance and actually agreed to the alliance?

Mr. McMASTER: I am not prepared to say that. I am not denying that specific fact, but I believe I am perfectly right when I state that the general policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was to decline consultation lest consultation involve responsibility.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member would have a hard time supporting that.

Mr. McMASTER: That is the policy which I believe Sir Wilfrid Laurier followed, and may I say this, that if premiers of this country present and to come will follow in the footsteps of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, they will follow a safe course for this beloved country of ours.

I am not going to attack the estimates as grossly swollen. I admit frankly that in this country we have been as free as most countries, and freer than some, from swollen military and naval estimates, but what I say is that we are particularly fortunate in our situation and we should take full advantage of our good fortune and set an example of reduction in expenditures wherever possible.

I am going to support the amendment moved by the Minister of Militia, not because I am altogether out of sympathy with what has been said by those who wish to go further, but because I believe that the direction in which a party is going is a matter of principle, but the speed with which the party goes in a given direction is a matter of expediency, and I am prepared to take the attitude assumed by the Minister of Militia, who says that he believes he can make substantial reductions in his estimates. I prefer to see the pruning knife used all along the line more or less, rather than to have one slash at a particular item. There is no question about it: I believe we can effect very substantial reductions in the militia estimates without impairing the service. To give just one instance, there are 4,125 men in our permanent force, and of these 1,406, if I mistake not, are non-combatants. I think we have 105 doctors, and knowing the health of the young Canadian manhood who form our militia I believe some of these doctors must be holding sinecures. The estimates must be cut down. We cannot get on in this country, we cannot have efficiency in government anywhere along the line, unless we come down to the old fashioned adage of making both ends meet, and we have got to cut our coat according to our cloth.

Mr. MILLAR: I had wished to speak on this matter but considering that we were up last night until such a late hour this discussion now ought to come to a close. If we can do that and take an immediate vote, I am willing to refrain from speaking; if we are to continue I have some observations to make.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The vote is on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. Lapointe.

Amendment to the amendment agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: The vote now is on the amendment of Mr. Power as amended.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not in favour of the motion as amended, or the amendment as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: It is not debatable. The amendment of Mr. Power has been amended upon the motion of Mr. Lapointe which was carried. That amendment provides for the reduction of the annual drill item of $1,400,000 by the sum of $400,000.

Amendment as amended agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the motion as amended carry?

Motion as amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednsday, May 10, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

TOPOGRAPHICAL MAPS

Mr. RINFRET:

1. In what provinces has the federal Government made topographical maps since 1911?

2. What territory was so covered in each of the provinces?

3. Does the Government intend to draw topographical maps in, (a) Eastern Ontario, (b) Quebec, and (c) the Maritime provinces?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

Department of the Interior—

1. Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario and Yukon.

2. Manitoba, 8,790 square miles; Saskatchewan, 12,080 square miles; Alberta, 16,070, square miles; British Columbia 6,600 square miles; New Brunswick, 22 square miles; Quebec, 193 square miles; Ontario, 850 square miles; Yukon, 1,845 square miles.

3. Receiving the consideration of the Surveys Board.

Department of Militia and Defence—

1 and 2. Since 1911 the Survey Division of the Militia Department has made topographical surveys and maps in the provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and a small area last year in Manitoba. The total area mapped by the Militia Department to date is as follows: Ontario, about 25,000 square miles; Quebec, 11,395 square miles; Nova Scotia, 860 square miles; Manitoba, 160 square miles; Total area mapped to date, 37,415 square miles. In addition to these areas mapped in Quebec, there are completely surveyed, but not mapped, 2,580 square miles, and in Nova Scotia 2,520 square miles; partly surveyed, Ontario, 2,580 square miles, Quebec, 2,500 square miles.

3. Yes, as funds are available.

Department of Mines—

1. Yukon Territory, British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia.

2. Yukon, 1,000 square miles; British Columbia, 9,396 square miles; Alberta, 14,565 square miles; Saskatchewan, 1,696 square miles; Ontario, 1,015 square miles; Quebec, 495 square miles; New Brunswick, 561 square miles; Nova Scotia, 250 square miles.

3. Yes, if geological work in any of these areas is decided upon for which a topographical map is a necessity.

POPULATION BY AGES

Mr. McDONALD (Timiskaming):

How many people are there in Canada of the ages of fifty-five, sixty and sixty-five years?

Hon. Mr. ROBB: According to the census of 1911 (latest census year for which the information for all of Canada is available) there were in Canada 52,945 persons of the age of fifty-five, 52,433 of the age of sixty, and 33,910 of the age of sixty-five years.

LIGNITE COAL

Mr. GOULD:

1. What is the present estimated cost of briquet coal per ton at the Bienfait mines?

2. What heat units per pound does the lignite briquet, at Bienfait, show?

3. In the process of investigation, is the board tied down to the process of briquetting only?

4. Is the briquetting of the aforementioned coal the only feasible means of efficient mechanical treatment?

5. Has the board taken into consideration the burning of lignite coal in pulverized form?

6. If not, why?

7. What was the initial estimated cost of completing the experiment?

8. What amounts have been expended by, (a) The Dominion Government; (b) The Manitoba government; and (c) The Saskatchewan government, in relation to the whole work carried on at Bienfait?

9. What prospects are there of any valuable by-products as a result of the investigation that is taking place?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. The Lignite Utilization Board at present estimates the cost of briquettes at $12.25 per ton f.o.b. plant at Bienfait, Saskatchewan.

2. About 11,500 B.T.U. per pound.

3. The immediate objective of the Lignite Utilization Board is to demonstrate a process of producing a carbonized lignite briquette for domestic consumption.

4. The process of briquetting carbonized lignite is the only method known to-day likely to be successful in preparing a suitable fuel for domestic consumption from low grade lignites.

5. Yes; but such method is not suitable for domestic heating.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Four hundred thousand dollars was the cost estimated by a committee of the Research Council in 1917. (Preliminary investigations delayed the commencement construction of the plant at Bienfait until 1920.)

8. The Dominion Government has expended $445,000, which sum will be decreased by an amount of $35,000 due from the province of Manitoba; the Saskatchewan government has expended $205,000, and the Manitoba government $170,000.

9. The question of by-products is, in the main, one of markets, not one of technical possibility. There is no question that by-products can be produced.

In connection with the work at Bienfait, it must be borne in mind that, as the

objective of the whole undertaking is to produce a domestic fuel, the process is designed to permit the greatest possible number of B.T.U.'s to be left in the lignite residue. If the objective were the removal of the maximum amount of by-products a much poorer residue would be the result. The recovery plant installed at Bienfait is, therefore, only for the purpose of removing the lignitic tars and pitches from the gas, in order that the pipes, flues and other passages may not become clogged up.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—RIGHT OF WAY AGENT

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Does the Right of Way Agent of the Department of Railways and Canals do any work in connection with the Canadian National Railways?

2. If so, of what nature?

3. Does he receive any remuneration from the Canadian National Railways over and above his departmental salary?

4. If so, what amount, and is the Civil Service Commission aware of the fact?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. The Right-of-Way and Lease Agent of the Department of Railways and Canals has always looked after such matters in connection with government railways and canals. When the Canadian Northern was taken over, the position of Right-of-Way Agent of that road was vacant through death. It was considered an economy to have the departmental Right-of-Way and Lease Agent take over that work in addition to his previous duties.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Yes.

4. $1,000. Civil Service Commission is aware of the fact.

AUTOMOBILES IMPORTED

Mr. COOTE:

1. How many automobiles were imported into Canada, what was the value of same and what was the amount of customs duty collected thereon, during each of the last five years?

2. How many of said automobiles were valued at less than $1,000, and how many over that amount?

3. What was the value of automobile parts or accessories imported, and the amount of customs duty collected thereon during each of the said years?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1.

Automobiles: Passenger

Fiscal Year	Number	Value	Duty Collected
1918.. ..	16,118	$11,317,245	$3,961,035 75
1919.. ..	6,473	5,326,510	1,864,278 50
1920.. ..	10,805	11,204,461	3,920,544 60
1921.. ..	5,907	8,399,537	2,936,004 83
1922.. ..	7,181	9,501,362	3,278,258 28

Automobiles: Freight

Year	Number	Value	Duty Collected
1918.. ..	964	$ 1,275,179	$ 446,312 65
1919.. ..	1,744	2,274,748	794,745 55
1920.. ..	2,274	3,831,084	1,338,386 28
1921.. ..	1,706	3,578,938	1,240,452 42
1922.. ..	806	1,537,765	533,541 39

2. Information not available.

3.

Fiscal Year	Value	Duty Collected
1918..	$ 6,671,419	$2,050,973 09
1919..	6,660,770	2,095,035 71
1920..	12,674,823	3,966,277 07
1921..	11,760,367	3,642,198 28
1922..	10,211,791	3,053,875 00

DOMINION TRADE

Mr. COOTE:

What was the total amount of Dominion trade in each of the three fiscal years, 1900-1901, 1910-1911, and 1920-1921?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Fiscal Year 1900-1901—	
Imports entered for consumption	$177,700,694
Exports..	194,509,143
Total Trade..	$372,209,837
Fiscal Year 1910-1911—	
Imports entered for consumption	$451,745,108
Exports..	290,000,210
Total Trade..	$741,745,318
Fiscal Year 1920-1921—	
Imports entered for consumption..	$1,240,158,882
Exports..	1,210,428,119
Total Trade..	$2,450,587,001

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. CHURCH:

For a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any official of that department, and the Minister of Justice or any official of his department, in reference to judgment given by Mr. Justice Morrison, of British Columbia, in regard to the mode of appointment of persons to act as nautical assessors to assist the Dominion wreck commissioners in the investigation of wrecks and other marine casualities.

Mr. SEGUIN:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, requests, and the report of the Griffenhagen Company, regarding the higher employees of the Montreal Post Office.

Mr. CAMPBELL:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, memoranda, memorials, petitions and other documents, in the possession of or under the control of the Government, relating to claim of residents of Canada for the independence of Eastern Galicia.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant) moved:

Whereas the Special Committee on Proportional Representation appointed at the last ses-

sion of the late parliament, reported in favour of the adoption of the Alternative Vote method of election in all single member constituencies where more than two candidates were running for election, and also found much merit in the system of true Proportional Representation,

And whereas the recent general election has fully demonstrated the many serious anomalies of the existing electoral system,

Therefore, be it resolved:

That, in the opinion of this House the Alternative Vote method should be adopted for use in future elections for this House in all single member constituencies where more than two candidates are running for election,

Also that, in the opinion of this House, for the purpose of demonstrating the working and effect of the true Proportional Representation system, one or more multi-member constituencies should be constituted as early as possible in which that system should be applied at the next general election.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I venture to address to the House to-day can make little or no appeal to those who do not believe in democracy. That there are many such in Canada, I am well aware; that there may be some in this House, I can well believe; but I have confidence that the majority of Canadians, both in and out of this House, do believe in democracy, in spite of its many weaknesses and bunglings. Democracy, indeed, is yet but an infant painfully learning, first to creep, and then to walk, and suffering many a tumble while growing in strength and stature. Some day democracy will grow up, and it is to those who look with faith towards that day that I make my appeal.

This is not the first time this question has been before this House, but inasmuch as there are many here to-day who have not been here in previous years, I think it well at the outset to make a brief statement of what consideration has been given to this question by previous parliaments.

Beginning then on the 15th March, 1909, the late Hon. F. D. Monk moved a resolution calling, among other things, for a select committee to investigate proportional representation. In his speech, which occupies about thirteen pages of Hansard, there is a vast amount of evidence given in favour of this new electoral method. There was considerable debate on that occasion, and finally the hon. Mr. Fielding moved a slight amendment to the resolution, and in that amended form the resolution carried unanimously. However, the matter was left over, it being then fairly late in the session and nothing further was done at that time. At the next session, on November 17, 1909, the late Mr. Monk again brought the matter up, and after a short discussion the

House again endorsed the motion unanimously. On the 25th November, a committee was named composed of the following gentlemen, Messrs. W. L. Mackenzie King, Monk, Turcotte, Burrell, Magrath, Wilson and Kyte. This committee did not meet that session, but were reappointed on February 8, 1911, on the motion, I think, of the same Mr. Monk. I find no record of the activities of that committee. However, on April 30, 1917, Mr. J. C. Turriff, now in the Senate, moved a resolution in favour of proportional representation, and in the course of the debate, Mr. Kyte, who was a member of the committee, stated that the committee had met once, but that owing to the illness of Mr. Monk, the chairman, nothing further was done. Mr. Turriff's resolution was not brought to a vote, the debate being adjourned. Early in 1919 a Royal Commission on Industrial Relations was appointed and reported in favour of proportional representation. On July 5, 1919, in reply to a question in this House, Sir Robert Borden said:

> I should be very glad indeed to have a Speaker's Conference established for the purpose of considering the important question—
>
> Namely proportional representation.
>
> —to which my hon. friend has directed my attention * * * * I recognize its importance and I will be prepared to have a Speaker's Conference appointed at the next session of Parliament.

This promise on the part of Sir Robert Borden was not carried out. I do not know why; and we find that on April 4, 1921, Mr. J. A. Sexsmith, the Conservative member for East Peterborough, moved:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in order to give each voter an equal share in the representation, some system of proportional representation should be adopted, and that a special committee of this House should be forthwith appointed, charged with an inquiry into the different systems of proportional representation, with a view to recommend one of these for adoption.

Mr. Sexsmith supported his resolution with a very large volume of evidence and argument, and the debate was engaged in by the following members of the then House: Mr. Levi Thomson, Mr. J. W. Edwards, Mr. Andrews (Centre Winnipeg), Hon. Mr. Calder and Messrs. Denis, Harold, Crerar, Cockshutt, McMaster, Steele (South Perth), Mackenzie King and Thompson (Yukon). I may say in passing that when Mr. Calder spoke he suggested an amendment to the resolution moved by Mr. Sexsmith, and finally, after

a debate of four hours, the amendment suggested by Mr. Calder was unanimously adopted. Now I want to place upon Hansard in this connection the statement made in that debate by the present Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie King. He said, as reported on page 1553 of Hansard of the year 1921:

> Proportional representation, so far as I can see, is a juster system than any we have at the present time, in that it gives the electors, whether of a minority or a majority, their fair share of representation in Parliament, where their views can be aired; and it seems to me that it also gives greater freedom in that it allows the greatest possible latitude to every citizen in expressing his choice of who shall represent him in parliament, because proportional representation is founded on the true democratic principles of justice and freedom, and as it gives better expression to those principles in our electoral machinery, I, for one, strongly favour its adoption.

The committee which was then formed in response to the resolution which was carried unanimously was composed of the following members of the House: Messrs. Blain, Calder, Crowe, Currie, Davidson, Denis, Harold, Manion, McMaster, Molloy, Pardee, Sexsmith, Simpson, Sinclair, Thomson and Whidden. This special committee thus appointed met on the following dates: April 8, 14, 22, and May 12, 21 and 28th. It had submitted to it a large amount of evidence from Mr. Ronald H. Hooper, honourary secretary of the Proportional Representation Society of Canada; Mr. J. R. McNichol, Toronto; Mr. J. A. P. Haydon, speaking for Mr. Tom Moore, of the Trades and Labour Congress, and Mr. C. G. MacNeil, speaking for the Great War Veterans' Association. The committee reported on May 30, 1921, and I may say in passing that I have here the evidence submitted to them during those sittings. It is embodied in four pamphlets which contain a large quantity of very valuable evidence on this subject. The instructions given to that committee were as follows, in the amendment which Mr. Calder introduced to the original motion:

> That in the opinion of this House a special committee of this House should be appointed to consider the subject of proportional representation and the subject of the single transferable or preferential vote, and the desirability of the application of one or the other, or both, to elections to the House of Commons of Canada, and to report thereon to the House, and that such committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to examine witnesses under oath.

This committee reported on May 30, 1921, in part, as follows:

> Your committee has come to the conclusion that at this time it is not prepared to recommend the application of proportional representation in the next general election as a method of electing members to the House of Commons.

Permit me, in passing, to comment on that paragraph in the report.

It is somewhat vague and does not indicate whether or not the committee was prepared to recommend a partial application of proportional representation in the next election, or whether it was not prepared to recommend the universal application of the system to all constituencies in Canada. Continuing, the report says:

> The committee, however, was impressed with many of the arguments advanced by the advocates of this system, and believes that the system merits further study and investigation by the Canadian people.
>
> Your committee believes that in constituencies where more than two candidates present themselves the adoption of the alternative vote offers a solution of the difficulty inasmuch as by such method the candidate finally declared elected would represent the choice of the majority of the electors.
>
> Your committee is of the opinion that this system will give a truer reflection of the desires of the voters in the various constituencies than will be obtained where more than two candidates run under our present method of counting the votes.

That was the situation last year. The committee reported in substance as I have just read, but Parliament did not, for some reason or other, take the matter up again. I presume that it was late in the session, other business was pressing, and probably the matter was set aside. We come now to the present year and to the resolution which I have asked the privilege of moving to-day. This resolution asks for two things: first the adoption of the alternative, or transferable, or preferential, or contingent vote—all of these names are applied to it—where three or more candidates are running in a single member constituency, and in that respect it would meet with the support and endorsation of the committee last year. It goes no farther, but it goes just as far. Secondly, this resolution calls for the application of proportional representation in a small way in certain constituencies. I am not asking the House on the present occasion to give an unqualified endorsation to the principle of proportional representation, or to authorize its application in any definite number of places, or in any particular constituencies in this country, but I am asking the House to authorize the trying out of proportional representation in certain constituencies.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Toronto would be a good place for that.

Mr. GOOD: It has already been tried with great success in Winnipeg, and, as the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lapointe) suggested, Toronto, I think, is another place where it could be tried out to great advantage.

I propose to examine the two parts of the resolution separately, the alternative vote, in the first place, and proportional representation in the second place. What, then, is the need for the alternative vote? I have before me a table giving an analysis of the returns of the Canadian general election last fall, and I would like permission to have this table inserted in Hansard. It is not very long, and it might convey in a very concise form the information which I wish to present to the House. I will read the table and give the House the particulars, and then suggest, if the House is agreeable, that the information be printed in tabular form, rather than as I read it. This is a statement by provinces of the three, four and five cornered contests, with a record, by parties, of the members elected by a minority vote of their constituents. I find that in the various provinces which I shall name there were the following three, four and five cornered contests:

Ontario	60
Quebec	25
New Brunswick	4
Prince Edward Island	3
Nova Scotia	8
British Columbia	8
Manitoba	10
Saskatchewan	10
Alberta	12

Making a total of 140 constituencies in which more than two candidates ran. Now out of that 140 the following numbers were elected on a minority vote:

Ontario	48
Quebec	1
New Brunswick	1
Prince Edward Island	3
Nova Scotia	3
British Columbia	5
Manitoba	5
Saskatchewan	3
Alberta	5

Making a total of 74 constituencies where the present representatives sit in this House as minority representatives. I do not wish to imply that these representatives have no right to sit in this House. It is quite possible that, under a better system of election, they would still be here, but we do not know about that. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it would be very much better for themselves, for this House and this country, if we knew that these gentlemen who have been elected under the system that we have had in existence for many years, were entitled by virtue of being supported by a majority of their constituents who voted at the election, to a seat in this House. The distribution of these 74 minority representatives among the different parties appears in a statement I have before me. I will not give it for the various provinces, but will give the totals, to save time. They are as follows:

	Representatives elected by minority vote
Liberal party	22
Conservative party	28
Progressive party	21
Labour and Independent party	3

I may say that, in a few instances, members were elected who received barely, or not much more than, one-third of the total vote.

In the Ontario election of 1919, if my information is correct, 74 out of 111 constituencies had three, four, or five cornered contests. I wish to submit to the House, arising out of that situation, a section of the report of the committee of the Ontario legislature appointed about two years ago to consider this whole matter. I wish to state that in the report of that committee there is an unqualified endorsation of the alternative vote where more than two candidates are running, and I wish to state further that a bill is, I understand, being introduced into the Ontario legislature this year to give effect to that recommendation. I do not know whether the bill has yet received its first reading, but when I was in Toronto a little over a week ago I read the draft of the bill which had been prepared, so that there is no doubt this matter will receive very shortly the consideration of the legislature of Ontario, and I feel quite confident that either this session or next session, at all events before another provincial election is held in Ontario, the alternative vote will be adopted.

I do not know that it would be wise or necessary to take up the time in explaining to the members here the method whereby this particular system of voting can be applied. As, however, there may be in this House possibly some members, although I think very few, who do not understand the method of applying the system, I will endeavour to explain it very briefly. The ballot papers are just the same as they are

at the present time. The names of the candidates running are arranged on the left hand side of the ballot paper in alphabetical order, and the blank spaces to the right are just the same as they are now. But the instructions to the voters are different; the voters are instructed to place the figure "1", or the common "x" mark, after the name of the candidate whom they choose first, the figure "2" after the name of the candidate who is their second choice, the figure "3" after the name of the candidate who is their third choice, and so on to any extent which they wish. This gives the voter an opportunity of transferring his vote from a candidate who has no chance of being elected to his second or third choice. Under our present system, every voter in a three, four or five cornered contest is placed in a most embarrasing and unfair position, and a grave injustice is done to him. Hon. members must know of many instances where voters have been placed in this unfair and embarrassing position. In the election of 1917, there were three men running in our constituency, and I remember being greatly puzzled and troubled as to how I should register my vote, because I had to consider which one of the two candidates whom I preferred above the third had the better chance of being elected. No voter ought to be compelled, by an electoral system, to consider a matter of that sort, a matter which, in the nature of the case, is utterly irrelevant; and it is unnecessary to embarrass and perplex and worry an elector with such a situation. If, on that occasion, I had been allowed to express my preference as between two of the candidates, to put my first preference down as No. 1, and my second choice as No. 2, I would have had no hesitation at all, and my wishes would have been respected. I remember, on that occasion, hearing of a man who confessed that he had voted, not for his first choice, but for his second choice, because he thought his second choice had the better chance of being elected, and he wanted to defeat the third man. I submit to all hon. gentlemen in this House, who have any regard for fairness and justice, that no elector should be placed in that position, and that if a system, which can be changed, places electors in a position like that, it is our duty to change the system in order to give the electors a fair show and a square deal.

Furthermore, not only is this embarrassing to the elector; it is unfair to the total electorate and to the country. It is discreditable to this Parliament to allow a situation like that to continue, particularly when we have so many three, four and five cornered contests as we have had recently, and as we are likely to have in the near future.

If we have any regard for the principle of democracy, we must surely go to this extent, at all events, that the representatives of the electorate in the House should be returned here by a majority of their constituents. We can do more; but that is the least we can do. And when we find, at the present time and in the present House, 74 members who sit here on a minority vote, such a condition of affairs is discreditable to this House, and we are not doing our duty to this country and to the electorate, if we allow such a condition to continue any longer. Therefore, with respect to the alternative or transferable vote, quite regardless of any system of proportional representation and having reference only to our present electoral system of single member constituencies, we ought to provide that, where more than two candidates are running, every elector should have the privilege of recording his second or third choice, as the case may be, so that, in the event of his first choice not having any chance of being elected, he should not lose his vote, but should be privileged to record his vote and to have it counted in the final result. If we do that, then we shall guarantee that, on every occasion, a member who sits in this House sits here as the representative of the majority of the electors in his constituency.

Now, why should we not stop there and say: That is sufficient? I will answer the question—because even if you go that far, inevitable inaccuracies will occur under the single member constituency system. The alternative vote will bring us back again only to the situation which we had before there were more than two parties; to the situation where a representative sat in this House by reason of the fact that he was elected by a majority. We shall get only that far, and I am going to submit to this House some evidence to show that that is not enough; that that will not get us where we ought to go and ought to be. I wish to cite some figures in connection with various elections to show the extraordinary inaccuracies and injustices that are bound to prevail to a greater or less degree under the system of single member constituencies, no matter whether we have the alternative vote or not. Let

us take first the British Columbia provincial elections of 1912. I find that the Conservative party on that occasion—and in order to save time, I will give the figures in round numbers—polled a vote of about 51,000 and got 31 representatives and also an additional nine by acclamation. The Liberal party polled about 21,000 votes, and they did not secure a single representative in that legislature. The Socialist and Independent party, with a total vote of about 12,000, secured two representatives. Therefore, in that particular case, 21,000 Liberal voters in British Columbia were totally unrepresented in the provincial legislature. Let us take the federal elections of 1904 in Nova Scotia. The Liberals polled about 56,000 votes and secured 18 representatives; the Conservatives polled 46,000 votes and did not secure a single one. Take the federal elections in British Columbia in 1911: the Conservative party polled a vote of 25,000 odd, and secured seven representatives; the Liberal party polled a vote of 16,000, and did not secure a single representative. So there you have the reverse situation from that which existed in Nova Scotia in 1904.

Here are the results, for the whole country, of the federal elections in 1896. The Conservative party at that time polled a vote of 416,000—I am giving only round numbers—and secured 88 representatives; the Liberal party polled a vote of 405,000 and secured 118 representatives. So that you have in that election a minority of the total vote securing a very considerable majority of the representatives. Independents at that time polled a vote of 76,000 and secured 7 representatives.

The Manitoba provincial elections of July, 1914, give this result: Liberal vote, 74,000, representation 21; Conservative votes, 68,000,—less, mark you—and representation, 25, along with 3 other representatives who were elected by acclamation. The Independent party, with a vote of nearly 8,000, secured no representation at all.

Take the Canadian federal elections of 1908: the Liberal party secured a vote of 594,000, getting a representation in this House of 135; the Conservatives, with a vote of 552,000, secured a representation of 86, so that the representation of Conservatives at that time was disproportionately decreased. In the federal elections of 1911 the Conservative vote was 669,000 and the representation 134; the Liberal vote was 625,000, almost as great, and the representation only 87,—a reversal of the situation in 1908.

Let us now come to the situation in Great Britain. The returns for the general elections in Great Britain of December, 1918, give the following results—the last column indicates the number to which the party is entitled by the vote registered:

Coalition groups	Votes polled	Seats obtained	Seats in Proportion to votes
Coalition-Liberal..	1,500,000	103	73
Coalition-Unionist.	3,500,000	285	184
Coalition-Labour..	48,000	3	3

In the last case you have an accidental equality, and the same thing occurred in the case of the National-Democratic party, which was entitled to 12 seats, having regard to the vote polled, and obtained 12. In the case of the Independent-Unionists, however, the seats obtained were 25, whereas they were entitled to only 20. The total vote was 5,500,000; seats obtained, 428; number of seats in proper proportion to vote polled, 292. I shall not give the details as to the vote polled by the non-Coalition groups, composed of Liberal, Labour, Socialist and Farmers, Co-operatives, National party and Nationalists, and Independents, but the total was slightly over 4,000,000 and the representation secured was 81, although they were entitled to 217. You see, therefore, that in that particular election the Coalition with its allied groups was disproportionately represented, whereas the non-Coalition groups did not secure their fair share of representation.

The Transvaal provincial elections of April 1914, show the following result:

Party	Vote polled	Seats obtained	Seats in proportion to vote
Labour..	26,000	23	16
Unionist..	12,000	2	7
South African parties.. ..	6,000	1	3

In the Ontario elections of 1919 a Conservative vote of 386,000 won 25 seats; a Liberal vote of 336,000 won 29 seats; a Farmer vote of 256,000, considerably less than either of the other groups, won 45 seats; a Labour and Independent vote of 173,000 won 12 seats. In the Alberta elections of 1921, 97,00 Liberal votes elected 15 representatives; 81,000 Farmer votes elected 39 representatives; 32,000 Conservative votes did not elect a single man; and 30,000 Labour votes elected 3.

May I refer also, amidst a great mass of similar evidence, to the situation in the New York aldermanic elections in November of last year. About 250,000 Democratic voters elected 33 aldermen; 258,000 Republican voters did not elect a single representative. I have here some other results of elections in the United States, but possibly I had better forbear reading them. The figures are even more astounding than in the case of the Canadian and other elections to which I have referred, showing that under the single member district system you sometimes get the most extraordinary results. I have in mind an election in Indiana. I have not the facts before me, but speaking from memory I think it was about the year 1912. At all events, in this particular election the Republican party was split into the Progressives and the Stand-pat Republicans, and the vote was so split in the various constituencies that the Republican party did not secure a single representative in the state legislature; the Democratic party, with a minority of the total vote, secured the total representation. In the next election, when the two factions in the Republican party had become reunited, the Republicans secured every one of the representatives. Now there is a situation, Mr. Speaker, that I think we ought to face very frankly. It does not always happen, but if it does not happen it is only by accident. It may happen at any time that you have the pendulum swinging from one extreme to the other, and I submit that it is a very unwise thing, it is a very harmful thing, for any such condition of affairs to exist.

I come next to the Canadian elections of last fall. I have prepared here a very exhaustive analysis of the results of the late Canadian general elections. The figures are given according to provinces; I will just explain briefly the information which this set of tables contains. In the left hand column I have the constituencies; following I have the various parties—Progressive, Liberal, Conservative, Labour, Independent and miscellaneous, and under each heading I have the name of the candidate and the vote which he secured. On the right-hand side I have three other columns giving the number of votes counted, the number of names on the list, and the percentage of the votes polled to the total vote. I think this may be useful for other purposes than that which I am using it for on this occasion. At the bottom I have the following information for each province: the number of candidates running for each party, the total vote for each party's candidates, the percentage of the total vote obtained by each party, the number of candidates actually elected, and the number who should have been elected according to the votes polled.

I now leave that rather extensive set of tables and turn to a condensation of them. On the first page I have stated the votes polled for the various parties by provinces, and I have added those votes together to determine the representation, on the basis of the total votes polled in the whole Dominion which each of the parties should have got in the last federal election. I find that representation should be as follows: Liberals, 96 members; Conservatives, 73 members; Progressives, 55 members; Labour, 4 members; Independents, 7 members.

On the next page I have an analysis of these figures by provinces. I think this page might well be inserted in Hansard because the information is conveyed in very concise form, but if this is not permissible I shall have to read out the figures. I have shown here the seats actually obtained by the various parties, with the number of seats which they were entitled to by reason of the total vote polled.

In Ontario the Liberals secured 21 seats, they were entitled to 45; the Conservatives secured 37 seats; they were entitled to 32;

Mr. McMASTER: Do those figures refer to the last general election?

Mr. GOOD: Yes. The Progressives secured 24 seats, they were entitled to 23; the Labour and Independent parties did not secure any representatives; they were entitled to two.

In Quebec the Liberals secured 65 seats, they were entitled to 45; the Conservatives failed to secure any, they were entitled to 13 seats; the Progressives were similarly unsuccessful, they were entitled to 3 seats; the Labour and Independent parties fared no better than the Conservatives and Progressives, they were entitled to 4 seats.

In New Brunswick the Liberals secured 5 seats, they were entitled to 6; the Conservatives secured 5 seats, they were entitled to 4; the Progressives secured one seat, they were entitled to one.

In Nova Scotia the Liberals secured 16 seats, they were entitled to 8; the Conservatives did not secure any, whereas they were entitled to 5; the Progressives also failed to get any representation, while they

were entitled to 2; and finally Independent and Labour parties failed to get representation though entitled to one member.

In Prince Edward Island the Liberals secured 4 seats, they were entitled to 2; the Conservative representation was zero, they were entitled to 2 seats; the Progressive, Labour and Independent parties did not secure a single seat; nor were they entitled to any—they might have been entitled to a fraction of a representative, that is all.

In British Columbia the Liberals secured 3 seats, they were entitled to 4; the Conservatives secured 7 seats, they were entitled to 3; the Progressives secured 3 seats; they were entitled to 2; the Labour and Independent parties failed to win a single seat, they were entitled to 1.

In Manitoba the Liberals secured 2 representatives, including one who styled himself an Independent Liberal; they were entitled to two; the Conservatives did not secure a single seat, they were entitled to 4; the Progressives secured 12 seats; they were entitled to 7; the Independents and Labourites secured 1 seat; they were entitled to 2.

In Saskatchewan the Liberals secured 1 seat, they were entitled to 3; the Conservatives did not secure a single seat, they were entitled to 3; the Progressives secured 15 seats, they were entitled to 10.

In Alberta the Liberals did not secure any representation, they were entitled to 2 seats; the Conservatives were equally unfortunate, they were entitled to 3 seats; the Progressives secured 10 seats; they were entitled to 6; the Independents and Labourites secured 2 seats; they were entitled to 1.

4 p.m.

In the Yukon there is just one representative, a Conservative. The vote there was very small.

I have a supplementary table, Mr. Speaker, giving an analysis of the vote in the island of Montreal and in the city of Toronto which may be of interest to hon. members.

In Montreal the Conservatives polled about 44,000 votes, they did not elect a single representative; the Liberals polled 166,000 votes, they elected 12 representatives; the Labourites and Independents polled 22,000 votes, they did not elect any representatives.

The representatives which these parties were entitled to are respectively: 2 Conservatives, 9 Liberals, 1 Labourite or Independent.

[Mr. Good.]

In the city of Toronto the figures are: Conservative vote, about 44,000, seats obtained 6, seats entitled to 3; Liberal vote 26,000, no seats obtained, seats entitled to 2; Labour and Independent vote 14,000, no representation, entitled to 1 seat.

Now, Sir, I should like to draw attention to this point. The Liberal party in this House is, under our present system, disproportionately represented. I am not attaching any blame to them at all on that account; it is not their fault.

Mr. McMASTER: It was the electors' fault.

Mr. GOOD: Whether that be so or not, I cannot say, but at all events they are disproportionately represented. There is a disposition on the part of any party that has more than its fair share of power to be rather well satisfied with the situation for the time being. But I would submit to the Government and to the Liberal party that there is another side, and a very important one, to that question. All elections under our system show that the swing of the pendulum is very severe at times. In Australia a few years ago there were two main parties in a general election, the Labour party and the Anti-Labour party. If my memory serves me right, the Anti-Labour party secured a disproportionate amount of representation. The Labour party were sore and disappointed and they protested, but the other party snapped its fingers at them; it was well satisfied with the results on that particular occasion. But the next election reversed the situation with a vengeance, and the Labour party was able to snap its fingers at the defeated Anti-Labour party. This is unfortunate.

Let me submit to the House some figures from two of our federal elections, those of 1908 and 1911, to illustrate this danger. In 1908 the Liberals polled 594,000 votes, and secured 135 representatives; the Conservatives polled 552,000 votes, and secured 86 representatives. The Liberal party had a majority of 49, but the majority they were entitled to according to the popular vote was 7. In 1911 the Conservatives polled, in round figures, 669,000 votes, and obtained 134 representatives, while the Liberals polled 625,000 votes and obtained 87 representatives. The majority for the Conservatives was 47, almost as great a majority as the Liberals had obtained in the previous election, while, according to the popular vote the Conservatives were entitled to a majority of only

9. I wish to point out in that connection this fact: that the Liberal party in the election of 1908 won their majority of 49 by majorities in 49 constituencies amounting in the aggregate to only a little over 6,000 votes. A change of somewhat over half of that vote, had it been properly distributed, would have wiped out their majority. In the 1911 election a similar situation existed with respect to the Conservative party, that is they won their 47 majority by combined majorities of only a little over 5,000 votes, and if a little over one-half of that had switched, it would have wiped out the total majority in the House. So I think all hon. gentlemen will see that under our present system all kinds of extraordinary results may follow an election. You cannot tell what is going to happen. If we are to regard our political life as a sort of game or interesting gamble, that may be all right, but if our viewpoint ought to be, and I think it will be, more and more, that we are gathered here to represent the various parties and opinions and elements in this country and to legislate for the benefit of the whole, I say it is wrong for us to allow any system to remain in existence which may cause such extraordinary and unfair results. It seems to me, therefore, that the Liberal party on the present occasion, or any party which may be over represented in any parliament or legislature, ought to recognize that the present method is a very unsafe foundation upon which to base any policy. The simple fact that a party has a majority in the House is not a satisfactory foundation.

I have pointed out some of the very extraordinary and very bad results that occur under the present system in single member constituencies, and I wish now to contrast with that some of the results that follow under proportional representation.

I wish to read a few figures to show the extraordinary accuracy with which proportional representation reflects the public will as expressed by the vote.

In the Tasmanian House of Assembly in the years 1909, 1912, 1916, and 1919, there were two parties running, Labour and anti-Labour. In 1909 Labour was entitled to 11.69 representatives, and secured 12; anti-Labour was entitled to 18.31, and secured 18. I shall not take the time of the House to read the figures for the other years, but the results were practically as accurate. In the Belgian parliament, in the elections of 1908, we find that the Catholics secured 3 seats, and were entitled to 36; the Liberals and Socialists secured 43, and were entitled to 44; the Christian Democrats, secured 1, the number to which they were entitled. In the parliamentary elections in Finland in 1909, the Social-Democratic party obtained 84 seats, and was entitled to 80; the old Finn party secured 48, and was entitled to 47; the young Finn party secured 28 seats, and was entitled to 29, and so with the three other parties that were running. I have also the figures for the New South Wales election of 1920, but I shall not read them for time is passing. The figures I have already given show that under this better and more scientific system of elections, the various groups of thought and parties in a country secure fair representation. In conclusion, I may point to the Winnipeg election of June, 1920, which was another admirable example of the accuracy which is obtainable under this new system.

Some men in Canada regard proportional representation as a fad. I was very much amused, in reading the evidence submitted before the committee last year, to find one gentleman, who does not happen to be in the House this year, making an assault upon one of the witnesses, charging him with all kinds of horrible things, and denouncing proportional representation as a "new fad," and I know not what. In answer to that objection, if I may so call it, I wish to state that proportional representation is not a fad. It has been seriously considered by, I think, most of the civilized countries in the world and has been adopted by a great many of them. I have here some figures in that connection which I should like to place before the House in as brief a form as possible. They are taken from the Journal of Comparative Legislation and International Law of January, 1921. I will first enumerate the various countries of Australasia where the system is in force and I will give the data in somewhat scrappy form so as to save time.

In New South Wales, First attempt made in 1862. Proportional representation enacted for election of Legislative Assembly in 1918. Used in 1920.

Queensland and Victoria. Use the transferable or alternative vote at the present time.

Tasmania. Proportional representation adopted in Tasmania in towns of Hobart and Launceston in 1896. Used in elections of 1897 and 1900. Repealed in 1901 owing to its limited application.

That is the application to just these two towns.

Adopted again in 1907 for whole island and used there in the years 1909, 1912, 1913, 1916, and 1919.

I may say that in 1917 there was an amendment to the law which provided for the holding of by-elections, a matter which I shall take up a little later.

New Zealand: Attempts first made in 1878. First established 1914 for election of the Legislative Council. Suspended during the war. It is to be used this year, 1922.

I have no information as to whether it has been used or not this year.

In 1914 it was made permissible for municipalities and used by the city of Christ Church and the borough of Woolston in 1917.

South Africa. Established by the South Africa Act of the British Parliament in 1909 to be applied to the Senate and the Executive Council, and to the Executive Committee of the Provincial Councils.

In the United Kingdom—

And I would like hon. members to note this.

In England proportional representation adopted for certain constituencies in 1918, also used for the election of the House of Laity in the Church of England, National Assembly 1920; and a Bill for the municipal use of proportional representation passed the House of Lords in 1920.

Scotland. The Education Act of 1918 provided proportional representation for school board elections, held in 1919.

I may say that I have—but it is not in my possession at present,—I left it with another member—a large sheet showing the detailed results of the last proportional representation elections for the Glasgow School Board.

Ireland. Government of Ireland Act, 1914, established proportional representation for election of the Irish Senate.

I will not read all the details for I wish to hurry on.

The Local Government Act in Ireland, 1919 established proportional representation for all local elections; the Home Rule Act in 1920.

India. The Government of India Act, 1919, provided for the use of the single transferable vote in several different elections in several of the provinces.

United States. Proportional representation has only been adopted so far in a number of cities.

Continent of Europe.

Switzerland. Proportional representation was introduced into Canton of Ticino in 1891 and adopted, in 1919, after having spread gradually through that country, by the Swiss Confederation for their federal elections.

Belgium. P.R. was introduced in 1895. Used for parliamentary elections 1899 and used ever since then. In use at the present time.

Bulgaria has used it since 1914.

Denmark since 1909 for municipal representation; since 1915 for parliamentary elections.

Holland since 1918.

Sweden since 1909.

Finland since 1906.

Norway for municipal purposes (optional) since 1896.

Germany since 1918-1919.

Austria since 1919.

Luxembourg since 1919.

Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy, and France in part, have recently adopted proportional representation.

In the South American countries there has been some considerable adoption of this new system of election;

I might mention the following Canadian cities as having adopted proportional representation recently. I will not give the dates although I have them here: Winnipeg, Vancouver, Calgary, Regina, Saskatoon, Moosejaw, North Battleford, Port Coquitlam, B.C., and West Vancouver. As to Canada apart from that—and we are more particularly interested in Canada—I submit the following facts:

Toronto District Labour Council has used proportional representation since 1898, and later other organizations followed suit.

In 1916 the city of Ottawa petitioned the Provincial government for permission to use proportional representation.

In 1916 the Alberta Legislature passed permissive legislation for Calgary and Edmonton. In 1917, 1918, 1919 Calgary used the method.

And there are further details, which I have not time now to read, as respects British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Ontario.

I may say that I have here the report of the Ontario committee which was appointed about two years ago to investigate this matter. It contains a lot of evidence and the recommendation for the adoption not only of the alternative vote but of proportional representation in four different grouped constituencies in the next provincial election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have before me here in very concise form the aims of proportional representation, as outlined in the organ of the British Proportional Representation League, which I would like to place on record. They are as follows:

Our aims.

1. To reproduce the opinions of the electors in Parliament and other public bodies in their true proportions.

2. To secure that the majority of electors shall rule and all considerably minorities shall be heard.

3. To give electors a wider freedom in the choice of representatives.

4. To give representatives greater independence from the financial and other pressure of small sections of constituents.

5. To ensure to parties representation by their ablest and most trusted members.

Now, in regard to the method of application of proportional representation, I

doubt whether at this hour, in view of the fact that there are a number of other speakers to be heard, I should take any time in explaining that method; but I would like to read in that connection from the evidence submitted last year to the Parliamentary Committee which I think puts it in a very pleasing, clear and definite way. I will read from the report of the committee of last year as follows:

Hon. Mr. Calder: Why do you speak of three groups of Conservatives and two groups of Liberals of 10,000 each?

Mr. Hooper: I will try to visualize it for you in a general way.

Hon. Mr. Calder: You propose one constituency for the city of Toronto?

Mr. Hooper: Yes, and the members would be elected in this way: Imagine the candidates to be spaced out at intervals on some large open space, and imagine each elector, as he arrives, walking up to, and standing beside, the candidate he most prefers. Now it is comparatively certain that one candidate—

Possibly more than one I may interject—

—will be outstandingly popular and that a large number of supporters will soon be gathered around him. It will be seen that he has a sufficient number of supporters to secure his election, and therefore other electors who might still desire to vote for him, will be asked, not to waste their votes upon one already elected, but to select a second choice from among the other candidates still in the field. In this way then, we will ultimately have all the electors grouped around the various candidates of their choice. But so far we have only elected one—

Possibly two I may interject.

—we desire to elect five. The next step then, will be to declare defeated the candidate who has the fewest number of supporters. The voters gathered around such defeated candidate will be asked not to lose interest in the election and go home defeated and sullen, but to make a second choice among the other candidates available. In this way the lowest candidates will be eliminated one after another, and their supporters will be asked to make other choices until, finally, five candidates only will remain, each of whom will have a quota of supporters standing beside him. In this way five groups would be formed of the electorate of Toronto each of whom would obtain a representative in Parliament.

In the second paragraph, which I will not read, the witness goes on to explain how, by the use of the single transferable vote and the methods of proportional representation, the same freedom of choice of the electors will be secured under our ordinary balloting system.

I have now come to the last section of my argument, and that is a consideration of the advantages of, and the objections to, proportional representation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think the hon. member has not explained the method by which the alternative vote is used.

Mr. GOOD: I think I explained the use of the alternative vote in a single-member constituency, where the voter has the privilege of expressing his choice and thus giving instructions to the returning officer to use his ballot for the second or third man, in case his first choice should not have any chance of succeeding in the election. That had reference to the election of members in single-member constituencies, and if the hon. minister who has just asked the question will pardon me from going further into it, and will read Hansard to-morrow, I think he will understand that part of it. I do not wish to take up time repeating what I have said, but the same system of voting is used in proportional representation, but applied slightly differently. To explain briefly: the surplus votes of those who get more than the quota are distributed according to the second, third, or fourth choices as expressed on them, and after the surplus votes are distributed, the returning officer starts at the bottom of the list and distributes first the votes of the man who is at the bottom of the poll, according to the expressed wish of the electors themselves, and so on upwards, until there finally remain the required number of candidates elected.

Returning to the advantages and disadvantages (or objections), I call attention first to a rather singular letter which appeared in the Citizen not long ago signed by T. W. Quayle, of Ottawa. I do not know the gentleman at all, but it is a very extraordinary letter, and it is practically, so far as I can understand it, a defence of majority representation, which, of course, we get under the old-fashioned system. If there are any hon. members who will defend majority representation as a proper system, it seems to me we might just as well poll our party votes in a lump, and give instructions to the party leaders to select committees to help them out in whatever way they liked. That would be the logical outcome of a system of majority representation. Nay more, it might be worse than that, because it might result in this—in fact, that is the logical result—that the leader of the majority party would be given carte blanche to govern the country. That, I think, is the ultimate logical outcome of the theory of majority representation. I would like to call the attention of the House, in reply to this objection, to the very necessary distinction between majority rule and majority representation: majority rule we must have, but majority

representation we need not and should not have.

In the second place, proportional representation provides for a reasonable security of tenure of office in the case of outstanding men. That is not so under the old system, and I call attention to the fact that in 1895 John Morley, one of the most celebrated of English statesmen, was defeated in his constituency and removed from the arena of political life for a number of years, to the great disadvantage of the public life of his country. I point also to certain instances in Canada in recent years. In the election of 1919 we saw the defeat of Sir William Hearst, former Premier of the province of Ontario. I think I may express the opinion, without endorsing Mr. Hearst's policies that it was not a good thing for the province of Ontario that Mr. Hearst was removed from the public life of Ontario; and under another system, no doubt, he would have been permitted to remain in public life. I call attention also to the defeat of the right hon. member who leads the Conservative party in this House (Mr. Meighen) in the last election in Portage la Prairie, and to the difficulties which occurred after that in finding a seat for that right hon. member. I may say also that there are not very many, although there may be some, who would wish that the right hon. member from Grenville should have been deprived of the opportunity to participate in the public life of this country, and I am not one of those. I regard the right hon. gentleman as a very useful member of the House, and if he could only get rid of his partizanship he would be an extremely useful man in this Chamber. I may also point out that the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart), a man of undoubted ability and integrity, who has had long experience in public life in the West, had all kinds of difficulties in finding a seat in this House. These are some of the things that are inevitable under the old system, but under the other system, with the multi-membered constituency, it would be relatively easy for men of outstanding ability to secure election, and the membership in our parliamentary bodies would be more continuous, and not so spasmodic or so excessively fluctuating as at the present time.

In the third place, I wish to answer the objection which has been registered against proportional representation, that it will lead to small government majorities, and that small government majorities are a misfortune. I submit that the allegation cannot be substantiated. What is the situation at the present time? What is the situation in Ontario, where under the old system the government has a bare majority of one or two? What is the situation at Ottawa where the Government has no majority at all? Consider the last British Columbia provincial election, when a minority vote gave the government a majority of two seats under the old system. In New South Wales, in 1910, Labour secured a majority of two and had to carry on with that majority. The government of the Australian Commonwealth, in the years 1913 and 1919, secured a majority of only one. In New Zealand, in 1915, under the old system, the government secured a majority of one. I submit, the facts do not at all substantiate this charge, indeed proportional representation will yield a small government majority only when the parties are evenly divided. And now, as we have more than two parties, we have an entirely new situation. You are practically never, not, at least, in the near future, going to get a situation, so far as we can see, where we have only two parties in this House and those pretty evenly divided. I submit further, that proportional representation will increase the strength and stability of governments in two ways: first, by improving the personnel—and I have some evidence to submit in that connection—second, by enabling a government to conform to the will of the people. I may just interject at this point that I am very glad to observe the disposition on the part of the Government to modify their policy in accordance with the opinions and wishes prevailing in this House. I wish to endorse what was said yesterday in that respect. In this connection, I desire to quote from a speech delivered by M. Georges Lorand, a Belgian, in London in 1914. He said in part:

> The various political parties were represented—

That is since 1900, when proportional representation began to be used.

> —by their ablest men and leaders whilst under the former majority system prominent men passed half their political lives outside the House.

I mentioned a few minutes ago the case of Mr. John Morley, who was ousted from public life in Great Britain because of the old system.

The Belgian government, prior to the war, remained in office for thirteen years, and at one time it had a majority of only 6 out of 166 members. Why did it stay

there? Because it correctly gauged public opinion. A government is more stable, even with a small majority accurately obtained under proportional representation, than with a very large majority inaccurately obtained. In fact, under the old system, political elections are pretty much of a gamble, and at any time a party, not controlled by the highest and most patriotic motives, might be tempted to try its luck in an election. I could submit also some testimony from Tasmania in that connection, and testimony by Mr. Asquith and Lord Robert Cecil; but as the time is passing, I refrain. Perhaps, I may submit just one of these testimonies. In a speech delivered by the Prime Minister of Australia on February 12, 1914, at a time when they were under the old system, he said:

> The present position of affairs is impossible . . . . There are tremendous financial and business problems requiring treatment and when we attempt to deal with them, we find ourselves "burked" and "scotched" by our opponents.

There you have the situation as it exists under the old system. I may say, by way of comment, that as anything may happen in an election under the old system a party may, if it is unscrupulous, try its luck in order to snatch an advantage, and the public interests will be thereby sacrificed. I have quotations from Mr. Asquith who has had a very long experience in British politics, and also a quotation from Lord Robert Cecil, but I shall not take time to read them on account of the lateness of the hour.

In conclusion, I should like to repeat that the allegation that proportional representation encourages small government majorities, and is therefore, not to be desired, cannot possibly be sustained. The evidence is wholly to the contrary.

Mr. LEWIS: While the hon. member is on this point, I should like to ask him a question. He said that the allegation as regards proportional representation encouraging small government majorities cannot be sustained. Will he kindly tell the House how he would deal, if proportional representation had been in effect in Canada during the last election with a House composed of 96 Liberals, 55 Progressives, 73 Conservatives, 7 Independents and 4 Labour members? There would have been no majority of any party unless we had some different form of coalition between two parties to form a majority at all. Will the hon. member kindly explain that?

Mr. GOOD: The situation would be different only in degree, not in essence, from the situation which exists at the present time, and the difficulties that we would have faced then would have been absolutely the same as the difficulties which we face now. In my judgment, while this is not altogether relevant to the question, I consider that we should turn our attention to some new constitutional methods of getting the best results out of a House like this where there are a number of parties. Perhaps, without taking further time to reply, that might suffice.

I come next to a charge which has been made against proportional representation, and in my observation—and I have had a good deal of experience in discussing this matter for a number of years—this is the greatest objection which has been levelled against proportional representation, namely, that it encourages the formation of groups and that, as groups are,—I will not say undesirable, but rather disagreeable to those people who wish the two party system to be maintained, therefore, proportional representation is undesirable. In that respect, I wish to submit the considered opinion of a committee appointed in 1909 or 1910 by the British Parliament in connection with this matter. Let me read just a sentence from this report which is well worthy of consideration. The committee states:

> We are inclined to think that the multiplication of small parties feared by opponents, and the encouragement of the independent member hoped for by advocates, are alike exaggerated in the evidence given before us.

Just as in the previous case, I desire to point out that groups have arisen and are bound to arise under the old system, and we are not getting away from the difficulty that is raised by the formation or extension of groups, by sticking to the old system of election. In England, the Parliamentary Companion of November, 1920, gives twelve groups as composing the British House of Commons. In France, under the old system of election—and I would like to mention that there are some people who point to France as a horrible example of proportional representation—groups existed, and the attempt which was made at proportional representation three years ago, was made in an endeavour to overcome difficulties created by the great multiplicity of groups. In Belgium too, we have some testimony, part of which I should like to read. This is from a book entitled "How

the World Votes" by two professors of Yale University:

> Proportional representation in Belgium has not increased the number of small parties, as was feared before its adoption . . . . Its desirability is no longer open to serious question. The leaders of all the chief political parties, and the bulk of the voters seek, not to abolish proportional representation, but to make it more perfect.

I have two other quotations along the same lines, one from Mr. J. Fischer Williams, an English writer on political subjects in a book entitled, "The Reform of Political Representation," and testimony also from M. Georges Lorand, Liberal leader in the Belgium House of Representatives. I will not read this because time is passing rapidly; but all this is testimony from people who have had actual experience, and it goes to show that proportional representation does not encourage the formation of groups, but only enables groups to be properly represented. In fact, M. Lorand, says that instead of encouraging the multiplication of groups it rather encourages the consolidation of various sections or groups into larger groups, at the same time permitting the greatest freedom within them. I submit also that in Canada at the present time groups are a condition, not a theory, and that we have to face the situation; we have to provide such electoral and constitutional machinery as will give us the best possible results under existing conditions. As an example of this, and in proof of my statement, I simply refer again to what I have already pointed out, that in the last Dominion elections 140 constituencies had three, four or five-cornered contests.

Let me for a few moments refer to the connection between proportional representation and the spoils system. I think there is an obvious advantage in having a constituency represented by a number of members from various political groups. Let me submit in that connection this testimony from the treasurer of Tasmania, who speaks after some years of experience:

> Districts still demand assistance from the government, but every electoral district—they are large—returns mixed representation, some supporters of the government and some supporters of the opposition. Under such a system there can be no discrimination between electoral district and electoral district in the appropriation of moneys.

We who have studied or watched Canadian politics for the last twenty or thirty years know how much evil has been done through the distribution of patronage in the various constituencies. Proportional Representation, I submit, is a measure which is calculated to make that distribution of patronage very difficult, if not impossible.

Again it is alleged that proportional representation is un-British. Now, that is a ridiculous, an absurd statement. I have here—I will not take time to read it—a quotation which appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press of January 7 of this year, containing an extract from a document prepared by a number of very prominent Britishers in which the principle of proportional representation was heartily endorsed. We have also the British report to which I have referred, indicating that the British Parliament and people are considering the matter. We have another report of the Speaker's conference held in 1917, which I understand the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) has here and may make some reference to. The subject, therefore, is being considered and regarded favourably by the British people.

I pass on to consider another objection, namely, that by-elections would be difficult, if not impossible, under proportional representation. Some people are staggered at the prospect of holding by-elections in multi-member constituencies. But there are ways of getting around the difficulty. In every new thing difficulties are involved; we ought to face them and solve them as far as possible. In the first place, then, in order to provide for by-elections we may do as, I think, is done in Winnipeg: each member elected may choose his own district in the order of his election, and in the event of his vacating his seat the vote would be polled only in that particular district; it would not be necessary to poll the whole constituency. That is a possible way out of it; it puts us back under the old system for the time being, for the purposes of by-elections. There is another system in vogue, in Tasmania, I think, and possibly elsewhere, under which a re-examination is made of the ballots used for the election of the member dying or vacating his seat, and the man next in order takes his place. I may say also that in Belgium a number of supplementary candidates are voted on at the principal election and on the same ballot paper, for the purpose of filling vacancies. It is also possible to co-opt a member for the time being, just as a board of directors in the case of a vacancy will elect somebody to fill the vacancy until the next meeting of the shareholders is held. Finally, something that we can

always resort to if other measures fail, or are regarded as undesirable, is this: we can poll the whole constituency. Although it may be a little expensive, it would not in some cases be a bad thing to reconsult the people.

Then again the statement has been made that a tremendous amount of labour would be involved under proportional representation in canvassing a large constituency. At first sight that seems to be a great difficulty, and it has been brought up time and time again. I submit, however, that the difficulty is imaginary rather than real. For example, in a single member district with 100 voters the candidate must get at least 51 of those votes to be elected; he must canvass or speak to the electors or in some way secure that percentage of the votes. But if you take a ten-member constituency with 1,000 voters, a candidate in order to be elected needs to poll a minimum of only 92 votes. It can readily be seen, therefore, that the difficulty has been grossly exaggerated. I would like to point out also that the practice of going round and shaking hands with every elector and otherwise personally communicating with him is disappearing; electors are voting now for candidates on their records as men who know something about public affairs, and on their integrity; also on the platforms of their parties. I think that the conditions are becoming such that this difficulty will be greatly minimized in the future.

I would point out also that under our present system, the small floating or purchasable vote in every constituency has a tremendously exaggerated influence, and a candidate may feel it necessary or desirable to cater to the desires of this class of voter. That is a most unfortunate and deplorable thing in our public life. I may say, too, that elections are likely to be cheaper under proportional representation; experience has shown that to be a fact. Where you have joint candidates running as representing any party, as happened in Winnipeg, the labour of canvassing and speaking at the various meetings may be divided between the various speakers. Literature may also be got out jointly. I recall that in the city of Ottawa last December two Progressive candidates—I do not know about the others—got out their campaign literature jointly. That shows the advantage of this system from the point of view of expense of either canvassing or otherwise conducting a campaign. I have some evidence in that respect from Winnipeg, but I prefer at this hour not to submit it.

The last point I wish to deal with is the charge that proportional representation would be difficult, if not impossible, to carry out in large sparsely-populated areas. I am not asking the House to apply proportional representation at this time to our large and sparsely-settled constituencies. But I would like to point out that the difficulty existing in a five or six-member constituency in my section of Ontario would be no greater than that which now exists in many constituencies in our newer country in the West—in Alberta or British Columbia. In fact, we can form group constituencies in lower Ontario which are very much smaller, and which can be covered very much more easily by candidates, than was the case in the last election in our north country. I venture to state that there are hon. members here who can give personal testimony to that effect.

Let me also submit to the House that the island of Tasmania, about the size of New Brunswick, is divided into five constituencies, six members being elected from each constituency. They have no particular difficulty there in applying this system. In Australia the senate is elected by proportional representation, each state being polled as a single constituency, and neither have they any particular difficulty there with the system.

Now I turn to Sweden. I quote the leader of the Liberal party in the First Chamber of the Riksdag, who stated in the course of a speech in London:

> Although I was in favour of proportional voting, I nevertheless hesitated about the advisability of adopting it in Sweden, in view of the vast extent and sparse population of the country. The experience gained up to now of the method in actual use does not, however, lend support to the misgivings that I cherished. My anxiety lest the then prevalent keen interest in the conduct of public affairs might wane and grow slack has not turned out to be well founded; the various schools of political thought have been represented in right and due proportion, and as a rule by those men whom they severally most favoured. A return to the majority voting cannot be looked upon any longer as a business proposition.

I have in my hand a letter received a short time ago from Mr. Alfred J. Gray, of the British Proportional Representation Society, with reference to elections in Australia under this system. I shall not read the letter, but its testimony is along the same lines.

I submit, therefore, that although there are difficulties in connection with the adop-

tion of this system in large areas, we do not need to consider those difficulties because we are not suggesting its adoption over the whole country at the outset. The second part of my resolution, as hon. members have no doubt noticed, calls only for the formation of certain trial constituencies—some cities have already adopted the system, for instance, the city of Winnipeg—and in that way we shall, without committing ourselves to any wholesale endorsation of the principle, start in a careful and cautious way, testing it out as we go along.

In the past this question has been discussed in this House without reference to party. I appeal to the House that it shall continue to be so treated. It is too important to be dealt with as a party question; on the contrary, it should be considered as a great fundamental question affecting the composition of this House—the representatives of the nation who have to decide all national issues. Therefore, I hope that this resolution will receive the unqualified and unanimous endorsation of this House, and that when the next redistribution bill is brought down steps will be taken to put it into effect.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I think all hon. members are under a deep debt of gratitude to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) for the carefully prepared and exhaustive discourse with which he has favoured the House this afternoon on this very important question. His speech shows deep research, and he has travelled more or less over the known globe in bringing to our attention places where the system which he advocates has been in successful operation.

I would invite the attention of the House to the moderation of the suggestions made by the hon. member. He directs our attention first of all to the fact that last year a committee of this House investigated the question of the alternative vote and proportional representation. I was a member of that committee, and I recall that we heard numerous witnesses and deliberated for some time upon the question. We came to the conclusion, unanimously if I do not forget, that we should adopt the alternative vote in connection with single-seated constituencies in which more than two candidates presented themselves for election; we offered no definite statement as to the wisdom or unwisdom of proportional representation—that is, true proportional representation.

The hon. member for Brant now proposes that we should adopt the findings of the committee in regard to the alternative vote, and that we should make an experiment in regard to proportional representation in two or more great city areas, dividing them up and electing a sufficiently large number of members to give proportional representation a fair trial.

Now, the hon. member resembles to a certain extent that great leader of the Liberal party, Edward Blake, for it was said of him that after treating a question there was very little left to be said by any one else, and that is the condition which I am happy to say I find myself in on this occasion. But there are one or two matters to which I would like to draw the attention of the House.

First of all, just how does this proposed alternative vote work? Let me take the typical case of a constituency in which three candidates present themselves, one, we will say, belonging to the National Liberal and Conservative party—I perhaps made a mistake; I think the name "National" has been dropped, and that it is now merely the Liberal-Conservative party, at any rate, that party which sits next the Speaker on the left-hand side of the Chamber—a representative of that party presents himself; a member of the Liberal party, without prefixes or suffixes, also presents himself; and then the third candidate presenting himself—or herself—will be on behalf of the Progressive party. We will call those three candidates, A, B and C, the names appearing in alphabetical order. Instead of being asked to make the usual cross, the voter will be directed to merely indicate on the ballot paper the order of his or her preference, 1, 2, 3. The votes will be counted, and the first thing those who count them will have to do will be to make three piles of those ballot papers which have the figure 1 put opposite the name of one or other of the three candidates.

Let us follow that operation. On the first count, candidate A has four thousand first choices, and we make a little pile of the four thousand ballots. Candidate B has three thousand first choices, and we make a pile a little smaller. Candidate C has two thousand votes. What is the result? Under the ordinary system A would be elected by a handsome majority, but he would not have had any majority at all. That is to say, out of nine thousand votes he would have had only four thousand. So what is done? C is regarded as being out of the race and his ballot papers are counted and transferred in accordance with the second choices appearing thereon. Suppose C's support-

ers were evenly divided in their second choices between A and B, we would transfer one thousand of C's to A, and the other one thousand of C's to B. In this way A would have four thousand on the first count, plus one thousand added to him on the second count, or five thousand. B would have three thousand on the first count plus one thousand given him on the second count, or four thousand. A would therefore be elected by a majority of one thousand. If, on the contrary, it was a constituency in which the representative of the Liberal-Conservative party had by some strange happening got 4,000 on the first vote, and the Progressive, indicated by C, had come third, naturally all the Progressives would have given their second choice to the Liberal, and in that case B would receive the whole 2,000 second choices of the Progressives and would be elected over A, the Liberal-Conservative.

Mr. LAPOINTE: It seems a fine system.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a good system because it allows those persons who fundamentally hold the same doctrines, the same beliefs, the same aspirations, and the same desires, to give their first choice to those who may perhaps be personally more attractive to them, and their second choice to those with whom they are in closer union than the representative of the third party. That is the advantage of the alternative vote.

Mr. CRERAR: In that event, when C is dropped, the second choices really become the first choices of those voters for the other candidate.

Mr. McMASTER: Exactly. It is just like this. Suppose I was a voter in that constituency. I would then have presented to me this problem. There are three candidates. One is a Tory, to use the short word, sometimes objected to but often used, one a Liberal, and the third a Progressive. Now, of course, my desire would be to vote first with the party with which I have been associated for many years, and my second choice would, of course, be for the Progressive candidate, so if the Liberal came at the foot of the poll my vote would not be lost but would go to my second choice, who was, after all, my alternative choice. It is the alternative vote. I say I want the Liberal elected, but in the unfortunate event of the Liberal being at the foot of the poll, I want the Progressive to have my vote. It is perfectly simple, and should work out satisfactorily, as I trust and believe it will.

It was Burke who said that the virtue, the spirit, and the essence of the House of Commons consists in its being the express image of the nation, and we want to get a House of Commons which will accurately reflect every important strain of public opinion in the country. That is practically what Mr. Asquith also said. There should not be, he said, an important strain of public opinion in the country unrepresented in the House of Commons. The alternative vote will help to a certain extent, but proportional representation, I believe, will help even further. We had an election in Montreal last April, if I mistake not, in which two city charters were submitted by referendum to the electors, and I was surprised to find that even some members of the legal profession seemed to regard proportional representation almost as the name of some newly discovered breakfast food. They did not seem to understand it at all.

The mover of this resolution has not attempted to describe to any extent the mechanism of the counting of the voting given under proportional representation. Perhaps he was wise in not attempting before a large committee to describe exactly how the votes were counted, but let me just say this: In order to get the full benefit of the results of proportional representation, you should have a constituency electing at least five members; it should be large enough to elect that many. I do not think it needs to be any larger. I am inclined to think that when Winnipeg in the provincial election was created a single constituency electing ten members, that was going rather far, and perhaps it would have been better to have created two constituencies electing five members each. The work of the voter is simplicity itself. He has only to indicate on his ballot paper by the figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as the case may be, the order of his preferences among the candidates, and the counting of the votes merely consists in giving effect to what is really in the voter's mind. I put the figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 down on the ballot paper. What do I intend to convey by that act? I intend to convey first, that if my first choice has got more votes than are necessary to elect him, you are to transfer my vote to my second choice. If my second choice has got more votes on the count than are necessary to elect him, you are to transfer my vote to my third choice, and so on; and inversely, if my first choice on the first count has so few votes that he is hopelessly out of the

race, I want you to transfer my vote to my second choice. If my second choice on the second count is hopelessly out of the race, I want you to transfer my vote for my second choice to my third choice. The theory is simplicity itself. The actual counting of the ballots requires a certain amount of what the Oxford under-graduate denominated as "that low cunning which enables one to understand figures," but after all, men can be got who understand figures; that matter can be very easily arranged. It may take a little longer to count the votes, but that is a matter of no very great importance. The important thing is that wherever the system has been tried, it has been found to give an accurate representation or reflection of the different strains of public opinion in the constituency.

What are the results of the present system? The present system has had some good results, Mr. Speaker, because by reason of it we are found here, but it also has had, in the past, let us say, some bad results. It has often given incorrect verdicts. I think the most strikingly incorrect verdict that came from the people was in the election in Great Britain in 1886. Gladstone was supposed to have suffered an overwhelming defeat when he went before the people with his Home Rule proposals in 1886, but, as a matter of fact, he had a popular majority of over fifty thousand. If that popular majority had been reflected in the representation of the House of Commons of that day, it is quite possible that the last half century almost, forty years at least, of strain and struggle and bloodshed in Ireland might have been avoided. That is one of the most striking instances, I believe, of the incorrectness of our present system. Under our present system it does not depend on how many votes you get; it is where you put them. Sir John A. Macdonald, that great politician, not only in the larger sense but in the lesser sense, understood the situation and arranged the Ontario constituencies so as to hive the Grits; that is, in those districts where the Grits were in the majority he put them all together so that the Liberal-Conservatives could have a greater effect upon the elections with their votes. You might have two cities with precisely the same number of Liberals and Conservatives in each, and you might so arrange the constituencies that one of them would be overwhelmingly Tory and the other overwhelmingly Grit. It is not a question of just how many votes you have got: it is how you sprinkle the majorities over the constituencies.

I am inclined to believe that in this country, as in Belgium before they had proportional representation, our present system serves to accentuate sectional, religious and racial differences. With all respect the Liberal party may be somewhat over represented according to the votes in this House. But so is the Progressive party, and what is the reason for it? Because they represent, and over-represent and exaggerate, the sectional feeling obtaining in those parts of the country where the greatest majority was obtained. That, I think, is true. Just the same, to some extent, as far as Quebec is concerned, the Liberal party in the House over-represents the Liberal feeling in the province of Quebec. There are Liberals in the West whose voices are not heard and cannot be heard in this House—they are unrepresented. There are Conservatives in Quebec whose voices are not heard and cannot be heard in this House because they are unrepresented. Toronto for years and years, has not elected under the present system a single representative to support the Liberal party, although I do not think I am far wrong when I say that forty per cent of the people who live in that city are very faithful followers of the Liberal party. It is a mistake, from the national standpoint, that the citizens of any section of the country, because of their geographical position, should find themselves cut out from active, efficient and effectual participation in the affairs of the country. These are thoughts which strike me as worthy of emphasis. However, the matter has been so amply dealt with that I hesitate to delay the House longer. What is asked for is the acceptance of a principle which, I think, will recommend itself to every one—the principle of the alternative vote in single-member constituencies, and merely to give a trial to the system of proportional representation in one or two, or more of our large urban areas.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): I happen to be deeply interested in this question of proportional representation. Had I been aware that it would actually come up to-day I would have been better prepared than I am. Proportional representation is splendid in theory, but it must be regarded with respect of its practical application to the form of government under which we live. And my contention is that it is not adaptable or suit-

able to the British system of responsible government. I see some hon. members smiling; they will perhaps agree with me before I am through. You can use proportional representation in the case of the French and American systems of government where the system is a representative one; but under our system of government —which is essentially a responsible system of government, where the Cabinet is responsible to the House, and the members are responsible to the people, giving thereby an elasticity which is not equalled by any other system of government—proportional representation will accentuate difficulties and will not aid the people in the solution of public problems. As to proportional representation in municipal affairs, I am thoroughly in support of it. In provincial and municipal affairs it may be proper; but in the case of the federal constitution of this country it certainly is not sound. The idea of the system is to give representation to groups of people. One man may be a prohibitionist, another may live in some section where the racial sentiment is strong; there may be another section of the community where the religious element is emphasized; and another where the people are in favour of public ownership; and so there are different groups of people who, from economic or other motives, or by reason of political affiliations, may be influenced by the idea of differentiating one vote from another. Proportional representation will send into Parliament a certain proportion from each of these groups according to their numbers in the country. But when they get into Parliament how are they going to form a government that will be able to control the majority of the House, and carry out the system of responsible government as it has been developed under the British constitution primarily since the time of Charles I? Suppose we had five different groups in this House. Let me take the instance of France where they have seven or eight different groups, each one basing its political existence upon certain definite ideas with which the others do not agree. Now a matter comes up in the chamber for decision,

Mr. GOOD: Was my hon. friend in the House when I explained what had happened in France during the last fifteen or twenty years with respect to the formation of groups?

Mr. LADNER: Unfortunately, I did not hear the hon. member. But I have had the advantage of reading Lord Bryce's "Modern Democracies" in which that aspect of the question is very ably dealt with. My hon. friend's position, however, does not interfere with my contention at all, because France has an entirely different form of government from ours. You could defeat the French government in the Chambre des Deputés and a new cabinet could be formed there without having to hold a new election. Under the British system, where there is a vote adverse to the government it is bound to appeal to the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. LADNER: Well, that is substantially the accepted view although some provinces do not carry out that principle; they are changing the British system but they may be changing it for the worse. Anybody who has taken the trouble of studying historically our Constitution will realize that it has been built up, step by step, on solid foundations, not on theories but to meet the practical exigencies of the case during the period of some nine hundred years. And so a system has been established which makes the government amenable to the popular demand. Take the United States, and what do we find there? During the course of the great war, President Wilson carried out an unpopular policy but it could not be changed because he was in office for a fixed period of time. His policy was afterwards shown to be absolutely contrary to the prevailing public opinion in the Republic, and he was thrown out of power. But what happened in the meantime? There was confusion in their legislation and confusion in their policies with respect to international policies. The government could not act and be sure of its decision in dealing with foreign powers; it was compelled to wait until the four-year term of the then President had expired. But a change came and there was given to the world the real national policy such as the Republican party has now established.

Now, in this Parliament we might have five or six groups as I was going to argue a moment ago. We will suppose that one group is prohibitionist, another is in favour of government control, a third is indifferent to both these things but is in favour of paving streets all over the country, or some such policy as that. By political manipulation it is possible for a man to put a resolution on the Order Paper which would test the position of the ministry. But the representative in the cabinet of a

group whose interest as a group was affected could not approach the consideration of the question from the standpoint of the public welfare, as a minister could who was sharing responsibility with the rest of the cabinet. In order to save his political existence he must adopt an entirely different policy, knowing that the group that placed him in parliament will take him away if he does not conform to their sectional and narrow view. Now, that is the practical application of the theory of proportional representation.

Mr. GOOD: My hon. friend said he did not hear me discuss the question of groups. I want to ask him whether he heard anything of what I said?

Mr. LADNER: If the hon. gentleman puts it that way, I may tell him that I heard very little of what he said, and if I had heard it, I do not think my view would be changed by the hon. gentleman's argument, having read the words of Lord Bryce and a number of other constitutional authorities for the past fifteen years. I do not speak without having previous information; I come here with some elementary knowledge of this subject, and hon. members in this House are equally well informed, and can deal with this matter on its merits. But there is one point and it is a simple one, namely, that we have a responsible system of government, with a joint responsibility of each member of the Cabinet for the whole. When you divide your House up into groups, and then form a government, what is the result? They will get men from these different groups, just as they do in France. In that country they get the groups together. Strong outstanding personalities are gathered together by a leader, and they form a government. How does this method work? They change governments once a month; they cannot have a strong government. They have a system of representative government, and when there is a division among them, they are not sent back for re-election. But what would be the result in our country? You have a Cabinet of seventeen ministers. Supposing you had eight groups, and each member of a group came here by reason of his allegiance to a particular idea—prohibition or whatever it might be, but his outstanding ability makes it necessary for him to join the Cabinet. Then his responsibility extends beyond his sectional idea, and his responsibility is to the whole country. Suddenly he is confronted with a resolution perhaps pertaining to the question that affects his group particularly, but the rest of the group decide that such a resolution is not in the best interests of the country, and, upon due consideration, he rather has that idea himself. He is then placed in the position that he must either stand by the joint responsibility of the government or must commit political suicide by going against the group which put him in power. Therefore, when you have the group system you destroy the bulwark of the system of democracy under which we have been operating; that is the principle of responsible government. The majority control the House, and the government is in a position to carry out its policy.

Mr. EULER: Have we not the group system under present conditions?

Mr. LADNER: We have observed that where group systems are developing, strong governments are going down. They do not act together.

Mr. EULER: Is there anything at all in the present system that prevents the formation of groups of any indefinite number?

Mr. LADNER: There is nothing to stop any number of groups getting into Parliament and any government being formed on the group system, but what will happen is this: that some wise ingenious fellow will insert, in between the ideas of his groups, a resolution with a direct purpose of testing the strength of character of the ministers, and making a minister say whether he will stand by his country in a broad way, or whether he will preserve his political existence by standing by the particular group with the particular idea on which he was elected.

Mr. EULER: What is there to prevent the same thing now under present conditions?

Mr. LADNER: I think that now, for the first time since Confederation, we have seen the operation of a group system such as would often occur under proportional representation, and, considering the consequences as we have them to-day, and as we witnessed them in the militia estimates the other day, who would say that that group system is in the public interest?

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): We have had a very excellent presentation of the merits of proportional representation, and particularly the value of the trans-

ferable vote in single member constituencies, from my hon. friend from Brant, (Mr. Good) who evidently has given the question a great deal of study, and I think the House is indebted to him for the information that he has placed before us, even if we fail to agree with him. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has also, in seconding the motion, given to hon. members a very clear exposition of the manner in which this reform is carried out in actual practice. It is, I think, a fact that legislative reforms, in the history of British parliamentary government, have usually been of slow growth. If we study the development that has taken place in the British form of government—which, after all, Mr. Speaker, is, I think, by general consent recognized throughout the world as perhaps on the whole the best form of government in existence—we find that the changes that have taken place, from time to time, have developed and been brought to fruition as the result usually of much discussion and agitation. It is a testimony to the characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race in matters of government that they desire to be certain of the value of the changes that are sought to be brought about, before absolute effect is given to those changes. The British form of government, which we have adopted in Canada, rests upon a very definite principle—the right of the people to rule themselves. That principle was established in England, long before it was established in any other part of the world, with the exception of the Netherlands. My recollection is just indefinite enough at the moment, that I cannot give the precise dates upon which responsible representative government, as we have it in Britain and in Canada, came into practice in the Netherlands, but at any rate, as far as the great powers of the world are concerned, this form of government first came into effect in Great Britain. Our experience and practice of it has brought home very clearly this conclusion, that we get the best results from it, when we have the machinery that most exactly expresses the will of the people, and that is absolutely necessary, resting, as it does, on the right of the people to rule themselves. We get, let me repeat, the best results in actual practice when we secure the most complete and exact representation of the people's will in the matter. I know there are those who think differently. In that respect I would include by hon. friend who preceded me (Mr. Ladner), but, nevertheless, to the students of our form of government the statement that I have just made is a fair and correct statement. My hon. friend from Brome quoted Burke. Burke was one of the greatest statesmen of his day, and he, perhaps, more clearly than anyone else of his time, recognized the soundness of the principle I have just stated. What does proportional representation seek to do? It seeks to advance one step further in carrying out this idea of getting as exact a representation of the people's will in the matter of government as it is possible to do. That is the whole purpose of proportional representation. That is the whole purpose and effect of the application of the alternative system of voting, or, as it is often termed, the transferable vote in single member constituencies. This method, this principle, as applied to democratic forms of government is not a new thing; it has been in effect, it has been tested, in many countries of the world; it is being tested even in Anglo-Saxon countries. As the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) has shown,—and I commend his speech to the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner), who apparently was not in the House when that speech was delivered—proportional representation is not only not incompatible with democracy, but entirely compatible with it, and I maintain that it is essential to the fullest functioning of democracy. It has been adopted by Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland in Europe, to speak only of European countries which have had it in practice for a number of years.

Mr. LADNER: Does my hon. friend not recognize the difference in the forms of constitutions of those countries from that of this country; and does he not think that to adopt proportional representation here involves a change in our constitution so as to make it similar to that of the French where the term of office of the chief executive is for a fixed definite period?

Mr. CRERAR: No, I think nothing of the kind, and before I am through, I hope to convince my hon. friend that he is wrong. Proportional representation has been in effect in those countries. It is true their form of governmental machinery may differ slightly from ours; but in those countries their form of government rests upon the principle of the right of the people to rule themselves, and if the machinery in existence to give effect to that differs slightly from ours, that does not affect the

principle of the reform which I am discussing. I would draw the attention of the House also to this fact that while those particular countries have had this method in effect for many years, you have less disturbance, and the fullest and freest functioning of democracy as regards the rights of the people in their government.

My hon. friend from Vancouver South asserted quite vehemently that proportional representation is not adapted to the British form of government. I think he will agree with me that the overseas Dominions of the British Commonwealth have, in effect and in practice, the British form of Government which he was discussing, and this principle has been applied in some of those states. It has been applied in municipal elections in Great Britain, and with very great success. Not only that, I find that my hon. friend from Vancouver South is not in very good company when he takes the position that he has taken. I have in my hand a leaflet of the Proportional Representation Society of Great Britain, a society formed a number of years ago for the purpose of educating public opinion in that land to the need and the value of this reform. And whose names do I find associated with that society? I find the outstanding names in all the political parties in Great Britain. At that time—and this was in 1920—the president was Earl Grey; the vice-presidents were the Right Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, the Right Hon. G. M. Barnes, the Right Hon. Lord Birkenhead—my hon. friend from Vancouver South would certainly not call Lord Birkenhead a Liberal, at that particular time at any rate—Viscount Burnham, the Right Hon. Lord Robert Cecil, who was one of the pillars of the Tory party in Great Britain; the Right Hon. Sir Donald Maclean; the Right Hon. the Marquis of Lansdowne, who has been an outstanding statesman in Great Britain, and who belongs to the particular political faith to which my hon. friend from Vancouver South is apparently glad to give his adherence; the Right Hon. Viscount Milner, another political associate, if I might so term it, of my hon. friend—all down the list, the outstanding men in all political parties in Great Britain have given their adherence and support to the furtherance of this reform.

I might be permitted to quote Mr. Asquith, who, I think, will be generally recognized as an outstanding British statesman. Shortly before he resigned as Prime Minister in Great Britain, speaking on the proposal that this reform should be investigated, Mr. Asquith used these words:

> 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.

A Speaker's Conference was formed in Great Britain in the year 1916. I find in that Speaker's Conference the outstanding men of the British House of Commons, men drawn from all political parties. And that conference, in the various suggestions of electoral reform which it brought down to the British House of Commons, recommended precisely the reforms which my hon. friend the member for Brant has submitted to this House this afternoon namely, that proportional representation could with profit be applied, and that, in single member constituencies, the transferable vote could also, with profit and use to the development of the British governmental system be applied in Great Britain.

Some hon. members probably imagine that this reform has had no application in Canada. It has had; in the province of Manitoba, proportional representation was applied to the city of Winnipeg in the last changes which were made in the election law. In the last provincial election of Manitoba, in 1920, the city of Winnipeg was one large constituency electing ten members. I am not going to detain the House with any statement as to the effect of that change and regard in which it was held by the people of that city. I will quote simply the opinions of the leaders in the Manitoba Legislature upon the result of that principle as applied in Winnipeg in the last provincial election. Mr. Thomas Johnson, who was then Attorney General of Manitoba, made this statement:

> I feel that I can truthfully say that I have not now and never have had a single regret for the efforts made by me personally in connection with the introduction of this reform into our election laws. The proportional representation system gives a more truly representative legislation than the system of single-member constituencies. The electors of Winnipeg had no more difficulties than usual, and the

counting, notwithstanding the great number of candidates, 41 in all, came off without a hitch of any kind.

Mr. Dixon, leader of the Liberal group in the legislature, also commended the system, and I want, particularly for the information of the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Ladner), to quote the opinion of Mr. W. J. Tupper, one of the Conservative members elected in Winnipeg and a son of the late Sir Charles Tupper. Mr. Tupper uses the following language:

> In my opinion the test that proportional representation underwent in this city during the late provincial election was successful.
>
> As I understand the system, it is intended to give representation to all parties in proportion to their numerical strength. The result of the late election showed that the minority parties in the city of Winnipeg received representation in accordance with their voting strength. It, however, did not favour independent candidates, as you will have observed.
>
> I might say that the success of the system seems to me to depend upon the efficiency of those in control of the counting. We were fortunate in this province to have exceptionally able men in charge and the result is no doubt in a great measure due to them.

Mr. J. T. Haig, who was for several years the leader of the Conservative party in the Manitoba legislature, had this to say about it:

> I feel in talking to my supporters generally that they are entirely satisfied with the working of the system. . . . Taken as a whole, I believe the members elected truly represent the proportional vote of the community as it was at that time. . . . As you know we have had a difficult situation in Winnipeg since the strike last year, and anything that will give all the elements in the community a chance to voice their opinions in Parliament appears to me to be a good thing for the whole community. . . . If we had had the old system in Winnipeg I doubt if a single Conservative would have been elected, and I have no doubt the Government would have had a larger representation in the House at the expense of the Conservative and Labour parties because they would have had the machinery of distributing the seats, and as Governments usually do, would have distributed them with an eye to the result being to their advantage. Under this system no such thing can happen.

He goes on and makes some further observations, which I do not need to read to the House, commending proportional representation to the people of Manitoba. These, Mr. Speaker, are the opinions of men in Manitoba drawn from the various political parties in that province, and while the persons who give expression to these views differ upon almost everything else under the sun, it is a significant fact that they are in agreement with regard to the merits of proportional representation as applied in the city of Winnipeg.

The resolution proposed by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Good) seeks rather to draw attention to the matter; he specifically suggests that it be applied to single member constituencies under the alternative vote and that it be tested out in a few urban constituencies in the next election. I think it is a reasonable proposal. The principle underlying it is sound, and I trust that it will have the support of the House and that effect will be given to it at the next general election.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be to the advantage of the House if this resolution could be disposed of this afternoon, and that is my reason for saying just a word or two at the moment.

First of all, may I congratulate the mover of the resolution (Mr. Good) on the exceedingly able speech he has made and the very lucid exposition he has given to the House of this important question?

In a word, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in entire sympathy with the resolution, and, so far as an individual member has voice in the House, would like to express myself as supporting it as it stands. In this matter the Government would wish to be governed by the opinion of the House, and if the House approves the resolution the Government will do all in its power to give effect to it as opportunity affords.

Let me say, in regard to the discussion that has taken place and the effect that this resolution, if carried, might have upon responsible government, that I failed to follow altogether the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Ladner). Responsible government is based primarily upon a representative parliament, and any measure that will help to make Parliament more truly representative of the public will must necessarily be furthering responsible government rather than in any way limiting it.

Mr. LADNER: But the cabinet would not be responsible to Parliament. Surely you would have to change the responsibilities and functions of the cabinet so that an adverse vote would not compel the administration to go to the country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my hon. friend quite sees the significance of the resolution. The government would be formed in precisely the same way under this system as it is at present—out of a body of representatives of the people who could command the confidence of the

House. I confess that as I study the question more and more, it is my view that instead of adding to the number of groups in the House, the adoption of what is proposed here might tend to limit the groups. My. hon. friend assumes that every man who runs on a given ticket will be elected on that ticket, but that is not going to be the effect of this system. You might have any number of persons seeking to represent certain sections of the people in Parliament, but it does not follow that they would all be elected. My view is that instead of a man being returned to Parliament on a minority vote of the constituents, if this system is adopted the only representatives who will find seats in the House will be those who command a majority of the votes cast. It is to ensure representation based upon a majority that the proposal has been made and that this reform is so much needed.

There have been quotations from Burke, and from illustrious political reformers. May I add just one to the number, from Pym, who in the time of Charles I, said:

> That form of government is best which doth actuate and dispose every part and member of the state to the common good.

I do not think it is possible to surpass that as a maxim of government; and a system of representation which will give freer and fuller and truer expression to the popular will on the part of all classes in the country is helping to bring about that form of government. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am only too glad to have this opportunity of helping to further an electoral reform of this character.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I admit that many good things have been said this afternoon in favour of proportional representation. I heard all these arguments thirteen years ago in this House when the matter was brought forward by the late member for Jacques Cartier, the Hon. Mr. Monk. We were told then that this system had worked well in Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands; that it had been tried in various European countries, and so on. But the House did not take to the idea, and the suggestion of the member for Jacques Cartier fell on deaf ears. The proposal has remained dormant ever since that time.

There is one point I should like the House not to overlook. Canada is a confederation; this Parliament represents people who entered confederation on the basis of certain fixed ideas, a certain definite understanding. It was stipulated that the representation of the province of Quebec would be fixed at a certain number and that that was to be the basis for the representation of all the other parts of the Dominion. Now the idea is prevalent in the province of Quebec that the views of other provinces are being imposed upon Quebec without its people being given a chance to express their opinion thereon. In the last election my majority was almost 5,000, though I left the riding fifteen days before the voting took place. But out of 13,000 voters on the list, 6,000 did not vote. The women abstained from voting, and they did so on advice given from the highest quarters. The stand has been taken by the most prominent members of the church in the province of Quebec that there is grave doubt whether female suffrage is in the interests of the state. The province has refused to allow female suffrage in provincial affairs. Last year the city of Montreal, voting on the choice of a municipal system, declared against proportional representation by an overwhelming majority. I submit very respectfully that notwithstanding all that may be said in favour of proportional representation in the cities —it has no application in the rural districts —nothing should be done—and I would have to vote against the motion if it was voted on—that would bind this House to the principle of it until the matter had been fully considered and the people of the province of Quebec given an opportunity, through their legislature or otherwise, of accepting it.

We have adopted that method in connection with other important measures which have come before this House, for instance, the Lord's Day Act. This legislation was largely advocated by Ontario and the West. The observance of the Sabbath is viewed in those sections and in the maritime provinces differently from the way in which it is viewed in the province of Quebec. The bill was amended in the Senate—that being the understanding arrived at—so as to provide that it could not be put into effect in the province of Quebec without the assent of the attorney-general of the province. That is, the people of Quebec entered confederation under certain fixed principles, and they felt they had a right to be consulted in regard to any legislation which affected those principles. I certainly take objection to a change in the franchise law of the province of Quebec through the

introduction of proportional representation until it has been made an issue in the province and adopted by the legislature.

Mr. GOOD: Is the hon. member aware that the resolution which I have moved does not call for endorsation of the principle of proportional representation by this House, but only for the creation of one or more multi-member constituencies to demonstrate its working?

Mr. MARCIL: There is another point to which I desire to call the attention of the House. The city of Toronto is often mentioned in this House, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier good-humouredly referred to it on one occasion as the city which cheered and honoured him but never gave him a vote. If proportional representation were adopted in Toronto it might work all right, because there and in Winnipeg—the latter city has already adopted the system—the people are largely homogeneous in a political sense. But in the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec we have, broadly speaking, two classes. When the voters' list is made up and taxation for schools is imposed, and so on, we have arrayed on one side the English-speaking people, that is, every one who does not speak French, or, in other words, a combination against French Canadians. I am confident that the French Canadians of Montreal would be a unit against proportional representation. I am afraid that in such a cosmopolitan city as Montreal is getting to be, if we had this system we would see every nationality, wanting representation, and we would have "racial" candidates running, which would not be an improvement on our present system, but rather the reverse. For that reason I am opposed to the principle of proportional representation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Mr. McQUARRIE: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MARCIL: I have still something to add, and I therefore claim the privilege of moving the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, May 11, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) presented the first report of the Special Committee appointed to consider railway transportation, recommending that the committee be empowered to sit while the House is in session, and that such evidence as it may take be printed from day to day, and that rule 74 relating thereto be suspended.

OTTAWA GAS COMPANY

Mr. H. B. McGIVERIN (Ottawa) moved that Bill No. 8 respecting the Ottawa Gas Company be withdrawn, and that the fee and charges paid thereon be refunded, less the cost of printing and translation, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be entertained by unanimous consent. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

BUSINESS WAR PROFITS TAX

Mr. GOOD:

1. What is the total number of returns made by tax payers under the Business War Profits Tax, from the date when this Act was made effective until the present time?
2. How many such returns have been made each year during this period?
3. How many tax payers have made returns but against whom no assessment of tax has yet been made?
4. How many returns in each year have not yet been assessed?
5. How many have made returns, been assessed, but have not yet paid their taxes?
6. How much interest, if any, has been lost by the non-assessment of the taxes on the returns furnished?
7. How many returns, if any, will it be impossible to collect owing to the failure or liquidation of firms or corporations?
8. Have there been any cases of incorporated companies in which a further allowance for capital than that provided by the act (namely the value of the capital stock, unimpaired reserve, rest or accumulated profits) was made and the capital for the purpose of this act allowed to be increased?
9. If so, on what principle and under what authority?

10. In cases of profits derived from mines, how much, if any, has been allowed to be deducted from the profits for the exhaustion of mines?

11. In cases of profits derived from mines, have there been any cases in which, in addition to the allowance made for exhaustion of mines, there has been at the same time added as a reserve, an allowance for the value of the mine?

12. If so, how many cases, what was the total amount so added and what difference has this made in the taxes assessed?

13. Have any similar allowances been made for the exhaustion and for the value of pulp or timber lands?

14. If so, under what authority?

15. Have any other methods of accommodation to tax payers been adopted other than acceptance of notes in payment for assessments levied? If so, what methods?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of Finance is advised that the supplying of all the information asked for would require quite a long time and a large expenditure for clerical work, which he thinks the honourable member would not desire to have incurred. The minister suggests that if it would be convenient to the honourable member he might call on the Commissioner of Taxation, Mr. R. W. Breadner, at the Finance Department, and discuss the matter with him, with a view to reducing the scope of the inquiry into such limits as might enable the Department to supply such information as the honourable member deems most important.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—MARRIED WOMEN AS EMPLOYEES

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. How many married women work with their husbands in the Post Office Department?

2. What salary and bonus do these women receive?

3. Is the Civil Service Commission aware that husband and wife are in some cases employed in the same branch of the said Department?

4. If so, what salary and bonus are received by husband and wife respectively?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. One.

2. Salary, $1,000. Bonus, $166.50 for year 1921-22; no bonus paid this year.

3. No. The Civil Service Commission has on several occasions recommended to the Government the desirability of framing regulations which would remove from the Service married women whose husbands are able to support them; to require female employees to retire upon their marriage; and to prohibit the appointment of married women, save under certain exceptional and specified conditions. As a result an Order in Council was passed on the 18th June, 1920 (P.C. 1393), approving the following regulations:

[Mr. Good.]

Hereafter no married woman, whose husband is living, shall be eligible for appointment in the public service.

Provided that, when the commission reports that the supply of experienced help for any particular kind of work is not sufficient to meet the demands of the public service, a married woman may be certified for temporary employment.

Provided further, that where it can be established by a married woman that her husband is unable, through illness or other cause, to contribute to her support, such married woman may be certified for permanent or temporary employment.

Provided further, that where, in the opinion of the commission, it would be desirable or necessary, and in the best interests of the public service to employ a married woman or to employ husband and wife together, such married woman may be certified to by the commission for permanent or temporary employment.

A further Order in Council of the 12th March, 1921 (P.C. 517), provided that:

Any female employee in the public service shall, upon the occasion of her marriage, be required to resign her position.

4. Husband, salary $1,260, bonus $297; wife, salary $1,000, bonus $166.50.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT BOARD—SHERBROOKE

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many persons are employed by the Government at, and in connection with the office of the Soldier Settlement Board at Sherbrooke, Quebec?

2. What are their names?

3. How many can speak and write French?

4. What salary do they receive?

5. When were they appointed?

6. Where did they reside prior to appointment?

7. By whom was their appointment recommended?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. Seventeen.

2. Buckland, A.J., DeLeseluc, C., Dunn, Miss M., Farnsworth, T. O., Honeyman, H. R., Hawker, Miss S. L., Kees, Miss V., Kerr, W., MacPherson, W. E. G., Matthews, G. D., McCallum, J. A., Palmer, Miss M. G., Porter, H. G., Stewart, Miss E. P., Smillie, Miss C. L., Standish, C. G., Wymbs, A. D.

3. Four speak and write French. Of the remaining thirteen, four have a speaking and reading knowledge of French.

4. Yearly salaries as follows: Buckland, A. J., $1,920; DeLeseluc, C., $1,320; Dunn, Miss M., $960; Farnsworth, T. O., $1,800; Honeyman, H. R., $1,800; Hawker, Miss S.

L., $900; Kees, Miss V., $900; Kerr, W., $2,700; MacPherson, W. E. G., $2,100; Matthews, G. D., $1,800; McCallum, J. A., $1,920; Palmer, Miss M. G., $960; Porter, H. G., $1,800; Stewart, Miss E. P., $840; Smillie, Miss C. L., $900; Standish, C, G., $2,100; Wymbs, A. D., $1,500.

5. Dates of appointment to the staff of the Soldiers' Settlement Board: Buckland, A. J., May 31, 1920; DeLeseluc, C., April 14, 1919; Dunn, Miss M., September 1, 1921; Farnsworth, T. O., April 21, 1919; Honeyman, H. R., November 3, 1919; Hawker, Miss S. L., December 17, 1919; Kees, Miss V., September 22, 1919; Kerr, W., January 31, 1919; MacPherson, W. E. G., January 16, 1920; Matthews, G. D., November 15, 1921; McCallum, J. A., September 15, 1919; Palmer, Miss M. G., October 1, 1921; Porter, H. G., September 17, 1919; Stewart, Miss E. P., October 1, 1921; Smillie, Miss C. L., August 25, 1919; Standish, C. G., June 24, 1919; Wymbs, A. D., September 8, 1919.

6. Buckland, A. J., St. Anne de Bellevue, Que.; DeLeseluc, C., Montreal, Que.; Dunn, Miss M., Sherbrooke, Que.; Farnsworth, T. O., Bulwer, Que.; Honeyman, H. R., Sherbrooke, Que.; Hawker, Miss S. L., Sherbrooke, Que.; Kees, Miss V., Sherbrooke, Que.; Kerr, W., St. John, N.B.; MacPherson, W. E. G., Toronto, Ont.; Matthews, G. D., Quebec, Que.; McCallum, J. A., Quebec, Que.; Palmer, Miss M. G., Sherbrooke, Que.; Porter, H. G., Sherbrooke, Que.; Stewart, Miss E. P., Sherbrooke, Que.; Smillie, Miss C. L., Sherbrooke, Que.; Standish, C. G., Quebec, Que.; Wymbs, A. D., Ottawa, Ont.

7. Buckland, A. J., H. Barton, professor of Animal Husbandry, MacDonald College; Arthur Jones, of Jones-Grant-Lunham, Montreal; Dr. W. L. Shurtleff, K.C., Coaticook, Que.

DeLeseluc, C., Bruce Campbell, then District Superintendent, Montreal; and W. R. Stevens, then Director of Agricultural Training, Montreal.

Dunn, Miss M., Capt. F. G. Forster, then District Superintendent, Sherbrooke, Que.

Farnsworth, T. O., E. A. Bailey, Provincial Manager (Que.) the Canadian Bank of Commerce; V. E. Moerith, of the Sherbrooke Daily Record, and F. R. Cromwell, of Cookshire, Que.

Honeyman, H. R., B. B. Morrill, then District Superintendent.

Hawker, Miss S. L., B. B. Morrill, then District Superintendent.

Kees, Miss S., B. B. Morrill, then District Superintendent.

Kerr, W., formerly District Superintendent, St. John, N.B.; J. F. Tweedale, Minister of Agriculture, New Brunswick, and J. G. Robertson, then Maritime Supervisor, S. S. Board.

MacPherson, W. E. G., Assigned by Civil Service Commission.

Matthews, G. D., J. G. Carl Fraser, B. S. A., Central Experimental Farm, Ottawa; R. Summerly, Professor of Cereal Husbandry, MacDonald College, Que., and N. D. MacKenzie, Superintendent, Dominion Experimental Farm, Indian Head, Sask.

McCallum, J. A., Major J. H. Roy, then District Superintendent, Quebec, P.Q.

Palmer, Miss G., P. Stewart, then District Superintendent.

Porter, H. G., B. B. Morrill, then District Superintendent.

Stewart, Miss E. P., P. Stewart, then District Superintendent.

Smillie, Miss C. L., B. B. Morrill, then District Superintendent.

Standish, C. G., C. M. Armstrong, 205 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal, and Major J. H. Roy, then District Superintendent Quebec, P.Q.

Wymbs, A. D., assigned by Civil Service Commission.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—TIES

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What quantity of railway ties have been purchased by the Canadian National Railway in Quebec, since January 30, 1921?

2. What are the names of the parties from whom said ties were purchased and the quantity in each case?

3. What was the price paid?

4. On what date was the contract given?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

Name	Date	Quantity	Price		
			No. 1 Ties	No. 2 Ties	No. 3 Ties
		Ties	c.	c.	c.
Viellet Bros.	Nov.26/21	75,000	55	45	25
C. E. Fleming Tie & Lumber Co.	Nov.26/21	125,000	70	60	35
International Land & Lumber Co. Ltd.	Nov.26/21	75,000	60	50	30
Clifford Supply Co.	Nov.26/21	75,000	55	45	25
C. Desrochers	Nov.26/21	10,000	55	45	25
J. A. Boulay	Nov.26/21	10,000	70	60	35
J. A. Turcotte	Nov.26/21	140,000	55	45	25
L. N. Huart	Dec.10/21	25,000	70	60	35
L. Nault	Dec.23/21	10,000	70	60	35
J. L. Mercier	Jan. 16/22	1,000	60	50	30
J. A. Pelletier	Dec.21/21	2,000	60	50	30
C. Lavoie	Dec. 2/21	1,000	60	50	30
Philippe Pitre	Dec. 2/21	400	60	50	30
Alph. C. Roy	Nov.25/21	300	60	50	30
Total		549,700			

LIQUOR IN SASKATCHEWAN

Mr. MILLAR:

Is it in accord with the Dominion statutes for any person, persons or corporation to engage in the business of operating in the Province of Saskatchewan, what is commonly known as an export liquor house, the business of which consists, in part, or entirely, of importing alcoholic liquors and exporting same to other provinces of the Dominion of Canada or to the United States of America?

Hon. Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is a question to be answered by the judicial tribunals, depending upon interpretation of the British North America Acts.

TORONTO—RAILWAY VIADUCT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Has the Government taken any action in reference to the requests of a deputation of various public boards, from Toronto, composed of the City Council, the Harbour Commissioners, the Board of Trade, the Trades and Labour Council, and others, which waited on the Government a few weeks ago, asking for the construction of a railway viaduct on the waterfront at Toronto, and for specific performance of The Viaduct Agreement, 1913, which provides for said grade separation there?

2. If so, what action?

3. In view of the way the public are suffering from the lack of proper terminal and station facilities, and from level crossings there, what action does the Government propose to take in the matter?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. The representations made by the boards are under consideration.

2 and 3. Answered by the answer to No. 1.

CIVIL SERVICE SALARIES

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. How many Civil Servants in Canada are receiving salaries of eight hundred dollars and less per annum?

2. How many are receiving nine hundred and sixty dollars or less?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): Stands as an Order for Return.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I think the rule as to questions standing as Orders for Returns covers questions the answers to which would be lengthy, and consequently would be expensive to print. In regard to this question, the answer to the first question would be a certain figure, and the answer to the second question another figure.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I would draw the attention of my right hon. friend to the second question asking how many civil servants in Canada are receiving $960 or less. This covers almost the entire civil service of the whole Dominion. If the question is allowed to stand on the Order Paper until we get that information it may be standing there for weeks. It is perfectly true, as my right hon. friend says, that the reply may not be very lengthy, but it will take a long time to obtain the desired information and in the meantime the question should not be allowed to remain on the Order Paper.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not to avoid the question standing on the Order Paper that the rule applies at all but only on account of the length of the answer. This is a very short question, and it would not matter if it stood all session.

Mr. FIELDING: It might be short, but the time required to obtain the information might be considerable. I think that is the real ground of the objection.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not the ground There is a rule, it was deliberated on this session, and I think a resolution passed by the committee. My recollection of it—and I am quite sure I am correct—is that it bears only on one point, the length of the answer, not the time to obtain it—the length of the answer and the consequent wisdom of putting it in Hansard.

Mr. FIELDING: My recollection is that it is not a change of rule, but it had reference to the printing of long answers in Hansard. I think the proper procedure to be taken is that if the question can be answered quickly it should be answered, but if it requires the collection of information throughout the Dominion, it may require a very considerable time.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The rule says that it is for the Speaker to decide whether the question should be changed into an order for return.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would say that the reasons given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) would indicate that this question should stand as an order for return, because I take it for granted that the question "How many civil servants in Canada are receiving salaries of $800 and less per annum" would require a great deal of work. It seems to me it covers a very wide range.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest that the question should stand till your Honour could look up the rules to see whether

anything else is involved in this decision except the matter of the length of the answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I refer my hon. friend to rule 37, paragraph 4, which reads:

If a question is of such a nature that in the opinion of the minister who is to furnish the reply, such reply should be in the form of a return, and the minister states that he has no objection to laying such return upon the table of the House his statement shall unless otherwise ordered by the House be deemed an order of the House to that effect and the same shall be entered in the Votes and Proceedings as such.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No doubt about that. The question is as to when the discretion should be exercised. I submit it is only in relation to one matter.

Mr. FIELDING: The minister is not bound to answer the question when he has not the information. Suppose the minister replied "the information called for would require considerable time, and, therefore we are not able to answer the question" that would get it off the Order Paper, but would hardly be courteous to the member who asked the information.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think we will let this question, No. 13, stand until to-morrow.

PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has any federal grant been paid on the cost of the Provincial Highway from Ottawa to Pembroke?
2. Were tenders called for the laying of that portion of this highway between Ottawa and South March?
3. If so, who submitted tenders and for what amounts?
4. Who were the successful tenderers, and what was the amount in each case?
5. Were any quarries purchased on this section of the above highway?
6. If so, who purchased same, and for what amount in each case?
7. From whom were quarries purchased, and what are the locations?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

No project covering the road in question has been filed with the Federal Highways Commission, nor has any agreement respecting it been entered into by the province of Ontario under the Canada Highways Act. Consequently, the Department of Railways and Canals has no information.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS 1911 TO 1922

Mr. PREVOST:

What have been the total imports and exports in Canada each year, from 1911 to 1922?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

Year	Imports entered for consumption	Exports
1911..	$ 451,745,108	$ 290,000,210
1912..	521,448,309	307,716,151
1913..	670,089,066	377,068,355
1914..	618,457,144	455,437,224
1915..	455,446,312	461,442,509
1916..	507,817,159	779,300,070
1917..	845,356,306	1,179,211,100
1918..	962,543,746	1,586,169,792
1919..	916,429,335	1,268,765,285
1920..	1,064,528,123	1,286,658,709
1921..	1,240,158,882	1,210,428,119
1922..	747,762,984	753,927,009

GATINEAU POINT FERRY PRIVILEGES

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. Has the Government called for tenders this year in connection with ferry privileges between Gatineau Point, Quebec, and Rockliffe, Ontario?
2. If so, what are the names of the persons who submitted tenders and what was the amount of each tender?
3. To whom was the privilege accorded and what was the reason governing the award?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.
2. Tenders received from:—Louis Cousineau, $1,600; Telesphore and Francis St. Jean, $862; John Letang, $800; D. Horace Seguin, $780; David Seguin, $505.
3. The license was granted to the highest bidder.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. How many acres of School Lands have been sold in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta, during the four years of 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921?
2. What amount of money is overdue in respect to the above sales in, (a) principal, and (b) interest?

Mr. PREVOST:

1. In what countries is Canada represented by trade agents?
2. What are the names of said agents, and what salary does each receive?

PUBLIC SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State) moved that the House do to-morrow go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to extend for one year the operation of the Public Service Retirement Act, chapter 67 of the statutes of 1920, as amended by chapter 49 of the statutes of 1921.

He said: The Governor General having been informed of the subject matter of the resolution, has recommended it to the consideration of this House.

Motion agreed to.

GENERAL MacBRIEN'S REPORTED UTTERANCE

On the Orders of the Day.

Mr. ANDREW McMASTER (Brome): Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to draw to the attention of the Government, and more particularly to the attention of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) a matter of real primary public importance. My attention has been directed to an article appearing in the Ottawa Journal this morning, with the following heading:

Some members show ignorance militia debate.

In this article Major-General MacBrien is reported as having said:

There have been debates in regard to the estimates recently as to the necessity for training for our men. Those who say training is not necessary simply display their ignorance.

The general is reported very much in the same terms in the Citizen. I know how easily it is for men to be improperly reported, but I would direct the attention of the Minister of Militia to this matter in order that he may make inquiries of the gentleman in question as to whether he made any such remark. Because, I submit to this House, for the general of our staff, who is the head of the staff, to make remarks about the discussion going on in this Chamber would be just as improper as if the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals gave his opinion publicly as to the advisability or nonadvisability of completing the Hudson Bay railway.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): I have not seen the article, nor has my attention been called to it. I agree with what the hon. member from Brome (Mr. McMaster) has said in reference to the words of General MacBrien, if the general used those words. The general is a pretty cautious man, and I would rather be inclined to think that he was discussing it on broader lines, and rather along the line that possibly the matter of training had not been given much attention by members of Parliament, and that they would not be in the same position to judge of the matter as experts. However, I will inquire of the general and get his explanation of what was said.

[Mr. Copp.]

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would ask the House to proceed to Order No. 32, second reading of Bill No. 56, to amend the Bankruptcy Act. It is the intention to have this bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, if there is no objection. I move that this House proceed to Public Bills and Orders.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two Mountains) moved that Bill No. 56, to amend the Bankruptcy Act, be read the second time.

He said: The purport of this bill is to amend the Bankruptcy Act as regards a particular point, namely, to strike out the word "locality" in paragraph 4 of section 4 of the act, and to substitute therefor the words "judicial district." As two other bills to amend the Bankruptcy Act have already been introduced in this House, and as those bills have been referred by the House to the Banking and Commerce Committee, I thought it would be preferable, before discussing the merits of this bill, that it should be referred to that committee in order that it might be considered with the others. The Banking and Commerce Committee, I understand, has not sat since the other two bills have been referred to it, and thus, as the three bills can be considered together, the time of the House will be saved. For that reason, after this bill is read a second time, I will move that it be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

On the motion of Mr. Ethier, the bill was thereupon referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

On the motion of Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King (Prime Minister) the House reverted to the Orders of the Day.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the chair:

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1921-22

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I suggest that we take up the Supplementary Estimates for the fiscal year ended 31st March, 1922. There are a number of items scattered over the vari-

ous departments, and we might take them all up in their order.

Charges of management—	
Printing, advertising, inspection, express, etc.—further amount required	$25,000
Brokerage on purchase of sinking funds—further amount required	$3,900

The item regarding the sinking funds arises from an increased investment in that direction. The larger item is chiefly caused by charges for express in handling gold between Ottawa and New York. The appropriation last year for printing, advertising, inspection, express, etc., was $100,000, and the expenditure to the 9th May was $123,000. As hon. gentlemen will remember, I explained the matter on the corresponding item in the Main Estimates.

Item agreed to.

Department of Finance—	
To provide for the salary of one private secretary from January 26 to March 31, 1922, at $3,360 per annum.	$ 614.19
To provide for the appointment of a Commissioner of Tariff from January 23, 1922, at $6,000 per annum, without reference to and notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act	1,129.03

Mr. FIELDING: The item regarding the private secretary is the same as those which have appeared in all the departments to make provision for private secretaries for the balance of the year. As regards the other item, the circumstances are these. A gentleman who had been forty-five years in the public service, chiefly in the Customs Department or in the Finance Department dealing with customs matters, had retired from the public service on superannuation. He was an officer whose services were regarded as being of the highest importance, and at my request he abandoned his superannuation and returned to the Finance Department, I am afraid not for a very long time. I am proposing that he shall be designated Commissioner of Tariff at a salary of $6,000 per annum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who was the corresponding officer, if any, prior to his return?

Mr. FIELDING: There was nobody appointed to do the particular service that he was appointed to do. He had retired, and I discovered him in California. He is a gentleman whose services are regarded as being very valuable.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand this is Mr. Russell?

Mr. FIELDING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So this is really a new appointment?

Mr. FIELDING: In a measure, it is. He is recalled to the Service, and we give him a new title and an increase in salary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How does the minister justify getting around the Civil Service Act by what is practically a special Act of Parliament?

Mr. FIELDING: My predecessor and his predecessor in office both found it necessary to get around the Civil Service Act, and I am obliged to resort to the same method.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not aware of the instance which the minister has in mind. Was he afraid that, if applications were called for in the usual way, Mr. Russell could not succeed?

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is quite possible that if applications were to be called for in the usual way and a competition to take place, the wrong man might get the office. I do not hesitate to say that. Mr. Russell is qualified by forty-five years' experience, and it is possible that some man might come in and, on account of being better able to tell the colour of Julius Caesar's hair, he might get the job. At all events, both my predecessor and his predecessor found it necessary to make similar appointments to the public service, notwithstanding the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the minister is quite correct. The Civil Service Act never applied to the Income Tax Department, but it did apply to the Finance Department, and the Civil Service Act was followed. If what the minister says is right, that would be an argument in favour of repealing the whole act and of going back to patronage quite unrestrained.

Mr. FIELDING: I would not like to discuss that point at the present time with my right hon. friend. The Income Tax Department would have been under the Civil Service Act unless a special provision had been made to exempt it, just as I propose to take the office of this particular gentleman out of the scope of the commission.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My hon. friend is not quite correct. I do not think that the Income Tax Department was ever under the Civil Service Act. It was in process of formation, and I do not know

whether my hon. friend thinks that the process is yet finally completed. It was considered, as in the case of many other new departments, that during that process of organization it ought not to be under the act. I do not think that it ever was under the Civil Service Act, although the Finance Department generally was under the Commission.

Mr. FIELDING: The Income Tax Department never came under the act for the simple reason that my predecessor took good care that it should not, because in the appropriation for that service he provided that the Civil Service Act should not apply to the department.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The whole of the Finance Department generally is under the act, but in this instance my hon. friend is making an exception, having regard to one particular appointment.

Mr. FIELDING: The appointment of every official at Ottawa will be under the Civil Service Act, unless an exception is made by vote of Parliament. I am making an exception now, just as has been made in previous cases.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all. The minister may justify what he is doing now, but he cannot justify it in that way. The Civil Service Act went a certain length. It included virtually all the services; certain services did not come under it, for definite reasons given. Now, we went that distance and stopped there. But the minister is asking Parliament to retrace a part of the step that has been taken. He desires to remove something from the operation of the act by special statute, because he is afraid that otherwise the right man might not be appointed. To a certain length and stop is very different from what the minister proposes. Having got a certain distance, he wants us to retrace our steps and to that extent repeal the act.

Mr. FIELDING: The Civil Service Act was passed before the Income Tax Act. When the latter act was passed every official appointed under it would have come under the operation of the Civil Service Act unless special exception had been made by vote of Parliament. The Civil Service Act never applied in this respect, because my hon. friends excluded this department from its operation. I am making an exception to-day in one case, whereas my hon. friends did so in hundreds of cases.

[Sir Henry Drayton.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not a fair statement at all. It is true that the Income Tax Department never came under the Civil Service Act; neither did the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.

Mr. FIELDING: It would have come under the act but for the fact that it was excepted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It was never put under the act. These two departments were never put under the act for the reason that the appointments made in connection therewith were in their nature temporary appointments. They did not prove to be as temporary as had been expected, but they were services that were not regarded as of a permanent character. For this reason they never came under the Civil Service Act at all. But what the minister proposes to do now is to take a distinctly reactionary step. He may have special reasons for doing so, but the reason he has so far given would be a reason for repealing the whole Civil Service Act. Has he any special reason to justify the step he is taking in this particular instance?

Mr. FIELDING: The special reason is that this gentleman has had forty-five years' experience in the public service and is exceptionally well qualified for the duty which I require him to perform. I would ask the House to accept that as reason enough. But I again state that if any department of the public service is not under the operation of the Civil Service Act it is because it has been excepted by just such a motion as I am making on this occasion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is entirely wrong. However, if we agree on the conclusion, I will not quarrel with him as regards the road we take to get there.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We may agree that there is a great difference between never having brought certain services under the act, and seeking to make an exception of certain services that are already under it. The minister says that the exception here is justified on the ground that Mr. Russell has long experience and is, in his judgment, a man eminently qualified for the duties to which he is to be assigned. I am not disputing the minster's judgment. I know Mr. Russell, but I am not aware of his special qualifications. Assuming that the minister's judgment is correct, does he

think that the same fact would not appeal to the Civil Service Commission? Would Mr. Russell's long experience not appeal to them as eminently qualifying him?

Mr. FIELDING: They would have no right to consider it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No right to consider his experience?

Mr. FIELDING: Not in competition with another man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the minister say that the Civil Service Commission cannot consider the experience of an applicant in estimating his qualifications?

Mr. FIELDING: Not in competition with other applicants.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Certainly; in competition with others the applicant's experience in this case would help him in the race, just as it would help anybody else. The Civil Service Commission takes an applicant's experience into consideration, in fact, they do so in regard to every application. So that what the minister is doing is tantamount to saying that what really qualifies an applicant is something which the Civil Service Commission should not consider at all. If that is the case, then we should have no Civil Service Commission.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friends say "hear, hear." How many of them are there, though, who did not say just the opposite during the last three sessions?

Mr. DUFF: Oh, no; we are quite consistent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Civil Service Act had all sorts of champions in this House, on this side of the Chamber, during the past three sessions. Even if we sought to refer to a committee the question whether or not it would be wise to make any exceptions, hon. gentlemen rose up in arms, indignant that anything should be done in the way of going back to patronage. But now they are enthusiastic advocates of such a course, because they think they will reap the rewards.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is entirely wrong in the basis of his argument. This is not a motion under which we are seeking to appoint a man. Mr. Russell was in the Civil Service. The superannuation order had been passed but had not taken effect. We did not need the Civil Service Commission to bring Mr. Russell into the service, because he was already a civil servant. All that we seek to do here, in the way of a departure from the act, is to give him a larger salary than he would have obtained under the Civil Service Act. He does not need the approval of the Civil Service Commission, because he was in the civil service. Superannuation had been ordered, but had not taken effect.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In his return the Civil Service Commission does not need to pass on his qualifications. It never did pass on them, as a matter of fact, because he was already in the service. That seems reasonable. But why should their jurisdiction in the matter of salary not apply?

Mr. FIELDING: Speaking generally, I suppose we have to accept a common principle. But I am going to submit that in the matter of salaries this House is a better judge than the Civil Service Commission; and on that ground, believing this to be a good appointment, I shall ask the House to give me authority to pay the increased salary. On that question I believe that this House is as good a judge as, if not better than, the Civil Service Commission, much as I respect their judgment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry I cannot agree with the minister in that respect. If that judgment is correct, then the minister has no ground at all for remaining another hour under the jurisdiction of the commission. If we in this House are better judges of what a fair salary is for work done than is the Civil Service Commission, then the act has no just foundation, neither as respects the inside service nor the outside. I do not think the minister's reason is sound.

Mr. SHAW: The minister has suggested a Commissioner of Taxation, and apparently the remarks of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) have reference to such an official. I notice, however, that the Supplementary Estimates refer to a Commissioner of Tariff.

Mr. FIELDING: If I said "Commissioner of Taxation," that is an error; "Commissioner of Tariff" is the proper term.

Mr. SHAW: What are the duties of the Commissioner of Tariff?

Mr. FIELDING: To assist the minister in all inquiries into the tariff question. From beginning to end this matter is entrusted to the Finance Department. But the minister, with a fairly good impression of his own abilities, does not think he knows it all, and is anxious to procure assistance. He thinks that this gentleman is particularly capable and can help him in this service.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I was not in the House when the matter was first brought up, but my recollection is that Mr. Russell's former salary was $3,900.

Mr. FIELDING: I think that is correct.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection, further, is that Mr. Russell, on the ground of advancing years and the necessity for rest, applied for superannuation, and on his insisting upon superannuation he was granted the sum of $2,700 a year. I should like to ask the minister whether the recalling of this superannuated gentleman—superannuated at his own request—will mean that the superannuation of $2,730 will be increased to what it would be on the basis of a salary of $6,000; or whether the appointment is looked upon by my hon. friend as of an entirely temporary nature, and that it is not intended to increase the superannuation allowance of $2,730.

Mr. FIELDING: The superannuation of an official is hardly under the control of a minister; it is fixed by law. My hon. friend says that this gentleman was retired at his own request. I hope that is so. But he is still in very good health and has come back into the department at my particular request, for I regard him as a very valuable officer—a better one than I could get from among younger men I shall be glad if he stays in the department longer than he intended, but when the time comes for superannuation he will have to be retired under the terms of the Superannuation Act, that is, having regard to his average salary for the last three years. Undoubtedly if he continues in the department this will give him a larger superannuation than if he had remained out.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Approximately $4,300.

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot say.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: As against a superannuation of $2,730?

Mr. FIELDING: Quite so.

[Mr. Shaw.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me that under the exceptional circumstances this ought to be looked upon as a special appointment at the minister's request, without extending the gentleman's superannuation rates.

Mr. FIELDING: That would imply a change in the Superannuation Act, and for the present I do not contemplate such a change.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not pretend to have made any examination of the act, but I would think that on the recall of a superannuated officer his old superannuation would automatically apply upon his being released. If that is not the case, and if his being recalled for a temporary period has the effect of very substantially increasing his superannuation on account of an increased salary, I would think that a very serious objection to the proposal.

Mr. FIELDING: The Superannuation Act will govern. If the operation of the act is such as my right hon. friend suggests, I have not any intention of changing it. I think he is mistaken. If that is the operation of the law, Mr. Russell will have to act accordingly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We are at cross purposes. I think both my hon. friends are right. The cases put by the leader of the Opposition is the case of a man whose superannuation has taken effect and who is recalled. The case advanced by my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, is that of a man who is still in the service, and while superannuation has been applied for by him it has not yet taken effect; he is still being paid a salary. Under the circumstances I am afraid there is some chance of that happening which the minister says will happen—a very largely increased superannuation may be obtained.

Mr. FIELDING: If Mr. Russell remains in the service—and I hope he will—I hope he will get the benefit of the average of his salary for the last three years, whatever it may be, and I do not think my hon. friend on reflection would wish it otherwise.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Knowing the great responsibilities that rest upon the Minister of Finance, do not hon. friends opposite feel that he is entitled to come to Parliament and ask for an appropriation for an officer in whom he has great confidence, and to expect to have such appropriation granted?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That applies to every minister. The point is that we do not know what obligation we are putting on the country by passing this vote. If it is a fact that by merely bringing Mr. Russell back for a temporary period it is going to have the effect of increasing his superannuation by $1,600 for all the rest of his life, that is one thing; if it is merely going to have the effect of giving him $6,000 for the temporary period, that is another thing. I would be under the impression that it would not have the more serious effect. But I think the committee should know what obligation will be incurred.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend is a legal gentleman and should be able to interpret the Superannuation Act better than I can be expected to. If Mr. Russell remains in the service two years longer —and I hope he will—I think he will be entitled to the full benefit of the Superannuation Act; if not, he will have to be content with my right hon. friend's interpretation.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister is a great deal older than I am, and his judgment ought to be better than mine in regard to this point.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: You would not think so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know the Prime Minister never had a very high opinion of my judgment.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The opinion seems to be reciprocal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Superannuation Act contemplates a man coming into the service, continuing for a considerable length of time, and paying in a certain amount towards superannuation; then upon his retirement he would get superannuation based upon the average salary of the last three years. That would never contemplate a case like this. Mr. Russell came into the service forty years ago at a small salary, worked up until he reached $4,000, and then applied for and was entitled to superannuation on the basis of his salary the last three years, or $2,700. Now the minister proposes to fix a special salary by statute, and thereby entitle Mr. Russell to superannuation, based on that special salary for the rest of his life, even though he is only in the service for three years. Surely the minister does not suggest that that was ever contemplated by the Superannuation Act?

Mr. FIELDING: The act will speak for itself.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This may mean thousands and thousands of dollars to Mr. Russell. Does the minister say that that was the original intention of the act? I am told it will mean $4,300 a year as against $2,700 a year, and Mr. Russell will get that all the rest of his life. If we are incurring that obligation we want to do it in the open; but the minister cannot say that that was ever the intention of the Superannuation Act.

Mr. FIELDING: The act says that superannuation applies on a man's retirement with due reference to his period of service, based on the average salary of the last three years. That is what the act says, that is our understanding in the case of Mr. Russell, and I cannot think the act contemplated anything else.

Item agreed to.

To provide for balance of legal expense in connection with the Canadian Northern Guarantee Bill, 1914, and the Grand Trunk Railway mortgage trust deed and lease of Eastern Division of National Transcontinental Railway, $13,154.03.

Mr. FIELDING: We are advised that these legal expenses were incurred in connection with railway matters under the late government. The Department of Justice has reported that they are all right, and we ask for an appropriation accordingly.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not quite sure that my hon. friend is right. I think this is a very old claim which was not recognized by the last government. It seems to me it has to do with legislation of 1914.

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend claims that the late government did not recognize the item, I will withdraw it without delay. The information I have is that these are amounts for services in connection with the Canadian Northern Guarantee Bill, 1914.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Who are to receive the money?

Mr. FIELDING: The estate of the late James Bicknell will get $11,404.73, less what has been paid on account, $6,200, balance $5,204.73; Messrs. Lewis and Smel-

lie, in connection with the Canadian Northern Guarantee Bill of 1914, $5,039, less already paid $2,107, balance $2,932; Messrs. Lewis and Smellie again, in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway mortgage trust deed, $5,017.30. Now, as these transactions occurred in 1914 they could hardly have been incurred by the present Government or even by the late Liberal government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I happened to have some familiarity with this matter as it is now described by the minister. The firms he refers to were engaged in 1914 to perform certain legal services in the preparation of the trust mortgages connected with the Canadian Northern legislation and guarantee of that year. Bills were put in by these firms in the usual way—by the firm of Bain, Bicknell and Company, of Toronto, and by Lewis and Smellie, of Ottawa. These bills were taxed by the Justice Department in the usual way and the amount taxed was paid to each firm. Both firms, nevertheless, came back and insisted that they did not get enough and asserted that they would not submit to the taxation of the Justice Department. The government of that day, and every government since, insisted that the rule had to obtain and that the firms in question would have to abide by that taxation. If they could show anything that had not been taxed; if they could show any services that had been rendered for which they did not submit a bill, all right; but we told them definitely that by the judgment of the taxing officer of the Justice Department the government was going to abide. That was the stand the late government took; the present Government takes a different stand and yields to their claims.

Mr. FIELDING: No, the present Government does not take that stand. I shall drop the item without a moment's hesitation.

Mr. GRAHAM: I move that the item be withdrawn.

Item withdrawn.

To cover unprovided items, 1920-21, as per Auditor General's report, part B, page 3, 1920-21, $544,009.25.

Mr. FIELDING: The various departments receive letters of credit under which they operate. They are kept within the limits of the totals of these, but sometimes they exceed the appropriation for some particular branch. At the end of the year

4 p.m.

the Auditor General calls attention to this in his report and asks for a vote of Parliament by way of confirmation. The details are all set forth in the Auditor General's report. I must say that this item has always been one that I regret, because if the departments would look after the matter more closely, they would keep strictly within not only their letters of credit, but also the appropriations for each particular item. But so long as they do not exceed the total of their letters of credit they seem to feel that some excess in a particular branch of their business will be condoned by Parliament.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with my hon. friend. It is a matter that I have referred to more than once in the House. It goes to show the uselessness of a past audit instead of a pre-audit, and also the futility of expecting some people to keep within the orders of this House and the amounts voted them by this House. As the matter stands, however, my hon. friend is quite right; there is nothing to do but to put it through.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Civil government—Department of Justice—to provide for one assistant private secretary from December 29th, 1921, to March 31st, 1922, at $1,600 per annum..	$ 412 90
Contingencies—further amount required (Governor General's Warrant, December 1st, 1921).. ..	10,000 00
	$10,412 90

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Does this indicate a new appointment? It would seem to, taking the dates into consideration.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There were two secretaries in my department; one has been transferred to another branch and replaced by an assistant secretary. The expenditure is less by some $1,500.

Mr. CRERAR: Would the minister give some explanation of the Governor General's warrant of $10,000 in this item?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This amount is required on account of the increase of work and the increase of prices. Our appropriation for some years has been insufficient and has had to be increased by supplementary votes. The chief increases are due to temporary employees, travelling expenses of officials, and printing.

Mr. HANSON: That means, if I understand the minister aright, that what the House says is sufficient for contingencies is exceeded by officials of the department, who over-expend from year to year. I do not think that is a proper state of affairs, or that the House should approve of it by simply passing this $10,000 item in this way.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I must say that most of this was spent before I took office. I will do my best in future to restrict the expenditure within the limit of the vote.

Mr. GOOD: As I understand it, then, this money has been spent?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: My recollection is that a warrant was put through in this connection, and the explanation given by the department at the time was that we had to spend a good deal more than had been expected owing to an injunction proceeding in which my hon. friend the leader to my left was one of the complainants, and which he lost.

Mr. CRERAR: I would be glad if my hon. friend would explain that again. I caught only the latter part of his remarks, and they sounded interesting.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: Is there any standard scale of salary for assistant private secretary? In the previous item the salary of the assistant private secretary in the Privy Council office is $3,000; in this case it is $1,600. Does the salary depend upon the wish of the minister, or is there some set standard?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is based on the experience of the official.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: But in the one case the salary is $3,000 and in the other it is $1,600.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: In the case of the previous item referred to, the assistant is required to have a knowledge of French as well as English. The length of his service, combined with the fact that he is qualified to take dictation and to read letters in French as well as English, justifies the difference in salary.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: It pays to learn French.

Item agreed to.

Department of Justice—miscellaneous expenditure, further amount required, $6,000.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: This is necessitated by the expenses incurred by the arrest, trial, at Fort Providence, N.W.T., and execution, of the Indian Lebeaux, convicted of murder. The judge and officials were brought from Alberta and maintained at Fort Providence during the trial. The total cost will approximate $10,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this charged against last year's expenditure?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Because the expenditure was incurred last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But I understood the minister to say it would be paid in the future.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It was spent last year, and we are holding the accounts.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are not paid yet?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Not paid yet.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why then is this charged against last year?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Because the trial took place last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Even though the trial took place last year amounts being paid this year should not be charged to this year's estimates? For example money voted last year is applicable very frequently to services rendered this year, though it is not payable this year. Should not the reverse be the case?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I am told that is not the custom. The trial took place last year and the expenditure has to be paid out of last year's budget.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The costs seem to be very heavy. I am afraid last year's expenditure is going to be enhanced by the extravagance of the three months at the end?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: There has been no extravagance in the three months referred to. This trial took place last summer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When were the figures submitted and agreed to as being right and fair?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Most of these accounts are from the Mounted Police Department. They were settled not very long ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I thought.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: But the trial took place last summer.

Mr. LAPOINTE: We have to pay for former extravagance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What I am complaining of is the ease with which the Government consents to almost any charge at all.

Item agreed to.

Penitentiaries—further amount required (Governor General's Warrant, February 22, 1922), $150,000.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The explanation with which I have been furnished with reference to this item is as follows:

Up to the 22nd instant, approximately $50,000 of this amount has been expended
The warrant was necessary owing to the following:

Amount deducted from Supplementary Estimates, May, 1921..	$ 54,000 00
Accounts received from Purchasing Agent, June 1st, 1921, chargeable to year 1920-21, and which had not been reported by him or estimated for..	11,971 41
Total carried over into present year..	$ 65,971 41
Expenditure for temporary cells, etc., due to increased population, which amounts to over 500 since the 1st of April, 1921..	37,000 00
Balance required to provide for maintenance and guarding extra population ($30,000 of which is required to pay for extra officers employed but not provided for in main estimates of current year)..	47,028 59
	$150,000 00

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is this expenditure all due to the increase of prison population?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Partly to the increase of prison population and partly to having to provide temporary cells, and the appointment of additional officers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The other items would be due to the increased population also?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When were these officers appointed?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I can get the dates of the appointments if my hon. friend wishes it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would like to get the periods. In this case I see the warrant was passed 22nd February this year. Are the cheques so governed that only payment for services up to 31st March is charged against this warrant, or is the money applicable even beyond that date?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: Only to 31st March.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is it really a fact that Mr. J. D. Adamson has been made King's Bench Judge of Manitoba?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: He has been appointed.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of War Claims, further amount required, $1,000.

Sir LOMER GOUIN: The vote of $6,000 in the main estimates has been exhausted, and a few outstanding accounts still require attention.

Item agreed to.

SECRETARY OF STATE

Department of the Secretary of State—to provide for the salary of a Private Secretary to the Secretary of State, from the 21st September, 1921, to the 21st November, 1921, at $3,500 per annum, and from the 22nd November, 1921, to the 28th December, 1921, at the difference between $2,460 and $3,500 per annum, $697.31.
Contingencies — further amount required, $5,495.

Mr. CRERAR: Might we have some explanation of this item? It seems to vary from the preceding items of this character.

Mr. COPP: The $697 was the difference between the salaries provided for the secretary of the Secretary of State, prior to the 31st day of September, 1921. When the new Secretary of State took office he engaged another secretary, at a higher salary, $3.500, and this amount is the difference between the salary of the former secretary and the salary of the secretary employed by my predecessor during the time that secretary was engaged. One was engaged at $2,400 and the other at $3,500.

Mr. CRERAR: Were there two secretaries?

Mr. DUFF: Who was the Secretary of State?

Mr. COPP: Mr. Monty. When he came into office he engaged a secretary at $3,500 a year. The amount provided for a secretary was $2,400, and the $697.31 is to provide for the difference in the salaries between the $2,400 which the former secretary received and the salary of the new secretary, Mr. Mercure, $3.500.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to get some explanation of the second part of the item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume the minister knows that Mr. Monty would require a secretary who understood and wrote both French and English, and that is the real explanation.

Mr. COPP: The expenditure for 1921-22 was as follows: Clerical assistance, $6,429.94; printing and stationery, $11,800.00; Companies Act, $12,800.00; sundries, $5,220.08; total, $36,250.02. Owing to a misunderstanding as to the number of copies of the report of the Secretary of State required for the use of Parliament, no extra provision was made in the Main Estimates for 1921-22 to cover cost of printing the same. The cost of printing the report is slightly under $2,800. Then there was a special item of a little over $2,000 for counsel fees in the appeal to the Privy Council of the Companies Act, which was not provided for in the Main Estimates, and that makes up the extra amount for contingencies.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What was the date of the appeal?

Mr. COPP: Judgment was given on the 25th February, 1921, and the appeal was heard before that.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under Naturalization Acts, 1914, and 1920—further amount required, $22,715.

Mr. CRERAR: Will the hon. minister explain this item?

Mr. COPP: The Royal Canadian Northwest Mounted Police conducted investigations from May, 1920, to October, 1921, amounting to $24,823.13, and that is provided for in this item.

Mr. CRERAR: What was the nature of the investigation they carried on?

Mr. COPP: Before naturalization certificates were issued to any applicant, they were referred to the Mounted Police for investigation and the investigations were made by that body and reported back to the department, and on their reports the certificates are granted or refused.

Mr. CRERAR: Is that done in all cases where there is application for naturalization certificate?

Mr. COPP: It is only when the department thinks it is necessary. When it is considered unnecessary, the certificates are issued without investigation.

Mr. PARENT: In what part of the country has this taken place in the past?

Mr. COPP: They have carried on in all parts of Canada. When any question arises in the minds of the officials of the department, and it is thought an investigation is necessary in any part of Canada, the investigations are carried on by that organization.

Mr. PARENT: I could not readily understand the answer of the minister, but apparently he has the report from his deputy, stating where this has been done in the past. We would like to know about it.

Mr. COPP: I may say that unfortunately we have not the details of every individual case, because each report in the particular file pertains to a particular man. There are something like fifteen or twenty thousand cases which have been investigated, but they are in individual files, and it is impossible to have them here to give my hon. friend the details of each individual case and where it is located.

Mr. CRERAR: You do not mean to state that this expenditure covers fifteen or twenty thousand individual cases.

Mr. COPP: The average expense in each case is 97 cents.

Mr. CRERAR: Cheap naturalization.

Mr. GOOD: On what ground does the department send the inspectors to make these investigations?

Mr. COPP: We cannot lay down any definite rule as to what they act upon. When the officials of the department consider an investigation should be held before a certificate is granted or refused, an investigation is held and a report obtained from the officials, and it is reported back to the department.

Mr. CAMPBELL: A good deal of the work has been done in the prairie provinces, and I have come in contact with a good deal of it myself. I see no particular fault to find with the system. The Mounted Police are very efficient; they travel out to these people's homes, inspect their houses, find out if their children are going to school, do other necessary work like that, and make a recommendation, based on the facts which they have ascertained, whether they consider these people are desirable citizens or not.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of war claims—Secretary of State —further amount required, $10,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Will the minister kindly explain this item?

Mr. COPP: This appropriation is required for the expenses of the clearing office in connection with alien enemy property. This clearing office was transferred to the Department of the Secretary of State. The amount of $50,000 that was appropriated last year was insufficient to carry on the work. The estimate last year was largely a guess, because it was impossible to get a correct idea of what this work would cost.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the total amount of alien enemy property in the custody in the department?

Mr. COPP: It would be impossible to tell that accurately, because it would depend upon what the property might be valued at and what it might be sold at. We have on hand a great deal of property that has not yet been valued or sold.

Mr. CRERAR: Do I understand that no estimate has so far been made of the value of the whole property?

Mr. COPP: As I say, it would be a mere estimate. I do not know whether an estimate has been made of the value of the whole property or not, but we have an estimate of a considerable portion of the property. I am informed that, originally, the estimate amounted to about $30,000,000; but on a revaluation, as after careful investigation, releases have had to be given of some property claimed, the estimate is now $20,000,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Is any charge made against this property for the administration of it?

Mr. COPP: The cost of administering this property is eventually taken from the property, with the exception that the cost of the clearing office is paid for out of the ordinary revenue of the country.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Were any shares of the Canadian Pacific railway seized, and, if so, to what extent?

Mr. COPP: Shares of Canadian Pacific stock to the number of 140,000 are now vested with the custodian.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What is the intention of the Government in regard to that? Is it a matter of trial, or for determination by some law officer, whether the property is to remain in the hands of the custodian or go back to some one?

Mr. COPP: That matter is under consideration, and it will take some time to settle the question so as to enable me to give my hon. friend a direct answer.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Would it not be better for the committee to have the details, especially as to property connected with a great enterprise like the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. COPP: We are willing to give all the details. My hon. friend has perfect freedom to go through the department and get all the information regarding this matter, or I will gladly bring down in the House any information that he desires. We are only handling the property as custodians for future determination as to who owns it.

Mr. CRERAR: Is this property not held against the reparation claims made under the peace treaty against our late enemies?

Mr. COPP: It may be under the treaty, but it has not been decided yet that it will be.

Mr. CRERAR: With whom lies the decision in the matter?

Mr. COPP: I presume it will be the policy of the governments of different nations which have taken part and which are interested. The question has not yet been decided. The Government, I believe, asked that claims be filed in regard to the matter; but the question as to what will be done as regards claims that have been made has not yet been decided.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): What, roughly, is the amount of claims that have been filed by citizens of Canada against aliens? And will Canadian creditors be protected by this fund?

Mr. COPP: I am informed that claims amounting to about $23,500,000 have been filed by Canadian citizens.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Has any settlement been made with Canadian creditors out of moneys in the custody of the Government?

Mr. COPP: No settlements have been made with regard to reparations.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They may not be reparations. Canadian creditors of aliens have these claims, and the Govern-

ment has this property in its custody. Has any effort been made to protect Canadian creditors by selling or using this alien property for the discharge of these claims?

Mr. COPP: Creditors are paid as soon as settlements are effected between the clearing offices in the two countries. Certainly a number of claims have already been settled and paid, and others will be as soon as settlements are effected between the clearing offices.

Mr. ANDERSON: Have any claims against Russia been dealt with?

Mr. COPP: They have not.

Item agreed to.

Department of Public Archives—contingencies, further amount required, $8,070.67.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the explanation of this item?

Mr. COPP: This is largely for printing required by the Archives branch during the past year.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous — Public Archives — further amount required, $7,600.

Mr. CRERAR: What is that for?

Mr. COPP: This was for the purchase of certain documents in England, authorized about a year ago by the Prime Minister. The sum of $20,000 was authorized for the purpose of purchasing what are known as the Monckton papers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The explanation does not recall anything to my mind.

Mr. COPP: An amount of $20,000 was authorized but was not all used.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was it not included in the vote of a year ago?

Mr. COPP: The authority was given after the close of the session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent?

Mr. COPP: About $3,000.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the nature of the documents?

Mr. COPP: They are very valuable historical documents relating to General Robert Monckton, at one time governor of the province of Nova Scotia. The rest of the money was used for the purchase of other manuscripts and books in England which are now in the archives. Hon. members may refer to them at any time.

Item agreed to.

Paper Control Inquiry—amount required to pay a balance of $200, to each of the three Commissioners, $600.

Mr. FIELDING: This is to pay $200 to each of three judges, whose names I do not know, for services in connection with the Paper Control Inquiry.

Mr. CRERAR: This is an item that has been outstanding for some time past.

Mr. FIELDING: It was authorized by Order in Council of October 26, 1920.

Mr. CRERAR: And the money has not so far been paid?

Mr. FIELDING: I assume it has not yet been paid. At any rate, it should not be paid until parliamentary authority has been given.

Item agreed to.

Grant towards expenses of Imperial Convention of Teachers in Toronto, Summer of 1921, $1,500.

Mr. FIELDING: Dr. James L. Hughes, of Toronto, on behalf of the Teacher's Association, represented to us that the right hon. the late Prime Minister had given him assurance of this aid, and to honour the engagement of the right hon. gentleman we put in this item.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think there is a slight over-statement in the matter. I do recall a conversation with Dr. Hughes in which I stated that up to a certain amount consideration would be given, and that I would lay the matter before my colleagues. I make no objection to the appropriation, but I made no binding engagement of any kind. It is only right, however, that the grant should be given.

Mr. FIELDING: Desirous of having things done in good form, I asked for evidence and my right hon. friend's letter was produced, wherein he gave the assurance—at least I would call it an assurance—that aid to the extent of $1,500 would be given. Accordingly, taking it for granted that the representation was correct, we included this item in the estimates.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The letter I wrote is an exact reflection of what I have stated.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Perhaps I might read the letter:

OTTAWA, ONTARIO, August 30th, 1921.

Dear Doctor HUGHES,

I regret very much that your letter of August 11th got mislaid. As explained in previous letters, it is not usual and, indeed, might be said to be unprecedented, to make grants for pur-

poses of educational conventions. However, the circumstances of yours are somewhat exceptional. We could not make any grant now, but I will submit for the Estimates next session a figure, and, while I cannot undertake that it pass and be submitted to Parliament,—

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

—I feel that I will be able to recommend it conscientiously to my colleagues. I would not like recommending more than $1,500 at the outside.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would ask that that be compared with what I said a few moments ago from memory, and I think there will not be found to be the slightest difference.

Mr. FIELDING: My right hon. friend said just now that he had made no engagement. I would consider a letter of that kind as an engagement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not undertake that anything would be paid; I said that I would submit the matter to my colleagues.

Mr. BUREAU: It might be called a diplomatic engagement.

Mr. FIELDING: I am not complaining at all that my right hon. friend made such an engagement, and we are only too glad to honour it.

Item agreed to.

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE

Department of Customs and Excise—to provide for the salary of one Private Secretary from January 1, to March 31, 1922, at $3,360 per annum, $840.

Mr. CRERAR: Explain.

Mr. BUREAU: The estimate explains itself. I did not suppose my hon. friend would have me think that he could not understand it, and that is why I did not volunteer an explanation.

Item agreed to.

Customs and Excise—Miscellaneous—Printing, stationery and publications for Inland Revenue Service for fiscal year 1920-21, $51,017.26—Gratuity to James Connor, formerly Customs Officer at Snow Flake, Manitoba, $125.

Mr. PARENT: Where was this printing done, and to what company or private individuals was it given?

Mr. BUREAU: I am unable to give the information. These bills were left at the time of the reorganization of the Department of Customs and Excise was carried out. The assignment of the various officers from one department to the other did not take place soon enough. The money was voted last year, but the fiscal year expired before these bills were checked and approved, and consequently we had to ask for a re-vote of the money. I think the printing must have been done at the government printing bureau.

Mr. BROWN: What is the gratuity to James Connor?

Mr. BUREAU: He was notified of his dismissal three days after he was dismissed; that was on the 1st of October, 1918, I understand.

Mr. McMASTER: Why did he not go if he knew he was going?

Mr. BUREAU: He only knew he was going away three days after he was gone.

Mr. BROWN: How long was Connor in the service, and what were the circumstances of his dismissal?

Mr. BUREAU: He was at Snow Flake, and his services were dispensed with on 1st October, 1918, but he did not receive notice until three days later, and he therefore made a claim for compensation. This matter was brought to the attention of the House by Mr. Richardson in 1920, as will be found at page 2590 of Hansard for that year, and it was decided that his dismissal should be investigated. The investigation was conducted by Mr. Stevenson, chief inspector of the Crown Timber Office, Department of the Interior, who recommended that in view of Mr. Connor's long and faithful service he be given a gratuity of two months' wages, amounting to $125. This recommendation was approved by the Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue at the time.

Mr. BROWN: Is there nothing in the correspondence to indicate the cause of his dismissal?

Mr. BUREAU: There may be, but I have not the correspondence here. If the hon. gentleman wants to see the correspondence he can put a question on the Order Paper and I will see that it is brought down.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We have different reasons advanced from time to time why items are included in these supplementary estimates. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, has given us a particular reason in this case. He points out that there were delays in the reorganization of the department, that there was a proper vote from which these payments could be

made, but that they were not made because the accounts had not been checked and approved before the end of the last fiscal year. I understand that the purpose of these estimates is not to make good departmental faults, neglects or delays, but to provide for payments which have not been provided for in the main estimates of the year and have since become necessary. It seems to be quite obvious that this is not a vote of that character, and ought not to be included in these supplementary estimates. The Minister of Finance will appreciate that point.

Mr. BUREAU: I think that expenditure incurred last year, and not paid, ought not to be in the main estimates this year, but in the supplementary. In this case, instead of being short of funds, this item is due to the fact, as explained by the officers of the department, that the reorganization was not carried through in sufficient time for these accounts to be checked up and approved before the expiration of the fiscal year, 1920-21. Therefore it was necessary to have this amount voted before payment could be made. I think that is a proper item to come under the supplementary estimates.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is pretty hard to say where the main estimates end and the supplementary estimates begin, and I suppose it is quite fair to give due appreciation to the position of my hon. friends. They seem to be cleaning up everything that has gone behind; they are making quite sure that everything that can be charged up will be charged up here.

Mr. FIELDING: Would not that be quite correct?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It may be quite right generally, but on some particular items it is not. I should like to know really what principle we are going on. As I say, I thought the general main principle of these Supplementary Estimates for the year that has passed was to provide for items unprovided for by Parliament in the main estimates. In this particular case we know that Parliament actually provided for payment of the items involved. If my hon. friends want to take this course, I wonder if they are going to say that the time when the work is done shall determine what is to be charged. I notice they do not bind themselves in any way; for instance, in connection with the grant for the Genoa conference, which, if I recall rightly, only started after the 31st March, they charge the whole amount up to last year's estimates. Surely there must be some rule other than the mere whim of the Government as to what is to be charged to last year and what is not.

Mr. BUREAU: Does my hon. friend take exception to this particular item?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Yes.

Mr. BUREAU: In what way would he pay it?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Through this year's main estimates.

Mr. BUREAU: For expenditure incurred and bills rendered last year?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You allowed the vote to go.

Mr. BUREAU: Then, what is the use of supplementary estimates?

Mr. CRERAR: I don't agree with my hon. friend the late Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton) in the position he is taking on this vote. I think that expenditures incurred in the past year should be distinctly set out by themselves, and not included in the main estimates for the current year. It would be a rather dangerous practice to follow the course he suggests.

Mr. FIELDING: It is certainly very desirable that the expenditures of the year should be covered by the estimates for that year; but still if there is an unpaid account, what are you to do with it? The only thing to do is to bring it forward in the next estimates you are presenting. If the account is not paid it is better to provide for its payment than to let it wait another year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Suppose we apply that rule to the item of $25,000 for the Genoa conference, it would drop.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not know what money has been drawn in connection with that item. The gentlemen may have taken the money with them, they may have needed it. I would have to inquire as to what amount was drawn. If you want to be strictly accurate you could cut it in two pieces and say that part shall come in one year and part in another year, but it is better not to take two bites at a cherry.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all, if you can load the "cherry" in one direction, as it has been loaded. My point is perfectly clear. The minister is correct

when he says: This must be charged in this particular account, notwithstanding the fact that a proper appropriation was made by Parliament for that purpose which my officials have overlooked, simply because the work was done that year. I am pointing out that in the same estimates you have an item—there may be others—which rests entirely on work to be done in the next fiscal year. Both principles cannot be right.

Mr. FIELDING: I think part of that appropriation would be used during the current year. I am not sure but what it might have been wise to divide in into two sums, but at the time the Governor General's warrant was granted it was made in one sum. Whether we should divide it in two and apply part to this year and part to next year would be a fair matter for consideration. After all, these are not accounts that we are presenting; they are appropriations, and in this case it is an appropriation to cover the whole service.

Mr. LEWIS: The minister has said that owing to the long and faithful service of this man and his summary dismissal, it was decided to give him the sum of $125. In 1905, when I was in Snow Flake, that gentleman was in that same position, and I understood then that he had been fulfilling those duties for quite a number of years. It is evident, therefore, that when he was dismissed he had occupied the position for nearly twenty years. I do not know whether or not he would have been entitled to pension if he had completed twenty years of service, but it does seem to me that $125, amounting to practically two months' salary, is not sufficient to give to a man under circumstances such as these. I do not know why he was dismissed—whether it was to make room for a political appointment or not. But when a man has given faithful service for so long a time, and when after investigation it has been decided that he should be given a gratuity, $125 does not seem to be an adequate amount to give him upon his summary dismissal.

Item agreed to.

MARINE AND FISHERIES

Department of Marine and Fisheries—to provide for one private secretary from January 1st, to March 31st, 1922, at $3,360 per annum..	$ 840
To provide for one secretary to executive at $1,860 per annum..	310
Contingencies — further amount required..	5,000
	$6,150

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the "Executive" to which the second secretary named here is appointed?

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): "Secretary to Executive" is the title adopted by the Civil Service Commission in the classification. The duties are those of assistant secretary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What are the contingencies?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The appropriation of 1920-21 was overdrawn by about $3,000, and it will require $2,000 more to cover the balance of expenditure for 1921-22. The department explains that the sum of $6,500, which was over-expended in 1920-21, was carried over to the fiscal year 1921-22, thus reducing the actual appropriation for 1921-22. This amount was spent last year.

Item agreed to.

Ocean and river service—to provide for the temporary relief of distressed seamen and to cover expenses of shipping forms, further amount required, $11,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Large numbers of destitute Canadian seamen in the United Kingdom have been repatriated to Canada by the British Board of Trade. The expenses thus incurred have been unusually large. There will be no necessity for further large expenditures of this kind, the abnormal conditions of shipping since the war, which have been responsible for there being so many destitute Canadian seamen in the United Kingdom, having now passed.

Mr. CRERAR: There was no item in the main estimates last year to cover this?

Mr. LAPOINTE: No, I understand this item covers the expenses incurred by the British Board of Trade over a period of three or four years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was an obligation entered into to pay this amount, and if so, when?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It has always been done, as my right hon. friend will understand. There is an agreement—at least, it is a custom—that the British Board of Trade takes charge of distressed Canadian seamen and the Canadian Government pays for the services thus rendered.

Mr. DUFF: Is it not a fact that the owners of the ships repay the department for the moneys expended on this account?

Mr. LAPOINTE: They do, when it is possible to claim the amounts from them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The money, then, will come back?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Perhaps in this case, the conditions being due to the war, it may be more difficult than usual to claim the repayment of the money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But if it does come back it will come under the hon. gentleman's receipts, though when it goes out it is charged against the late government's disbursements.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I shall be glad to give my right hon. friend credit for it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister will not have the power, no matter how glad he will be, in his way of being glad.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, but it is a good thing to be glad in life.

Item agreed to.

Lighthouse and coast service—to provide for breaking ice in Thunder bay, Lake Superior and other points deemed advisable for the good of navigation, further amount required, $16,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE: This further amount is required to meet the claim made by the Canadian Towing and Wrecking Company, Limited, of Port Arthur, Ontario, for services of the ice-breaker James Whalen during the spring of 1918. This company was instructed by the department to proceed with ice-breaking work in the spring of 1918 on a basis of cost. A claim for $50,000 was made and the department paid $18,750. The
5 p.m. company refused to accept this amount in full of account. It was claimed that no provision was made for cost repairs to the ice-breaker due to extremely heavy ice, and that the company suffered considerable financial loss, as owing to her being retained on this work a very favourable offer for the boat had to be refused. After discussion, the company offered to accept $16,000 in full of their claim for the balance of $31,250, without prejudice, and the Department of Marine is of the opinion that payment should be made on this basis, in view of the facts. I may add that this arrangement was made September or October last. I have no doubt that the settlement is good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When was the settlement made for the payment of $16,000 in full?

Mr. LAPOINTE: In September or October last.

Mr. CRERAR: How long had the claim been outstanding?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Since 1918. Part of the claim had been paid, but there was a further claim for $31,250. The company agreed to accept $16,000 in full, and the department agreed to pay that amount.

Mr. McCONICA: Would the minister tell us if this is to be in full settlement of all claims? I understood him to say it was accepted without prejudice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Offered without prejudice.

Mr. McCONICA: Oh, offered without prejudice? Is it to be accepted in full settlement?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes. In full of their claim.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of War Claims. Marine and Fisheries (Governor General's Warrants November 9, 1921, and March 8, 1921), $70,837.90.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the explanation of this?

Mr. LAPOINTE: This amount was expended for legal costs, expert accountants, etc., in connection with the claim of the Dominion Iron and Steel Company for damages resulting from the cancellation of the contract between the department and the company by which the latter agreed to furnish 50,000 to 75,000 tons of steel plates per annum for a period of five years. The company started furnishing in March, 1920, and the contract was cancelled by Order in Council on 18th February, 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Were the legal accounts taxed by the officers of the Justice Department, and if so are these details in accordance with the amounts so taxed?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, I surmise they were taxed. All the Department of Marine and Fisheries had to do was to pay the amount as sent to it by the Department of Justice.

Mr. DUFF: Could the minister tell us what the amount of damages paid to the Iron and Steel Company was?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The case, I understand, is still pending. An amount of $3,000,000 has been paid to the Dominion Iron and Steel Company in virtue of an agreement. The agreement would be final if the Government were paying a further amount of, I think, $1,600,000. This amount has not been paid and the case is pending.

Mr. DUFF: When was the $3,000,000 paid, does the minister know?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I cannot say the exact date. I think it was some time in December last.

Mr. CRERAR: Was the $3,000,000 paid by way of damages?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Yes, by way of damages.

Mr. CRERAR: What value did the Government get for it?

Mr. DUFF: None.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Well, it is a long story. The case, as I say, is still pending. Of course, if an amount of less than $3,000,000 was granted by the court the Government would have a claim against the company for reimbursement for part of that sum.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister might add that the amount was paid on the strong recommendation of the Justice Department, of the officers of the department who were engaged in the litigation.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I agree that the attorney for the Department of Justice in the case, I think, Mr. Meredith of Montreal, recommended the settlement.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I think so.

Mr. DUFF: Was this $3,000,000 paid under the present administration or under the previous government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The previous government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the balance will be paid by the present administration.

Mr. FIELDING: If the court says so.

Mr. McCONICA: Would the minister tell us what the status of the Government will be if this amount is paid? Does this wind the business up?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Oh, no.

Mr. McCONICA: What is the idea of making two bites of a cherry?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It is not a cherry but a peach.

Mr. McMASTER: It is a bitter pill.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I understand the solicitors for the Department of Justice had to employ engineers and expert accountants both Canadian and American. They have to be paid as soon as their work is completed.

Mr. LANCTOT: Who were the lawyers that defended the case for the Government?

Mr. LAPOINTE: Mr. F. E. Meredith, K.C. of Montreal.

Mr. LANCTOT: The Department of Justice has ten or twelve lawyers on its staff, why should it employ outside lawyers to plead for the government? I would like to see an end to that practice. We are paying enough money to lawyers in the department without having recourse to outside help?

Mr. LAPOINTE: I am not supposed to speak for the Department of Justice, but my hon. friend will understand that the lawyers who are employed there attend to the internal work of the department—they do not usually plead before the courts on behalf of the department.

Mr. DUFF: I would ask the minister if this matter is still unsettled, and whether this $3,000,000 was paid to the company before the litigation was decided?

Mr. LAPOINTE: It is still unsettled.

Mr. DUFF: And this $3,000,000 was paid before the litigation was decided?

Mr. LAPOINTE: As I explained to my hon. friend, an agreement was entered into between the government and the company by which the company accepted, I think, $4,600,000 as a settlement. The government had to give its final answer accepting that agreement one month after the first $3,000,000 was paid—they were paid on account at the price set out in the agreement. If after one month the balance was not paid the agreement was cancelled altogether, and that is what has happened. The case is still before the courts.

Mr. DUFF: It seems to me a rather strange procedure for the late government to pay $3,000,000 to any company in Canada for damages while the suit was still in course of settlement?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Lanctôt) as to the engagement of outside counsel I quite agree with the minister that it is necessary to go outside very often for counsel; but I would recommend to the hon. member that he continue his pressure regularly, insistently,

and increasingly because it will probably be needed.

Mr. LANCTOT: I will.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the remarks of the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), if he will refer back some years—many years in fact, particularly between 1896 and 1911—he will find many cases of settlement in that period. This, however, was not a case of settlement. The company offered to settle at a certain amount which counsel for the government and the officers of the Justice Department recommended. I think the amount was what the minister says, $4,600,000, and their claim was in the neighbourhood of $10,000,000,—I cannot recall the exact amount. There was no question in the judgment of ourselves, or in the judgment of anyone engaged in the case, that the company had suffered very considerably but it was essential, it could not be helped. They were out of the money and as a consequence there was a very considerable lack of proceeding in their work, and although we were recommended, and strongly recommended, by our own officers to settle for $4,600,000 we took this step: We paid the $3,000,000 to enable them to go on with their work without which they would not have been able to go on, and we left it to the incoming government to decide whether they would accept the settlement by paying the balance, or whether they would go on with the litigation. As to which course they should pursue I have nothing to say. They have decided to go on with the litigation and the court will decide whether there is any balance and, if so, what it is. I submit the proceeding was right, particularly in the interest of the territory affected and in the interest of all concerned.

Mr. DUFF: The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) desires me to run backwards to 1896. This is the year of our Lord, 1922. I do not intend to run forward and backward. We should settle this matter on its merits this year. If the Dominion Iron and Steel Company had a claim against this Government, no money should have been paid until that claim was settled by litigation, or compromise, or some other way. If the Government owed the Dominion Iron and Steel Company this money, they should have had the courage of their convictions, and should have paid, not $3,000,000, but $4,600,000. That would have been the business way. But, as in everything else they did, they compromised the matter, and paid the Dominion Iron and Steel on November 25, 1921, just three weeks before the election, the sum of $3,000,000; and then, knowing that they were not going to be elected, left the balance to be settled by the new government.

Mr. LANCTOT: I want to come back to the lawyers. The Department of Justice has about ten lawyers at least, and my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), told the House that sometimes we have to go outside for lawyers. I am a farmer as hon. members know, and if I have ten employees, and have some work to do outside my farm, I take a few of my employees outside to do the work. I understand in this case the hearing was in Ottawa and the court sat in Ottawa. Why could they not take a couple of lawyers from the Department of Justice to defend the action? Why go outside and pay $70,000 for counsel? Someone refers to the fact that it was just before the election, and that the $3,000,000 was paid during the election campaign. Why not wait until after the election? That is the part of it that I do not understand. When my hon. friend advises me to watch this Government, my answer is that I will do so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must say, for the poor, much assailed lawyer, that this item is not for legal fees, except to a small extent. I would presume, from what I have read in regard to the Grand Trunk Arbitration case, that a great part of this item would be engineers' fees, disbursements for engineers, actuaries and so on, and I would recommend to the hon. member that, if it is money he is seeking in life, he should take one of those professions.

Mr. LANCTOT: I am not seeking for money at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If he intends to get into the government employ—

Mr. LANCTOT: I do not care for money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is the late government who are responsible for whatever selections were made of counsel in that action. I only address this remark to the hon. gentleman: this was an action for a tremendous sum of money. The government encounters such actions and will do so, because government is a big enterprise. If the government is to keep in the Justice Department sufficient counsel of capacity to do justice to actions of this sort, they will pay salaries to which the hon. member for Laprairie and Napier-

ville (Mr. Lanctot) will raise considerable objection under the civil government estimates.

Mr. LANCTOT: I think they have too many now.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not a case of too many. It is a case of the calibre, the capacity of men that will be required for this character of action. I do not reflect for one moment on the officers of the Justice Department; so far as I have come in contact with them, I say that they are hard working and competent. There are, doubtless, one or two capable of taking charge of almost any action; certainly the deputy minister is; but no deputy minister living, and, to my mind, no two or three of them, could ever take care of the amount of large and important litigation that inevitably falls on the Justice Department.

Mr. LANCTOT: I do not complain of the capacity of the deputy minister, but if there are too many who are incapable, why not employ a good one who is capable of defending all cases?

Mr. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend is against lawyers on general principles.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): On what does the Dominion Iron and Steel Company base its claim?

Mr. LAPOINTE: The Dominion Iron and Steel Company had a contract with the government. The government agreed to buy a quantity of steel, about 50,000 tons a year, during five years, and, in consideration of that undertaking by the government, the company built a special manufacturing plant, at a cost of $5,000,000. Of course, the government bought steel during the first year of the agreement, but the war came to an end, and it was considered by the late government that no further quantity was required, and they cancelled the contract. On the other hand, the company had incurred a big expenditure in the building of that manufacturing plant, and they filed a claim for damages of that amount.

Item agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Department of Interior—contingencies—further amount required, $32,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is this?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The sum of $45,000 was provided in the Estimates for the fiscal year 1921-22 for the payment of printing and stationery accounts, but the amount required is estimated to be $77,000 for that service, leaving an amount of $32,000 to be voted. The estimate is madeup as follows:

Accounts for April and May 1921..	$11,022 66
" " June 1921..	8,646 04
" " July 1921..	7,216 35
" " August 1921..	6,312 39
" " September 1921	8,759 89
" " October 1921..	7,118 81
" " November 1921	3,632 30
" " December 1921	4,886 15
" " January 1922	5,488 53
Estimated amount required for February and March, 1922..	13,916 88
Total..	$77,000 00
Less—amount already voted in estimates..	45,000 00
Amount to be voted..	$32,000 00

Mr. CRERAR: This seems to be a very large expenditure for stationery and printing in one department of the government. I am not objecting to the vote, but merely drawing attention to the fact. It seems to me that an expenditure of $77,000 in 12 months for printing and stationery is one that can be properly looked into, with a view to bringing about reduction in another year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The money is needed to pay for books of various descriptions, such as index books for the registration branch, land patent record books, etc., for file backs, special paper for patents, printed forms, the purchase of typewriters and stationery required for the general use of the inside service at Ottawa. There are over 250 typewriters constantly in use in the inside service, and the cost of repairs and supplies connected with the same amounts to a very large figure each year. It may be added that it is a most difficult problem to estimate fifteen months ahead, with any degree of accuracy, what the requirements for this item will be for an organization such as the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I agree wholly with the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). I am not making any criticism of the Government or the Prime Minister in advancing this request. I really do not think there is just excuse at all for the department putting in an estimate for a specific item like that $45,000, and then actually spending $77,000. No doubt the proportion spent under the late government is just as great as the proportion spent under this Government, but it seems to me

the minister should bring to the attention of his office the fact that an estimate is an estimate, and that they have no right to go beyond it, without the written authority of the minister of the department.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I agree with my hon. friend. The item all relates to the last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, I did not try to make a point against the Government. The Prime Minister's Government was in office three months of the last year. I stated that there was just as large a proportion before as after; it applies equally to both governments. I think it is the officer of the department who is at fault.

Item agreed to.

Government of the Yukon Territory—to pay salaries and expenses connected with the administration of the territory, further amount required (Governor General's warrant, December 1, 1921), $25,000.

Mr. LANCTOT: Will the Prime Minister kindly explain this item?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The amount voted for this service was $35,000, being only one-half of the amount appropriated for 1920-21. This reduction was decided upon in anticipation of certain retrenchments which are being carried out. A number of changes in the personnel has already been dealt with, but as the officials who are being retired will have to be paid the amount of their accumulated leave which will mean the carrying of their names on the pay-list up to very near the end of the fiscal year, the situation will not be very materially affected. As there was no money left to pay salaries, etc., an Order in Council was passed on the 1st December, P.C. No. 4462, recommending that authority be granted for the issue of a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. LANCTOT: I understand there is a reduction for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The reorganization or rearrangement made effects economies that will result in the year 1922-23. I would have expected a word of gratitude from the Prime Minister that we took in hand that work and arranged for economies of which he will derive the benefit.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): How much economy does the right hon. gentleman expect to result from the rearrangement he made?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The economy he expected was $25,000 in this respect alone; but there were many others in the Interior Department than that in this special item.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I recall, about four years ago, when I was last in the House of Commons, endeavouring to arrive at some statement as to how much of the money of the rest of the people of Canada was being spent in this far-away corner of Canada. I think the population consists of eight or nine thousand people.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Four thousand.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The amount spent at that time was away over $1,000,000 for all purposes. When one reflects that, in any part of this country, $1,000,000 of the money of the Canadian people is being spent to maintain law and order amongst a population of 4,000, it seems to me the time for drastic economy should arise. There is no sense in keeping up a panoply of government, a commissioner, courts and all these officials in a district to look after 4,000 people. Such a state of affairs seem absurd and ridiculous. It may be said that we ought to provide for future conditions in that territory; but when the time arrives, if we have a large population, we can then expend the money. But when you have a subsidy of $250 apiece for the 4,000 people in the country, it seems to me the matter might well be inquired into.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Lands and Parks,—

Canadian National parks, further amount required (Governor General's warrants, August 13, 1921, October 17, 1921 and November 12, 1921), $166,500.

To pay the corporation of the city of Ottawa for local improvements on streets fronting on ordnance lands, $2,629.24.

To pay the Clarke Trading Company for transportation of supplies to the inhabitants of the North Shore, Quebec province, $1,500.

Mr. DUFF: What is this large amount? In the general estimates we have a very large amount for Dominion parks, and this is a very large amount in the Supplementary Estimates. I notice that this amount was spent last year by Governor General's warrant. What is the reason?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: An amount of $115,000 was provided in the Estimates for the fiscal years 1921-22 in connection with work on the Banff-Windermere highway in Kootenay park, British Columbia. About the middle of August this amount was ex-

hausted and as the minister considered it desirable to carry on operations until late in the fall rather than close down the work and force approximately 140 men out of employment, an Order in Council was passed on the 13th August, 1921, P.C. 2917, recommending that a Governor General's warrant should issue for the sum of $50,000. With this extra amount, an additional twelve miles of road was constructed and nine miles of clearing of the right of way was completed.

By an agreement with the British Columbia government executed in 1919, the Dominion government agreed to complete this road by January, 1924, and to ensure the fufilment of this agreement, it was considered advisable in the month of October to continue operations as long as winter conditions would permit, and an Order in Council was passed on the 17th October, 1921, P.C. 3892, recommending that a Governor General's warrant should issue for a further sum of $16,500. With the additional work done, there is every possibility that the roads will be completed in 1922, and that Canada will begin to derive benefits from the increased tourist revenue in the season of 1922-23, as this is the only uncompleted section of what is probably the most spectacular automobile route in the world, namely: an international circuit highway connecting the Pacific coast, the Grand Canyon of Colorado, Yellowstone and Glacier parks of the United States and all the various cities of the southwestern states with Banff and the Canadian National parks. It is estimated that the first year that this highway is open will increase Canada's tourist revenue by some three million dollars.

In view of the unemployment which existed in the West during the late fall and the possibility of its continuing throughout the winter months, the question of providing employment on necessary construction works in the different parks was carefully considered, and as the working organizations in the various parks, and as the field engineering forces were such that the different works could be economically carried on, an Order in Council was passed on the 12th November, 1921, P.C. No. 4319, recommending that a Governor General's warrant should issue for the sum of $100,000. This provided work for approximately 215 men for a period of four months during a time when such employment was necessary to relieve possible distress.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. LANCTOT: To keep the men busy during the last campaign.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The suspicious member will note that the decision was arrived at long before there was any decision for a campaign. He is a little off the mark. This is something for which we take full responsibility, and the explanation given by the Prime Minister is precisely the explanation that actuated the late government in its decision. We intended to perform a certain amount of work last year and we provided the money for the purpose. Owing to two considerations, the primary one being the need of providing employment in that district and particularly from Calgary where the need was very great—and I am sure, had the hon. member (Mr. Lanctôt) seen the petitions that we received and learned the facts that we learned, he would have done everything he could to have relieved the conditions—we decided to go on further. It was a work that had to be done and one that would provide a revenue as soon as, or sooner than, any other work that we could have performed. It was work in which practically all of the money was going to the labouring man; it was work on this highway that had been going on during the summer. As the Prime Minister says, the anticipated revenue to the people of Canada from that road when completed is expected in the first year to be $3,000,000. It surely was the part of wisdom to utilize the occasion and give the work when it was most needed, in view of the fact that the revenue would come so soon. I hope, in the course we took, we shall have the support of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) because, if there is anything he should be interested in, it is this. This is a case where unemployment was relieved, and not where it was promised and left unrelieved.

Mr. DUFF: I notice by the main estimates that in 1921-22 the sum of $800,000 was voted for Canadian National parks. For the same purpose we are asked to vote, if I remember the Prime Minister's statement rightly, $150,000 for extra moneys spent by the late government. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) gives, as the reason for an expenditure of almost a million dollars, the fact that it gave employment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. My hon. friend has mistaken the figures. I forget what the Prime Minister gave as the amount of the appropriation, but the hon. member is astray.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: $115,000.

Mr. DUFF: Yes; that makes $915,000 altogether, practically a million dollars.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Where does my hon. friend get the balance of the million dollars? There is $115,000 and $166,000 odd. The hon. gentleman's arithmetic is a little weak this afternoon.

Mr. DUFF: No, it is not; in fact, it is not nearly so weak as my right hon. friend's has been during the last few years. His arithmetic has been very weak, otherwise the country would not be in its present financial position. The right hon. gentleman is more to blame for the present financial position of the country than any other man.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the Government says that the country's financial condition is good.

Mr. DUFF: Well, the Government are wrong when they say that.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is prophetic.

Mr. DUFF: If the leader of the Opposition will turn to page 57 of the Main Estimates he will see that in 1921-22 $800,000 was voted. We shall see whose arithmetic is wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Part of that $800,000 was for salaries and part for administration, and the $115,000 I have already mentioned was for the roads themselves.

Mr. DUFF: Does the Prime Minister mean to say that there was some $685,000 spent for salaries and administration?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount spent on this road for everything is $115,000. The hon. member is referring to the Banff-Windermere road, and the amount in last year's estimates for this work was as the Prime Minister has stated. This is an extra amount spent; the balance has nothing to do with that road at all.

Mr. DUFF: I am referring to the amount spent on Canadian National parks, and I presume that this $115,000 is part of the total of $915,000 spent on that work last year. While, of course, it is a very good thing to try to make good roads all over the country and in this way incidentally relieve unemployment, of which we had so much last year, I do not see any more reason why we should spend this money on the Canadian National parks than anywhere else. The leader of the Opposition says that in three or four years' time we shall have a revenue of a few million dollars from the roads in this particular part of the country. Well, the same thing might be said in regard to the roads in any other part of Canada. If the Government spent a million dollars in Nova Scotia we should have thousands of tourists there who would spend a large amount of money. The same thing might be said of New Brunswick or of Quebec, particularly the latter province, into which there would be a large influx of tourists. But that, I contend, is no good reason why $915,000 should be spent in one particular part of the country; nor is it a good reason, even, that the expenditure of this money would relieve unemployment. Other provinces in the Dominion have had a good deal of unemployment, but they did not come to the Government with a request that money should be spent on the roads to relieve that unemployment. The provincial governments took charge of that problem, and to a certain extent the citizens themselves have endeavoured to find a way out of the difficulty. Those who could not find employment in their own particular vocations sought work in other lines. I see no good reason why, on the eve of an election, this large amount of money should have been voted by the late government and spent in this way. The late government, in my opinion, deserves in this respect the censure not only of this House but of the country at large.

Mr. SHAW: I entirely disagree with the remarks of the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I think the late government are to be complimented on having pushed this work on during the last fall and winter, having practically completed it with the exception of a few miles. And I desire to compliment the present Government, as well, upon their foresight in realizing the necessity of completing this particular work at the earliest possible date, because I have every confidence that what the Prime Minister says is absolutely correct, that the finishing of this road, completing as it does, what is known as the Grand Circle Tour, will mean millions of money to this country and will repay very amply indeed the investment which this Government makes. Now, it is quite true that you might expend money in Nova

Scotia with the result of bringing a number of tourists to that part of our country. But I think there are few who will question the fact that the expenditure of this sum of money—spent, mind you, by virtue of an agreement with the province of British Columbia—is certainly a far better investment, from the tourist point of view, than any expenditure of a similar amount that might be made in Nova Scotia. I compliment the past government on their energy in carrying on this work; and the present Government, in providing for it this year, is doing a great service indeed, not only in meeting the difficult unemployment conditions that exist in that part of Canada, but also in completing the work in order that returns may be secured from the investment at the earliest possible date.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): While the estimates in connection with the Parks branch of the Interior Department were under consideration I did not happen to be in my seat, and if I am in order at the present time I should like, with the permission of the committee, to revert to the former item in order to discuss a question with reference to migratory birds. This question comes under the Parks branch, I believe, and with the consent of the committee I would like to refer to certain resolutions that have been forwarded to me, and no doubt to other hon. gentlemen from the maritime provinces who are interested in this matter.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the hon. member would be quite in order in dealing with the matter under this item. The question of migratory birds comes under National parks.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): When the Migratory Birds Act was put into operation it seems to have worked beneficially to all the provinces except Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. In the two latter provinces it has created a great deal of dissatisfaction. The close season starts, I think, on the first of March, and that is about the time the birds migrate northward. This is the only time of the year that the people in the province of Prince Edward Island have an opportunity to get any birds in their migration north. Fishermen and sportsmen are allowed to shoot the birds only on their return in the fall, and it is practically impossible for them to get any birds at that time of the year. The matter has been taken up by the legislatures of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and resolutions passed by these two bodies have been forwarded to me. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee reading them, but the resolution from Prince Edward Island, after setting forth the various reasons for the opinion it expresses, concludes as follows:

> Be it therefore resolved that in the opinion of this assembly the shooting of geese and brant in this province is only practicable in the spring and then only for a very short period and that the prohibition in this province of the spring shooting of these birds is not only wholly unnecessary for their protection but on the other hand operates as a discrimination against this province in that it amounts to practically a total prohibition of the shooting of these birds at any time, and this assembly is strongly of the opinion that this province should be excepted from the operations of the said act in so far as the season of shooting of geese and brant is concerned but that the present provincial game laws or similar regulations regarding the shooting of migratory birds should be adequately enforced and that this would afford ample protection to the birds and would sufficiently conform to the spirit of the said federal act and the treaty upon which it is based.
>
> And that the act 7-8 George V, chapter 18, should be so amended as to permit the spring shooting of brant and geese in this province.

A similar resolution was passed by the government of Nova Scotia at the instance of Mr. Kinley, member for Lunenburg. It is as follows:

> Whereas the federal Government, by virtue of the Migratory Bird Treaty, has acquired and assumed jurisdiction over migratory birds in the province of Nova Scotia.
>
> Therefore resolved that the provisions of the Fish and Game Act relating to the protection of such birds should be repealed.
>
> A committee of the House be appointed to review the regulation made by the Dominion Government under said treaty, for the purpose of recommending such changes as the conditions in Nova Scotia may require.

Possibly it is beyond the power of this House to deal with the matter, as an international treaty is involved, but I wish to point out that this treaty works an injustice to the people of that province. A few days ago some five or six men who happened to be out with their fire arms were arrested, although they had not shot a bird, and were taken before a magistrate twenty-five miles away, who fined them $25 each. This was rather harsh treatment. We are not in favour of slaughtering these birds for market purposes; but fishermen and sportsmen claim that they should have the privilege of shooting a few in the only season of the year that they can get near them during their migratory flight to the north. Only a few days ago I noticed an item in the newspapers describing the destruction of fishermen's nets by brant,

gulls and other birds. In order to get at the fish in the nets these birds tear the nets to such an extent that they become almost useless, yet the fishermen are not allowed to fire a shot to scare the birds away. These men are only asking that they be allowed to take a few birds in their flight north, which is the only time that they have any chance of bagging them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: We complain of the Americans shooting migratory birds in the spring just before they come north to breed. How can we justify the shooting of these same birds after they have left the South?

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): Do they not shoot those birds up to the first of March?

Mr. CHAPLIN: No, they do not; the spring shooting is done away with under the new agreement.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): When was that amendment made?

Mr. CHAPLIN: Last year. If you will look up our own game laws, you will find that to be the case.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): The complaint our people had was that the Americans could shoot those birds from March first, whereas on the 2nd of March in our country we were not allowed to take a single bird.

Mr. CHAPLIN: That was true up to last year.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): That was where it was so unfair.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It was unfair.

Mr. HANSON: Is there not a season in the fall when our people can shoot these migratory birds? I have heard no complaint in my part of the country against the close season in the spring of the year. It does seem to me that my hon. friend is complaining because two of his friends have been "pinched".

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince): No, they did not happen to be my friends. They were from another county. There is no complaint from my friends; they obey the law. In the fall of the year they claim it is impossible to shoot any of those birds on their return south because they stay far out to sea, very few of them frequenting the estuaries of our rivers. Their feeding place is out at sea where they are beyond the reach of our sportsmen.

Mr. LEGER: I desire to support my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. MacLean). I have heard many complaints in my own county against this law. As far back as a hundred years ago I understand there was no closed season for migratory birds, and to-day they are just as numerous as they were at that time, so I do not think there is any fear of their extermination by allowing our people to shoot a few in the spring season.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) said that perhaps the reason why the member for Prince (Mr. MacLean) brought this subject to the attention of the committee was that some of his friends had been fined for violating the provisions of the Migratory Birds Act. I am glad to know that this Government deals differently with offenders against the law to what the late government did. I had a case in my county last fall where two young men, contrary to the provisions of the act, shot some of those birds. They were haled before a magistrate, the Department of Justice retained a solicitor to prosecute them, and were found guilty and each fined $30 and costs. Some good friend of the late government telegraphed to Ottawa, with the result that the present leader of the Opposition passed one of his famous Orders in Council, remitting to these young men the fines which the magistrate had imposed. This happened three or four days before the general election last December. That is the way the late government carried out the provisions of the Migratory Birds Act.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to add a word or two to the observations made by the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. The people of Nova Scotia object that while they are prohibited from shooting these birds in the spring, when they return from the northern latitudes in the fall, nice and plump and fat, the American sportsmen get at them. It is quite impossible for our sportsmen to shoot these birds after the spring, as they remain for a short time only along the coast of the maritime provinces, and then proceed to the north and stay there until fall. On their return, as the hon. member for Prince has said, they do not land in the estuaries of our rivers, but feed out at sea and then proceed south. That is the time that the American sportsmen, having no close season, can shoot them as they return plump and palatable after feeding upon the fertile pastures of the northern latitudes. This Migratory Birds'

Treaty is an entirely one-sided, jug-handled agreement. It is unfair to the people of the maritime provinces. I am not speaking for the so-called "sportsmen." I have no sympathy with men who go out and shoot these birds purely for "sport"; but I have sympathy for the men living along the coast of the maritime provinces who shoot these birds only because they regard them as a prime necessity. While under the terms of the present Migratory Birds Act they are deprived of that privilege at the only season of the year when it can be of any use to them, sportsmen across the boundary have the full benefit and advantage of shooting these birds without any limitation whatever.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): I hope that the remarks which have been addressed to the committee by some hon. members against the provisions of the Migratory Birds Treaty Act and the convention between Canada and the United States in that regard will not have the effect of lessening in any way the restrictions applied under that act and agreement. You may find in isolated districts complaints coming from, I may say, selfish people who want to continue to kill these migratory birds in the spring of the year when they should be protected from sportsmen and people who pretend they depend on their flesh for food. Who ever heard of people living in Canada who depended on the flesh of wild geese in the spring for their food? These birds that have been spoken of—the brant and the duck—are scarcely fit to eat; they are thin and emaciated. My hon. friend spoke of the brant breaking up the fishermen's nets in an effort to get fish; apparently he does not know that the brant is not a fish-eating bird—not a diver, even. When the provisions of the convention between the United States and Canada were first put into force in Canada, there was an inclination—and I may say that I was somewhat affected that way myself—to complain against these restrictions which prevented the very fine spring shooting we used to get. In the case of the Yukon Territory these restrictions involve more hardship, perhaps, than in any other part of Canada; the fall comes so early there that the main flight of the birds is gone even before the open season commences, and in the spring there is as good shooting as can be had any where in the world. The birds come there in millions, on their way to the breeding grounds a short distance further north; you could shoot any amount of them. I am bound to admit that since the Migratory Birds Convention Act was put into force the fall shooting has been very much improved, and I think that applies all over Canada. If these provisions are observed by the people of the United States and Canada, the number of birds which can be hunted in the fall in both countries will very soon be materially increased.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. member for Yukon expresses surprise that there are any people in Canada who would really use these birds for food. I say they are very much more palatable than the dog-meat that is sometimes, of necessity, eaten by the people in other parts of Canada. Circumstances may arise which make it necessary for people to go out and shoot these birds for food, just as circumstances may arise in the northern country under which people go out and obtain dog-meat for food.

Item agreed to.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

Department of Railways and Canals—contingencies—further amount required, $6,400.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Will the minister kindly explain the item?

Hon. W. C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways and Canals): The information I have is this: In the civil government estimates for 1921-22 the department provided for certain clerks who were eligible under "blanketing in" anticipating that such "blanketing in" would be accomplished and effective from April 1, 1921. As such was not the case these salaries had to be taken care of from the contingencies vote, as follows:

A. J. McDermid, Clerk-Stenographer	$ 900	
L. Walters, Typist	600	
I. McBursey, Clerk-Stenographer	1,080	
		$2,580
The travelling expenses of the officials of the department were about $3,800 higher than estimated, the increase being due, principally, to the large amount of work relative to the Canada Highways Act		3,800
		$6,380

Item agreed to.

Welland Canal: Port Colborne elevator—to pay balance of claim of J. A. Jamieson, $7,000.

Mr. CRERAR: What is this for?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): This amount is required to settle in full for services rendered by Mr. J. A. Jamieson as engineer in charge of the construction of the Port Colborne elevator, including its enlargement from a capacity of 850,000 bushels to a capacity of 2,000,000 bushels. The original contract entered into with Mr. Jamieson in 1905 stipulated terms of payment by percentages of costs for services in the design and supervision of construction of a 2,000,000 bushel elevator. The project was modified and the elevator was built with a capacity of 850,000 bushels. Later it was decided to enlarge this elevator to the capacity originally intended of 2,000,000 bushels. The enlargement was an excedingly difficult problem owing to the fact that the work was necesarily carried on while the elevator was in active operation. The above circumstances gave rise to differences of opinion as to the application of the terms of the original contract for services. Payments on account were made during the currency of the work. Mr. Jamieson claims a balance still due of $20,770. After negotiations with officers of the department an agreement was arrived at for settlement at $7,000.

Item agreed to.

Welland ship canal: construction—additional amount required (Governor General's warrant, February 23, 1922), $435,000.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Will the minister please give us an explanation of this item?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I have this explanation:

The program of the season's work was laid out upon the assumption that the funds to be derived from the sale of the plant on the work, to contractors, would be available for the purpose of the work, in addition to the parliamentary appropriation. When the ruling was made that this credit was not available, the Chief Engineer pointed out that to keep within the parliamentary appropriation it would be necessary to close down the work before the end of the fiscal year. As such a course would be to the serious detriment of the work, and would aggravate the unemployment difficulties the work was continued under a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. CHURCH: I do not rise to object to this item because I have every confidence in the minister, but it is the first opportunity we have had of discussing this very important item.

The CHAIRMAN: That discussion can take place on the Main Estimates.

Mr. CHURCH: But this item has relation to the policy of the Government with respect to the Welland Ship Canal.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): When we take up the Main Estimates a discussion can take place on the whole canal question.

Mr. CHURCH: This involves a matter of policy and the item is a very large one. I wish to offer some observations in respect to it, but I promise not to be very long. In my opinion this project has not been handled in the way it should have been handled. We had a statement from the minister the other day that the Welland ship canal will not be ready to be opened until 1927. Now this canal is a most important link in the whole route for water borne traffic from the city of Montreal to the head of the lakes. Until it is completed the larger boats on the upper lakes will be unable to come down to lakes Erie and Ontario. At present a barge carrying 500,000 bushels of grain, when it reaches Port Colborne, has to have its cargo transshipped to two or three smaller barges and conveyed to the city of Montreal at an additional cost of four or five cents per bushel. This transhipment diverts a large part of the grain intended for Montreal into other channels. According to a report brought down at an earlier date by the International Joint Commission, a great part of this grain now goes to Buffalo. I do not say that the minister is responsible for this state of affairs, but it is exceedingly unfortunate. The Erie canal which was started about the same time as the Welland canal, or shortly afterwards, has been completed and is now open, with the result that the former is getting a large bulk of the business which should pass through Canadian channels. If the same vigour had been displayed in prosecuting this particular work that was shown in the deepening of the Queenston and Chippawa canal, the Welland should be ready to be opened in about two years. Until this work is finished we shall not derive the value that we ought to receive from the large expenditure which the people of Canada have made upon this canal system. Consequently the ports on lake Huron and the Georgian bay, and on lake Erie and lake Ontario, as well as those on the St. Lawrence route are going to suffer. Now, according to information disclosed to the House, $30,000,000 have been spent on this project already and no-

body knows when it is going to be finished; it is an eye-sore in the Niagara district to-day. If the work on the Welland canal was vigorously prosecuted it could be completed in a year or two and the large boats on the upper lakes would be able to reach lake Erie and lake Ontario. The result would be that we should have some regulation of the rates for five or six months in the year as between the railways and the water routes. The importance of getting this canal finished is fully set out in the report of the International Joint Commission. I know the minister has given consideration to the important factor which the immediate completion of the Welland canal will prove in lessening the rates on wheat from the great West. I do not wish to detain the House to-night with any further remarks. I hope, however, that when we take up the Main Estimates the Government will disclose the fact that they are so seized with the importance of the subject that they will give effect to the recommendations of the International Joint Commission who investigated this problem. We are away behind the times in our handling of this great project. The Erie canal will have been in operation, I think, this year, for the third summer, and the people of the United States are deriving great benefit from the use of this channel of communication. And it was a most important factor, as Mr. Hoover said the other day. Of course Mr. Hoover is a very high authority and is doing good work in lowering the high cost of living in the United States. He said that when the Welland canal was finished we would get the results in cut rates that this great canal would force. While I have every confidence in the minister, I hope when the Main Estimates are brought down he will give the House and the committee some idea as to when the canal is going to be finished.

Mr. LEWIS: I understand that in the Main Estimates last year $5,000,000 was appropriated for the work of this canal, and I want to know who authorized further expenditure of nearly half a million dollars for the extension of this work. We understand that when $5,000,000 is voted the people who are responsible for continuing this work will keep within that amount; otherwise we will have no say in the matter as to how far it shall be exceeded until the work is done, and we are asked to vote a supplementary estimate. I do not wish to go into the matter of the Welland canal at this particular period, but it seems to me that that canal will become a competing factor with the two transcontinental railways. At the present time the railways do not pay, and before the Welland canal can be completed and put on a paying basis, it would be of great interest to this country to continue the branch line service to the farmers, in order that they might be able to get their products to the trunk lines and transcontinental lines and give the men some work to do. For that reason, instead of continuing to expend $5,000,000 and a supplementary estimate of nearly $500,000, I think it would be to the interest of the country at large, and would also put the two transcontinentals on a paying basis, if this money, providing there is any to be spared, should be spent in extending the branch lines to the real sources of the products that will be carried over them.

Item agreed to.

Governor General's Cars—attendance, repairs and alterations—further amount required, $6,600.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the purpose of this?

Mr. GOOD: It seems to me it will soon be time to call a halt in regard to those particular expenditures. We were asked to vote some $20,000 this afternoon in connection with this same matter. I wish to protest against any enlargement of expenditure in this particular direction.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The amount was spent, as is customary when there is a change of Governor General, and the cars were overhauled and other necessary repairs made. There were two cars and the cost was $6,600.

Mr. CRERAR: Were these repairs absolutely necessary? Were the cars in a dilapidated condition, or does the Government take occasion whenever there is a change of Governor General to overhaul all cars at additional expense?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I do not understand that it is the custom or practice that there shall be money expended when a change of Governor General takes place. It did so happen in this case that the cars were not in good shape. They were sent to the shop and overhauled and it was found necessary to expend the amount mentioned.

Item agreed to.

To provide for expenditure for rails accessories and repairs to equipment to December 31st, 1921 (Governor General's warrant December 31st, 1921), $735,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Orders placed by the Canadian National Railway for rails under the general authority of Order in Council No. 3800, October 6, 1921, in connection with measures for the relief of the unemployment situation, necessitated a payment amounting approximately to $735,000, about December 31, 1921, and by Order in Council No. 4652 payment was provided for by authority of Governor General's warrant. Later arrangements rendered it advisable that the amounts so paid be included in the railway loan, the charge was accordingly transferred, and this warrant will not be utilized. Notwithstanding that this warrant will not be drawn on, it has been considered necessary, in accordance with the customary practice relative to Governor General's warrants, to print it in the Supplementary Estimates. As a matter of fact, the loan of $50,000,000 was passed this year and made provision for this $735,000, and this amount will not be called on. It is simply a bookkeeping item.

Mr. CRERAR: Those contracts were let in October.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): By Order in Council of the 6th October authority was given for the making of repairs on 2,000 cars of the Canadian National Railways, for the purpose of relieving unemployment.

Mr. CRERAR: Where were the repairs made?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Five hundred in New Glasgow, five hundred in Amherst, five hundred in Montreal and five hundred in Hamilton.

Mr. CRERAR: Does this whole item cover repairs to cars?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): And rails were also included in the Order in Council at that time. I have a statement of it, if the hon. member would like to hear it.

Mr. CRERAR: I would like to get the particulars.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): By Order in Council of the 6th October, 1921, authority was given for the making of heavy repairs to 2,000 cars of the National Railways for the purpose of relieving the unemployment situation and also for ordering for the Canadian National Railways and the Grand Trunk Railway system 75,000 tons of rails for the same purpose. These orders anticipated the requirements of the railways for the new year.

Five hundred and forty cars were completed before 31st March, 1922, at an average cost of $927.34 or a total of $500,763. Since March 31, 950 cars had been repaired, leaving a balance of 510 not yet repaired.

Of the rails authorized, 40,000 tons were purchased by the Canadian National Railways and paid for out of the appropriations for the past fiscal year:

Dominion Iron & Steel, 19,380 1st's at $49 ton. f.o.b. mill.
Dominion Iron & Steel, 619 2nd's at $46.55 ton f.o.b. mill.
Algoma, 19,000 1st's at $50 ton f.o.b. mill.
Algoma, 1,000 2nd's at $47.50 ton f.o.b. mill.

The Grand Trunk Railway placed orders for 29,000 tons.

Dominion Iron & Steel, 15,243 at $49 ton f.o.b. mill.
Algoma, 13,828 at $49 ton f.o.b. mill.

Orders were for delivery in April and May, payment to be made in May and June. No payments have yet been made. The balance, 6,000 tons, was not ordered.

Mr. CRERAR: At what price were these orders placed? What was the cost of the service?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Dominion Iron and Steel Company $49 per ton f.o.b. the mills. That was for firsts, and for seconds $46.55 per ton f.o.b. the mill. The Algoma price was $50 per ton f.o.b. the mill for firsts, and $47.50 f.o.b. the mill for seconds. Of the orders placed by the Grand Trunk Railway, the one with the Dominion Iron and Steel company of 15,243 tons was placed at $49 per ton f.o.b. the mill, and the one with the Algoma Steel Company of 13,828 tons, at $49 a ton f.o.b. the mill.

Mr. CRERAR: What are the current prices for rails?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): We have not been on the market for rails since then, and I am not in a position to give the hon. member the information.

Mr. LEWIS: Are these rails being utilised, or are they still on hand?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): They are being distributed and used for replacement purposes.

Mr. LEWIS: I understood the minister to say in his speech, that there were to be no extensions of lines this year. It would be a good plan to use the rails on branch lines.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): They are being used for replacement purposes.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): In connection with this item, I should like to explain to the committee that, in the closing months of 1921, very strong representations were made, not only to the Department of Railways and Canals and the government, but to the boards in charge of the operation of Canadian-owned railways, that the unemployment situation in large centres of industrial activity throughout Canada was such that a very great hardship was likely to result to the working people during the winter season of 1921-22. It was urged, not only upon the boards of management of the two systems, but upon the government, and urged by representatives of municipalities, by boards of trade, by labour organizations, by, in fact, all interests, that the railways should, as far as possible, anticipate their requirements; that orders likely to be placed for the season of 1922, should be so placed that the industries could be operated during the winter season. That is exactly what was done. The government conferred with the Canadian Northern board and the Grand Trunk board and suggested to them that it would be well that, having regard to the unemployment situation, they should take into consideration the advisability of placing these orders. It was decided that the two boards, having determined what the possible requirements for this season would be in the way of rails and having taken stock of the cars that were in hand and would be required to be replaced or repaired for the season's operations, should place orders for repair and reconstruction of cars and orders for rails for replacement purposes, and the action of the government was confined to providing in anticipation the funds. It was in pursuance of this policy that the government, in carrying out the Order in Council referred to by the minister, authorised the boards and undertook to provide the funds.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I am a little surprised to hear the ex-minister (Mr. Stewart) say that those contracts were given out just to relieve unemployment in some parts of the country. Does he not know that all this work of repairing cars could have been given to the shops of the railways in the province of Quebec or elsewhere? From the very fact that the ex-minister gave that work out to some private corporations he reduced the number of men in the railway shops. They were turned out and added to the ranks of the unemployed in other parts of the country just for the sake of those private corporations of which the government that was in power at that time was so fond. I was greatly distressed to see hundreds of men turned out in the cold of winter just because private corporations wanted to have those contracts notwithstanding the hardship inflicted upon the men who were working in the shops at Rivière du Loup. I am surprised at my hon. friend coming boldly before such a House as this and supporting the firing out of these men into the cold just for the sake of some private corporations.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): In reply to the hon. member for Témiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau), I should like to explain to the committee that neither the late government nor the Department of Railways and Canals had any part to play in placing the orders. I am sure the boards in control of the shops to which my hon. friend refers, would place those orders, having due regard to the requirements of their staffs. The orders for rails were distributed amongst the companies which were engaged in the manufacture of rails. Some of the orders went to the Algoma Steel Company and the balance to Nova Scotia. In the repair and reconstruction of cars as also, for that matter, in connection with placing orders for rails, regard was had to the question of unemployment, and the Order in Council which authorized the orders which were placed, provided that, in the placing of those orders, conference should be had with the Department of Labour in order that the work should go to relieve unemployment, and not as my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau) states, to private corporations for any considerations outside of that of unemployment, because no order could be placed until after conference with the Minister of Labour and until after the situation in the locality where an order was placed had been canvassed and surveyed, regard being had to the question of employment at the time and also to the question of possible employment during the winter season.

Mr. CRERAR: Do I understand that the Minister of Labour decided where those orders would be placed?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I hope the committee did not understand me as apparently the hon. member for Marquette did. I said that the orders were anticipated in order, as far as was consistent with good business and management, to relieve the unemployment situation. The

government having that in view, it was decided that, in the placing of orders, the boards should appreciate exactly what the unemployment situation was, and the records in the Department of Labour gave that information to an extent that it would have been impossible to get it in any other way. The hon. gentleman hardly states the situation as it existed. Unemployment was at the basis of the whole policy, and the late government was very careful to impress upon the two boards that, in anticipating the requirements upon which those orders would be based, due regard should be had to what was to be required this year. And it was provided that while these companies were to go on and manufacture, payment was not to be made until delivery. They could go on and make rails and pile them up, but payment by the board was to be made at the time that delivery was taken; and delivery would be taken when the requirement arose.

Mr. KYTE: While this item is under consideration I would draw to the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) the conditions of unemployment that exist in the city of Sydney at the present time, and have existed for some months past. The city of Sydney has been built up around the steel industry which was established there many years ago. It is one of our best markets—in fact it is the best market that we have locally—for the consumption of the coal which is produced in the island of Cape Breton. As the member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart) stated, an order was given last year in anticipation of the requirements of the government railways, and that order had a very considerable effect in relieving the unemployment situation as it existed in that centre of population some months ago. Unfortunately, however, owing to the depression that prevails throughout all the avenues of trade in the maritime provinces and in Canada generally, no general orders for the manufacture of steel have been secured by steel companies.

The plant in Sydney a year ago employed some 4,000 persons who, with their families, constitute the largest proportion of the population of the city. But the number of employees was reduced some months ago to 800. There are to-day, and have been for some months, 3,200 steel workers in idleness in that city. The city has been unable to collect taxes from these people for the simple reason that they have no money wherewith to pay them; and as a consequence the civic officers have not been paid their salaries for more than a month. That is a condition that ought not to exist in any part of this country if it can possibly be obviated.

The late government did very well in placing the orders which they gave in anticipation of the requirements of the government railways but I do think that the present Minister of Railways, in further anticipation of the needs of the Government railways in the matter of rails, should give an order to the steel company at Sydney for, say, 25,000 tons, so that the steel plant there might start again and provide much needed employment to the steel workers of that community.

Now, Sydney is unfortunately situated with respect to the receiving of orders from other railway corporations in Canada. Up to the present time the steel company at Sydney has never received an order for steel rails from the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the reason that the Canadian Pacific railway line does not extend to the city of Sydney, and that company are averse to paying freight on the rails to another railway corporation. Therefore, so far as the purchase of rails in Canada goes, the Canadian Pacific Railway places its orders with the rival plant at Sault Ste. Marie in the province of Ontario. The same has been true with respect to rails purchased by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway Company. They have placed their orders for steel rails entirely with the steel plant in Ontario.

The Dominion Government has owned a railway in the maritime provinces for many years. That railway is now linked up with the Canadian National Railway System, and I submit that in the very near future there must be a necessity for very large orders of rails for this government system. Even though the Minister of Railways may have on hand a sufficient quantity of rails for the present year, I do not think that, taking into consideration the conditions as they exist in Sydney to-day, and having regard to the desire of all classes in Canada to relieve as far as possible the unemployment situation throughout the country, the Government would be justified in placing another order with the steel company at Sydney for the purpose of relieving unemployment. I am told by gentlemen who are experts in the matter of the value of steel rails, that steel rails are the one commodity which do not deteriorate while not in use. On the contrary, they increase in value and use-

fulness with age, and I am informed that the Government would not be losing anything even if they were to pay interest on money borrowed for the purpose of placing another order with the steel company at Sydney, because the value of the rails, as regards durability, would have increased so much by being kept in storage for a year or two, that the additional cost would be more than compensated for.

I trust that the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who after all is the one member of the Government that has to provide the wherewithal to meet the demands that would be made in connection with these additional orders, will be able to find the means whereby an order can be placed in Sydney. I do not think it would be fair to place the cost of these rails against the operating account of the railways for the present year, because the rails would not be used until probably 1923. I think it would be worth while for the Government to consider the proposal to borrow a certain sum of money to defray the cost of the rails; but the cost should not appear in the accounts for the operation of the Railway Department for 1922 or 1923. Now, this is a most serious matter, and besides bringing it up before this committee to-night, my colleague (Mr. Carroll) who is at present engaged on a committee in another part of the building and myself have taken it up with the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance, and I give notice now that at a very early date we hope to renew the application for this order. I trust therefore that the Government may find some way, in view of the conditions that prevail to-day, to accede to the request and get the steel rail mills going once more in the city of Sydney.

Mr. CRERAR: I occasionally find myself in agreement with the sentiments expressed by the genial Whip on the Government side (Mr. Kyte). But I must, in the strongest manner possible, dissent from the strange and remarkable doctrine which he has just propounded to the House. I sympathize very deeply indeed with the position of the steel workers in the town of Sydney; but I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to draw the attention of this House to the fact that the condition that exists in Sydney to-day is indeed a striking commentary on the whole public policy that has been followed in the past in respect of the steel industry in Canada. The official records will disclose the fact that in the past this Dominion has subsidized the steel industry of Canada to the tune of between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000. I cannot speak with exact knowledge of the precise amount; but I know it is somewhere between the figures I have mentioned. Now, what have we got? We have given out in cold cash to the steel companies in this Dominion somewhere between $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 in the way of actual bonus to build up their business for the purpose of creating these industries in Canada and giving employment to Canadian labour. And after having done all that, we are faced now with the remarkable doctrine that we must further subsidize this particular industry by placing government orders with it in order that the workmen who have been gathered around it may be enabled to live. If that is a wise, sane and sound method of developing the country, then I certainly have a great deal to learn. I will make that confession very fully and very frankly.

The Minister of Railways will be ill-advised indeed as far as the Government is concerned if he is governed by any other than the soundest business principles in the placing of orders for the National Railways. One of the criticisms I have to make against the late government in respect to these particular orders that we are now discussing, is, that in my judgment they were not placed according to sound business principles. I am not going to draw further attention to the significant fact that they were placed a few months prior to the election. My hon. friend, the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) states that this was done to relieve unemployment.

Mr. GAUVREAU: And good Liberals were dismissed from the shops.

Mr. CRERAR: I accept his assurance in that respect, but the significance of the time at which the orders were placed is not lost. We find that orders for rails were placed at $50 a ton. I am not aware at what price rails could be purchased to-day, but I think I am well within the mark when I say that they could be purchased at very considerably less than that figure. That illustrates one of the business practices that should be followed in the operation of the Canadian National Railways,—that rails, cars, and all other equipment and rolling stock required for their operation should be purchased at the lowest prices. It is not a sound business policy for the Government—for the late govern-

ment or for this Government—to place orders for rails or any other materials or equipment required for these railways in order to relieve unemployment, if that means that higher prices have to be paid and charged against the railways. And I serve fair warning now upon the Minister of Railways that I reserve the right to criticise in the freest possible manner that method of conducting the business of our National Railways.

I have always maintained in this House and in the country that the operation of our National Railways should be placed on a sound business basis. I believe it can be done. But it cannot be done if unsound business practice is allowed to govern. It should be left entirely with the management and the directors to decide where these purchases shall be made, and when. The Government and the Minister of Railways occupy a very influential position, and it is the most natural thing in the world that even the management or the board of directors of the National Railways would pay attention to suggestions made by the minister as to where and when orders should be placed. Therefore it lies with the Minister of Railways and with the Government more than with any one else to absolutely dissociate the administration of these railways from considerations of this nature.

I inquired a little while ago from the minister what these rails would cost if they were purchased now, and I am sorry that he could not give me the information. I trust that before the main estimates of the Railway Department come down the minister will be able to furnish it. I was told—I do not know with what truth—that when these orders were placed last October they could have been placed at a cheaper rate. As I say, I do not know if my information is accurate. But before I take my seat I repeat once more that this is the only consideration that should govern in the administration of these National Railways, that the things necessary for their operation, the repair of cars and other rolling stock, the purchase of equipment, rails, ties and everything else, should be purchased on strict business methods by buying always where they can buy to the best advantage.

Mr. KYTE: I would assure my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), that I do not think the conditions existing in Sydney differ very much from the conditions existing among the wheat-growers in the western provinces. Some years ago they were very prosperous, they were receiving good prices for their wheat; and in the same way the steel workers were prosperous because the steel mills were busy and they were receiving good wages. We have an application before Parliament now for the establishment of a wheat board. I have no fault to find with that application; the western farmers have a perfect right to ask for it. But is that for the purpose of reducing the price of wheat to the growers of western Canada, or for the purpose of securing to them larger returns? If for the latter purpose, then surely the increased profit will have to come from those who consume the flour which is manufactured out of that western wheat.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. KYTE: My hon. friends opposite say "no." I confess that I am not sufficiently familiar with the process by which they expect to get larger profits, but it always follows that if the producer of an article designs to get a higher price for it, then the consumer must pay more for the commodity.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. KYTE: A wheat board was established a couple of years ago and the government financed its operations. I do not know if that is desired at the present time by the western provinces, but as I gathered from the discussion in this House some weeks ago it was the desire of our friends from the West to have a wheat board established whose operations would be financed out of the Treasury.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. KYTE: The Government, of course, would not lose by doing so, because, as in the past, they would be recouped any moneys advanced. At all events, whether the particular details I refer to be correct or not, the fact is that conditions have arisen in western Canada which appear to make it necessary for our friends from the prairie provinces to take some further steps to secure better returns for the products of the wheat-growers. I did hear one hon. gentleman after another state in this House during the present session that wheat growing was most unprofitable for them owing to the small prices they received last year. That is perfectly true, and for my part I am prepared to support

any reasonable proposal that my hon. friends from the western provinces may present to this House for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of their constituents. Therefore I say it is unkind at least for my hon. friend from Marquette to object to a similar proposal, although in another form, which I am making in behalf of my constituents in the city of Sydney.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The member for Marquette has questioned the soundness of the business methods adopted by the late government last October. I am quite willing to take issue with him upon what was done from a business standpoint, and to permit the House to judge whether the business methods then adopted were sound or unsound. What was fundamental in the action of the government, and what that action was predicated upon, I submit was good business practice that was not uncommon during the past winter among private concerns.

First of all, we had a very serious unemployment situation. In the steel centres particularly where the car construction works were located it was the opinion not only of those in charge of the industry itself but of the municipalities that in no recent years were the prospects so serious for the working classes, and the government was petitioned time and again, and deputations from the municipal councils of those localities waited upon us to emphasize the seriousness of the situation.

Now, what did the government do? After conferring with the Department of Labour the government convinced itself that the conditions in the different localities, as represented by the municipal authorities, were very serious indeed and that the prospects for the winter season were absolutely hopeless for the working people. What the government did do was to confer with the representatives of the two boards in charge of the government lines as to the wisdom of placing orders for such supplies as would be used this spring and this season. Now, aside from the possible question of price, which has not been raised, I submit there is no bad business about that. The government ordered such rails as in the opinion of the boards would be required this season, and it was part of the arrangement that no payment was to be made until delivery was taken, and there was no obligation to take delivery before the rails were actually required. If it was bad business in the fall of 1921 to provide that these industries should operate during the winter season when it was most desirable, in the interests of the employees as well as of the country generally, that there should be employment, then I am quite willing to admit that my hon. friend from Marquette is right. But we acted as we deemed best; we took the responsibility then, and we stand by our action now. Why, it was not uncommon during the past season for those engaged in private industry, in manufacturing in many lines throughout Canada, to ask their customers to anticipate their requirements in order that the factories might be kept busy during the winter months when the really serious unemployment situation existed. If that was good business on the part of those engaged in private enterprise, surely no question can be raised as to the action of the government with regard to the orders that were placed.

9 p.m.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Will my hon. friend allow me a question I want to put to him with regard to the contracts for the repairs of cars? He says he wanted to relieve unemployment, but he took action which threw out a good many men in Truro, Halifax and Quebec, thus adding to the unemployment in our towns and cities.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The situation with reference to the repairing and rebuilding of cars rested on precisely the same basis as the placing of orders for rails.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You were wrong in both, then.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): In the placing of orders for rails and other supplies and for repairs to cars, the Government and the Department of Railways played no part at all.

Mr. MITCHELL: I understood the hon. gentleman to say a few moments ago that neither the Government nor the railway management had anything to do with the placing of these contracts.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): No, I said the Department of Railways.

Mr. MITCHELL: And that the Minister of Labour had something to do with it.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The Minister of Labour was asked to confer with the boards of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk in order that in placing the work regard should be had to the con-

dition of unemployment. There were also conferences between the executive heads of the two national systems and the Canadian Pacific, because in taking care of the unemployment situation it was necessary that the Canadian National board should know what the Canadian Pacific was doing in the matter of its commitments in respect of rails and cars. There were conferences, I say, not only between the Department of Labour and the two boards of the National system, but between these two boards and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. My hon. friend referred to the placing of the cars and its effect upon the car works of the National system and of the Grand Trunk system. Well, that matter was fully considered by the boards; whether or not their judgment was correct is something that hon. members will themselves have to form an opinion upon. But the question of unemployment, in private industry as well as in the works of the companies themselves, was all canvassed. Whether or not the final decision was wise is something—

Mr. BOIVIN: Will the ex-minister please make it quite clear whether it was the Government that was advising the railway board or the railway board that was advising the Government?

Mr STEWART (Lanark): It was a matter upon which advice was unnecessary and was not given, so far as I know. If there was to be anticipation of the requirements of the road, it was necessary for the Government to make provision for the funds, and, in the Order in Council to which reference has been made, authority was given to the boards to anticipate the requirements that would result from the course that was to be taken.

Mr. VIEN: When was that done?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Early in October.

Mr. VIEN: After dissolution?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): After dissolution, yes. My hon. friend from Marquette has suggested that the transaction had some political significance.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman deny that it had any political significance?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Absolutely and positively. The fact that the dates synchronize does not involve that conclusion. My hon. friend who has just asked the question will not deny that the condition of unemployment existed. Surely he will not accuse the late government of having brought about that condition because there was an election coming on and it might be considered expedient from a political point of view to give the orders. If he does not go that far; if he admits that there was unemployment and that it was good business to give the orders, then his suggestion falls to the ground.

Mr. VIEN: I do not admit anything.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I would not expect my hon. friend to do so.

Mr. WARD: I would like to ask the ex-Minister of Railways if he was aware that last fall, between the middle of October and the first of November, a train-load of new rails was shipped to the little town of Ste. Rose, presumably, I would say, to purchase a part of the Dauphin constituency for the government candidate.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I would presume that my hon. friend would know sufficient about the policy under which our national roads are managed to find it unnecessary to ask the question, but as, apparently, it is necessary to make an explanation, let me say this: Under the law as it stands now, and as it stood in October of last year, neither the government, nor any department of the government, has anything to do with the very condition which he states exists; and unless he suggests that the board of management of the road was operating the system and depositing the rails for political purposes his argument falls to the ground. Under the law as it stands, the government has absolutely nothing to do with the administration in the respect of which he has made this reference. Therefore I say that unless hon. gentlemen go the length of arguing that it was unsound business to attempt to take care of the unemployment situation, the action of the late government cannot be questioned. It did not require the expenditure of a single dollar prior to the time that it became necessary to take over these supplies for the purposes of the road. The car repairs were placed in such centres as was deemed wise. They were placed by the board of management of the road, not by the government, and they were placed all over this country. Certain regard had to be paid to the question of the location of the industry concerned. That is, it would be impossible from a business point of view to take cars from western Canada to Nova Scotia to repair them. It would not

be considered good business to haul rails from Nova Scotia to the western provinces when those rails could be as well purchased at the Soo from the Algoma Steel company. All these were considerations which were dealt with by the board of management and in connection with which the government itself took no part directly or indirectly. That is the point I desire to stress—that the government had nothing in any way to do with these contracts, aside from supplying, or undertaking to supply, the money that would be necessary to anticipate these orders after the close of the fiscal year. Now that is the condition. As I stated before, if that is a matter as to which the late government should be censured then I assure you they are quite willing to take the censure.

Mr. MURDOCK: I have been very much surprised, as well as pleased, to hear the explanation given by the former Minister of Railways as to the letting of the car repairing contracts last fall, because this statement shows conclusively that I have been altogether misinformed on this question since I became Minister of Labour. For the first two or three months of this year I gave interviews to gentlemen, several of them, who forcibly indicated to me that all that was necessary to place an order for the repairing of cars of the National Railways, including the Grand Trunk, with their concern, was simply to make the necessary recommendation to my colleague the Minister of Railways. He, in turn would convey the view of the Minister of Labour to the operating officers of the railroads that such order was necessary to relieve unemployment in this centre or that centre and that any car repair order should go forward. I was given to understand that distinctly, and that is why I could not refrain from rising to say how pleased I am to receive the statement of the former Minister of Railways that these gentlemen who were coming to me for the first three months of this year were giving me entirely inaccurate information. Further, I understood the former Minister of Railways to suggest that it would not be good business to draw cars for repair from western Canada to eastern Canada. My information is—and I would like to be corrected if it is wrong—that Grand Trunk cars were hauled from a point west of Montreal to New Glasgow, Nova Scotia, a distance of about eight hundred miles, repaired and hauled back again. If that was not done I would like to have that inaccurate statement also corrected by the former Minister of Railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS: You are right.

Mr. MURDOCK: I am very glad indeed to have had the explanation that has been given in regard to the letting of these car repairing contracts, because, I repeat, I was told it was done on the recommendation of the Minister of Labour, through the Minister of Railways, to the operating officers of the railroad.

Mr. MANION: I should like to say a few words in regard to the relief of unemployment that was assisted by the late government. I happen to be somewhat familiar with one section of this country anyway, that is the northern Ontario section, and I can say that the late government in that part of the province—the section in the neighbourhood Sault Ste. Marie and the section at the head of the lakes—did very much to relieve the unemployment just through such contracts as my hon. friend the late Minister of Railways has mentioned. I have no doubt at all that the present Minister of Labour has had many people call upon him for unemployment doles: I do not think that he has had any request from the head of the lakes for any assistance financially. There has been a certain amount of unemployment at the head of the lakes, but there has been very little in comparison with what there would have been had the late government not given instructions for the repair of government railway cars in that district. That is also true of Sault Ste. Marie because of the rail contracts that were given there.

Now, in regard to hauling cars eight hundred miles for repairs, I do not pretend to know anything about railway matters at all; but I do know that cars are often hauled eight hundred miles for that purpose. Many of the cars which are repaired by the Canada Car Company at the head of the lakes are hauled eight hundred miles from the prairie provinces, and a great many more than that distance. They come down loaded with wheat. Even though they do require repairs, their injuries, I take it, are not so great as to prevent them still remaining in use as rolling stock. They come down a great deal farther than eight hundred miles and are repaired, as I say, in the Canada Car Works; and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company does the same thing with its cars.

As a matter of fact the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—which we very often boast about as the greatest and most efficient corporation in the country—often gives contracts to the Canada Car Company, and the cars are of the same type—cars which have been used for carrying wheat from the prairie provinces, and many of them travelling much more than eight hundred miles to be repaired. So far as I am concerned—and I had something to do with the policy and saw something of it—I believe that the late government deserves a great deal of credit for the contracts they gave. If those contracts happened to be awarded before the election, was that any reason why the late government should ignore the unemployment conditions and not give them. Certainly not, to my mind.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend tell me how many cars were repaired at Fort William?

Mr. MANION: I do not happen to have the figures, but I know there are still about five hundred men working in the car plant turning out that order, and that it is helping to relieve the unemployment conditions there.

Mr. FIELDING: Has not the late Minister of Railways just stated that the Government did not give these contracts?

Mr. MANION: I do not care anything about who gave the contracts. We are speaking about contracts given either by the Government, or by the government railways, for the repair of cars. I do not know who gave the contracts. I had nothing to do with that; I was not Minister of Railways. But I know that government railway cars were repaired at the head of the lakes, and I repeat it had much to do with relieving the unemployment situation in northern Ontario—that work and the contracts which were obtained by the steel mills at Sault Ste. Marie.

Now, in regard to the remarks by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) who speaks of desiring the greatest efficiency on the part of the government railways. I doubt if there is an hon. member here who does not wish to see that. But at the same time, if a government road contract for the repair of cars, or the repair of something else, or the manufacture of rolling stock, or the manufacture of rails, can be given in such a manner that it helps to relieve the unemployment situation in this country, whether given by the late government or the present Government, so far as I am concerned, even if it can be shown that it costs a little more—unless the cost is so much more that it is a disgrace—I will promise the present Government that I will support them in such a contract.

Another remark of the hon. leader of the Progressive party (Mr. Crerar) was rather a criticism of the steel bonus. I remember when the present Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was citicised on other occasions in regard to this steel bonus which he brought in, when previously in office, I have seen him rise to his feet on some occasions and prove, and I think conclusively, that this bonus was a fine piece of legislation. I notice that when the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) raises the same cry, the Minister of Finance does not rise, I presume for the reason that it is not good policy, in the present condition of the Government, to quarrel with the hon. member for Marquette. I am going to help out the Minister of Finance in that matter, because I agree with the policy he introduced in 1896, or about that time. I think I am correct in saying that the bounties were brought in by the present Minister of Finance when he was in the Liberal government of that time. He brought in bounties which amounted to some millions of dollars. The hon. member for Marquette gave some figures which, I think, are approximately correct, as to the amount paid on these bounties. I have looked into the question myself, because, as some hon. members of this House know, I gave on occasions various discourses on the iron question in this country, and I considered the iron and steel question at some length. I heard the hon. Minister of Finance state, and I agree with him, that due to these bounties to a great extent the steel and iron manufacturing plants of this country were built up. The steel and iron industries were built up to a great extent by the very bounties given about 1896 by the present Minister of Finance who was a member of the former Liberal government. Possibly they were put on just before, but I think it was about that time. In my opinion these bounties had very much to do with building up the iron and steel manufacturing processes of this country. I wish to compliment the present Minister of Finance upon having kept them in force as long as he did. For some years past they have been discontinued.

I notice that my hon. friend from Marquette and many of his friends cheered him strongly when he criticized these bounties. I hold the Estimates in my hand, and in the Estimates I find a figure of $6,084,000 in the agricultural estimates. Last year it was $5,900,000. I challenge my hon. friends to my left to show that this $6,000,000 item is not a bounty to the agricultural interests of this country when the money is paid. I challenge them to say that it is not practically a direct bounty. In the agricultural estimates I find these items: Experimental Farm, $1,315,000; Administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, $235,000: Health of Animals, administration and enforcement of the Animal Contagious Diseases, and Meat and Canned Food Acts, $1,710,000, and so on, and all these items make a total of over $6,000,000. If that is not a direct assistance to the agricultural interests, I do not know what it is. It does not assist me as a professional man, and it does not assist manufacturing or any other interests. It is certainly a direct assistance to the agricultural interest, and therefore it is a bounty to that interest. So far as I am concerned, I support it, and support it whole-heartedly, and I think it should be carried out. But I think the members of the agricultural section of this House should be consistent when they criticise bounties, and if they are going to absolutely condemn all bounties in their criticisms in this House, then they should go after the agricultural bounty in the present estimates.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I wish to ask a question, which perhaps is not in order, but the hon. gentleman referred to the votes for the administration and enforcement of the Destructive Insect and Pest Act, Health of Animals, administration and enforcement of the Animal Contagious Diseases, and Meat and Canned Food Acts, and so on. I would like to know how the hon. member could call that a bonus to the agricultural interest. As a matter of fact, it is due to a large extent—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that this is getting almost beyond the bounds of order, because the particular item deals with the expenditure in connection with rails and so on, $735,000, and while it is quite possible to make comparisons, such as were made by the hon. gentleman from Marquette, it is getting now beyond the bounds of relevancy to this particular item.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I think so.

Mr. MANION: I think the Chairman is quite right. I shall apply anything I have to say to the item under discussion. I wish to say that when you help to relieve unemployment, as is requested by my hon. friend from Cape Breton South (Mr. Kyte), who asks that work under this item be performed in the steel mills in his constituency, it is reasonable to do so, even if that work does cost this country a little more than it costs in some other plant. Is it not better for this country that we should pay a few more dollars that way, than that we should hand out doles, as a charity, to the unemployed of this country? I certainly think it is, and I am perfectly in accord with the request of the hon. member for Cape Breton South, when he requests that the steel mills should, if possible, if the expense be not too great, be kept in employment in times such as these. I say that, perhaps, with a certain amount of selfishness, because, if the unemployment became very bad in New Ontario, I should certainly be one of the first to request that the New Ontario corporations should be assisted in the same way to prevent unemployment continuing. I should like to have dealt with one or two other remarks of the hon. member for Marquette, but seeing that objection is taken, I think I shall have to refrain at the present time.

Mr. BOIVIN: It is not my intention to enter into a discussion of the bounty question to-night, because I think you had good reason to declare it out of order. The proper time for this discussion will be the budget debate. There is, however, a very important question before this committee to-night in connection with this item, and that is: Are the Canadian National Railways administered by the Canadian National Railway Board, or were they administered by the late government on the eve of the last general election for political purposes? The ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) tells us he and his government had absolutely nothing to do with the sending of a train load of rails to a certain constituency on the eve of the election, and I think, in giving that answer, he was perfectly right in theory. But if he was right in theory in giving that answer, was the late government right in deciding where these orders were to be placed? "Oh, but," he said, "there were a great many

private corporations who did absolutely the same thing, who placed orders for goods they did not need, in order to relieve unemployment." I sat in this House during the last session, and if I remember rightly, I heard a great deal about unemployment and about the methods employed by the late government to relieve that condition. During the recess I heard a great deal about unemployment, but the government made no move in the way of giving orders until the month of October, after the general election had been announced, and when it was once more seeking the support of the people of Canada. Then they thought of unemployment, and what did they do? They passed an Order in Council authorizing a member of their government, the Minister of Labour, to put the gun to the head of the administrators of the Canadian National Railways and tell them when and where they should get their cars repaired, and when and where they should buy their rails. The ex-Minister of Railways said that private corporations did the same thing, but I should like him to name one private corporation that purchased goods from other similar corporations when its own shops were closed and its own employees were going without labour and without food. It is well known that the Canadian government railway shops at St. Malo, while they were, perhaps, not completely closed, were working on very short time with a greatly reduced staff. The Grand Trunk shops in the city of Montreal were working on short time with a reduced staff. The shops at Fraserville were working on short time with a reduced staff, and at Moncton the same state of affairs existed. What happened? Was employment given to their own men? Did they prevent their own machinery from being ruined by rust and neglect? Did they endeavour to use it by giving employment to their own men? Not at all. They closed up their own shops and they gave work to other firms. They did that by Order in Council. What right did the late government have to decide by Order in Council where the work should be done? If the late government desired to operate the National Railways of Canada and were brave and courageous enough to say so, well and good; but that is not what they pretended. They told us in the last Parliament that they had absolutely nothing to do with the National Railways. When they were asked an ordinary question concerning disbursements, or the cost of coal, or supplies, or rails, or cars, they said: We do not know anything about that. We will ask Mr. Hanna in Toronto. We cannot give you an answer; we have no right to give you an answer. We have nothing to do with the administration of these roads. They maintained that attitude until Parliament had been dissolved, until the candidates of all political parties were before their electors, and then they decided to change all this and pass Orders in Council to oblige Mr. Hanna and his associates to place their orders just exactly where the government would decide.

It may be argued that an Order in Council was necessary to provide the funds. There was no Order in Council passed to provide the funds in the month of October last. A Governor General's Warrant was passed, on the 21st December, 1921, to pay the debts contracted just a few days before the late government laid down the reins of office. The first Order in Council was passed in order to enable the then Minister of Labour to wield the big stick we heard so much about the other night, and to tell the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways where those orders would be given. The hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) said that he would support this Government if it did the same thing. I should like to ask him if he would support this Government, if it took damaged cars from his constituency, from the other side of Fort William, and brought them to St. Malo, in the province of Quebec, to have them repaired, while his own shops were closed or running on short time.

Mr. MANION: Speaking generally, I would not; but the question depends a little on unemployment conditions at the time. I know nothing about the St. Malo shops; but I repeat what I said a few minutes ago; I do know that whatever contracts were given in northern Ontario, which is a part of the country I am most familiar with, did a great deal to relieve the situation of unemployment and were very badly needed.

Mr. BOIVIN: Exactly. The action taken by the late government on the eve of the election relieved unemployment where they wanted to relieve it and created unemployment where they wanted it to be created, or where they did not care whether it was created or not.

Mr. MANION: Would it not be a rather peculiar thing if they relieved unemployment where they did not want to relieve it?

Mr. BOIVIN: It would have been a very peculiar thing, but not half so peculiar as many things accomplished by the late government. My closing remarks are that from the explanations of the ex-Minister of Railways—and I may be very dense—I have not yet been able to understand why an Order in Council was necessary. I have not yet understood why a government, that had nothing to do with the administration of the National Railways, could empower a Minister of Labour by Order in Council to direct where this work should be done, and I have yet to learn that it is good policy for any corporation to close its own shops and use its money to have its work performed by other institutions while its own machinery and employees are absolutely idle.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin) has expressed very great surprise that the late government found it necessary to pass an Order in Council in order to determine where certain car repairs should be carried on. No such Order in Council was passed; no Order in Council was ever passed directing where any work would be done. He also expresses very great surprise that an Order in Council should have been passed by the late government providing that the Minister of Railways should wield the big stick—

Mr. BOIVIN: I said, the Minister of Labour.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark):—that the Minister of Labour should wield the big stick and direct the officers of the two railway boards where the cars were to be repaired. No such Order in Council was ever passed, and there was no Order in Council giving to the Minister of Labour the right to determine where the work should be done.

Mr. BOIVIN: What did he have to do with the matter then?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): He had nothing further to do with it than was authorized in the Order in Council itself—

Mr. BOIVIN: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark):—to confer with the representatives of the boards.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): It seems remarkable that hon. gentlemen should be so much amused that, in the consideration of the question of unemployment, the Minister of Labour and the Labour Department should be brought into consultation. The whole question of the placing of orders, of the number of cars to be repaired, of the number of rails to be ordered, was one with which the late government, neither directly nor indirectly, had any voice. I should like to make that clear.

Mr. BOIVIN: Except the Minister of Labour.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The Minister of Labour had absolutely nothing to do with it.

Mr. VIEN: What did he do then to relieve unemployment?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): If my hon. friend is not able to grasp the situation, I am afraid I cannot help him. Neither the late government nor the late Minister of Labour had a single thing to say or had any voice in the question of what cars were to be repaired, what supplies were to be purchased. That was a matter that was entirely within the jurisdiction of the two boards. Let there be no mistake about that. No attempt was made on behalf of the government to influence either board in any direction.

Mr. MITCHELL: The hon. member said a moment ago that the Minister of Labour was to confer with someone or another with reference to the expenditure of this money. With whom was he to confer?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Possibly I would make myself clear to the committee if I said this, that the Minister of Labour was to be the source of information as to the question of unemployment in the country.

Mr. MITCHELL: To whom was that information to be given?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): That information was to be available for the members of the two boards of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, in whose hands the whole question of the placing of these orders and the purchase of supplies rested.

Mr. BOIVIN: Why was that included in the Order in Council?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Why was what included?

Mr. BOIVIN: The fact that the Minister of Labour should advise.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Because the whole situation was predicated on unemployment.

Mr. BOIVIN: So that it was included in the Order in Council.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Yes. The Minister of Labour could not direct where a single order should go. He could give to the officials of the two boards the information as to unemployment which goes to the department and is on record there.

Mr. VIEN: Will my hon. friend tell me whether the Minister of Labour at the time advised the board of the Canadian National Railways as to where there was unemployment to be relieved?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I have no knowledge of that: I never was present.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Hon. gentlemen laugh; but I would ask them in what respect it would be possible for me to have the information which my hon. friend has just asked for?

Mr. VIEN: It should be possible, because you were Minister of Railways.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The Minister of Railways, under the law as it stands and as it stood then, has absolutely no authority to place orders for supplies. Surely my hon. friend knows that. That was the condition in October of last year, and it is the condition to-day.

Mr. VIEN: Can my hon. friend explain why 100 men were discharged at Fraserville when there was unemployment there, while unemployment was relieved elsewhere?

Mr. CASGRAIN: And 300 in Quebec city?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am afraid I cannot make the matter clearer to my hon. friend. If unemployment existed in the industries that were owned by the government, that was something of which the government had no notice; and I know that in the placing of all orders consideration was taken of the whole question of unemployment, not only in connection with the industries owned and operated by the government, but throughout the country as well. With regard to the question of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) as to whether or not the late Minister of Railways knew that cars were taken from Montreal to Nova Scotia to be repaired, I do understand that cars were taken from the province of Quebec to Nova Scotia to be rebuilt, and they were taken there for two reasons: first, because some of the car companies, not only in the province of Quebec, but also some in Nova Scotia, were not equipped for the handling of the class of work that was to be done; and, secondly, because at that particular time the condition of unemployment was much more severe in some centres of the province of Nova Scotia than in Montreal, where the work might have been done had it been done in the province of Quebec.

Mr VIEN: And the relief in Nova Scotia served a more useful purpose.

Mr. DUFF: The minister has given two reasons. I might add a third: Colonel Cantley was a Tory candidate.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): That is a matter which the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) will have to thresh out with the boards of the two lines who placed the order.

Mr. DUFF: Colonel Cantley was a member of the board.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): That is a matter that does not go to the root of the whole question, for the reason—

Mr. DUFF: And he was defeated too.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark):—that the department did not place the order.

Mr. CASGRAIN: That order went to grease the wheels, so to speak.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I wish to make one further reference to what was said by the Minister of Labour, who referred to the placing of orders through the Minister of Railways. If I understood him aright that is what he told the House.

Mr. MURDOCK: What I said was that the impression had been conveyed to me repeatedly during the first two or three months I was in office, by representatives of these car concerns, that all previous orders for the repair of cars at New Glasgow, Amherst, Montreal, Hamilton and Fort William, had been made as the result of recommendations made by the Minister of Labour, as to the unemployment situation in the particular localities. Those recommendations were made through the Minister of Railways to the officers of the boards of directors of the National railways, and the orders went forth ac-

cordingly. I was given to understand that all that was necessary was for me to realize the unemployment situation in the various localities interested in the matter, and to make the necessary recommendations to the Minister of Railways, and that he would pass the word along to the board of directors, who would be only too glad to place another order for the repairs of additional cars, if we had additional cars to repair.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I desire to state without any qualification that all that was said to my hon. friend the Minister of Labour as to what took place last fall is entirely without foundation in fact. I have no mental reservations on the matter. I declare that his statement with reference to what took place has absolutely no foundation in fact at all.

Mr. LOGAN: I desire to speak on this matter only because it seems to me that there is a considerable amount of misinformation, not only on the part of hon. members directly opposite, but on this side of the House as well. In the first place, it is admitted to-day by the best railway concerns on this continent that it is not a paying proposition for railways to repair their own cars. In the United States there is not a single big concern to-day that does so. In Buffalo and in other parts of the United States there are large car repairing plants that do this sort of work, not for the government, but for private railway systems in that country. As regards this order that was placed by the late government and which is being completed at the present time, I would venture to say that in the Canada Car and Foundry Company's shops in Amherst the repairs have been made at 30 per cent less than they could be done in the government shops in any part of the Canadian National Railway system.

Mr. PARENT: What about the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. LOGAN: They are also giving out work for repairs. Now, what are the facts? I am not here to discuss whether or not this order was given with a view to political effect. If it was, they made a mess of it, because they did not get to work until about three days before the election. As I say, I know not what the idea was from the political standpoint; but I do know that if ever there was a government or a railway board that was justified in giving work to car companies in Amherst and New Glasgow, that government existed last October. I say this in justice to these towns, although possibly the statement may not be popular on this side of the House. In the town of Amherst, in which I live when at home, there are ordinarily employed in the different industries 2,300 men. Last fall out of those 2,300 workmen less than 400 had employment. For some months the local car works, which had employed from 1,000 to 1,250 men, were absolutely idle; men walked the streets; women were suffering; children were in want; the town itself spent large sums of money in attempting to deal with the situation; a relief association was formed and distributed thousands of dollars collected from the people; the red cross society endeavoured to cope with the situation. This order for five hundred cars was a godsend to the town.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend realize that the criticism directed against the late government was not because they gave a car order to Amherst to relieve unemployment, but because they delayed doing so until the election campaign began, granting relief only when they thought it might be useful to them?

Mr. LOGAN: I am not here to tell my hon. friend or anyone else what was in the mind of the late government. I am reciting the condition of affairs that existed in Amherst at that time, a condition which demanded immediate relief, and I am only saying that the best managed railroads throughout this continent are adopting this particular principle of placing their cars for repairs in outside shops. I am also pointing out that the government would have been derelict in its duty if it had not come to the rescue of the unemployed in Amherst last fall; there is no question about that.

Someone has said that certain Grand Trunk cars were brought down to New Glasgow for repair. Why? Because they were steel cars which could not be repaired anywhere else, as the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) stated to-night.

Let me now speak particularly to my hon. friends directly opposite. We expect this fall the greatest crop that western Canada has ever produced. We all pray that it may be so. There are to-day on the government-owned roads and roads controlled by the government about 15,000 cars needing repairs. Suppose there is a

bumper crop in the West this fall, do you not think that any government should be reprimanded that did not put those cars in proper order to move that crop? Why should not the Government place those cars in the repair shops and relieve unemployment?

Mr. VIEN: At what date was unemployment felt for the first time in Amherst?

Mr. LOGAN: About fifteen years ago we had unemployment.

Mr. VIEN: At what time did the late government start relief there?

Mr. LOGAN: It was about fifteen years ago that we first had unemployment in Amherst, and then the government of my late lamented chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, placed contracts with the Robb Engineering Works for the repair of locomotives, to relieve the situation. That was the precedent which was established for putting work in private shops. I believe that the late government was not only justified in placing this order, but I also believe that it is the absolute duty of the present Government to relieve by similar means the unemployment situation existing in these towns to-day.

Mr. BOIVIN: Would the hon. gentlemen tell the committee if in his opinion the law as it stands to-day permitted the late government, or permits this Government, to dictate to the management of the Canadian National Railways where they shall place orders for the repair of cars?

Mr. LOGAN: I do not think that question is relevant to this discussion. If I did think so I would say that as the Government owns 22,000 miles of railways, and has the right to do anything for the relief of unemployment, it is its duty to take such action as may be necessary to that end. I may be defending the action of the late government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. VIEN: Does my hon. friend believe that the late government should have started before dissolution to relieve unemployment?

Mr. DUFF: A li'tle bit sooner.

Mr. LOGAN: Unemployment was not acute in Amherst until about August of last year. Let us be honest in this matter now. That is when unemployment became acute.

Mr. VIEN: You said it began ten years ago.

Mr. LOGAN: I said that unemployment became acute in August of last year; but in order to satisfy my hon. friend that we had a precedent for what was done by the late government, I reminded him that some years ago the government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier awarded contracts for the repair of locomotives in Amherst when there was unemployment there, although unemployment was not acute at that time.

I do not think that our friends opposite should take the view which they do upon this question, because they may need these very cars within a few months, and we all hope they will. If it is true that there are 15,000 cars which need to be repaired, and if there is unemployment in this country, I think that a government instead of handing out doles here and there should give work to these men, who do not want charity but wages.

A good deal has been said to-night as to unemployment at Moncton, Fraserville and other places. I do not know the condition of affairs except in Moncton, and I deny that there was unemployment at Moncton at the time or that a single workman was displaced by giving this order to the Canadian Car and Foundry Company to relieve unemployment in Amherst. There is not the slightest doubt that an emergency existed in that town and that the relief was absolutely necessary.

Mr. SIMPSON: Considerable criticism has been levelled against the late government for having placed certain orders last fall for steel rails and other equipment in order to relieve unemployment. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has described much more forcibly than I can the conditions prevailing in some of our industrial centres last fall. If some hon. gentlemen who have been criticising the action of the government at that time could have seen those conditions, I do not think they would be so ready to condemn the course that was then taken in placing orders in anticipation of our rail requirements in order that employment might be given to our workmen during the winter months.

The hon. member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) asked when the unemployment commenced. I may say that strong representations were made to the managements of the railway companies last spring by representatives of the steel companies at

Sydney and Sault Ste. Marie to place railway business in order to provide employment for the men during the summer season. Accordingly, the orders were placed; they were completed in the fall, and the men were faced with unemployment in the winter. It was only natural, therefore, that the Minister of Labour should suggest to the railway companies that they should anticipate their requirements in the matter of rails and place orders so as to provide against unemployment. That is what was done. It is said that this course was adopted for political purposes. Well, so far as rail orders were concerned, at any rate, if it was adopted for that purpose it did not have the desired effect, because the greater portion of the rail orders were given to the mills at Sydney. What was the result? The hon. member for Cape Breton asked the Minister of Railways to have the managements of the railways anticipate their requirements to provide against the unemployment that has been existing down there for some time. I quite sympa-

10 p.m.

thize with him in the situation that he finds there. But let me tell you how the steel company in the constituency that I represent took care of the business that was given to them last fall. They realized that if they worked on full shift they could turn the order out in a very short time, and that the men would again be out of employment; so they put the mill on single shift and were thus able, on the business which they got at that time, to keep the wheels turning until about the middle of April. They sustained a loss of over half a million dollars in their endeavour to play fair with the companies that gave them the orders and with the men whom they employed. Is it not much better that the management of the government railways should anticipate their needs in this regard than that they should hand out large sums of money to relieve distress and suffering throughout the country, as the Department of Labour has had to do? You find in the estimates appropriations for over $500,000 to be paid out for relief—practically charity. The men do not want that; all they are asking for is an opportunity to work to earn an honest living for themselves.

Apparently the hon. member for Marquette does not think very kindly of the steel companies in this country; he criticises severely the subsidies or bounties granted to them in order that they might become established. While he is correct in stating that the bounties amounted to some $15,000,000, I may say that four of the largest steel companies in Canada have paid back to the Dominion treasury, through the medium of customs taxes on machinery and supplies, more than they received from the Government by way of bounties. The Algoma Steel Corporation in Sault Ste. Marie has a pay roll of approximately $8,000,000 a year. Think of the immense amount of tonnage that is provided for the National railways as a result of the operations of that corporation. Think of the amount of money that is collected by way of income tax upon the salaries of their officials and some of their better paid employees. When these things are taken into consideration, the amount paid by way of bounties is very small indeed, compared with the return that has been made to the public treasury. Moreover, when war broke out and Canada was asked to make munitions, we were able to do it only because we had the steel companies to take up this work. The hon. member for Marquette is very critical when it comes to the matter of bounties, but he is not so critical of the amounts found in the estimates to provide relief to needy settlers in Alberta and Saskatchewan by way of necessary supplies, wood, clothing, fuel, etc., and fodder for their animals. The amount provided for that purpose this year is $325,000, and a similar amount was voted last year. I do not criticise that at all, but is it not better for the government railways to anticipate their needs and thus provide work for the unemployed, than to hand out doles and charities?

Mr. VIEN: Was any unemployment relieved in my hon. friend's riding?

Mr. SIMPSON: Unemployment certainly was relieved in my riding and in the city of Sault Ste. Marie as the result of rail orders placed. No part of the $500,000 that is to be passed by this House for the purposes of relief is going to Sault Ste. Marie, —due to the fact that this rail order was placed.

The other day the hon. member for Marquette pleaded eloquently against the appointment by the Government of a special railway committee, to consider the question of freight rates, but suggested that the Crowsnest pass agreement be allowed to again come into effect. He realizes that our railways have to be run on a business basis and that a proper schedule of rates must be maintained if increased deficits

are to be avoided; yet he asks for the restoration of the Crowsnest pass agreement in July, the effect of which would be materially to reduce the earning power of the national railways and to confer the greatest proportion of benefit on the shippers of grain in the West. Why, then, should he object when it is suggested that rail orders should be placed in advance to provide for unemployment, thus avoiding the necessity of handing out large sums for the purposes of relief?

Mr. HOEY: Now that the oratorical contest is ended, I would like to speak on behalf of the few in this corner of the House who still survive and who are fearful of a second attack. I would like to ask the minister how much of this money spent on car repairing was expended in the city of Winnipeg, and in the town of Transcona, where the government shops are located, and where the men were working on short time throughout the months already referred to in this debate? I put this question because I would like the people of these constituencies to know the extent to which the government came to their relief at that time when unemployment was rampant. I cannot see why my constituency should be discriminated against in favour of the constituency represented by my hon. friend from Fort William and Rainy River.

Mr. MANION: Before that question is answered may I point out one little fact to my hon. friend on my left—this is just for the information of the committee. While a contract was given for the repairing of cars in Fort William—I forgot to mention the fact before—the work on that contract was not done until one month after the election was over. That may answer my hon. friend's question. It did not have very much to do with the election apparently. If there had been a desire to influence the election the work would have begun one month at least before the election was over.

Mr. HOEY: That is not a reply to my question.

Mr. KENNEDY: In reply to my hon. friend, as regards the 2,000 cars mentioned in the Order in Council under discussion no orders were placed in the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to make one suggestion. If the Government have discovered any irregularities in connection with this matter on the part of the former government, they should make a charge to that effect publicly and follow it to a logical conclusion. The discussion on this matter for political reasons does not seem to get us anywhere whatsoever. I would suggest that the Government should do that and then let us pass the estimate and get on with business in view of the fact that so much time has already been spent in the discussion of this matter.

Item agreed to.

Mr. GOOD: I want to make a suggestion. It has already been stated by the ex-Minister of Railways that the practice has been followed of giving orders and making no payments until deliveries have been made. Now, I do think we must have some regard for conditions of unemployment, and I want to suggest that possibly orders can be given without specifying any prices, and that the prices to be paid finally when delivery is made be competitive prices. In that way our railways in the country will be protected against any kind of loss.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I did not have the opportunity of being present—

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that the item has been passed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member who has just resumed his seat was speaking to that item.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not know what he was speaking to, but the item has been passed. However, if the committee is satisfied—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I have heard you declare items carried on other occasions and other hon gentlemen have risen to their feet and spoken after you had made the declaration. I understand that some criticism has been indulged in with respect to the expenditure under this item last year.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member will allow me to read the next item his remarks will be pertinent to it and quite in order.

Staff and repairs—further amount required, $91,000.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I can only speak with such information as I have as to the criticism which has been made of the expenditure last autumn in connection with the repairing of cars for the government railway in shops other than those of the government railways. I want to speak particularly with reference to the repairing of steel cars. There are no facilities in any of the shops belonging to the Canadian National Railways for the repairing of steel cars. The only facilities that exist for the repairing of cars of that kind exist in the shops to be found in my constituency belonging to the Eastern Car Company. And when we stop to think of the tremendous number of cars that are to be found out of repair on the Canadian National Railways, and the fact that if you kept all the ordinary shops belonging to those railways doing nothing else you could not begin to effect those repairs, you will realize the situation we are apt to find ourselves in. To-day there are evidences in the great Republic to the south of the return of prosperity, of increasing development in all the manufacturing industries, and what will ensue will be this: In the United States they will retain all the Canadian cars that go there and that happen to be found there in connection with their business. They will keep them there and when my hon. friends from the West will want cars in the autumn for their good crop, such as we hope they will have they will not have them. It will be found that unless the cars now in hand are repaired and ten thousand other cars belonging to the Canadian National Railways are put in proper condition the West will be suffering from the want of cars for its crops and there will be a further shortage of cars needed for other industries. The theory that sufficient facilities exist in the ordinary shops of the Canadian National Railways to repair steel cars is a delusion. Such facilities are not to be found there; the facilities needed for repairing and re-fitting a car and putting it back in its old condition are only to be found in car making establishments. The Canadian National Railways have no car making establishment in connection with their plants, and it is perfectly absurd for hon. gentlemen to say that only shops connected with the National railways should be used for the purpose of repairing cars. As to steel cars, there are no such facilities in any shops on the Canadian National system.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Now in regard to the question of the purchase of rails and other equipment in connection with the system, and the expenditure of money which has been made, in view of the conditions that have existed in the past six months let me say that in times past there have been advances for seed grain to the West, and advances of various kinds in order to meet special conditions there; and I do maintain that bearing in mind the conditions that were to be found in all the manufacturing centres in eastern Canada when our railways needed, as they did need, rails, there was no reason why this expenditure should not have been made. I do not pretend to say that there was not in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite the idea that this expenditure in repairing cars, made at the time it was, might have been for political purposes; but the fact that fifteen other gentlemen along with myself were elected as supporters of the present Government from the province of Nova Scotia must have convinced them that if they did have any such idea in their minds, it did not work when it came to the election.

Speaking for those who are to be found in the coal and steel industries in my province, I want to say that the position taken by the late government in carrying out this expenditure, whatever their motives might have been, was one that was perfectly justified by the conditions and they had a perfect right to take the course they did. It is all very well to say that there may have been shops throughout the various portions of this railway system that are not operating and that could have done this work; but those who have not a knowledge of the conditions which appertain to the construction and proper repair of cars do not realize that these things cannot be done without the necessary facilities, and the special machinery that must be kept on hand in order to recreate a car, a proposition which is just as abstruse as the making of a car from the very beginning. In view of the fact that there are nearly ten thousand cars to-day that are in a state where they cannot be operated successfully I maintain that it is the duty of the present Minister of Railways to provide for the repair of these cars in the proper car shops of the country. If these cars are not repaired and if the ten thousand cars that are to be found all over the Canadian National Railways are left in their present condition, those members from the West who say this expenditure should not be made will have only them-

selves to blame if, when the autumn comes, they have not got sufficient cars to haul out their crops.

Mr. CRERAR: I want to correct a wrong impression in the mind of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). He did not hear the rather animated discussion before he entered the Chamber, or he would not be labouring under a misapprehension, as he appears to be doing just now. No one from the West, or from any other part of Canada, as far as I know, is objecting to having cars repaired.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Where are you going to repair them?

Mr. CRERAR: They should be repaired wherever they can be repaired to best advantage. We have repair shops attached to the Canadian National Railways. I submit that, when we have plants for the repairing of these cars, our own plants should have the opportunity of repairing them. I know it was argued by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan)—probably with a good deal of reason; I do not know—that in the United States the railways are giving their repair works out to private corporations. That may be. I am not discussing that aspect of the question. The point that I endeavoured to bring out earlier in the evening is that it is not a sound business policy to let contracts for the purpose of relieving unemployment at higher costs or higher prices than would otherwise obtain.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): They were not let at other prices than would otherwise obtain.

Mr. CRERAR: That information has yet to be disclosed.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Does the hon. gentleman suggest that the contracts that were given last fall were at a higher price than would otherwise obtain?

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend, the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) appears unduly sensitive in respect to this. My remarks earlier in the evening were in response to the remarks of my hon. friend from Cape Breton South and Richmond (Mr. Kyte) in which he argued that it would be sound policy for this Government to borrow money, build cars, make rails and store them up against the future. I submit that is not a sound policy, and it was against that principle of doing business in connection with our national railways that I was protesting and that I still protest. It is not sound business. Our National Railways are operating under a great handicap. We have deficits in operation. We are unable to meet our fixed charges. We have a constant stream of criticism coming from those who are opposed to government ownership of these railways, and we have the railways, not by virtue of our belief in the principle of public ownership, but because of the absolute and complete breakdown of private ownership. Now when we have them, let us handle them in a business way. That is all I am pleading for or suggesting. I am not suggesting, and no one is suggesting, that we should go along without making the necessary repairs to cars and engines, but I maintain it should be done according to sound business practice.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Does my hon. friend want to continue paying in the shops the McAdoo award wages, which are a great deal higher than are paid in the ordinary steel industries of this country, where steel cars are repaired? They are paying higher wages in the United States and cars are repaired at a much greater cost than when we have the arrangement for the repairs of cars on the cost plus basis. But that is not the policy he suggests. It is all very well to talk of repair shops at all points of the Canadian National railways. He has not the slightest conception in regard to the repair shop. There is not a repair shop on the Canadian National where they can repair a steel car, which is the modern car used in the transportation of freight in this country, and, therefore, it was wise and sound policy to send the steel cars to be repaired at these places where steel cars are made, and steel cars are not made in any shop that belongs to the Canadian National railways. It was sound and wise policy to have cars repaired on the basis of cost plus, rather than to pay the McAdoo award wages and the Chicago award wages in the ordinary shops of the country. That is the position of the matter. Moreover, in a very great number of cases the repairs could not be made in the ordinary repair shops. I say, instead of giving grants to municipalities, on the basis of one-third of the expenditure being made by the municipality for the purpose of relieving unemployment it is better to undertake work of this kind having regard to the fact that these cars supply the transportation necessities of the country. It is not sound business policy

to allow these cars to remain unrepaired, or, if you are going to repair them, to repair them at a higher cost than the amount which you could have them repaired for on a business basis, and thus allow the railway to deteriorate, instead of endeavouring to keep the railway up to date. Is it not better to buy those things which are essential to the operation of a government railway system, and have them on hand, and by this means prevent unemployment, than to give money for which there is no return, on the basis of a one-third contribution by the municipality?

Mr. CRERAR: I have no particular quarrel with the remarks of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). They do not conflict with anything I said a moment ago, or earlier in the debate. By all means have repair work done where it can be done most cheaply. I am suggesting to the Minister of Railways that the Board of Directors of the National railways should do that very thing. If there is only one repair shop in which they can repair steel cars, they will have to go there. I can tell the hon. member that, as far as western Canada is concerned, there are tens of thousands of cars hauling grain and not one of them is a steel car. At the very time when the unemployment question was very serious, and the orders were placed last autumn for the relief of unemployment, there was not a single car sent to Transcona shops, which are situated a few miles from Winnipeg, where millions of dollars have been spent in establishing a car plant for the National railways. I really think that the hon. member for Pictou has not caught the sense of my remark, and I have no quarrel with what he said.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The only difference between the hon. member and myself is that apparently he wants to have the cars repaired at Transcona. There is a car shop there, and he thinks they should all be taken to that shop, although he does not know whether they can repair them there or not. If they do not go there, does he object to cars in eastern Canada going to shops which are quite handy, if they can be repaired at a less cost than in the other shops?

Mr. CRERAR: Not at all.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The hon. gentleman agrees with me.

Mr. CRERAR: Certainly.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. LOGAN: I desire to make one explanation which, I think, will enlighten the House as to the way in which these cars are repaired.. I regret very much, if this matter is to be discussed, that we have not before us the contracts made by the late government, or by the Railway Board, with the different companies. I wish to say that these cars are not dealt with exactly on what we call the cost plus basis. The contract was made that the government was to pay the car companies for their labour, plus a certain small percentage, but as far as all supplies for those cars are concerned, the Government itself, or the Canadian National Board, has the right to supply every article that is required in this work, and if it is not considered that the price being charged by the company for its supplies is reasonable, it will not pay that company for those supplies, if it can show that they could have been bought for a less price elsewhere. So that it is not only a contract on the usual cost plus basis, but it is even a better contract than that, because it is only the labour cost plus.

Mr. BEAUBIEN: While we are talking about car repairs, I desire to offer a suggestion to the Minister of Railways. Being an old railroad man myself, when I am travelling on the Canadian National railway system, it is always a pleasure to me and, in fact, second nature, to chat with railroad men. I have asked them this question: Why do we have so many wrecks on the Canadian National Railways? I give this to the Minister; I do not know how true it is; but they tell me that the reason is that American railways ship their old cars, loaded, of course, to Canada. These cars, which are in bad condition when they cross the border, are accepted, and shortly afterwards in Canadian territory, a journal or something else will break, and that will cause a wreck. The railway men tell me that these cars have to be repaired at the expense of the Canadian railways before they are sent back to the United States. I merely offer the suggestion to the minister that, I think, the inspection of these cars before they enter Canadian territory should be very severe.

Mr. COPP: I rise, not for the purpose of entering into a discussion of the matter before the committee, nor to criticise the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart), nor to come to his defence as regards contracts let for the repair of cars during the

late campaign. I feel it is my duty to correct an erroneous impression that may have been given to the committee in regard to the railway shops in the city of Moncton. When the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) says that there is not, in the Dominion of Canada, a railway shop connected with the Canadian National Railways that is in a position to repair steel cars, I can only say that he is altogether mistaken as regards the magnificent shops in the city of Moncton belonging to the National Railway system. If my hon. friend has any doubt in his mind or fails to accept my word in regard to the matter, all he has to do is to drop off at that city, and he will see steel cars being repaired there every day of the year.

I also desire to correct an error that was made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). I only wish his remarks were absolutely correct. I understood him to say that one of the reasons why the cars were—and should have been—repaired at Amherst and New Glasgow was the extreme unemployment situation in Amherst, while not a single man was out of employment in Moncton. I only wish the facts had been as stated by the hon. member; but I would draw to his attention this fact—and I know no one understands it more clearly than the ex-Minister of Railways—that last summer between six and seven hundred employees of the Canadian National Railways were laid off in the shops in the city of Moncton, and only a small percentage of that number have been reinstated.

I rise only for the purpose of correcting those two errors that have been made by my hon. friends from Nova Scotia, and I would point out, for the information of the Minister of Railways and the committee, that, in the city of Moncton, we have, in connection with the Canadian National railway system, shops splendidly located, splendidly equipped and manned by employees who are absolutely competent and able to carry out, not only the repair of cars, but the building, construction and equipment of all classes of cars required for the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few minutes ago the Minister of Railways informed us that the price of steel rails was $49 or $50 a ton. The suggestion has been made by some hon. members that that price was not in accordance with the market. Was the price at which the rails were purchased in accordance with the market at the time?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): One would have gathered from the discussion this evening that I was not present when the order was placed, but I understood that the price at which it was placed was about the market price at the time. I promised the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) that I would give him some information upon that point, and I hope, when my main estimates come down, to be able to give my hon. friend the information that he desires.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have endeavoured two or three times to get from the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) the exact meaning of his remarks in regard to the negotiations that took place between the then Minister of Railways and the railway management or the Government officials, or whoever these negotiations took place with. In view of the discussion that has taken place in this chamber to-night, I think it would be wise if we could have that Order in Council laid on the Table of the House so that we might understand exactly what its effect was.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I have not a copy of the Order in Council myself, but the minister or some other member of the Government can place it on the Table. There is nothing in that document that would justify the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, or upon which could rest the suspicion that appears to exist as regards the action on the part of the boards of the government railways and as regards the late government itself in permitting and authorising the action by the boards.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have no suspicion at all. I simply want to find out the facts. I asked the hon. member twice, and I was unable to grasp, from the answers that he made, whom the then Minister of Railways had these negotiations with. If he can answer that question, probably we shall not need the Order in Council.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I have stated several times, since this discussion started that, as regards the then Minister of Railways and any other official connected with the government, they played no part in the placing of these orders. That is surely an unqualified statement, and it is the fact.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am speaking now of the Department of Railways,

because that is the official department having control of railway management. That department had nothing to do with placing the orders. The orders were placed by two boards as a result of conferences held between certain members of those boards, as I understand the matter and understand it still, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. The only connection between any government official and the boards in the consideration of the matter was that the Labour Department, through its minister, was the fount of information upon questions of unemployment upon which they might wish to secure information. The then Minister of Railways played no part in any connection further than to secure the authorization through Council of the necessary financial arrangements to give effect to what was decided upon. That is the whole story as regards the Department of Railways and the then government. I might qualify that by this, that when the petitions and memorials and all the other communications came to the department from municipalities in which unemployment was most severe—

Mr. MITCHELL: Which department?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The Department of Railways. There is no question that we received petitions from municipalities, boards of trade, and labour organizations.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why were these petitions sent to the Minister of Railways? Should they not, in the ordinary course, be addressed to the Minister of Labour?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I do not know why they were sent to the Minister of Railways, but my hon. friend will bear me out when I say that there is generally throughout the country a great misconception as to the part which the Department of Railways plays in the actual management of the nationally owned railway system. That is a condition for which the late government was not responsible, and one for which this Government would not be responsible. There is a very large volume of public opinion in this country that the Department of Railways and Canals plays a direct part in the administration of the National Railway System. I do not know how it is now, but I do know that it was not an uncommon expectation on the part of the public that the department should reinstate employees, purchase ties, and do all manner of things incidental to the administration of the system. That condition obtained in the past, and I have no doubt it obtains to-day, and what the department is obliged to do is to pass these things on to the board to which each particular instance may relate. Unquestionably representations were made to the Government and, as well, to the Minister of Railways, from day to day with reference to unemployment. There was only one thing for the Government to do, and that was to pass them on to the board whose duty it was to deal with them. And that was done. But so far as the Minister of Railways was concerned, let me make it quite clear that neither he nor any other officer of the Government played any part in deciding what rails it was wise to buy, or what cars it was wise or necessary to rebuild or repair. Not one word was offered by the minister or any officer of the Government as to where cars should be repaired. The Minister of Labour supplied to those who had the deciding of the matter the information with reference to unemployment in the different centres where rails were manufactured and cars built and where there were industries suitably equipped for carrying on the work. But, as I say, neither the Minister of Railways nor any other officer of the Government had anything to say in the matter.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): In response to the request of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell), I shall be glad to lay the Order in Council on the Table to-morrow.

Mr. MacLEAN (Prince, P.E.I.): Listening to the discussion to-night, it appears to me that we are arguing altogether on false premises. If the Canadian National Railway system or public ownership is to be made a success, are we going to continue the policy of making the Canadian National railways the scapegoat in regard to all unemployment throughout the Dominion of Canada? Knowing the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy), as I do, to be a shrewd business man, I do not believe that he will tolerate any such condition as that. If this or any other government is to make a success of the Canadian National railways it is their duty to place these orders where they can be executed at the lowest possible cost; and if there is unemployment to be dealt with in the country, then let the Government have a policy to cope with that situation, in keeping with the efforts that are being made by the local governments and the municipalities in the various provinces. But I contend that it is an entirely wrong principle that, in order to

relieve unemployment in any part of the country, some particular public service, such as the Canadian National railways, should be saddled with a burden which would inevitably be reflected back in the freight rates, in respect of which we have complaints coming from all parts of the country. I think the Government would be well advised if they adhered to strict business principles, and having every confidence in the Minister of Railways, I take it that he will do so..

Item agreed to.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Post Office Department—to hereby increase from March 1, 1921, the salary of the retiring General Superintendent of Postal Service to the rate he is now receiving, namely $5,700 per annum, $325.

Contingencies—Clerical Assistance—further amount required, $6,000—Printing and Stationery—further amount required, $14,000, $20,325.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Postmaster General): The first amount in this item is to provide a sum necessary to make the salary of the retiring General Superintendent of Postal Service from the first of March, 1921, equal to the amount which he is at present receiving. The gentleman in question has been in the postal service of this country for 47 years, having rendered notable and efficient service. Unfortunately, his health has broken down and he has applied for superannuation, and this small amount is required to put his retiring allowance from March 1, 1921, on the basis of the salary he is now receiving. As worked out it will increase his retiring allowance only to the extent of $75 per year. The second amount is $6,000 for clerical assistance, due to the fact that in the Main Estimates for last year the amount voted was found in the year's operations to be insufficient. By arrangement between the Finance Department and the Post Office Department, the latter was allowed to overdraw its appropriation to this extent on condition that the overdraft would be provided for in the Supplementary Estimates. Hence this item. The $14,000 is a vote to cover a shortage in the estimates of last year for supplies of printing and stationery that were obtained through the Printing Bureau on condition that the shortage, as in the case of the preceding item, would be provided for in the supplementary estimates.

Item agreed to.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE

To provide for urgent engineer services in Quebec (Governor General's warrant, Febuuary 10, 1922), $19,350.

Mr. CRERAR: Will the minister explain this expenditure?

Mr. GRAHAM: Our engineer in Quebec reported that the roof of the ordnance building was leaking badly and some damage had already been done. While he had his staff there to attend to these repairs he reported that he could also undertake some other repairs which would have to be done in a couple of months, and by doing all the work together the cost would be much lower. So we had the warrant cover the whole amount.

Item agreed to.

Civil Pensions, Life pensions to Robert Allen, Ronald Morrison, Walter Pettipas, $1,115,42.

Mr. GRAHAM: Vote 406 is inserted here in error; it should be in the supplementary estimates for the present year. I therefore wish the three items under this vote to be dropped. They will reappear in the other supplementary estimates.

Items dropped.

IMMIGRATION

Civil Government—Department of Immigration and Colonization—contingencies—further amount required (Governor General's warrant, February 22, 1922), $12,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Will the minister explain?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): This further amount is required because owing to the extraordinary conditions prevailing on the continent of Europe in regard to immigration work it was found necessary to delegate high officials of the department to Belgium, Italy, Poland, etc., to investigate and study existing conditions in those countries with a view to regulating the emigration movement to Canada. The travelling and living expenses of these high officials, some of whom remained there many months, were naturally heavier than if they had travelled in Canada; the result being that our appropriations for this service are being found inadequate to meet our obligations chargeable to that particular vote.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of War Claims—Immigration and Colonization (Governor General's warrant, November 11, 1921), $140,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This item is to cover expenses incurred under the provisions of order in council 179 of January

29, 1919, and amending orders authorizing the repatriation at public expense of the dependents of men who served in the Canadian military and naval forces. When the departmental estimates for 1921-22 were prepared, a sum of $150,000 was applied for to meet the expenses of this service for the current fiscal year. This sum having, however, been reduced to $25,000, it was entirely inadequate to meet the liabilities, and after a careful estimate, based on liabilities already incurred and the estimated sum required to meet our obligations to the end of the fiscal year, 1921-22, it was found necessary to apply for a special warrant of $140,000, which was granted under Governor General's Warrant No. 3932 of November, 1921.

Item agreed to.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Indians—field and garden seeds—further amount required, $7,000.

Supplies for Destitute—further amount required, $34,000.

General Expenses—Further amount required, $10,600.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the explanation given by the department as to why their estimates were so far below the requirements?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This vote is required for field and garden seeds to the amount of $7,000. Last spring Indians who had land prepared but were without funds to purchase the necessary seed grain, and having no band funds held in trust by the department, were advanced funds upon the understanding that the cost of the seed would be refunded from the sale of grain raised. On some of the reserves in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta the crops were a failure, and in consequence the Indians are unable to make all the refunds. This vote is required to cover the deficits, as there was no appropriation in the main estimates. Had there been fair crops the whole cost would have been refunded. The Indians who still owe for seed grain will be required to make refunds from next season's crop if they have one, so that eventually the amount of this vote will be refunded, and should be regarded simply as a loan. A statement of the expenditure and refunds is given, if my hon. friend wants it.

As to the supplies for destitute, $34,000, this vote is required to pay for provisions, ammunition and twine delivered under contract during the summer of 1920 by the Hudson's Bay Company at different points in the Peace river, Athabasca and Mackenie river districts. The contractors are required to have their accounts for these supplies certified by the Indian agent to whom delivery of the supplies is made, but through neglect on the part of the Hudson's Bay Company's officer at Edmonton, the certified accounts did not reach the department until after the close of the fiscal year 1920-21, and consequently payment had to be made from the appropriation for the current fiscal year, 1921-22. It became necessary, therefore, to provide for these payments as the appropriation for the fiscal year 1921-22 is insufficient to meet this extra charge. These supplies are delivered annually under contract and are to meet treaty obligations. Hitherto they have always been paid for within the fiscal year in which they are contracted for.

As to the further amount of $3,600 required for general expenses, in the supplementary estimates for 1921-22 the sum of $19,200 was included to pay for 640 acres of land at $30 an acre within the boundaries of Ermineskins reserve in the province of Alberta, but only $12,600 was appropriated under Vote No. 518. It becomes necessary therefore to ask for a supplementary vote of $3,600 to enable the department to pay the balance due on this land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The amount asked for is $10,600, not $3,600.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The further amount required for general expenses is $7,000. This with the previous amount will make the $10,600. This vote is required to replace the Indian agent's residence at Fort Smith, Alberta, on the Slave river, accidentally destroyed by fire on February 3 last, and it was absolutely necessary to replace it. Building materials such as hardware, windows, doors, cement, brick, building paper, etc., also a furnace, were purchased at Edmonton and transported to Fort Smith via Peace River, a distance of 988 miles. The necessary lumber was manufactured at the department's sawmill at Fort Smith, but funds had to be provided for wages, etc. The expenditure not being provided for in the main estimates, this vote becomes necessary.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With regard to the minister's explanation of the $3,600, can he tell me whether that is the case of Janse brothers who had a section of land within an Indian reserve that the depart-

ment exchanged for a Hudson's Bay section? I remember the negotiations were pending a long while owing to a difference of opinion as to the value of the land.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Under the terms of the deed of surrender given by the Hudson's Bay Company to the Crown when relinquishing all claim to the lands in Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories, which entitled the company to claim grants of land up to one-twentieth of all lands set out for settlement within the fertile belt, the section of land referred to passed to the Hudson's Bay Company. In September, 1885, the limits of the Ermineskins Indian reserve were surveyed by this department, in accordance with the terms of the treaty, and this section was included. This reserve was confirmed by Order in Council, dated May 17, 1889.

In 1906 the Hudson's Bay Com-
11 p.m. pany sold this section to Messrs. Janse brothers, of Calgary, both parties evidently having entered into the transaction in good faith, without the knowledge of its being part of an Indian reserve. Messrs. Janse brothers are unable to make use of their land as it is part of an Indian reserve. The department has endeavoured to arrange the matter by obtaining an exchange of lands, but the Indians refused to give a surrender, and the only recourse is to purchase from Messrs. Janse brothers. They have signified their willingness to accept $30 per acre, and to assign to the Crown whatever title they have received from the Hudson's Bay Company.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The price paid seems to me rather high. When was the arrangement completed for the purchase of it?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some months ago, I am informed—before December 6.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That may be. I remember when I was in the department we tried for years to make the exchange and we had great difficulty in doing it. We sought to refer it to an arbitration, but never were able to get that done. The price was below $30 an acre. But I do not just see why this should be in last year's estimates; it would be provided for in next year's estimates in the ordinary way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Some appropriation was made in the estimates of last year to cover this, but evidently it was not sufficient.

Item agreed to.

Indians—British Columbia—
Relief to destitute—further amount required.. .. .. $ 4.000

Mr. MACKELVIE: Will the minister explain the details of this vote?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The estimated expenditure for this service for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $31,000, but owing to circumstances over which the department has no control, it proved inadequate to meet all the demands due to various causes, namely, failure of crops in some districts, fishing restrictions imposed upon the Indians by the federal authorities, unemployment and sickness amongst the Indian population of about 25,000. The expenditure for ten months up to 28th February has actually been $26,189.44, and for the twelve months ending the 31st March, 1922, it will at least be $35,000, so that a supplementary vote of $4,000 becomes necessary.

Every effort was made to keep this expenditure within the amount voted. Each agency was apportioned its share, and instructions were issued that these amounts were not to be exceeded without first obtaining the authority of the department. There are sixteen agencies in the province and extra grants had to be made to several upon representations made by the agents that unless the amounts first allowed were not increased, there would be suffering amongst the Indians through no fault of their own. On humanitarian grounds, therefore, the department was bound to come to their relief and authorize increased expenditure.

Item agreed to.

Hospitals, medical attendance and Medicines, further amount required, $5,000.

Owing to circumstances over which the department has no control, namely, sickness amongst the Indians of this province, the amount appropriated for this service, $68,200, is insufficient to meet all necessary expenditure up to the 31st March, 1922, and it is estimated that a further appropriation of $5,000 will be necessary. Increase generally in hospital rates have also added to the cost of this service. When

it is considered that there is an Indian population of about 25,000 in this province, the expenditure on this account cannot be regarded as excessive. Every effort is made to curtail the expenditure, but it is difficult to estimate accurately twelve months' ahead what it will be. The expenditure up to the 28th February has been $74,000, so that a supplementary vote is necessary.

Item agreed to.

Office, Miscellaneous and Unforeseen Expenses; further amount required, $7,100:

An unforeseen expenditure of $2,100 was incurred in fighting forest fires that started on the Indian Reserve, at Christie Creek in the Nelson Forest District, and on the Tobacco Plains Reserve No. 2 in the Kootenay District. The fires were extinguished by the Provincial Forestry Department and much valuable timber was saved. The department repaid the provincial government on properly certified accounts, and as the estimates did not provide for this unforeseen expenditure, a supplementary vote is required. The sum of $2,000 is required to provide for payment of taxes which have been levied under the British Columbia Drainage, Dyking and Development Act in the West Nicomen District, on Indian Reserves Nos. 4 and 10 on West Nicomen Island in the New Westminster agency. As no provision was made for these taxes in the main estimates, a supplementary grant is necessary. The sum of $3,000 is required to meet expenditure it was found necessary to incur last summer in making necessary repairs to the agent's residence and office at Hazelton, B.C. When the present agent took over the duties of the late agent, who was superannuated, he reported that he found the residence and office in a very bad condition, the roof leaking, doors and window fittings rusty and falling, floors so badly worn that carpets or linoleum could not be put down without ruining them, the paper on the walls dirty and cracked, paint dirty, chimneys unsafe and fence greatly in need of repairs. No repairs or painting had been done to this building for many years. The late agent was a bachelor, which no doubt accounts for repairs not having been made before. The present agent was therefore authorized to have the necessary repairs made as economically as possible, in order that the house might be made habitable for his family. As this expenditure was not foreseen when the main estimates were prepared, provision was not made for it, and therefore a supplementary vote is necessary.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would call attention to the fact that there is an item there of some $2,000 to cover taxes imposed by the provincial government in respect to some drainage. The provincial government of course, cannot impose taxes in respect of drainage or anything else assessable against Indian reserves. The way it is taken care of is by contract, by arrangement in the first place, the department agreeing to pay so much. There should not be anything on record which acknowledges the right of any government to impose taxes of this kind.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is under the Drainage, Dyking and Development Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Of the province?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They cannot by any act impose taxes upon Indian reserve property.

Mr. FIELDING: We pay local taxes in Ottawa for certain purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That would be by contract.

Item agreed to.

Indians—general—	
Relief to destitute Indians in remote districts—further amount required	$50,000
To prevent spread of tuberculosis—further amount required..	8,000
To provide for expenses in connection with epidemics of smallpox and other diseases—further amount required..	5,000
	$63,000

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the cause of the very large extra amount for destitute Indians in remote districts?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The estimated expenditure for this service for the fiscal year 1921-22 was $65,000, but owing to circumstances over which the department has little or no control, it proved inadequate to meet all demands.

For the ten months ending Feb. 28, accounts aggregating $116,000 have been presented for payment, and therefore a supplementary vote is necessary in order that all accounts may be paid.

Relief in the form of food, clothing, ammunition, twine, medicines and medical attendance, is provided for Indians and Eskimo who live in the more remote districts of the Dominion and are dependent entirely on the hunt for their existence.

This relief is administered by the fur trading companies at their various posts where the department has no resident agents, and the department has endeavoured from time to time to control and curtail this expenditure as much as possible by instructing these companies that supplies should only be issued to relieve distress amongst Indians and Eskimo who are too old or unable through sickness, etc., to hunt their own living; and at times to others who are in distress through failure of the hunt.

The department is compelled to adopt this method of affording relief to these natives when in distress, but every possible care is taken in checking the accounts through missionaries or members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, where available, besides which they are very carefully scrutinized in the department before payment is made, with a view to preventing abuses which might arise from the companies outfitting Indians who are capable hunters and who should not be a charge on the government. There are, therefore, inherent difficulties of management which the department has had to overcome, with a certain degree of success, but until these remote districts are more closely connected with civilization, and until the department is represented by local officers, the conditions will not be entirely satisfactory.

Owing to the remote situation of the posts, where relief is issued, the cost is naturally high, consequent upon the excessive cost of transportation.

Item agreed to.

Indian Education—further amount required, $35,615.45.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I only have one criticism to offer as to this item, and in doing that I can only take the same ground that was taken by hon. members to my right in the case of estimates of another department. When the Main Estimates containing the vote for Indian education was brought down a decrease of something over $101,000 was observable. Some of us took exception to that on the ground that education was one thing that should not be neglected. In the course of the discussion that followed we were assured that provision would be made in the Supplementary Estimates. Provision has been made for a certain amount but I still notice a decrease compared with last year of a little over $66,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: These estimates relate to last year. There are still further supplementary estimates to be presented.

Item agreed to.

Board of Commerce—further amount required to provide for arrears of salary of the secretary from July 1, 1921, to March 31, 1922, $3,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This ends the Board of Commerce.

Mr. CRERAR: This winds it up?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, it covers the funeral expenses.

Mr. FIELDING: Financially and otherwise.

Item agreed to.

Expenses of the Canadian Delegates to the Economic and Financial Conference at Genoa (Governor General's warrant, February 20, 1922), $25,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Might I ask the Prime Minister the circumstances under which the Canadian Government were asked to participate in the Genoa Conference? Did we receive an invitation direct from Italy, as I understand the other countries that are sending delegates to this conference did?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: An invitation direct from the Italian government to the Government of Canada asking us to send delegates was received.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did the conference commence?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My recollection is that it was about three weeks ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this charged against last year's expenditure?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may inform my right hon. friend that it was necessary for the delegates to leave Canada during the last fiscal year to reach Genoa in time, and that the whole amount has not been used up. I am informed that there is an unexpended balance of $8,852.62 which has lapsed and must be revoted when we come to the estimates for this year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did the delegates leave Canada?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have not the exact date here, but it was some time in the last fiscal year.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Some time in March, because the conference opened on April 5.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Even if they did leave Canada toward the end of the fiscal year that would not make it a legitimate charge against last year's expenditure. It would be a very small amount that could possibly be justified, if anything at all, against last year's expenditures. It should have been included in this year's expenditures in the usual way.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: An estimate was put in about the middle of March.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But even so the conference is being held this year.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I object to this resolution carrying. I think the Government should be fair in this matter. It is not a very large item, but it shows a rather too ardent desire to shove this year's expenditures into last year.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. members think it is a joke. Well, there is something of a joke about it.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Not at all. It is impossible to make provision for any delegates attending the conference except by Governor General's warrant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well if there was a little money required to carry them on their way the Governor General's warrant might have covered it. The whole thing might have been covered by one warant but to charge it to last year's expenditure is not right.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The delegates were each given an advance of $8,000, I think. That does not seem a very large amount to take over for such a purpose.

Mr. JACOBS: Particularly for Sir Charles Gordon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member thinks he is a pretty expensive man.

Mr. JACOBS: I am sure he needed money before he started.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The proper way for the Government to have acted was to have advanced such money as was essential if the delegates had to leave in March, and to advance the balance the coming year. Then the thing could have been done quite rightly without charging the entire amount to last year. That seems to be the general policy adopted—to make last year pay for this year's work.

[Mr. Lapointe.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I may point out that the invitation was received on January 21 and it was at that time the Government began to make this arrangement.

Mr. CRERAR: I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he can give us any information as to the nature of the instructions given to these delegates as far as their work at Genoa is concerned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Generally they were asked to participate in the conference, and to keep the Government informed as to any matters which it was thought advisable to bring to the Government's attention. I think my hon. friend had placed before him the proceedings at the Cannes Conference which outlined the work to be done at the Genoa Conference and the duties of the delegates would pertain to the programme outlined there. The delegates were instructed to observe those matters pertaining more essentially to the European countries, but to pay particular attention to those matters relating to the Dominion and not to take final action with respect to the signing of any treaties or agreements without fully informing the Government of the nature of the proposed treaties before final action was determined upon.

Mr. CRERAR: And receiving the Government's approval.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, and also to see that all agreements or treaties that were signed were made subject to the approval of Parliament.

Mr. JACOBS: I see by the press that the conference has determined the question of the mandate of Great Britain over Palestine. Can the Prime Minister tell us if any instructions have been given our delegates with regard to their action in the matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, they have an absolutely free hand in regard to Palestine.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Can the minister tell us what has been accomplished by Sir Charles Gordon and his co-representative on behalf of Canada in the way of economic regeneration?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government has asked Sir Charles Gordon to give a report at the end of the proceedings, and I will have pleasure in seeing that that report is brought down in due course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As yet they have not any information as to anything being accomplished.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think the world has word of anything being accomplished in the conference, our delegates are in the same position as delegates of other countries, and I presume they are doing just as well as the others.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I observe that certain countries are in danger of losing their representatives on account of the high cost of living at Genoa. Has the Government considered that matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I think their expenses are being paid by the Italian government, so that, as far as this Government is concerned, we have escaped.

Item agreed to.

Reprinting Criminal Code including 1920-21 amendment, $1,500.
Reprinting annual statutes, years 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1919, 1920, $9,100.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think this is charged under the wrong heading. It is charged to legislation. The reprinting of the Criminal Code is part of the administration of justice and I think should be charged to that department, and probably "reprinting annual statutes" should also come under that department. I do not know whether any one desires the change to be made at the present time, but I think for the future notice should be taken of it, and it should be put in its proper vote in the Department of Justice, and not under legislation.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I think the hon. gentleman is quite right in regard to that, although this work has been done by the Law Department of the House of Commons.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I did see some explanation to the effect that this was to cover the cost of material at the Printing Bureau, and that copies of these statutes were for sale on application.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is it in last year's estimates?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should think probably the 1921 amendments would be done pretty well in the early part of the year.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not know whether I am in order in asking the Government whether it is their intention to revise the Criminal Code. This code was introduced about 30 years ago and no revision has taken place since. It is customary to revise the ordinary statutes every ten years. I know that the matter was discussed at a recent meeting of the Council of the Canadian Bar Association, and it was thought advisable to urge upon the Government the necessity of a revision of this code, because many amendments have been introduced in the past 30 years.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It was revised in 1906, when all the statutes were revised.

Mr. JACOBS: That is 16 years ago, and I think something should be done in the matter of consolidating it and bringing it into some kind of shape.

Mr. BOIVIN: I might say, for the information of the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs), that he can obtain a copy of the Criminal Code which is completely revised, with the exception of the amendments passed last year. The revision has been made from time to time by the Parliamentary Counsel, and the code in its completed and amended form can be obtained from the King's Printer.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not mean the ordinary revision, but I refer to the question of overhauling the entire code and bringing it abreast of the times. There are very many matters which I think ought to be re-codified and re-discussed, if I may use that expression. The Criminal Code must naturally keep abreast of public opinion, and, as it is the rule in other countries to have their criminal legislation gone over from time to time, I think it would be well that we should deal with that now. There are many things in the Criminal Code that might be changed, as many things have happened during the past sixteen years. The Criminal Code is an important piece of legislation, and it should be given more attention than it has been receiving during the past sixteen years.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What my hon. friend has said has application to the Criminal Code, but the time has long since passed when the whole of the statutes of Canada should have been revised. There has been no revision of the statutes since 1906, when the Criminal Code was revised, consolidated and passed. The work of revision of the statutes which, I think, should take place every ten years, is long overdue, but I understand the work was well under way last autumn. Very substantial progress had been made on that work on, I believe, very

satisfactory financial conditions and terms. It would not take very long now to complete the work, and I sincerely hope the Government will prosecute it to a successful conclusion at the earliest posible moment.

Mr. JACOBS: To what extent was the work done last autumn?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I should think three-quarters of the work had been done.

Mr. JACOBS: By whom?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. O'Connor had done a good deal of it. I do not remember just what the arrangements were; but they provided for complete revision at a cost very substantially less than it had been done before, although ordinarily the cost would be very much greater now. I think the Government would do well to review the whole matter thoroughly, because I thought it an excellent arrangement for revision.

Mr. JACOBS: In matters of that kind, is it not necessary to have reports made from time to time to the Government as to the advisability of changes, additions, amendments and so on in legislation? I do not mean in the matter of consolidating the statutes, but in overhauling an entire statute.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That, of course, is another matter which hardly should be committed to the man in charge of revision.

Mr. JACOBS: To Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes. It is certainly time we had a complete revision; the arrangement made for revision was economical, and the work was going on most expertly. I hope the Government will continue the revision and have it completed.

Mr. BOIVIN: How long was Mr. O'Connor employed on this work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not say; but Mr. O'Connor is a man, who, when he is on a task, works night and day. He is a prodigious worker when he is at work, and he is a very efficient man in that class of work.

Mr. BOIVIN: What salary was paid to him for the work?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I could not say what was paid. I knew at one time what the arrangement was, and it can easily be ascertained.

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General): I hardly think there was any such understanding about the matter as that given by my right hon. friend. The leader of the Opposition says that there was an arrangement with Mr. O'Connor about this work. We all know that Mr. O'Connor is a very capable man and a very efficient worker in anything which he undertakes. But it must not be supposed that it rests with this Government to continue the arrangement, because the arrangement was cut off by the late government many months before they went out of office, and they paid Mr. O'Connor for the work he did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that is right.

Mr. McKENZIE: If there is anything to be done henceforth, what will be done must be taken up afresh and some new arrangement made.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really think my hon. friend is wrong because I knew nothing about that.

Mr. McKENZIE: My right hon. friend will find that I am not wrong.

Mr. MEIGHEN: By what officer was this done?

Mr. McKENZIE: The matter, as regards the settling up, was done by the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know what the Deputy Minister of Justice may have felt or thought or done about the matter; but I do not think the government, as a government, authorized the cancellation of any arrangement. If so, I knew nothing of it, and I would be surprised that such is the fact.

Mr. McKENZIE: My right hon. friend may rest assured that I have the correct information, because I have it from Mr. O'Connor himself. It is not second hand at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I talked to him not long ago, and I did not get that impression at all.

Item agreed to.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture—for stock grazing and feeding—Governor General's warrants, December 1, 1921, and February 7, 1922, $50,000.

Mr. LUCAS: Will the minister kindly give us some explanation of this item?

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): This heading is somewhat misleading. I do not know exactly why it

is inserted in this way, but this is the way in which it has been carried in the estimates from year to year. It is really for what is familiarly known as the free freight which the Government of the Dominion, the western provinces and the railways have arranged to carry for the settlers in those dry areas. About $25,000 was for Alberta, $10,000 for Manitoba and $15,000 for Saskatchewan.

Item agreed to.

Labour—unemployment relief, further amount required (Governor General's warrants, July 23, 1921, and January 16, 1922), $400,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was the warrant of January 16, 1922?

Mr. MURDOCK: Each warrant was for $200,000.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There are only two remaining items—401, and 426 relating to Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Possibly, if there is no objection, we might pass them; and if there is likely to be any discussion on them it could take place when the main estimates come up.

The CHAIRMAN: The items have all been passed except 406, which has been withdrawn.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) is anxious to have Bill No. 71, to amend the Railway Act, 1919, go to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. With the consent of the House I would move that we return to Public Bills and Orders in order that the hon. member may move the second reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Church, Bill No. 71 to amend the Railway Act, 1919, was read the second time and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

THE IMMIGRATION ACT, AMENDMENT

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: With the permission of the House I move to have the following names added to the Special Committee to which have been referred Bills Nos. 16 and 17: Messrs. Ryckman, Ross, (Kingston), Hocken and McQuarrie. That makes up the twenty members of this Special Committee.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King, the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Friday, May 12, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

RAILWAY TRANSPORTATION

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax) presented the second report of the Special Committee appointed to consider Railway transportation, as follows:

Your Committee recommend that the discussion, as well as evidence being taken by the Special Committee considering Railway Transportation Costs, be stenographically reported and printed as part of the record.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Frederick Naylor.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 82 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Yallowley Jones Conalty.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 83 (from the Senate), for the relief of Telesphore Joseph Morin.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate), for the relief of Daisy Mary Nicholson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

REDISTRIBUTION

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—DAYS FOR PRIVATE MEMBERS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. JOSEPH T. SHAW (West Calgary): Mr. Speaker—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask:

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for West Calgary (Mr. Shaw) caught my eye first.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he would be prepared to recommend, and the House if it would be prepared to concur in, the recommendation that the resolution regarding redistribution, of which I gave notice, should be considered at some time fixed conveniently to suit the Prime Minister.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): There is no objection to having

any matter considered, but the Government would like to select its own time for its consideration.

Mr. SHAW: Could the Prime Minister now indicate what time would be satisfactory to him?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No, it would not be possible to do so at the moment. I might mention that my hon. friend's resolution is one of a large number that appear on the Order Paper, and I think it would only be fair to hon. members that these resolutions should be taken up in the order in which they appear. There appears to have been some misunderstanding as to when private members' day would end. I said to the House—and I think it was generally so understood when I spoke the other day—that Monday and Wednesday of the present week would be the last days on which private members' business would have precedence. I should now like to say that there is the motion relating to the subject of oleomargarine, No. 23, which reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in the best interests of the Dairy Industry and of the public generally, the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine should be discontinued in Canada after September first next.

The Government would like to have the views of hon. members of the House on that subject, and I would be agreeable to promising consideration of this resolution on Monday next, if members of the House wish to have it taken up at that time. In regard to the other motion, I think I will have to ask my hon friends to allow the Government opportunity to consider what would be the best time to consider it.

Mr. GOOD: I have read the resolution which was submitted by the Government, and it distinctly states that next Monday will be available for private members' resolutions. I had previously understood the Prime Minister as he now expresses himself, but the resolution distinctly permitted members, resolutions on Monday next. I hope that is generally understood.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am glad my hon. friend has raised the point. Of course, I shall have to place myself in the hands of the House in this matter. I noticed in looking over the records that the resolution did appear as my hon. friend has said, but I immediately drew the attention of the Clerk to the circumstance that the amendment that I had proposed was intended to mean on and after Monday. The words "on and" were omitted in the printing. I think every hon. member who heard me speak here—and I think Hansard will bear it out—understood that the Government would desire to take Monday next for its business. The Government would like to hold to this, but we are agreeable to making an exception with respect to the one motion I have spoken of. If hon. gentlemen did not so understand me, I am prepared to consider the matter further, but I think it is desirable to get on with the main business of the House as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CRERAR: My understanding of the matter was precisely as the Prime Minister stated, that after this week the Government would take all days for their business. It is true, the motion as it appears in the records bears a different construction. I would suggest to the Government however that, perhaps, under the circumstances it would be advisable to leave Monday for private members, if the Government can see its way to do so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to meet my hon. friends opposite so far as possible. Might I suggest—if this is agreeable to the House—that the Government undertake to ask that resolution No. 23, that is the one respecting oleomargarine, be considered first thing on Monday next, and then when that resolution has been disposed of, we take up the other notices of motions in the order in which they appear? If that is agreeable to hon. members, I will undertake to follow that procedure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): As resolutions passed by the House govern their wording, and not speeches—I am not at all contradicting what the Prime Minister says—we have Monday next as private members' day unless some action is taken in the meantime; and it is only by appropriate action to the contrary that that could be changed.

DATE OF THE BUDGET

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I think I will anticipate the question of the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton). I almost imagined that he had some reference to the possibility of the Budget. I had the hope

and plan, indeed, that I might fix a date towards the end of the coming week, but to be on the safe side, I propose to fix Tuesday, the 23rd, as the date of the Budget.

PRIVILEGE—MR. COPP

CORRECTION OF REPORT CONCERNING REPARATION CLAIMS

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. A. B. COPP (Secretary of State): I desire to take this opportunity, as a matter of privilege, of correcting a statement attributed to me in a report appearing in the Montreal Gazette, and possibly in other newspapers throughout the country:

> Mr. Copp stated that reparation claims amounting to $22,000,000 had been filed. Some of these claims had already been satisfied.

I desire to state most explicitly that I made no such statement as that, and if hon. members will refer to unrevised Hansard, page 1735, they will see exactly what I did say. I do not, for a moment, suggest that the reporter wilfully made this statement; but I do not want the statement spread broadcast throughout the country, because there have been filed in the department a large number of these claims, none of which has been paid. Those who have filed reparation claims, if some had been paid, would naturally be surprised that all the claims had not been considered at one and the same time. I want to make it clear that no claims have been considered or paid by the department.

POTLATCH INSTITUTION

NUMBER OF INDIANS SERVING GAOL TERMS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. W. FINDLAY (South Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Government if they have any further statement to make with regard to the matter, to which I referred a few days ago, of those in British Columbia who are at present taking part in the Indian celebration commonly known as the Potlatch. It will be remembered that, when I brought this matter up the other day, the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) said that he was unable to hear sufficiently what I said to conclude what I was talking about. He suggested that he would confer with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) and myself, and let me know what the situation was. I have had, I may say, one or two private conferences with the Minister of the Interior, and it will be remembered that, when I first introduced this question, the reason was that the minister had made a statement in reply to a question placed upon the Order Paper by the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Ladner), and—

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman intends to put a question?

Mr. FINDLAY: Yes, for information.

Mr. SPEAKER: No debate is permissible on questions on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. FINDLAY: I merely want to know if the Government intend to give me any information as to the situation with regard to those Indians.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I think I owe my hon. friend an apology for not having given him this information sooner. It was at hand yesterday; the Minister of the Interior had it, and he intended to give the reply in the House yesterday; but he was obliged to leave in the afternoon, and he left the answer with me. I have it here. The position is as follows, according to this statement by the acting deputy Superintendent General:

> The reply as prepared for the House contained the particulars with respect to the number of convictions for potlatching and the number of those serving terms of imprisonment as ascertained from Mounted Police reports up to the date of the question as it appeared in the Order Paper. We have just now received—

This is dated May 10:

> —from our agent for the Kwawkewlth agency, where these prosecutions have taken place, a report which contains the following paragraph and which I presume is an exact statement of the facts and is somewhat different from the particulars that we have gleaned from the Mounted Police reports: ;
>
> "The principal item of interest during the month of April was the completion of the potlatch prosecutions., Fifty-eight informations had been laid which after being heard resulted in nine dismissals, twenty-three were given suspended sentence, twenty-two were sentenced to two months' imprisonment and four six months' imprisonment. In the case of three of the latter the stay of execution was suspended and an application made for parole."

Those, I think, are the true facts of the case.

Mr. FINDLAY: Do I understand that, at the present time, they are all released except four?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Apparently not. The hon. gentleman will be able to refer to the statement I have read.

SUPPLY

AIR BOARD

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

The Air Board—	
Salaries..	$ 75,000
Contingencies..	17,500
Canadian Air Force and Civil Aviation..	907,500
	$1,000,000

Mr. PARENT: What does the Civil Aviation consist of?

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Militia and Defence): The Civil Aviation consists almost altogether of work done for the other departments, such as fire ranging, work done for other provinces, and survey work.

Mr. JACOBS: How much for other provinces?

Mr. GRAHAM: The province of Quebec last year erected buildings worth, if I remember aright, $20,000 at Roberval, and the department went fifty-fifty They took the buildings as the province's share, and they did the fire ranging for the province. Ontario paid $50,000 for her share, and British Columbia $20,000.

Mr. JACOBS: If this was worked up by the provinces, why do the Dominion authorities contribute anything to it? The provinces in some cases, are much better off than the Dominion authorities.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is one of these peculiar situations where the federal Government participates, as it does sometimes in the matter of education. It is an experiment in collaboration with the provinces. The imperial authorities presented by the federal Government $5,000,000 worth of aviation equipment, and the work could not very well be undertaken by all the provinces unless they purchased their own equipment, so we gave it to them. The federal government undertook for a time to do this work. This year we have informed the provinces as well as the other departments of the Dominion government that if they want work done we shall be glad to undertake it, provided they pay the cost of doing it.

Mr. STEVENS: Is this reduction in connection with civil aviation, or with what might be described as the military branch?

Mr. GRAHAM: Both. There is a misconception as to what the department really intends to do with the Air Force. It was divided into civil and military. As a matter of fact, if Canada were in a position to enter largely into a field of this kind I should be rather inclined to leave the service as it was, under an air board attached to the department. But the force is comparatively small, and, in my opinion, must for a few years at least be in a merely experimental state. Consequently it and the Militia Department are being brought under the Department of National Defence. The Militia Department is not absorbing any of these entities; the idea is simply to amalgamate the three services so as, if possible, to reduce executive expenses. There has been a considerable difference of opinion, and not without reason, as to whether it was better to keep the Air Force outside the military branch than to bring it into the Department of National Defence. If we had a large organization and anticipated a large expenditure and a great development in the Air Force, it might be as well to leave it by itself. But I take it for granted that we are not in a position to develop any considerable organization just now in Canada. Furthermore, when civil aviation has reached a certain point in its development, private companies will largely undertake this work. I may not be in accord with hon. members, but I do believe that the Dominion is not prepared to enter upon any large scheme of government-owned and operated civil aviation service. I think that we should rather, for a time, act as instructors, allowing private companies and the provinces to get into the business themselves and look after their own affairs. That part of the work will be carried on under the new arrangement precisely as was done previously, and we hope this year to carry on all the civil aviation work we did last year. We are asking, however, that the provinces and the other departments of the Government pay the costs of operation, and we can assure them that the work will be done just as thoroughly as heretofore.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There are two changes, I understand. The minister purposes to ask for larger contributions from the provinces for the services they get, and he also intends to assess the other departments for the benefits they derive from the organization. That accounts, I presume, for the substantial diminution in the estimates?

Mr. GRAHAM: It will account for some of it; the amounts are not overly large.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I hope the minister will not feel discouraged when I say that I concur in the attitude that he has taken towards this estimate, and I sincerely hope that my fidelity to the estimate will not alter his, and that we shall not find him coming back with another one later on. Very manifestly it would not be the part of economy, and consequently not the part of wisdom—because it would not carry with it efficiency—if all the provinces should commence individually air force organizations, at least while the science is in the experimental stage. You could scarcely conceive a greater waste of effort and money than would eventuate from such a course as that. The Dominion is the possessor of the equipment for this work. The work is almost wholly experimental, and undoubtedly can be done better by the Dominion Government in co-operation with the provinces than it ever could be done by the provinces themselves, each acting on its own initiative and separately. For myself, I have the utmost confidence—well, I will not say that, but at any rate I have some confidence—that very considerable results will be achieved, and that ere long, in the matter of forest fire protection. I may be wrong, but I think that in discussion of the estimates of the Interior Department this session the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) explained how a very considerable saving had been effected already on the timber areas in British Columbia by the adoption of this method of preservation. The department is therefore well advised as respects that matter, if there were nothing else to influence them, not to abandon the Air Force work. In regard to survey work for the Interior and other departments, although I am not sure that it has yet reached the point where it might be described as being a success, nevertheless it has not been brought to the point where failure is evident. There is in this connection also an opening for real service and real economy. For these reasons I support the attitude of the minister and hope he will not abandon it.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) is right. I imagine it will not be very long before a good deal of the work on the ground in the matter of fire protection is done away with. Most of the work is done in the air; in the Winnipeg district that is the case at the present time. The department received a letter the other day from the engineers, who are preparing their report on the deep waterways, informing us that the air service had been of inestimable value to them in doing their work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I understand that the High River station has rendered a great service in saving the Dominion forest reserve in that district, or at least in the vicinity, from destruction by fire during the past year. Is it the intention of the department to do away with this station at that point?

Mr. GRAHAM: We hope to be able to do the work, to put it mildly, as thoroughly as it was done last year, and if possible to do more work.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I should like a more definite statement from the minister. I have had letters from the boards of trade, not only in my own constituency but in the constituency of my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Coote), protesting against any diminution on the part of the federal government of its activities in this matter. They are opposed to such a course for more reasons than just the preservation of the forest as such. The preservation of the forest is absolutely essential to the irrigation projects now under way in southern Alberta, and we protest most earnestly against any diminution on the part of the Dominion government of the good work that has been done in the past. I should be glad if the minister would state definitely whether or not that station is to be maintained.

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot for the life of me see how the report got out that the air station at High River was to be abolished. I received a great many communications myself, and delved all around the department, but without avail, to find any one who knew how the suggestion had got out. The station will be maintained, as I said before, and possibly more work will be done than was done last year.

Mr. KELLNER: Did the minister say it was the intention to have the provincial governments pay for this work in the different provinces?

Mr. GRAHAM: We are asking the provincial governments to pay the cost of operation in connection with any work we do for them. They were informed last August of this decision on the part of the department.

Mr. KELLNER: It would not seem right that the provinces which have not got their natural resources should have to pay those expenses in the same proportion as the provinces which have.

Mr. GRAHAM: Three provinces have asked us to perform the work—Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia, and I am afraid the question of natural resources does not come up in connection with these provinces.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): How much of this work was done in each of the provinces last year, and at what cost?

Mr. GRAHAM: The cost of the operations at Vancouver was $63,958.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): That would be for the province of British Columbia?

Mr. GRAHAM: No, some of that was for the Dominion. About $20,000 was paid by the British Columbia government. At High river the cost was $120,669. Quite a large proportion of that was for construction of the wireless station there and other work in connection with it.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Would that $120,000 be charged wholly against the province, or would part of it be borne by the Dominion?

Mr. GRAHAM: All by the Dominion, I think. At Victoria Beach, Man., the expenditure was $66,870; at Sioux Lookout, $35,574; the Ontario government reimbursed the federal government $15,000 of that expenditure; Roberval, Quebec, $31,099; Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, $43,322; Ottawa, $59,512; Haileybury, $1,049.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is the High river station the only one in Alberta? I think most of the timber is in the northern part of the province.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is the only station in Alberta. Last year a machine was sent to Jasper for a short time.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is it the intention of the department to extend the work into northern Alberta in view of the fact that this method is more efficient than the other?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am afraid we cannot promise much extension of the work with the estimate where it is.

Mr. DUFF: What work was done at Dartmouth, Nova Scotia?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a station which was used largely for sea-planes. It was in use during the war. The work performed at that station was not very extensive last year, most of the expenditure representing maintenance.

Mr. DUFF: Does not the minister think that that station should be closed?

Mr. GRAHAM: We will consult with the provincial government.

Mr. GOULD: I did not catch from the minister his report for the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. GRAHAM: It would be hard to catch. There was no request from Saskatchewan, and no work was done.

Mr. GOULD: I am pleased to hear the minister state that fire prevention work over our timber areas would be done by aeroplane, and I merely wish to add that that is the thought which was in the minds of our people here when we were talking about the militia estimates, that the air service will do the work in future instead of the militia.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think the plan is right of assessing against the provinces the services performed for them, as certain provinces will require more service than others and they should pay proportionately. But what is the value of collecting from the various departments for any services rendered in regard to work formerly done by those departments? It will entail all sorts of bookkeeping and an additional cumbersome organization.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a matter of arrangement between the departments. As Minister of Railways my experience was that whenever anything was to be carried some members of the government got it into their heads that my railways ought to carry it for nothing, and my department was made the goat, and at the end of the year the real showing of the railways was not evidenced in the report. So far as the Dominion treasury is concerned it does not make any difference. But for years past the militia estimates have been severely criticised and economy has been urged. What I had in my mind was this. For example, if the Interior Department wanted to appropriate $50,000 for fire rangers, and this Air Force were not in existence, the Department of the Interior would have to pay for the men engaged in the work. If we do the work for the Interior Depart-

ment, then the Department of National Defence should not be charged with an expenditure, that ought to be made by the Department of the Interior. I wanted to show the actual expenditure of my department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has been pretty frank. The only object he has in mind is to keep the defence estimates down, and thereby be able to show that the Government has kept its pledge.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the other men do the same thing it will be all right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know he is all right. The Intercolonial Railway when it was operated by the Department of Railways was made the goat—it was supposed to carry everything free. That was all remedied by the late government, so this government will not have to face that condition again.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not see any evidence of that anywhere. I will bring that up on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has all been cured. This is a case of the government service. You might just as well take any other department and where it does anything that was formerly done by another department charge it up to that other department. That would apply to the Departments of the Interior, Militia,—to every department of the Government. You would have a sort of interchange bookkeeping system that would be the most cumbersome and unmanageable in the world. If the Department of Militia and Defence is performing certain services, those services are not performed for particular individuals, as was the case with the railway service in former years; those services are performed for the whole nation. I see the object the minister has in view, but that is no good reason for adopting this course as relating to the Air Force. I submit the same plan should be followed as in all other departments of the government.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not want to block these estimates, Mr. Chairman, but I submit that the man who is put at the head of a department should run it on business principles, and if some other department wants his department to spend $50,000, that other department ought to ask for the appropriation and make the necessary transfer. In a large departmental store every branch is on its own footing, and if it lends anything to another branch it gets credit and the other branch is debited with it. That is the only way in which the head of such an institution can tell which branch is doing business properly and which is not. Now, if one branch of the government service is to be charged with work done for three or four other branches, it may look like a very extravagant branch when it is perhaps the most economical of the lot. I had my difficulties with the Department of Militia and Defence when I was Minister of Railways with reference to the transport of troops and so forth. I insisted that they should use their own railway and that they should pay for it when they did. Why should the Department of Railways carry troops for the Department of Militia, run up its deficit and keep down the expenditures of the Department of Militia?—I am referring to it, of course, from the point of view of the presentation of the results of the work of each department to the House and to the public.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What the public want to know is what the Air Force is costing. The minister proposes to charge each department for any special work he does for it, and there will be no way of ascertaining what the Air Board costs. That is a way of camouflaging it, of disguising it, by making it appear, if only the total is looked at and no examination is made beneath the surface, that the expenditure has been reduced. If I understand the minister's statement aright, the whole operations of the Air Board are to be continued. I have not heard that any are to be cut off, unless it be that work heretofore done for the provinces on the principle of fifty-fifty is now to be done entirely at provincial expense. That would involve a reduction, but only a very slight one, because the amount contributed by the provinces was very small indeed. But the whole work is evidently to go on and the whole expense will probably be there. All the salaries are continued—$75,000 for this year just the same as last year. What I object to in the system is this: certain newspapers in this country when these estimates were published proclaimed that the minister had performed a wonderful service; that he had cut down the Air Board estimates by some $600,000 or $700,000. But it is evident that the whole work is to be continued; there is no real cut in the estimate, no real reduction in the expense. A good many promises of reduction were made, but according to the

statement given this afternoon by the minister the work is to be carried on as formerly, though instead of charging it to the Air Board, where it should be charged, it is to be spread out over various departments, with the result that the public will not know what the Air Force is costing. Now, last year the Air Board performed services for the Department of Marine and Fisheries; coastal patrols to prevent poaching and fishing out of season; transportation of spawn; rapid transportation to inaccessible points in British Columbia. That is all charged against the Air Board; we know what the Air Board is costing. Last year certain work was performed by the Air Board for the Department of Agriculture: securing vertical and oblique photographs of mosquito-infested areas in proximity to Vancouver. That was charged to the Air Board. If that work is continued it will be charged to the Department of Agriculture and we shall not know what the Air Board is costing. Last year the Air Board did work for the Department of the Interior; oblique photography of deltas, lakes, etc., for map purposes; also forest fire protection work, forest reconnaissance, and inspection of burnt areas from the air All that work was charged to the Air Board, so that the people know what the cost is. Now, the minister proposes to charge it to the Department of Interior, and no one will know what the Air Board costs. Last year the Air Board did work for the Department of Customs—here is a new avenue of work for it: patrols to prevent smuggling of drugs from the East into Canada. I think it was brought out in a debate we had in the House a few days ago that a good many of these drugs gain access to Canada by being thrown overboard in casks and barrels and picked up by fishing boats near the coast and brought ashore. That has been very largely stopped through the efforts of the Air Board. The activities of the board in this respect are now to be charged to the Department of Customs. I submit that the proposal is wrong. The air service is now a very important item in the budget of every country. Last year the vote for this purpose in the United States was $95,000,000; I think it is about the same this year, or perhaps larger. In Great Britain the amount spent is tremendous. Australia and New Zealand have made their first expenditure in air service, and I think every civilized nation has done likewise. The work is experimental as yet and the people are curious to know just what it costs. It is an expensive service, there is no doubt about that. Machines are costly; repairs run into large sums; high-class men have to be well paid—flying operations from the beginning to end are vastly expensive. I submit that the estimates last year and the year before were pared down to a very modest and reasonable amount, one quite in keeping with our general expenditure and our general requirements. This year there is a change in method, but there is going to be no change in result; in fact, any change made under the proposal of the minister will be detrimental. We know to-day just what the Air Board costs, what officials will be retained, and what salaries are to be paid. By the way, I understand that the resignation of the only official who acted in a purely honorary capacity and who gave wonderful service has been accepted since the new Government took office. I refer to Colonel O. M. Biggar, who since the Air Board was constituted had been its deputy chairman and gave his services without remuneration. About a year ago he tendered his resignation to me when I was acting as chairman of the board, but I did not accept it; he was too valuable a man. But I believe that the new administration has accepted his resignation, although he was the only unpaid official in the air service, and his work was extremely important and exceedingly well done, as is everything which Colonel Biggar does. On the whole I cannot take exception to the amount which the Government proposes to expend, but I do think it should be put just as plainly as it was last year; the House and the country should know what we propose to spend. It should all be in the estimates; let us know what the Air Board is costing Canada.

Mr. GRAHAM: That is so easy that I am surprised that my hon. friend should bring it up. If he had kept in mind what I said about the departmental store he would know and the country would know exactly what the air service costs. If there are to be credits from other departments they will appear as well.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why not put them all in one?

Mr. GRAHAM: They will be in one, but if there are any receipts from provinces or from other departments, they will be shown. The estimates will not be changed. Last year there were receipts from provinces.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then the information the minister gave the committee a few moments ago was very misleading, or I am very dense. I understood, because he put it in very plain language, that all that was done for the various departments was to be paid for by them. Now he leads me to believe that his present estimate is the whole expenditure on the air service. I do not know which is right. If the amount stated in this estimate, $1,000,000, is to be the total expenditure, reduced by $625,000 from last year, the minister should not maintain his whole staff as he is doing. He has cut down 33 per cent of his expenditure. I assume, then, that he will cut down at least one-third of his air operations. One may reasonably suppose that a third of his staff would likewise be cut down. But the first information which he gave to the leader of the Opposition was the correct information, that he proposed to continue the operations. He is now trying to camouflage it by letting each department charge itself with the amount which the service performed for that department represents. What the committee want to know, and what the people of this country want to know, is what the whole cost of the air service is going to be; if $1,000,000 is going to be the expenditure, let us know it, and if every department is going to add to that amount, let us know that also.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will remind the minister, before he rises, that I pointed out the difference between the $1,000,000 and the $1,625,000, and after he told me there were to be charges against departments and against governments, I said "That accounts for this difference," to which he replied that it accounted in part.

Mr. GRAHAM: To a very small extent, I think I said.

Mr. MEIGHEN: To any extent at all, it contradicts what the minister said, because if all the charges are in the $1,000,000 and the credits come in from the departments, they would not account for one dollar of the difference.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hon. gentlemen seem to object to the way in which I have brought this estimate down, and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) talks of "camouflage." There is no camouflage about it at all. He talks of not reducing the staff, but I am inclined to think he knows better. He knows because there have been many people to see him about it. Practically all the temporary staff of the Air Force, or at all events the great majority, have gone now and $35,000 will be saved in temporary employees who were paid out of the Air Board vote. There is $35,000 saved before we begin to reorganize.

Mr. GUTHRIE: First, that is not a correct statement; secondly, it is an unfair statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: Absolutely correct and perfectly fair.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No one has seen me on this subject, not a single individual from the minister down to the lowest official, and there has not been one letter—not a word.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have been to see me.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What I state is absolutely correct. Here is the estimate, $75,000, for this year just the same as last year. If you have cut down your operations this year one-third, why do you need the same vote as last year? I maintain that you are not cutting it down except on paper. You are really going to continue the same operations. I hope you will, but I say that you are trying to camouflge the expenditure. What about the resignation of Colonel Biggar, may I ask?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think this matter was explained by myself in the House on a former occasion, but when the militia estimates come up my hon. friend always takes great pains to make it embarrassing for the gentlemen themselves as well as for the minister, when any person retires of his own accord or is retired. The hon. member for South Wellington is no better friend of Colonel Biggar than I am. As I said in this House some weeks ago, Colonel Biggar worked for this
4 p.m. department gratis as vice-president and as soon as I came into the department he told me that he had offered his resignation some time before, and he offered it again. I asked him to retain his position for a while until we discovered what we were going to do. Then, when the time came to discuss the question of amalgamation, Colonel Biggar again offered his resignation, and I accepted it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has his place been filled?

Mr. GRAHAM: His place has not been filled.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the minister propose to fill his place?

Mr. GRAHAM: If we have the reorganization, there will be no place to fill.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the Air Board as now constituted to be continued?

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend has probably not read over the bill. The Air Board is not to be continued.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How is it to be operated—as a branch of the Defence Department? Is it to be a separate branch, and if so, who is to be the presiding genius, and what assistants will he have?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is very difficult to give these details before the reorganization is at least partially completed. The bill for bringing about the reorganization has not yet become law. As I explained some time ago, the Air Board will be an integral part of the Department of Defence: it will not be absorbed by the Department of Militia and Defence. I think I can say to the House that practically all the technical officers and most of the staff will be taken into the new Department of Defence. We shall have a Director of Aviation, and perhaps one or two assistants. The technical officers we have now will be part of the Department of Defence, and not on the outside but on the inside.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I see that the sum voted for salaries last year was $75,000. The minister says that he is getting rid of temporary employees to the amount of $35,000, but there is no corresponding reduction in this item. Why is that?

Mr. GRAHAM: That was not under this item. That was not my explanation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Out of what vote were the temporary help paid last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: Out of the general vote for the Air Force.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What were these people doing who were in temporary service?

Mr. GRAHAM: I am informed they were doing technical and equipment service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know just what that means. What is it? Repairing machines?

[Mr. Graham.]

Mr. GRAHAM: Aeronautical engineering staff, and stores. In addition, there were a lot of temporary clerks, as there are in every department. They were carried in the main bulk vote to the amount of $35,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why was that service necessary last year and not this year? The officer of the department will know.

Mr. GRAHAM: Because the staff does not need to be so large. In the first place, we are amalgamating, and we expect to get along with fewer quarter-masters and accountants, for instance. We expect to save something there. Then we have not so much money to spend. Some of the details of operation will be cut out, although the main work will be carried on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not just get my mind around that. The bill is not through yet for the amalgamation. I have always contended the minister did not need the bill, but he says he does. The bill is not yet through, and if these temporary employees are all being let out in anticipation of the bill going through, if they are away from the service now, they are not needed there, of course. There must be something that was done last year that is not being done this year, and I am anxious to find out what service that is. What would the amalgamation have to do with the aeronautical engineering service, for instance? Nothing in the world. The men repairing aeroplanes are not going to be any different whether the department is called National Defence, or Air Board.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will be doing less flying; there will be less of this kind of work.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What flying service is being cut down or eliminated?

Mr. GRAHAM: At the present time there is little or no training being done at Camp Borden. The camp will be opened up a little later on, but not to the extent it has been, probably.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But what service is going to be reduced? There would not be any training at Camp Borden last year more than this year. What service is being cut down or taken away?

Mr. GRAHAM: My information is that flying is being cut down proportionately. All I have stated in the House here is in

reference to the main work of civil aviation in the department. We hope to carry on the work that is being done for the provinces this year, but the other work is being cut in every particular, or we could not make this reduction.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is to say, there is going to be less aeroplane service for the protection of our own forests?

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. minister said that outside of what we were doing for the provinces all the rest was cut proportionately. Now, we are not protecting our own forests for the provinces, we are protecting them for ourselves. It follows, therefore, that that is being cut, or else the minister was not accurate. The minister's reply from his seat would indicate that he is not cutting that service. Then what is it? Is it the survey service for the Interior Department or for the Customs Department? What is it that is being reduced?

Mr. GRAHAM: I merely gave my hon. friend one item. We are not building any stations this year. We built quite a number last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I presume when stations are built they are built, and it would hardly be economy to tear them down. That accounts for some. Can the minister account for anything else?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is very technical.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not in the witness box. I am giving the House all the information I can give. We are doing this thing at Camp Borden, and cutting the expense in every quarter, without interfering with the special service of the organization.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked him if he was cutting at one quarter and he indignantly denied it.

Mr. GRAHAM: The right hon. member must not put words in my mouth. He is not catechising a witness in the witness box, and I am not going to permit him, even if he has been Prime Minister, to put words in my mouth which I have not used. I have answered the question fairly and thoroughly, and if talking and manufacturing in his own mind questions that he did not put, and answers that he did not receive, amuses him, let him go on.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister may not be a witness in the witness box; I did not say he was. But he is a minister of the Crown in Canada, subject to inquiry in the House as to his estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: Surely.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I asked him was what being reduced; I desire specific answers, and I am entitled to them. I am not demanding any answer because I was Prime Minister or anything on account of myself, other than that I am a member of Parliament, with the rights of a member of Parliament. The minister wants to get away by simply saying "Oh, I am reducing, I am cutting down expense," with the hope that the committee will get the impression that this is a great matter of economy on his part without reduction of service. Then I asked him what service he was reducing, and his reply was that he was reducing all-round proportionately. Then he said that he was not reducing the service to the provinces, but was reducing the rest. I am not putting words in his mouth. These are his own words. I said he must be reducing the service for the protection of our forests. From his seat he disputed that. Where have I put words in his mouth? Not at all. He is not reducing that service. He has so answered. I hope that answer is right and that he is not reducing the service. What service is he reducing? He said "we built some stations last year, and did not need to build them this year." That accounts for some reduction, but it is not a reduction of service.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a reduction in money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very good. I have accepted that. That is quite clear. We understand that. If that accounts for the whole reduction, all right, I am satisfied, but if it is something else I want to know specifically what it is, and I would like the minister to explain on what ground I am not entitled to an answer. I would like to know specifically what is being reduced, what has enabled him to do it, and where is the service that is going to be left, and why?

Mr. GRAHAM: I have answered these questions several times. The right hon. gentleman does not expect to get answers in dollars and cents in every detail. He knows that is impossible. We do be-

lieve that when we get the department properly organized, if we are allowed to do it, we can perform the essential service that we did last year at a much less expense than last year. We are cutting out at the present time training at Camp Borden. We will have the instruction school at Camp Borden later on I hope, and without giving the details in every particular, as no person can know at the present time just what they will be, we are undertaking to carry on the work with the reduction of $625,000, and I hope we will be able to do it; I believe we will. The work to be done by the different departments of the Government will depend on the requisitions of those departments of Government. Just at the moment I cannot tell in what I am going to reduce the work done for the different departments of government. I may reduce some and increase others; that will depend on the requisitions the different departments make. But we do believe we can carry on the service and give satisfaction to the provinces for $1,000,000. When the department is fully reorganized, and we get it in working shape, we will be able to give details, but at present it is impossible to give them, because we have not our organization perfect.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to ask one or two specific questions. Is it the intention of the department to maintain the same forest patrol in the railway belt in British Columbia, and in what is known as the Peace River block? Take the railway belt—

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, in the railway belt.

Mr. STEVENS: Is it intended to maintain the same patrol service at Vancouver in connection with the Customs Department and the other miscellaneous services rendered by the board and the department last year?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Customs Department have already asked that the patrols be maintained, and we believe we can maintain them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister resists giving us the details. He says "I am cutting down the amount, and you must leave it to me to make the saving where I can." I submit, the minister is not treating the committee properly. He can give many more details than he has given. Here is an estimate of $1,525,000 Canadian Air Force and Civil Aviation. His officers cut it down to $907,500. Note the "$500." They have it down to a matter of a hundred dollars. It is not as if it were reduced to a round $1,000,000, but it is reduced to $907,500. The officers of this department have the details making up that $907,500. They have the corresponding details making up the $1,525,000 of last year, and those details will show where the reductions are in each case, and the minister or his officers can tell this committee just how the reductions are made, whether by reduction of service, or how and just how much of that is due to the fact that the stations have been built, and how much is due to something else, and what the other things are.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Furthering what my right hon. friend has just said, the item of $907,500 has not been put there by chance or guess. It represents something. Last year the same item was $1,525,000, and we know what it represented. It was stated in the estimates last year that $700,000 of it was for civil aviation; $825,000 of it was for the Air Board for the military end of the service.

Of the $700,000 the items were as follows:

Flying for other Government Departments	$365,000

They charged it all up to the Air Board last year.

Experimental Flying Research	$ 50,000
Upkeep of equipment	80,000
Acquisition and equipment of civil air stations	220,000
Total	$715,000
Less amounts for operation on account of Ontario and Quebec	35,000
Total sum required	$680,000

In addition, there is an item of $20,000 for licensing, inquiry into accidents, survey of air routes, etc. This makes a total of $700,000. When we come to the military side of the Air Board work, we have a total of $825,000, according to the following details:

28-day refresher course for 190 flying officers	$380,000
28-day refresher course for 50 ground officers	22,000
3 months' course for 400 mechanics	240,000
Spare parts	100,000
Seaplane training	60,000
Provincial executives	23,000
Total	$825,000

That is what Parliament voted last year.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member has given us the full details of the expenditure of 1921-22. Would he be good enough to keep right on and give us the details for this year?

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. DUFF: Has the hon. member the details?

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, I have not.

Mr. DUFF: The hon. member has those of last year, wherever he got them. Will he tell us where he got those details from?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I had them in the House last year. I was questioned on them.

Mr. DUFF: Not those details.

Mr. GUTHRIE: If I was asked questions on them, I certainly had them before me, because this is the memorandum that I presented to the House last year when my estimates were before the House.

Mr. DUFF: Does it not belong to the department, and not to the hon. member? What right has the hon. member to that memorandum? It belongs to the department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have a right to it, and there is the duplicate of it in the department. I think there is a duplicate of it at this moment in the desk of the minister. If there is not, there should be. I want to know what is going to be done with the money for the current year. There is a lump item of $900,000, and not a single detail of what they are going to do with it. The least the minister could do would be to give to the committee some idea of what the expenditure is going to be. He must know how that item of $900,000 is made up. It will not take more than a minute or two to give it to the committee, and the committee is entitled to the information.

Mr. GRAHAM: I made the explanation a moment ago. It was all very well for my hon. friend last year to have the estimate of what he was going to do, because he was carrying on the Air Board just as it was before. All he had to do was to sit down and make out the estimates in detail. He knows, and the committee, knows that, on account of our reorganization, which I hoped would have taken place some weeks ago, but which has been delayed, it is impossible to sit down and make out those details, because we have not got into our new organization, we have not our departments together. The Air Board itself is not in a position to sit down and make out all those details, because it does not know whether it will be operated. Let me point this out to my hon. friend. I could give him some figures in connection with stations, not details, because, under present conditions, it is impossible to make out the details for the coming year under present conditions. We propose to keep the estimates within $1,000,000 and to give the essential services.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will that include the work which the Air Board is going to do for other departments?

Mr. GRAHAM: That will depend whether I can get any money out of the other departments or not. The figures to which I referred are; in round numbers:

Headquarters	$32,440
Vancouver air station	81,560
High river air station	82,000
Victoria beach air station	90,000
Parry Sound and Whitney unit	31,810
Ottawa air station	49,000
Ottawa photographic section	21,000
Aeroplane and engine repair depot	38,000
Roberval air station	35,000
Dartmouth air station	9,000

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister has let us have some light on some things that have been a mystery to us for some time as regards the merging of the three departments of Militia, Naval Service and the Air Force. He intimates to the committee now that, as regards the Air Force, the essential features are to be retained, which I assume to be the commercial or civil aviation features. As regards national defence, the Air Force is going to cease to exist entirely. The training at Camp Borden, the minister has informed the committee, is to be discontinued.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I did not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Or, that he hoped to have it reinstated at a later date.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say it was to be discontinued.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Then I misunderstood the minister. The Air Service is one that, I am afraid, the majority of people are inclined to underestimate. At the conference which took place at Washington some time ago between the great powers, one might have observed how readily the disarmament proposals which were made were being accepted by some of those countries, and at the same time the information

came out—and it is undoubtedly the view of many of those countries—that the air force was going to be a much more prominent feature of warfare in the future than it had ever been in the past, and that possibly some of those naval armaments would not be so invulnerable as they had been in the past, and might possibly be a handicap. As far as I can understand from the minister's explanation, the Air Force, as a defensive force, is practically going to cease to exist; the civil aviation is going to be continued if some arrangement can be made with the provinces to employ these people, who will be under the Department of National Defence, purely as a civil force, and the services of those men who attained such wonderful experience and training during the war will be dispensed with. The minister is apparently unable to give the committee the information which has been repeatedly asked for, because he does not know what arrangement he may be able to make with the different provinces in utilizing the force which would be under his control. I hope I have not misstated what the minister has said. The Departments of Naval Service, Militia and the Air Force are not being amalgamated into Department of National Defence; and so far as I can gather, the only body of, I will not say men, but of anything savouring of military training in this country, which body is going to be maintained and for which the estimate has been kept up, is that of the Boy Scout movement in Canada. Is it possible that the people of this country are going to depend on our boy scouts as a body of national defence in the future? The minister may smile, but this is a serious matter. While peace may prevail in this country at the present time, who knows how long peace may continue and how soon we may require the services of those men whom the minister is practically ignoring to-day and allowing to go back into civil life again? It is most important and essential that a number of these highly trained experts should be retained, so that this country might benefit from the valuable experiences which they have gained from the services which they rendered to Canada, instead of allowing this to become purely a civil force.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am glad to have my hon. friend speak in that way, because my great trouble during the past two weeks was in the opposite direction. The majority of people complained that I was making this all military and not leaving any civil force. As a matter of fact, practically all the aviators engaged in forest protection work are members of the Canadian Air Force, of the Defence force. This work which they do in doing civil aviation is for civil purposes, but it gives them possibly the best training they can get. They are really training for defence purposes in the work that they are carrying on. For instance, flying over the forests, photographing the ground beneath, is just the work they would be doing on the battlefield. While civil aviation is to be carried on, the bulk of it will be carried on by members of the Civil Aviation Force who will get the best training in air work in that way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I quite understand that the only men who are really competent to operate these flying machines are the men who have seen military service. But the minister has not denied the fact that it is becoming a civil force and is no longer a part of the national defence force at all. Why should men who are acting as fire rangers throughout the country be listed as part of the defence forces of the country? Yet that is what the minister is doing.

Mr. MANION: There is a very strong opinion on the part of authorities throughout the country that there is a great deal of destruction going on in our forests, and I understand that part of this force is used for the purpose of protecting these forests. Possibly the minister at an earlier stage may have explained this matter thoroughly, but if he did I was not present. I should like him to give to the committee more in detail some of the work which is being done by the air force in the protection of forests. He might tell us how much work is being done in sections of the country where the natural resources belong to the Dominion, and in other parts where the provinces own their own resources, such as Ontario, British Columbia and Quebec. This is an important question which is engaging the attention of the people of the country to-day.

Mr. GRAHAM: We discussed that matter at great length. We have been doing work for the province of Ontario, for example, in the protection of forests, and also for Quebec and British Columbia. The activities of the force have been engaged in the Forestry branch, the Geodetic Survey branch, the Topographical Survey branch, the Dominion Water Power branch, the Parks branch, the Reclamation Service

department, the International Boundary Commission and Town Planning branch, and the Geological Survey branch; and also in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Customs, the Canadian National Railways and the Department of Trade and Commerce. The force did some work for the Ontario government in forest protection, and, as well, for the provinces of British Columbia and Quebec.

Mr. MANION: What arrangement is made, in regard to this work, between the Dominion government, and, say, the province of Ontario, which owns its own lands? Is there some arrangement by which the work is carried on partly by the Dominion government and partly by the province?

Mr. GRAHAM: We are running two stations in Ontario, at Whitney and Parry Sound. The province pays the cost. Last year they paid $15,000. British Columbia last year paid $20,000. In Quebec there is a station built at Roberval. We took their construction of the station as their share of the work; but this year we propose to do the work on a return payment basis.

Mr. MANION: That is, they pay the expenses.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has given some stations where the cost is to be so much, totalling a very small sum, and he evidently desires to leave the impression that he is to have $625,000 saved by economies pending some bill which is to pass the Senate. Now, in the first place, the minister has been in departments long enough to know that all the amalgamation in the world will amount to a comparatively small matter compared to the cost of the services themselves. In fact, I doubt myself if it will amount to anything at all; I think it is mostly talk. For that matter, the minister could bring about the amalgamation under the law as it is to-day. The Air Board, under the statute passed a few years ago, could be moved into his department at any time; he does not need any bill for the purpose. But to say that he cannot tell what is to be applied to certain services, that is, how his officers estimate the application of this money, because he is awaiting the results of reorganization, is really to make a statement that cannot be accepted by any one who has had anything to do with departments. The minister knows what services were rendered before by the departments under every head; and when he comes to this committee and says that he does not know what he intends to do as respects any service that last year cost so much money, but wants the committee to vote him the money and let him do what he likes, he is simply asking for a blank cheque. Details have been given in previous years, and reorganization—a matter of an accountant or a supervisor here or there—has nothing at all to do with the question of services rendered in these various fields, so that there is no reason why the information cannot be given. If I am wrong the minister will correct me, but it seems to me that he told his department to cut the vote to a million dollars. They saw they would have to have $75,000 for salaries, and in order to make up the reduction they have cut the second vote to $17,500, and the estimate for Canadian Air Force and Civil Aviation to $907,500. If they have not made up their minds as to how they intend to apply the money in the particular fields of service, as was done last year, then they are not prepared to come and ask for a vote. They should wait until they are ready to submit the figures to Parliament; but they need not wait for reorganization. They cannot cover such a multitude of sins with the pretext of waiting for the bill to pass the Senate. They should know, if they do not, what it is intended to apply in the various fields designated by the ex-Minister of Air Service. I really think they must have that information here. If they cannot give it with absolute accuracy, they could be accurate enough for all the purposes of the committee.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): I represent a section of the country covering some 10,000 square miles, where forest fires are an annual occurrence. Tremendous losses are sustained in both Gaspé and Bonaventure as a result of these fires, and I am glad to know that an arrangement is being made with the provinces by which protection is to be given to the forests. I think that is the phase of the aviation service that will appeal to the people generally, because our forests are one of the most valuable assets of the country. Do I understand from the minister that this service is provided on application from the provinces, and that the arrangements rest with the provincial governments? Is there a patrol kept up regularly in the Gaspé peninsula?

Mr. GRAHAM: Where the Dominion has no lands the province itself is responsible for the protection of forests. They call on the department to provide the service, for which they pay. We are now in correspondence with the Quebec government.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not intend to detain the committee, but I want to point out as a final protest that while we, as the people's representatives are deliberating on an item involving a million dollars, there is not one man in the committee, save the minister himself, who knows what is to be done with that money. Now, is that right? If we vote this money, every dollar of it can be spent for the militia of Canada, and there is nothing before the committee to limit the minister in any way in the expenditure of the money. We are asked to vote it blindly without any particulars except as regards two or three stations mentioned by the minister a few moments ago, which account for a small portion of the vote, and the general statement that work is to be done at High River and one or two other points. If we are to vote a million dollars without inquiry and without any definite information except the general statement that it is to be applied to the air service, I do not know why we cannot vote millions and millions of dollars without any details. I never saw a more blank vote asked for, and, if this committee passes it, I never saw a more blank vote given. I make my protest; I am not going to do anything more about it.

Mr. JELLIFF: I am not sure that I fully understood some of the figures given by the hon. minister. I understood him to say that the expense of the High River patrol last year was $120,000, and that this year it was to be $82,000, and that he expected to be able to give the same patrol service as was given last year in that part of the country. It is almost impossible for me to conceive how he can do that unless there was much extravagance and waste in the expenditure last year. We are very insistent in our part of the country that the patrol system be maintained to the fullest extent possible, and even extended. I do not know how far the patrol extends, but I live pretty well south in the province, in the Lethbridge district, and I know we have had a number of very serious forest fires to the west of us in the Waterton Parks region. My recollection is that we have had such forest fires nearly every year. I do not think that the High River patrol as at present constituted reaches that far, although I may be mistaken. If it does not, I deem it essential that, instead of being restricted, the High River patrol should be extended so as to cover the Dominion forests and parks clear to the international boundary line. That is essential not only to preserve the forests for their timber, but to ensure the success of our irrigation projects there, as the snow on the forest clad hills is the source of moisture upon which that part of the country depends in a large degree. I hope the minister will look into this matter again and see that at least there is no cut in the amount allocated to keep the patrol at High River in a state of the highest efficiency.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difference is largely due to the fact that we spent approximately $30,000 last year in construction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I would suggest to the minister the advisability of letting this vote stand over until we have some definition of what "National Defence" really is. In the bill for the consolidation of the three old branches of the service I do not see any definition. If national defence in the future is to consist of an air force for forest ranging and the detection of smugglers, I think the House should know it, and that the Upper Chamber should also be so advised before the bill becomes law. To my mind national defence has an entirely different meaning from that of civil aviation for the purposes which have been outlined here. An air force undoubtedly is going to be a tremendously important factor in the defence of all countries in the future, much more so, I believe, than the average person realizes to-day, and it seems to me that you are dragging the service into the mire when you utilize it to detect smugglers and forest fires. The prevention of smuggling is essentially a work for the naval service—for the ships that are to be returned to the Motherland with the compliments of the Government of Canada. I quite agree with the late Minister of Militia (Mr. Guthrie) that we should have something more than this information so far given to this committee. If this money is to be expended on civil aviation, and the training at Camp Borden and elsewhere is to be abandoned, I think it is a very, very important matter and should be treated a little more seriously by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will try to explain the matter to my hon. friend again. This civil aviation in no way interferes with the practical work of the members of the Canadian Air Force, which is a defence force. As I said before, Camp Borden is closed at the present time, but it will be reopened and instruction will be given there as heretofore, but whether on as extensive a scale I do not know.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: During the present year?

Mr. GRAHAM: During the present year. Civil aviation for forest ranging and that kind of thing is confined to a few months in the summer. The training of the men in the Canadian Air Force can be carried on not only in flying but in other defence work during the whole year. I have given two or three times already particulars of the stations to which half of the $900,000 is to be allocated. The balance will be used in training of a military character for defence purposes and for the replacement of equipment and parts. As a matter of fact, it is hard to say what that amount will be. As was stated by the leader of the Opposition, I think it is comparatively easy to get the personnel for the flying corps; the expensive matter is the purchasing and maintenance of equipment, and you have to get the equipment as spare parts before you know whether you need it or not. I do not see how I can give the committee any further particulars. I have given them every particular that my official says he has. When we get down to our reorganization, which I assure my hon. friend is the most difficult thing I ever tried in my life to bring about—except, perhaps, to get a wife—

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: You made a better job then.

Mr. GRAHAM: I had better raw material to work on, perhaps. When we get the staff reorganized and working together we will have a plan in detail of just how much work will be performed with the balance of this vote.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Cannot the minister at least tell us how much of this $907,000 we are asked to vote is for the Canadian Air Force and how much is for civil aviation? Surely a rough division is possible.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have given that two or three times already.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: May we have it again? I have not got it right.

Mr. GRAHAM: The amount for civil aviation will be approximately $473,000 odd. As I have just explained, the balance will be for military training at Camp Borden by our instructors and the replacement and procuring of material and equipment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister says there is reorganization and that there is no telling what he may do. Well, he ought to know what he is going to do. Is he going to continue, for example, the votes under housing and personnel, the vote under hangars? That information was all before the House last year. It may be the minister cannot tell us whom he is going to be able to let go; I am not asking him for that. But of the services rendered the state he can tell us what ones he is going to continue and what ones he is not going to continue, and what ones he is going to reduce. If his officers are not in a position to give that information, then they should be sent back and made to get into that position. Also he can tell us how much was spent last year on construction and equipment of stations that does not need now to be spent. How much of this $625,000 is accounted for by that? That, with the other information, would give us all we are entitled to. I ask the minister to remember the orations we have heard often in this House and all through the country about the "fullest information to Parliament," about "the larger liberty" and "the new freedom," and to try to give us a little information.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year we spent on the construction of civil aviation stations, about $60,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And equipment?

Mr. GRAHAM: Equipping the stations, of course.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all the information we are going to get.

Item agreed to.

NAVAL SERVICE

Naval service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, in asking for the supply for the Naval Department for the ensuing year I think it is but fair

to the committee that I should explain that the money chargeable to the Naval Department is not expended entirely on the naval service proper. I will place on Hansard the names of the various branches of the department so that in discussing the estimates hon. members will understand that under certain headings we are asking for supply for services which have nothing to do with the Royal Canadian Navy.

We have what is known as the Royal Naval Service itself. Then we have the Fisheries Protection Service, which is composed of ten vessels, two on the Atlantic, two on the Pacific, two on the Great Lakes, and four not in use at the present time. These patrol the coasts of Canada and are charged with the regulation of fisheries. The duties of that branch I will explain under the estimates relating particularly to it. Then we have the survey of tides and currents, a service that is highly technical, involving the preparations of tables, etc., for the use of navigation. Then we have the branch called the Hydrographic Survey, composed of four main parties and five ships. These operate on the lower St. Lawrence, gulf of St. Lawrence, southern coast of Nova Scotia, and coast of British Columbia. The duties of this service are the preparations of charts of the coasts of Canada, such charts being guides for mariners; the fixing of relative levels of the St. Lawrence system as a basis for the study of international relations on the river by means of chain of automatic gauges. Then we have what is probably the most wonderfully developed branch, the Radiotelegraph Service. There are 43 radio stations owned by the Canadian government. On the eastern coast these are operated by the Marconi Company, who are subsidized by the Government; on the Pacific Coast they are operated by the Government. They have charge of the direction-finding radio stations on the Atlantic, at St. John Chibucto, Canso, and Cape Race, Newfoundland. This service administers the Radiotelegraph Act and has charge of all radio matters in Canada; issues licenses to all radio stations in Canada, commercial, experimental and amusement; issues licenses to ships equipped with radio; inspects all ships and stations to which licenses are granted; holds examinations for various grades of radio-telegraph operators; handles all accounts connected with radio matters.

The subject of the Canadian navy is one which has interested the people of Canada for some years. In 1910 what is called the Naval Service Act was passed, under which Canada established for herself a naval service. In 1911, I think it was, arrangements were made under which the British Admiralty handed over to the Dominion certain services which the Admiralty had previously performed, particularly those relating to the docks at Esquimalt and Halifax. Now, there was great divergence of opinion as to what we should do under the Naval Service Act. That act, of course, provided for different things. Under it the then government purchased two ships, the Niobe and the Rainbow, for the purpose of training young men for naval service. The purchase was made in 1910, in consultation with the Admiralty. In 1911 the government changed, and in 1912 these ships were tied up. When the war broke out in 1914, the Niobe was refitted and placed in service, and served one year. Then it was taken out of commission and used as a depot shop, or something of that kind. In 1911, I think it was, an arrangement was made, followed by a treaty later, by which Canada agreed to do what Great Britain would otherwise have had to do in the matter of patrolling the waters of the Behring sea for the protection of the seal fisheries around the Pribyloff islands. The Rainbow was deputed for that service and she was steaming for these waters when the war broke out. She was brought back into naval service, and served during the war. In 1920 she was sold for $67,000 to some commercial firm, by whom she is still being used as a freighter. We had no ships to take the place of the Niobe and the Rainbow until the British government, after the war presented to Canada three ships, the Aurora, the Patricia, and the Patriot, and two submarines. The records of the British House of Commons disclose that a question was asked in the House as to whether Canada undertook to maintain these ships in commission when they were accepted, and the answer was, in substance, that there was no agreement except that implied by the acceptance of the ships. I think we are all agreed, notwithstanding any criticism that has been made, that Canada must maintain something of a naval service. We started such a service in 1910. It has passed through various vicissitudes, and I think the opinion now generally expressed as to what Canada must do in the matter of naval service is primarily to protect her own coasts and harbours, and her fisheries. We

showed during the war, although we had no navy, that Canada was ready to do her part just as well as any other portion of the overseas dominions, or as thoroughly as the Motherland herself or any of her allies, so there can be no question of the willingness and anxiety of the Canadian people to do their duty as a young nation in the making. What has been done in the past will be continued, I believe, in the future.

We are in this position in regard to the question of a navy. Every country in the world to-day is endeavouring to reduce its armament. At the great conference in Washington recently, where we were represented, the great nations of the world agreed not only to take a holiday in naval construction, but to scrap many of their fighting ships. All over the world to-day people are anxious to reduce as far as possible, within the limits of safety, and without any sacrifice of national dignity the expenditure on fighting machines and fighting material. Let me quote just a few sentences from the report made by our own representative at the Washington Conference, Sir Robert Borden, to show what the trend of public opinion is on this question. On page 17 of that report, in sessional paper No. 47, we find the proposals that were made for the reduction of naval armaments:

(1) That all capital-shipbuilding programmes, either actual or projected, should be abandoned;
(2) That further reduction should be made through the scrapping of certain of the older ships;
(3) That in general regard should be had to the existing naval strength of the Powers concerned;
(4) That the capital ship tonnage should be used as the measurement of strength for navies and a proportionate allowance of auxiliary combatant craft prescribed.

I also want to read from page 80 of this report to show the trend of public opinion as represented by the great minds of the great powers of the world, and to make it clear that the trend is towards a reduction in expenditure on armaments, without any sacrifice of national dignity and consistent with considerations of safety. Referring to the great powers the report says:

5 p.m.

The treaty provides that all other capital ships of these Powers, either built or building are to be scrapped or disposed of as provided in the treaty.

It is provided that the present building programmes are to be abandoned and that there is to be no building of capital ships hereafter, except in replacement and as the treaty provides.

Let me pause for a moment to make a comparison with the proposal which was made on November 12 on behalf of the American Government in respect to capital ships.

That proposal set forth that 18 ships were to be retained by the United States, with a tonnage of 500,650 tons. In this treaty the same ships are to be retained.

In that proposal there were set forth 22 capital ships to be retained by the British Empire. Under this treaty the same number of ships is to be retained; in fact, the same ships, with the single substitution of the Thunderer for the Erin, with a tonnage of 580,450 tons, as against the calculation in the proposal of 604,450 tons for ships retained.

In the case of Japan, the proposal set forth 10 ships to be retained. By the treaty, the same number of ships is to be retained, the difference being that the Mutsu is to be retained and the Settsu is to be scrapped. The tonnage retained by Japan, as indicated in the proposal, was 299,700. The tonnage retained under the treaty is 301,320. The effect of the retention of the Mutsu, a ship just completed, on the part of Japan, was to make necessary certain changes for which the treaty provides.

Mr. LEWIS: The minister referred to the number of ships permitted to the British Empire. Would that include Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would include, I think, all the overseas dominions.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Have we a capital ship?

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think we have.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then how can it include Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM: I said, the overseas dominions, and if Canada had a capital ship it would affect us.

Mr. LEWIS: We would benefit, of course, from having these 26 capital ships in the service of the Empire. Is Canada paying towards the upkeep of those ships? Is it because all nations in the world are moving to reduce their expenditure on armaments, as the minister has just read, that he is reducing this item to $1,000,000? Or did that apply to Canada, which practically, to all intents and purposes has no navy?

Mr. GRAHAM: It applies to Canada, being one of the overseas dominions. As I pointed out, Canada has no capital ships. She does not contribute to the upkeep of the British Navy. No man in the world, I think, would agree more heartily than myself to the proposition that the British Navy is essential to the peace of the world. The British Navy not only saved Canada but saved our friends on the other side of the line, and it is a question of policy whether there should be a contribution, or

that each portion of the British Empire should do its own part. Canada at the present time has taken the ground that we, as a young country, growing up, having our own service,—the British government having handed over to us the naval service, which we undertook, and the management of our militia,—should proceed along that line. It may be in the years to come that Canada will have to develop, perhaps, a larger naval service than she has or has had, but one that will maintain the principle of Canada, within the Empire, being a nation that, so far as possible, looks after her domestic affairs. However in the times of stress and war, the British Navy is the safety of the world.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to know from the minister if under the Washington Agreement, it is possible for Canada to have a capital ship until the expiration of that agreement which will occur, I think, in 1940.

Mr. GRAHAM: I would rather think not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Unless it were in reduction of Great Britain's capital ships.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: We could look after one of her ships.

Mr. SHAW: We could not in Canada, if we are bound by the terms of the Washington Agreement, build one capital ship until 1940, unless we did it through England.

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine, as part of the British Empire we could have one transferred.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: No difficulty about that.

Mr. GRAHAM: But I am not absolutely sure that we will.

Mr. LEWIS: One reason that I asked the question was that I noticed a statement in the paper by Lord Lee a little while ago that he was just a little disappointed that the whole burden of the 26 capital ships was going to fall on the taxpayers of Great Britain, who were already overtaxed. But, morally, I think we are responsible, because we are receiving protection, and if the members on the other side of the House, and we on this side of the House, are always saying that, as far as we are concerned, we are a nation, and that we want to stand on our own feet, I think we ought to help pay for the protection we receive.

Mr. GRAHAM: If we started discussing that question, it would take us pretty far afield, because that is a pretty large policy, It has been said that certain things did take place at the conference of premiers. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The resolution is on the table of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am inclined to think what is on the Table of the House is not everything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is everything:

Mr. GRAHAM: It is everything that is on the Table of the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is everything, in so far as Canada's engagements go.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not going to be led astray. Some day we may discuss that matter. I have a lot of documents in my desk relating to it. I was just reading part of the report of Sir Robert Borden of what took place at the conference at Washington, merely to point out to the House and to the country the trend of the public mind. I find the following in this report:

"The United States proposes, if the plan is accepted—

"(1) To scrap all capital ships now under construction. This includes 6 battle-cruisers and 7 battleships on the ways and in course of building, and 2 battleships launched.

"The total number of new capital ships thus to be scrapped is 15. The total tonnage of the new capital ships when completed would be 618,000 tons.

(2) To scrap all of the older battleships up to, but not including, the *Delaware* and *North Dakota*. The number of these old battleships to be scrapped is 15. Their total tonnage is 227,740 tons.

"Thus the number of capital ships to be scrapped by the United States, if this plan is accepted, is 30, with an aggregate tonnage (including that of ships in construction, if completed) of 845,740 tons."

Under this arrangement as made, instead of the 15 ships under construction being scrapped, there are 13 of those ships scrapped or disposed of, and the total number of ships to be scrapped or disposed of instead of 30 is 28. The tonnage is substantially the same—a very slight difference.

In the case of Great Britain the proposal was this:

"The plan contemplates that Great Britain and Japan shall take action which is fairly commensurate with this action on the part of the United States.

"It is proposed that Great Britain—

"(1) Shall stop further construction of the 4 new *Hoods*, the new capital ships not laid down but upon which money has been spent. These 4 ships, if completed, would have tonnage displacement of 172,000 tons.

"(2) Shall, in addition, scrap her predreadnaughts, second line battleships, and first line battleships up to, but not including, the King *George V* class.

"These, with certain predreadnaughts which it is understood have already been scrapped, would amount to 19 capital ships and a tonnage reduction of 411,375 tons.

"The total tonnage of ships thus to be scrapped by Great Britain (including the tonnage of the 4 *Hoods*, if completed) would be 583,375 tons."

Now, the fact is that under that the present treaty, Great Britain, as stated in the first paragraph I have just read, has stopped the further construction, has abandoned the construction of the four new *Hoods* which are mentioned. Great Britain is permitted under the treaty to have two new ships, but these are not ships of the size contemplated in the case of the four *Hoods*, which was in the neighbourhood of 48,000 or 49,000 tons, and, as I have said, there are four ships to be scrapped when these two new ships are completed.

And the provision for the scrapping of the three dreadnaughts, second-line battleships, and first-line battleships, is substantially unaffected, the fact being that there will be, I think, under the treaty 20 ships scrapped instead of the 19 that were mentioned in the proposal.

Now, I read that quotation from Sir Robert's report just to show the trend of the world's thought. We do not expect war. We hope we will not have it for many years. We hope we will never have it in our time, and the action of the great nations in uniting to take a holiday in the work of armaments points in that direction. Nevertheless, if there never is to be any war, we have certain duties to perform, and, having accepted the mantle of nationhood, in a measure at least, we must assume part of the responsibility. The responsibility we undertook with the Mother Country was to have a naval service of some kind. At the present time, as I said before, the Dominion of Canada has five ships. When the Government came into office I discussed the question of the naval service a great deal with the officials of the department. The Aurora is a small cruiser. There are two destroyers and two submarines. These make up the fleet. I had in my mind, as I have at the present time, and will disclose it to the House in a few minutes, the idea that other naval plans could be outlined and carried into operation, which would be far more effective in the way of placing Canada in a position to have an effective service than the training that can take place on these five ships. I suggested to the officers that we could divide these ships, send one or two of them to the Pacific coast and keep one of them on the Atlantic coast. I had an idea that the Aurora could be used on the Atlantic, and this shows my absolute unacquaintance with the naval service and what a navy is supposed to do. I had the idea that we could take two destroyers to the Pacific coast, and keep the Aurora on the Atlantic, and continue our training, and possibly train on the Pacific coast as well, and perhaps perform our obligations in reference to the protection of the seal fisheries at Behring sea with the use of the destroyers. This, the officer told me, was absolutely out of the question; if we separated those ships and sent two of the destroyers to the Pacific coast, those destroyers would not do at all for the purposes of training by themselves and would be wholly unsuitable for the pelagic sealing protection. He also informed me that the Aurora, by itself, would not supply the training that was expected to be had by the young men in the navy. I then gave up my idea of using those ships for that purpose. We discussed the question of maintaining, say two of them on the Atlantic coast. This presented obstacles in the way of cost for the benefit received; and as a final solution of the matter, I asked the officers of the department to prepare me a scheme which could at once give training to the men both on land and on sea, that would be more in keeping with the protection of our coasts than it would be in harmony with high-sea fighting, because the fleet as now constituted is for action on the sea, and not for the protection of our harbours and coasts, as we understand that protection.

The policy outlined by the technical officer, Captain Hose, the committee will find under the Naval Service Act, chapter 43, of the statutes of 1910, which provides for a naval service, as follows:

The Naval Reserve Force shall consist of such persons as join the said reserve after naval service or after undergoing such training as may be prescribed. All members of the said reserve shall be liable to active service upon an emergency.

The Governor in Council may make regulations for the government of the Naval Reserve Forces.

In time of war no officer or seaman in the Naval Reserve Force shall be required to serve continuously for a longer period than one year; but any officer or seaman who volunteers to serve for the war or any longer period than one year, may be compelled to fulfil his engagement. Provided, however, that the Governor in Council may, in case of unavoidable necessity (of which necessity the Governor in Council shall be the sole judge), call upon any officer or seaman to continue to serve beyond his

one year's service for any period not exceeding six months, and for such further service he shall not be entitled to any increased rate of pay, unless, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, the circumstances of the case and the conduct of the person concerned merits it.

That is one kind of force. Then there is another which provides for a volunteer force, and I want to submit to the judgment of members of the House that, in the Dominion of Canada as we are now situated, a better service on our own behalf, a better service for the Empire at large, will be obtained and can be retained by using the voluntary effort of our young men better than by having a great permanent force. The act of 1910 provides for this. It reads:

The Governor in Council may organize and maintain a force to be called the Naval Volunteer Force.

The Naval Volunteer Force shall consist of officers and seamen raised by voluntary engagement from among seafaring men and others who may be deemed suitable for the service in which such volunteers are to be employed.

The Governor in Council may make regulations for the government of the Naval Volunteer Force.

Every naval volunteer shall be engaged for the term of three years and, provided his conduct and qualifications are satisfactory, shall be eligible for re-engagement for further periods of three years up to the age of forty-five years; at the expiration of each term he shall be entitled to his discharge, save as hereinafter mentioned.

Naval volunteers shall receive such training and capitation or other remuneration as may be prescribed.

In an emergency the Governor in Council may order and direct that the Naval Volunteer Force, or such part thereof as may be deemed necessary, shall be called into active service, and the naval volunteers so called out shall be liable to serve under such regulations as may be prescribed.

If a naval volunteer's period of service expires while he is employed on active service, he shall be liable to serve for a further period of not more than six months, and for such further service he shall not be entitled to any increased remuneration, unless, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, the circumstances of the case and the conduct of the person concerned merits it.

In short, the proposal that I have to lay before the House, and for which estimates are asked, is that we discontinue in commission the ships that we now have; that we continue the protection and care of the wharves and docks at Halifax and Esquimalt; that we provide a reserve force composed of officers and men, officers who are now in the navy—the number of them altogether, I think, will be 233, if I remember correctly—that we create on the Pacific coast at Esquimalt an establishment with one small ship and two trawlers of about 450 tons; that we establish there a portion of our naval force for training in the protection of our shores, protection of our harbours, mine-sweeping, mine-laying; that at Halifax in the east we have the same services. I may say that we have the boats that we can use for this service economically. We have in contemplation the selling of one small boat that we have and the purchase of another which, if it can be secured at the same price as the other one is being sold at, will make an ideal ship for the Pacific coast, and Captain Hose tells me that it is just the ideal craft for patrolling the seal fisheries. We have not such a craft in the present group of ships. With these three at Halifax and these three at Esquimalt, we shall have, in those two services alone, ships, boats and crews that will give first-class training to young volunteers. In addition to these ships, it must be remembered that the second line of defence, if one might call it so, the great reserve in the Dominion of Canada, is our merchant marine. I do not mean altogether by that the merchant marine owned by the Government; but it includes all our wonderful merchant ships which during the late war performed such great services, a service second only to that of the great warships and, perhaps, in many cases not second.

Then we have the Fisheries Protection service, containing quite a number of smaller ships. We hope in time, if the scheme goes through and is successful, as I predict it will be, that we shall find an outlet for our young men whom we train in those ships in our own boats in the Fisheries Protection service. Further than that, as long as the Government continues to operate the merchant marine, I believe that will furnish an outlet for the young men so trained. This means that, under this estimate, in another year—it will take most of this year to get organized—some 1,500 men can be trained during the year on land and on sea for two or three weeks. These young men will not go to Halifax or Esquimalt at the same time; they will go at different times and receive their instruction, so that the officers will be kept busy most of the year. This will have one benefit, namely, that it will not take a single man out of industrial employment in this country. In a permanent force he is out of industrial employment and is a consumer and not a producer; but by this method the young men will get training on land and sea for two or three weeks per year over a period of three years just as the militia get train-

ing now for several weeks during each year. They will be given the rudiments the first year; the next year they will receive training in mine-laying and mine-sweeping; they will be taken out for a short cruise in the ocean and back again. This will have the effect of instilling into the minds of our young men that they can take a part in this work and train for naval service without leaving their own employment. They will be absent for only a few days.

It strikes me that another feature of this will be that, as part of the course, the regulation will require that these young men take a drill wherever they reside, of an hour a day for some few days in the year, at no cost to the country except, perhaps, that of an instructor from the department. This will not involve the expense, proportionately, that our military training has involved, for the simple reason that we have in all centres of the Dominion now armouries where this department, organized with the National Defence Department, will provide the quarters for the young men who wish to train, without the expense to the naval service. Newfoundland has a force of this kind; so has South Africa; and I believe that in preparing the young men in the way I have outlined, forming a volunteer force, we shall instil a better spirit into them because they will feel that they are doing the thing because they want to do it. I believe that in the years to come it will be shown that in taking this step we have begun at the right end of the problem. To my mind the problem of having anything like a naval service is not solved by getting one or two ships, and having a permanent force on them. The force at present consists principally of men from Great Britain; we have men of our own, of course. But this proposal will bring our own young men more intimately in touch with the naval service and so far as patriotism can be inculcated by that kind of service it will develop that spirit to a greater extent in our youth. I do not want to be prophetic, but should we require, in the years to come, to develop a navy, we shall have on hand in the Dominion young men trained to take positions in that navy. Under this scheme we are retaining four officers from the British Admiralty. The rest, kindly loaned to us, will return to the Royal Navy. The others will be young Canadians. I do not know that I can say anything further. This is the scheme we have in mind for the training of 1,500 men annually for this work and for which we now ask from the committee an appropriation of $1,500,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister's statement is important in this sense, that it touches a subject that is of paramount consequence to our whole country. It has been of great concern for years, and indeed will be so long as we are a country. I do not propose now to go into any detailed criticism of what are described as the proposals of the Government as related to naval service. They require careful examination, particularly at the hands of one who is not familiar with the question from any technical standpoint. I merely give now a statement of my view in a very broad and general way.

I was impressed, as the minister proceeded, with the thought that the Government's plan of defence is admirably adapted to guard our shores with absolute security throughout the days of peace and quiet. So long as there is no danger I am quite sure that this force which the minister proposes will be entirely adequate to meet any assailant. I am thoroughly in accord with the sentiment he uttered when he commenced his address, and I am only sorry that his concrete proposals have not the remotest relationship to that sentiment or to its inevitable consequences. Yes, in time of quiet and serenity the five trawlers will be all right and we shall be quite safe in training our navy in our armories. But in time of emergency and danger, which in my humble judgment, as a layman, is really the time one requires to prepare against, then it is that defence is rather more desirable than in sunshine and calm. In such a time, though, we are to depend upon the British navy and the British taxpayer—I do not know of what value this Government's service is going to be. I wonder if the minister is armed with any statement, from one acquainted with the needs of empire defence, as to the value of this service? If he has such a statement I should be very glad if he would give it to the committee. It occurred to me, as he spoke, that it would be rather serious for us if Great Britain herself prepared for her and our defence in this manner, if she put a few trawlers on the Atlantic to watch the fish, and put a few boys into our armouries as a sort of diversion or pastime. If she took that course what would become of our defence in the hour of crisis and peril? Where would Britain be? Where would we be? No, she does not take that course; that in-

dulgence is reserved for Canada. I am afraid the minister's statement will be received with profound disappointment, if not with poignant humiliation, on the part of this country.

The statement just given makes some comparison of what we are doing, with what South Africa has done. I fear his comparison will not hold good very far. South Africa is a very small country in population and a very young country compared with Canada. He also compared us with Newfoundland. I do not doubt the comparison is likely a very good one in the measure of what we are doing. I have no doubt, too, that possibly Trinidad and maybe Bermuda would be appropriate comparisons; but the minister omitted these two countries.

So far as our freedom of action is concerned, it stands to-day where it has always stood throughout our history. The position taken by this country last summer was embodied in a resolution agreed to unanimously by all the representatives of the nations of this Empire. It was a resolution which obviously expressed the right course, because the measure of imperial defence essential could not be known until the measure of world armaments would be dealt with by the Disarmament conference. The Disarmament conference is over, and now the time for determination of our policy has come. We are free to decide. This is the resolution that was passed:

> That while recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire to provide such naval defence as may prove to be essential for security, and while holding that quality with the naval strength of any other power is the minimum standard for that purpose, this conference is of the opinion that the method and expense of such co-operation are matters for the final determination of the several parliaments concerned, and that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming conference on disarmament.

That was the resolution that was passed.

Mr. SHAW: I should like to know from the right hon. gentleman if that resolution is to be taken as implying a contribution to the Empire by Canada for naval purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; it is to be taken as implying just what it says. Let me read it again:

> That while recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire to provide such naval defence as may prove to be essential for security—

[Mr. Meighen.]

The word used is "co-operation." There are many ways of co-operation. The method is left absolutely open.

> —and while holding that equality with the naval strength of any other power is the minimum standard for that purpose, this Conference is of the opinion that the method and expense of such co-operation are matters for the final determination of the several parliaments concerned, and that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming Conference on Disarmament.

Now, it would be well to proceed with the estimates for the purpose of obtaining any information that may be desired; but I do not think the discussion should be closed to-day. I think perhaps some time next week might be fixed when the discussion of the issue in its general aspect could be continued.

Mr. GRAHAM: We might take the other branches in this department first, such as the Hydrographic.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I should like to ask my right hon. friend one question to clear up a matter of doubt which appears to be in the minds of a good many hon. gentlemen. I assume he has read the London despatch which appeared in the newspapers of the 10th instant of an address delivered by the Right Hon. Lord Lee, First Lord of the Admiralty, who was one of the British delegates to the recent Washington conference, before the Colonial Institute in London on the subject of the Washington conference. The despatch contains the following:

> Lord Lee pointed out that the Imperial conference, after a full, prolonged, and intimate discussion of the naval needs of the Empire, had agreed that the maintenance of an Empire navy was the common concern of the whole Empire, and that the extent and form whereto the burden should be shared should be left until after the Washington conference.

Is my right hon. friend aware of any understanding arrived at at the conference which he attended with respect to any obligation upon Canada in relation to an Empire navy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am certainly not aware of anything beyond the resolution. That, I presume, is a press statement of what Lord Lee said. Lord Lee was doubtless interpreting for himself the resolution. There was no agreement or understanding of any kind whatever save that embodied in this resolution which has been on the table of this House since the opening of the session.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Was that resolution not passed in the face of proposals similar to those suggested by Lord Lee in the newspaper report? In other words, were there not proposals made by the British representatives at that time for a contribution from the dominions?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would have no difficulty whatever in answering the question if I could do so in honour. The conference published its report, and I am bound to abide by it. Those are the conclusions of the conference. I cannot go behind those conclusions until it is agreed that publicity can be given. The Government is in a position to obtain consent for such publicity, if it yet can be obtained. It has refused to try. Some things are confidential for a time, but do not need to be so for all time, and the seal of confidentiality can be lifted sooner or later. If the Government secure consent to lift that seal, the details of the proceedings at the conference can be known. Until then I abide by the report which is on the table, as I am in honour bound to do.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Are we right in assuming that the Canadian government is not obligated in any particular with respect to matters of imperial defence beyond what this Parliament has already approved?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government is not obligated by me save to the extent disclosed in the document now on the table.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I ask the right hon. gentleman the question as one of the representatives of Canada at the Imperial Conference. Is he aware, directly or indirectly, of any obligation resting upon the government of this country as a consequence of the conference which he attended with respect to naval defence other than what has already been approved of by this Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware of none, and there is none arising from that conference other than what appears in this document.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It might be interesting to get the sequel of the matter we have been discussing with the right non. gentleman, so that we may know the position in which Canada stands at the present time. We find that at the conference which took place last summer in England a conclusion was arrived at by all the representatives there from the various overseas dominions, and was embodied in the resolution which the right hon. gentleman has read, and which practically stated that consideration of the question of participation on the part of the overseas dominions in naval defence was to be postponed until after the conference which was to take place at Washington. Sir Robert Borden's report in regard to that matter is interesting. He points out that the conclusions arrived at at Washington do not apply to the navies of the overseas dominions, because these navies were treated as being part of the entire naval defence of the empire, and he instances the fact that the cruiser Australia, one of the largest vessels of the Australian navy, which played such a prominent part in the war, is to be scrapped. He goes on to say:

> While the provisions of the Treaty limit the total naval power which the British Empire as a whole is permitted to maintain, they leave entirely untouched the question of co-operation in the maintenance of that power. This question stands exactly where it stood before the Conference, for the decision of the Parliaments of the Empire. The subject of Imperial co-operation was not discussed at Washington, either in the British Empire delegation or elsewhere; it was unnecessary to consider it for the purposes of the conference, nor were the delegates authorized to discuss it.

The point I want to make is that, as a result of the Disarmament Conference at Washington, when conclusions were arrived at as indicated by the minister in discussing this question, that the time had arrived for a naval holiday by dismantling a good many ships in commission and stopping construction of others already laid down, participation of the overseas dominions in any scheme of imperial defence was left entirely untouched. It must therefore form the subject, if it is to be considered again, for the next Imperial Conference. That seems to be the sequel of the situation following what the right hon. gentleman read as the conclusion of the Imperial Conference last summer.

One cannot help remarking in connection with this matter that the statements made by Lord Balfour and by the American authorities, and the conclusions arrived at there, showed that the opinions of the leading statesmen of the world on this subject is that the time has arrived when there must be a suspension of the abnormal expenditures which have been made for naval defence, and that that suspension is to continue until 1936. I do submit that this country, in view of our financial position and the onerous burdens we are carrying,

must face the situation in the light of the experience which these men have gained and which is embodied in the conclusions they have arrived at.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If I caught correctly what the hon. member said, I take no exception at all to the terms of the extract he read from the report. I would presume it was quite right that the Empire delegation at the Disarmament Conference was in no way entrusted with the power of decision in anything that related to co-operation among the dominions of the Empire in the matter of naval defence, and therefore I am in thorough accord with him. I think perhaps I have as good a right as any member of this House to express the fullest sympathy, indeed, enthusiasm, with all the purposes of the Disarmament Conference. That that conference did make it possible for the heavily burdened nations of the world to reduce their naval armaments is a matter for the sincere congratulation of all humanity. It is no doubt that it did take a very long and a very practical step to that end. As to what may be the residuum of necessary defence for this Empire, after all that is done, and as to what, the residuum fixed, may be our share therein, is another question. I venture to suggest that he would be a remarkable Canadian who would find our share taken care of in an honourable way by the estimates presented now, and by the proposals of the minister.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The right hon. gentleman may be enthusiastic with regard to the result of the conference at Washington, but he knows very well that the conclusions of the Imperial Conference were that this whole subject should be postponed until after the conference on disarmament at Washington had taken place, and that the question as to what participation there should be on a permanent basis should form the subject of another imperial conference. In the meanwhile, why should we not have a naval holiday, the same as every other country?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Until another imperial conference?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But I did not understand the minister to say he was deferring the final pronouncement of his policy until there was another imperial conference.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Nor did I say so, either.

[Mr. Macdonald.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought we were getting the policy now. The naval holiday that the hon. member wants for Canada is only to last until the next imperial conference; is that what I understand him to say?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): No; my right hon. friend is at his old trick of quibbling and hair-splitting. The point I am making is this: the effect of the resolution adopted by the conference which my right hon. friend attended last summer, and agreed to by all the delegates, was that the question of the participation of the overseas dominions in the naval defence of the Empire should be postponed for consideration until after the holding of the conference in Washington. That was expressly set forth in the resolution which my right hon. friend has read. Now, the conference at Washington has taken place; conclusions of a general character have been arrived at, and the absolute inference, having regard to the manner in which the question was dealt with by the Imperial Conference last year, is that its consideration is to be postponed until another imperial conference is held.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, if I was hair-splitting and quibbling I was only repeating the position which the hon. member himself had taken and which he has now repeated. That is what I understood him to say before. The resolution that was passed did not postpone the determination of the part to be taken in imperial defence by any dominion until the next imperial conference. It says:

> That, while recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire to provide such naval defence as may prove to be essential for security, and while holding that equality with the naval strength of any other power is a minimum standard for that purpose, this conference is of opinion that the method and expense of such co-operation are matters for the final determination of the several parliaments concerned, and that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming conference on disarmament.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who are going to make the recommendations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The recommendations referred to there would doubtless be recommendations by another imperial conference if it chose to make any, but it does not say by any means that nothing should be done pending another imperial conference. If this Government is saying that it is waiting for recommendations from an-

other imperial conference, then perhaps my hon. friend's words would have some application. Does the hon. member say that they are waiting, before making a declaration of policy, for the findings or recommendations of the next imperial conference? The hon. member, when I suggested that, resented it with some heat.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That is what the Imperial Conference wanted the overseas dominions to do—to wait until another conference was held.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not at all; this resolution means just what it says. But, I say, if the Government were to state—which it does not—that it is waiting before coming to its conclusion for another conference, possibly the comments of the hon. member would have some relevance. But the Government does not say so; the hon. member himself affirms that the Government does not say so and that he does not say so. The Government has come down with its policy, as it had a right to do; it was not in any way bound to wait by the terms of the resolution of last summer. It has come down with its policy, and that policy is now before us for our consideration.

Mr. IRVINE: May I ask the right hon. gentleman what these recommendations which he has read refer to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: To the method of co-operation with the other dominions and with Great Britain as to naval defence.

Mr. IRVINE: Do they not also imply the expense on the part of each nation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: What imply the expense?

Mr. IRVINE: The recommendations. The right hon. gentleman has, in his resolution, mentioned the expenditure and the method.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The recommendations can cover anything that another conference decides to recommend upon.

Mr. GOOD: I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether in his opinion this Government is under any obligation to advise a policy prior to any recommendations which may come from a subsequent imperial conference? It seems to me a rather strange thing that the Government should attempt to lay down a policy prior to the holding of another conference. Does the right hon. gentleman think the Government would be wise or justified in taking such a step at the present time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the question arises, because the Government has taken the step. The minister has made no reference whatever to waiting for another conference; he has announced his policy, such as it is.

Mr. SHAW: I am very glad to hear the leader of the Opposition say that the resolution to which he has referred does not involve this country in any obligation, and I accept his statement in that connection so far as contribution is concerned. But I am frank to say that while I have been able to read only the summary of the speeches of the premiers of New Zealand and Australia, they seem to bear a somewhat different construction. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should have an opportunity to discuss this matter very fully in order that we may determine exactly our position and exactly what our obligation may be in the future.

Mr. GRAHAM: My suggestion is that the item for the naval service proper be allowed to stand until next week, so that hon. gentlemen may have an opportunity to get ready for a discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Could we fix Thursday?

Mr. GRAHAM: I suggest that my right hon. friend consult the Prime Minister as to that. But the proposal is one of some magnitude; it reaches further, possibly, than our own shores and we ought to fix a day for its discussion.

Item stands.

Civil Government—naval service—salaries and contingencies, $255,220.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is more than last year.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is an increase of $5,000, but we had to provide for statutory increases amounting to $8,000, so it is really a little less than last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: With a "five-trawler" policy, one would think it would be a good deal less.

Mr. GRAHAM: A five-trawler policy would not be very effective for the purposes of the nation. This item includes radio-telegraph, hydrographic services, and so on.

Item agreed to.

Hydrographic Survey and to provide for the maintenance and repairs of Hydrographic steamers, $350,000.

Mr. GOOD: The minister explained that the work involved here was a survey of the coast. Is this survey never to be completed? If it is not completed now, how long before it will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: This survey will be continued for a long time. As my hon. friend here says, like the brook it goes on forever. Changes, of course, are taking place all the time, and the survey will probably continue as long as my friend and I last, at all events, as long as I last.

Mr MEIGHEN: There is an increase of $35,000 this year. This is a very large item, and I do not think the increase is really necessary. It is not necessary to push the item through before six o'clock.

Progress reported.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 24, respecting The Quebec Railway Light and Power Company.—Mr. Mitchell.

Bill No. 44, to incorporate The General Missionary Society of the German Baptist Churches of North America.—Mr. Hudson.

Bill No. 53, respecting Itabira Corporation, Limited, and to change its name to "Itabira Corporation."—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Bill No. 63 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ethel Turner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 64 (from the Senate), for the relief of Walter Michie Anderson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 65 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fredenburg.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 66 (from the Senate), for the relief of Sheriff Elwin Robinson.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 67 (from the Senate), for the relief of Rhoda Renfrew McFarlane Brown.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 69 (from the Senate), for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz.—Mr. McQuarrie.

[Mr. Graham.]

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 72 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Robert Lloyd Beamish.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clarence Robinson Miners.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 74 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Eleanor Menton.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 75 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harvey Easton Jenner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 76 (from the Senate), for the relief of Marie Louise Dagenais.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Lawrie.—Mr. Gordon.

THE CANADIAN TRANSIT COMPANY

The House in committee on Bill No. 52, respecting the Canadian Transit Company—Mr. Rankin—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. McBRIDE: I should like to say a few words in connection with this bill. I do not want the committee to think I am criticising their work in any way, but I think this bill passed the committee in somewhat of a hurry, as the committee was in session only about twenty minutes. This company, which goes under the name of the Canadian Transit Company, wants to change its offices from Windsor, Canada, to the American side, and I think we should look into this bill a little more carefully before we pass it. We must stand up for the good name of Canada, and if any company comes over here in order to get prestige from the name of Canada, I think Canada ought to be good enough for it and to keep, its headquarters in. Not only do the directors of the company want their headquarters transferred to the other side; but they want to sell bonds in Canada and when they do so, they want to have the right to mortgage the property. I know, on a number of occasions when this sort of thing was carried out in British Columbia, bonds were sold up to pretty nearly the limit of what the company intended to do. They sold the bonds to people who did not expect that there would be anything crooked about the matter. They sold the bonds to men working for $30 a month. I know men working for that amount who invested over $2,000 in such a company. They then mortgaged the property and allowed the mortgage to lapse, so that the people lost everything they had. I do not think this bill should be passed as it is. I do not think it has had the consideration

that this House should give it nor that the Railway Committee should have given it. We have the good name of Canada at stake in this matter, and I think this bill should be referred back.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would suggest that, as the sponsor of the bill is not present, it might stand, unless the hon. member wishes to make a motion.

The CHAIRMAN: The committee has no power to refer back. That is the power of the House only.

Mr FIELDING: I think the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) that, as the sponsor of the bill is absent, the hon member will, perhaps, be content to let the matter stand for the present. My disposition in a case like this is to accept the judgment of the committee; but as neither the sponsor nor anyone from the committee is present to support the bill, I would not like to join in passing it to-night. I would concur in the view that it be laid aside for the present.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

NAVAL SERVICE

Hydrographic Survey, and to provide for the maintenance and repairs of hydrographic steamers, $350,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: At six o'clock the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) called my attention to the fact that there was an increase of $35,000. This increase over last year's estimate is accounted for in part by the steadily increasing number of new charts and new additions to old charts that require to be published each year, and in part by statutory salary increases. In addition the sums provided for the operation of ships' parties on the Atlantic coast and on the lower St. Lawrence for the last two years were not sufficient to maintain these parties at work during the whole season, and consequently operations had to be curtailed. It is much more ecomomical to continue operations, once they have been started, as long as possible, and it is proposed that a sufficient sum should be provided this year to enable the parties to remain in the field until weather conditions compel them to return.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries Protection Service and to provide for the repairs and maintenance of the Fishery Protection steamers, $345,500.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood from the minister that the fisheries protection service was included in the first vote, No. 214. I knew it was not, but there must be some explanation of what is included in that vote related to the fisheries service as distinguished from this vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: I explained that I was giving the list of services performed under the Naval Service Department, but which had no connection with the naval service vote.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood those trawlers were to protect the fish.

Mr. GRAHAM: Those trawlers I said were practising coast defence. I did not make any reference to their being used for fisheries protection. I did say it was hoped that we would be able to supply men for the fisheries protection boats at the time they would be part of our reserve force.

Mr. MARTELL: What progress has been made towards handing back the patrol boats in connection with the fisheries protection service to the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. GRAHAM: The deputies of the two departments are working out a scheme for the transfer of more than one of these branches to the Department of Marine and Fisheries in case our plan for reorganization goes through.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Does the minister intend that all the various services covered by items 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220 and 221 shall now go under the jurisdiction of the new Department of Defence, or will they be left with the Department of Marine and Fisheries?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is the matter I was speaking about. The deputies of the two departments are working out a plan, if it can be worked out, for the transfer. Under that plan will go a portion of the staff, the estimates for which I put through this afternoon. We are trying to make a division of the staff as well as of the service. My own idea is that the Department of Defence should have nothing in it except that which pertains to defence.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The hydrographic survey I assume pertains to defence as much

as to fisheries, and the fisheries protection service belongs as much to defence as anything else. Where would the minister put the radiotelegraph service?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have in the Department of Militia and Defence a small radio service, but that service proper is in the Department of Naval Defence, and no definite conclusion has been arrived at in regard to it. My own idea is that that should go with the Marine and Fisheries Department as well, for we will still have in the Department of National Defence a small radio service sufficient to carry on our work in connection with flying operation and the naval service.

Mr. MARTELL: Is Captain Barkhouse under the control of the Naval Service or of the Marine and Fisheries Department?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Naval Service.

Mr. MARTELL: I suppose in the event of the transfer of the fisheries protection service to the Marine and Fisheries Department, he also will be transferred to that department?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. MARTELL: I should like to bespeak the minister's favourable consideration for Captain Barkhouse. He has been in the service for a great number of years. My experience with the department, and I think it will be borne out by every official there, is that Captain Barkhouse is probably the ablest man in the employ of the Marine and Fisheries Department on the Nova Scotia coast as regards the fisheries protection service, and I believe the minister would be well advised when the transfer is made and a commodore, or some such officer, of that service is appointed, to promote Captain Barkhouse to the position on account of his long experience, thorough training and outstanding ability. I do not think there is a better man in Canada for that position. In a word, he is a fine type of Nova Scotia seaman and an excellent official.

Mr. GRAHAM: Everything my hon. friend has said about Captain Barkhouse is true, so my officials tell me, and I shall call the attention of the Minister of Marine to my hon. friend's recommendation.

Mr. STEVENS: I understood the minister to say that the Fisheries Department was to be put back under the Marine Department.

[Mr. Cuthrie.]

Mr. GRAHAM: I was talking of the fisheries protection service. The Fisheries Department is in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but the fisheries protection service has been taken charge of under the Naval Service since its inception. Whatever complaints there may be about the fisheries protection service come naturally to the Fisheries Department and have to be transferred to the Naval Department. This roundabout course involves delay and is condemned both by the deputy and correspondents. In view of that it seems to me it would be better if the fisheries protection service were put under the Fisheries Department.

Mr. STEVENS: I do not know whether this would be the correct time or not for me to refer to something in connection with the fisheries on the Pacific coast. Perhaps it should be held over until the Fisheries estimates are before us.

Mr. GRAHAM: If it belongs to the Fisheries Department, the minister is not here.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister will at once advise me if I should hold this over. During the latter years of the war the fees in connection with the salmon fisheries on the Pacific coast were very drastically increased, a step which, I think, was quite correct; but with the conclusion of the war certain cheap classes of fish became unsaleable, and the canners found themselves still saddled with these abnormally high fees, although the earnings from their product had dropped off very substantially. I believe that last year the minister was considering the reduction of these fees. I intend to briefly discuss that point, and the minister will at once advise me whether or not he is in control of the fees under these estimates.

Mr. GRAHAM: That comes under the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How many vessels are engaged in the fisheries protection service?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are six.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are these armed vessels, and are the crews enlisted under the Naval Service Act?

Mr. GRAHAM: Two on the Atlantic are armed, and one on the Pacific, but those on the Great Lakes are not. I am informed that the crews are not enlisted men.

Item agreed to.

Radiotelegraph service, and to provide for the building and maintenance of wireless stations and the general administration of radiotelegraphy throughout the Dominion, $440,400.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much of the vote of last year was spent?

Mr. GRAHAM: $436,741.75.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Have we any stations in the interior part of Canada—I know we have them on the seaboards—which could be used in case of interruption of telegraphic service? I understand there was a proposal to establish some stations in Ontario and some in the midwest, as well as one on the eastern side of the Rockies. Has any advance been made in that direction?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Marconi Company have the right under their contract to establish cross-country stations. They are now building one at Montreal.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is that the first one?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: Where are the stations located on the Pacific coast?

Mr. GRAHAM: Prince Rupert, Dead Tree Point, Alert Bay, Bull harbour, Estevan, Cape Lazo, Vancouver and Victoria.

Mr. STEVENS: Has the department in contemplation the extension of this service on the Pacific coast—for instance, to connect the coast service with the Yukon?

Mr. GRAHAM: It has not been considered as yet. Eventually it will have to be done.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I suggest that the Government consider the question of cost. The cost of maintaining the telegraphic land line to the Yukon is, I always did think, prodigious. I remember bringing the matter up more than once and asking the officials to go thoroughly into it with the view of determining the possibility of establishing wireless stations. The cost of upkeep would surely be infinitely less than the cost of the upkeep of a land line.

Mr. GRAHAM: The department has discussed that with the Public Works Department on more than one occasion. I think they have a scheme practically worked out, but it has never been consummated. I agree with my right hon. friend that it would be cheaper to maintain a radio service than to meet the annual cost of repairs and upkeep of the telegraph line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I may say for the benefit of the minister that the strongest pressure will have to be brought to bear upon the officials of the Public Works Department. They have had it under consideration—and I kept prodding their consideration—for a long while, and that under a live minister. The minister will have to keep very busy indeed if he is going to get any results there.

Mr. BLACK (Yukon): In connection with the suggestion that the radio be substituted for the present land line to the Yukon, known as the Yukon telegraph line, I think myself that the Government might very well seriously consider such a proposal, but not with the view of altogether scrapping or abandoning the Yukon line, because in the Yukon territory its operation and maintenance is economical. That part of it is not subject to the heavy storms or weight of snow with which the part of the line in northern British Columbia has to contend. An examination of the accounts and expenses of upkeep will show that fully eighty-five per cent of the cost occurs south of the Yukon boundary in northern British Columbia. I think it would be altogether in the interests of economy if that Yukon telegraph line could be disconnected from its southern connection at, say, the new mining camp of Atlin in British Columbia, or at White Horse in the Yukon Territory. The line from there south to the National Transcontinental is practically of no use except as a connecting link, and on that portion of the line the greatest part of the expense occurs. There is practically no revenue from it. The stations are isolated; supplies for upkeep of service and maintenance of operators have to be carried over hundreds of miles on pack-horses, with consequent high cost for both maintenance and repairs. Double shifts have to be maintained at these stations, they are so isolated; it is not safe to have only one man, as is done in the Yukon. Now, from the National Transcontinental west to Prince Rupert that government telegraph line is duplicated by the National Railway telegraph line. There is no need whatever for two lines from that point of contact west to Prince Rupert. If the Government would establish one radio station either at the mining town of Atlin, British Columbia, or at the mining town of White Horse in southern Yukon, they could cut out all that expensive stretch of land line. The sooner this is done, the sooner they will commence to save money and bring about greater efficiency. For weeks at a

time nearly every winter that line is down; the people of the north country are cut off from communication, and are obliged to send their messages by radio or by cable around to Alaska and Seattle. I would very much regret the taking of any step which would remove the telegraph line within the Yukon territory, connecting, as it does, points along the trail and along the river, affording means of communication for steamboats in trouble along the river, and providing communication between the mining camps. I may say that I am negotiating with the Public Works Department in an endeavour to have them extend that line within the Yukon Territory for a distance of some 75 miles from the main Yukon telegraph line to Mayo. More business goes over that section than over any other part of the line, and leaving out of consideration the expense of maintaining the line through British Columbia, that section is a paying unit, and the proposed Mayo branch would undoubtedly pay and handle a great volume of business. The Mayo branch would undoubtedly pay and handle a great volume of business. I therefore wish to support the remarks that have been made in favour of establishing a radial station in northern British Columbia or southern Yukon, which would make unnecessary that very expensive telegraph line to the south connecting with Prince Rupert.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Public Works has heard the remarks of my hon. friend, and I hope he will be successful in getting that line fixed up in the Yukon.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to add this observation to what the hon. member for the Yukon has said. On the Coast we have a series of wireless stations which are rendering a most valuable service in many ways, not only commercial but the usual service rendered by such points of communication on a coast. They form as it were, a link with the north which could very easily be extended into the Yukon, and that is a point that I think the Minister of Public Works, as well as the minister having this service in charge, should bear in mind. I note in the estimates that for the Yukon service from Ashcroft to Dawson the sum of $279,000 is set aside. I think a very substantial reduction could be made in that expenditure and the saving transferred to the item now under consideration.

[Mr. Black.]

Mr. GUTHRIE: To me $279,000 seems an enormous amount for the maintenance of that line from Ashcroft to Dawson. It represents the interest on five or six million dollars. I believe I am within the mark when I say you could establish a radio system throughout the whole Yukon for $2,500,000, or not more than $3,000,000 at the outside, and give the people there and the people of Canada a better service. I believe this item could be cut in two.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This matter is under consideration by the Department of Public Works at the present time, and I hope we shall be able to proceed more rapidly with it than apparently was the case under the late administration, despite the fact that the then leader of the Opposition was prodding the Public Works Department.

Item agreed to.

Patrol of the northern waters of Canada, $15,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is really to publish the reports of the Stefansson expedition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the minister state what is the policy of the Government towards the northern islands, with particular reference to those covered by the Stefansson expedition, laid claim to on behalf of Canada, and to Wrangel island.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a delicate matter to state the policy of the Government on that question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the Government any policy?

Mr. FIELDING: What we have we hold.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would recommend the Government never to fall away from that principle.

Mr. GRAHAM: Some people have failed to do that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Government failed once, but I think if they had the same thing to do over again they would act differently.

Mr. GRAHAM: The old government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the old government my hon. friend was in. It is well known that there is a dispute as to Wrangel island. The question of the proper attitude of Canada towards that island is doubtless before the Government. This vote has to do with these matters, and I am asking if the Government is in a position to say what its views are with relation

to the retention of Wrangel island or the continuance of Canada's claim thereto; and the same words apply to the other islands covered by the expedition.

Mr. GRAHAM: The policy of the Government, as I understand it, is as just expressed by the Minister of Finance—what we have we hold.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, have we Wrangel island?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, as I understand it, and we propose to retain it.

Mr. FIELDING: We had it in December, and we have not let it go.

Mr. SHAW: I think there is probably, as the leader of the Opposition has said, a great deal more to this matter than appears on the surface. I understand that the United States have published a map in which they show all the lands north of Melville island, I think, as being a country which does not belong to anybody, and which is consequently open for discovery by any nation whose expedition may happen to locate there. I think it is a matter of the utmost importance that we should not lose sight of the fact that the extreme northern part of this country should be preserved to Canada. It may not seem of much importance now, but I have no doubt that in the years to come it will be a matter of very great regret if this or any other government fails to take proper measures to ensure that that country belongs to and is secured and maintained by Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I can only say in addition to what has been said by the hon. member for West Calgary, that this question is being discussed in the United States papers now. Within the last month it has been discussed in the New York Times and the Washington Post, and there is no doubt that certain interested parties in the United States intend to make a claim to Wrangel island as United States territory by right of prior discovery. In my view, from the little inquiry I have made, I am satisfied that that claim is unfounded. There is no right of prior discovery beyond the right of Canada or Great Britain in that respect. However, this matter is going to come to the front in the very near future, and I think it is high time that this Government should take a stand on the matter, and make its stand known to the world. It will be a matter for international discussion very soon unless we are going to forego our claims and let the United States take over the island. Whether the island is of very much practical importance I do not know, but parties in the United States seem to think it is. In fact, one paper says that from one point of view, the mineral wealth of Wrangel island is far greater than that of Alaska. That may be problematical, but it is the basis of the claim which is made by certain interests in the United States.

9 p.m.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The Government has had interviews with Mr. Stefansson. I do not know that it is in the public interest to disclose the full nature of those interviews, but I might say that at the present time the Canadian flag is flying on Wrangel island, and there are Canadians on the island, members of a previous expedition of Stefansson's. Mr. Stefansson is about to take a ship up to Wrangel island with some of his men, and has recently had it fitted out with supplies. The Government certainly maintains the position that Wrangel island is part of the property of this country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is clear and definite. Of course, the Prime Minister knows that the men that were there were there long before he had been in his present position, and therefore some considerable length of time. I may say as well that there may be claim to this island on behalf of Russia, a claim based very largely on the geographical location of the island. The island of Ellesmere on the west coast of Greenland is also one to which the Government should give some attention. An expedition was about to be launched by a Dane, with, I think, the approval of the Danish government, designed to make some occupational claim in Ellesmere island, and it was anticipated, probably, to base on that occupational claim certain rights of Denmark in the island. I call that matter to the attention of the Government, so that whatever position Canada is in with respect to Ellesmere island will be held, because, in my judgment, Ellesmere island is of greater consequence than Wrangel island.

Mr. BROWN: This is a matter of intense interest to every member of this House. Some subjects are discussed, and those who take part are able to speak in a loud tone. This is a matter of great interest, and yet this whole discussion is

conducted in such a tone of voice that it is almost impossible for us to hear anything, and absolutely impossible for those at the far end of the chamber to hear at all.

Item agreed to.

Pay of temporary officers and clerks at Headquarters Halifax and Esquimalt dockyards, $20,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is being omitted in the services as respects temporary clerks, or what services are being reduced to account for the reduction of $20,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: My deputy informs me that it is just as it has been in the Militia Department. The services of the temporary clerks were required during the war, and there has been a natural decrease since. This is the result of the temporary service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That has been going on for some time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mostly in the records department?

Mr. GRAHAM: Mostly overseas account.

Item agreed to.

Adjustment of war claims—naval service, $956,800.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What are the claims?

Mr. GRAHAM: The items are as follows:

Imperial Government—		
Pay and victualling of overseas division from October 1917 to March 31, 1919— £96,500	$470,000	
Claim for difference in exchange	268,500	
Sundry amounts charged to British Admiralty refunded by them but now considered by the Imperial authorities as expenditure payable by the Canadian government	100,000	
Re-conditioning of Imperial drifters and trawlers	90,000	
		$928,500
War Service Gratuity & Separation Allowance adjustments		10,000
Medal—		
British War—Silver, 4,800 at $1.50	$7,200	
Victory—Bronze, 4,100 at 26¾	1,100	
		8,300
Vessels in reserve—		
Watchmen, etc		10,000
		$956,800

Mr. GUTHRIE: I suppose the committee understands that these war claims that are now being paid under the heading of "adjustment of war claims" were formally carried in the estimates under an item called "Demobilization vote." The name has been changed, but the purpose of the item is just the same. This claim arises out of the late war. There are a number of claims, I fancy, not ready for settlement. I had occasion last year to enter into a controversy and discussion with the Ministry of Shipping in England in regard to their claims against the Dominion of Canada. What I want to know is whether the item now under discussion is one of the items which were taken into account which we adjusted last summer. I may say that after three or four weeks of pretty hard work, in which I had the very able assistance of an accountant from the Militia Department, we succeeded in reducing the claim of the Ministry of Shipping by an amount of $750,000, and we agreed upon a stated amount for the various items that were chargeable against capital, but the account had to do very largely with the question of passage money, and damages to ships while in the Canadian service. It was purely a shipping account, I cannot remember just what the figure of the total account was, but there was one very serious outstanding claim which I refused to settle, and I hope it has not been settled yet. It was in connection with a boat which was submarined, and which was in the hospital service of the Dominion of Canada at the time at which it was submarined. The case had been referred in England to a board of arbitration upon which Canada was not directly represented. The finding of the arbitration board was that Canada must pay the replacement value of the ship, and I think that value was something like $5,000,000. The ship was certainly chartered by Canada, or by the British government and used by Canada at the time of the disaster. The cost of the ship was about half that amount, and, in the first instance, when the Admiralty dealt with losses of that kind, they allowed the cost of the ship, but after a few months' experience, with an allowance of that kind, the same board of arbitration changed the basis of allowance and allowed the cost of reproduction, and, as the cost of construction of vessels had risen enormously in the interval, Canada was let in by the arbitrators finding for an award of something like a million or twelve hundred thousand pounds, but, as Canada was not

represented directly on the board—we were nominally represented by some department of the Admiralty—I objected to the payment of that amount, and I assume the amount is still outstanding. My object in mentioning it now is to bring it to the attention of the minister, because I think that is one of the claims that should be very seriously reconsidered before it is allowed. The other claims I dealt with were all shipping claims, and the account with which we were dealing was adjusted after a reduction of $750,000. Does this item involve the matters which were settled by the representatives of the Admiralty and myself and Mr. Garrison of the Militia Department last summer?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is not in this expenditure. I think you will find it in the Militia Department.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There was some uncertainty. The Admirality made a claim against Canada for a million dollars which they said the naval service of Canada owed them, and they requested authority to deduct it from the settlement of accounts, I had no authority to agree to that and I thought perhaps it was this $1,900,000 which we had before us.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Something was said by the minister as to a claim on account of the difference in exchange. It was some $200,000, was it not?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was $268,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How does this arise?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I understood the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) to say that the British government were seriously asking the Canadian government to become responsible for the loss of this hospital ship that was sunk by a German submarine. It seems to me that a claim of that kind would be absolutely absurd, and I join with him in saying to the minister that I hope the minister will never acknowledge any such claim on the part of Great Britain against Canada.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We have not acknowledged it, but there is something in the contention that we are liable for something in the matter. When we took over ships as hospital ships, we took them into the service of the Dominion of Canada, and we became responsible for them and for all the wear, tear and damage. The rates got so high that it became impossible to insure these ships. The British government abandoned insuring ships and we did likewise; in fact, I do not know that we ever attempted to insure them. We have, however, paid losses on ships under our control which were sunk by submarines. The point that struck me was that we should not be liable for anything but the actual value of the craft sunk, and that was only 50 per cent of the amount found by the board of arbitration.

Mr. GRAHAM: If my recollection in reading over some of the documents in the department serves me aright, some of the settlements were made through the High Commissioner's office; but the details, to which my hon. friend refers, I imagine, I have in the Militia Department somewhere.

As regards the question asked by the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton), the British Admiralty sent us drafts on New York instead of on Montreal. We really received more money than we should have received, because we got the benefit of the exchange on the American currency. They are now making a claim for the amount of exchange.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I hope that will not be given into at all, because at the same time that we received drafts on New York, if I remember correctly, they also insisted on our making payments in New York at the New York rate. I also remember very distinctly that the British Admiralty took full advantage of the New York rates; and if we have taken advantage of them, we have only been acting in accordance with the same rule. I think the item should be struck out.

Mr GRAHAM: My hon friend knows that the decision in this matter lies with the Department of Finance. Although this item is inserted, we do not propose to pay the claim unless we are instructed to do so by the Finance Department after investigation. By inserting the item in the estimate, we do not admit the claim at all; but should the Finance Department, after investigation, decide that this claim is good, we have provided the money to settle it.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It seems to me that it would be better to settle the matter in this way, namely to advise the Finance Department that we do not think there is any claim; and if a new claim has

to be looked after as a result of different advice, it may be dealt with by a Governor General's warrant. I do not think it should be admitted even to the extent of inserting the item in the estimates. We have a claim for a very much larger amount which England as steadily declined to admit. Unless I am very much astray in my recollection, I think the fact is that we have already settled cross accounts with the Admiralty on the basis of New York exchange, and I think, therefore, no action should be taken in this matter.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a large question between this Government and the British government in connection with the matter of exchange, and we must be prepared to give and take; whatever we lay down on one side we expect to claim on the other. My impression is that, if this claim be approved, it would require an appropriation of Parliament to pay it. Therefore, my hon. friend may be wise in inserting the item, but I quite concur in the view that he had better not be in a hurry to make payment until the whole matter is adjusted.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I certainly agree that he should not be in a hurry to make payment. I am quite sure that the whole matter will be properly and fairly adjusted. When it once gets to the British government and out of the routine of the offices, I do not think there will be much difficulty in adjusting the matter. I have no doubt, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) takes a very well earned holiday this summer and goes over to England, he will be able to adjust the whole of this matter without any difficulty.

Mr. DUFF: I think the minister said, in explaining the details of this item, that part of it was for war medals. The department issued a war service badge which was very unsatisfactory, and many complaints have come to the Minister of the Naval Service and his officials. I have received, in the last two or three years, probably two or three hundred letters from young men who received this war service badge which was issued to men who served in the Canadian navy or to Canadians who served overseas in the British navy. The badge was very much larger than the one issued to the soldiers, and these young men claim that it should be similar to the one issued to soldiers, instead of the large white badge which was issued by the Naval Department. I have, upstairs in my room, about a dozen of these badges which were sent to me by these boys. They would not keep them, and they asked me to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Naval Service and to ask him to have issued a new badge which would be satisfactory to them. They want one the same size as the one issued to the soldiers, which badge was quite satisfactory. This will cost a very small sum of money, and these young men, who risked their lives on the sea, should receive some consideration from the Government. I trust the Minister of Naval Service will look after this matter and issue the badges to the naval men.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I understood the minister to say that one of the items contained in this very large appropriation is for reconditioning or repairs to certain vessels, known as drifters. We had a very large number of most curiously constructed, queer looking vessels floating around the coast of the maritime provinces. I do not know where they were built, and anybody who knows about conditions there knows they were of no value during the war. I cannot understand why we should be now voting money for vessels of that kind. Some of them belong to the Canadian Government, but I do not know whether there were brought across the Atlantic any that belonged to the Imperial government.

Mr. GRAHAM: As a matter of fact, these were trawlers or drifters that were built in Canada on the order of the Imperial government and lent to Canada. The contract with the Imperial government was that we should repair them and place them in the same condition as they were before. None of these items, of course, will be paid without the fullest scrutiny.

With regard to the medals, I must admit that the medals issued by the Naval Department have called forth a good deal of protest. Many that were issued by the British Admiralty were large. The Naval Department, I understand, has issued some that were smaller; but so far as I could learn, neither the larger nor the smaller were quite satisfactory. We will go into the matter and see if any alteration can be made in the design of the badges.

Item agreed to.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I think there was an understanding with my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) that we might go on with Public Works to-night, although that was not the understanding last night.

We have departed a little from the announcement made last night, but this has been done after consultation with the two leaders opposite. We will take up Public Works for the rest of the evening.

PUBLIC WORKS

Public Works—public buildings—rent, repairs, furniture, heating, etc., $4,959,600.

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): The first three items in this vote have been passed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Subject, I think, to getting some information as to what was spent last year.

The CHAIRMAN: That reservation does not apply to the first three items; they have been passed. The item now under consideration is the fourth:

Lighting, including roads and bridges, $90,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then we will ask for information regarding this item.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount spent last year up to the 31st of March was $80,084.59.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Can you not get on with $80,000 this year as well?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The accounts are probably not all in yet. I notice that in 1920-21 the expenditure was about $88,696.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, costs are going down now.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There was a contract let last year for lighting, and I imagine that this estimate is based upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Are things not cheaper this year? I thought the Government was to bring about a lowering in the cost of living.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These contracts were entered into on the first of October, 1921.

Mr. MEIGHEN: For how long?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): For five years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much does that cover of this amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The contract covers the lighting of the Parliament buildings, and all buildings owned or rented by the Government in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Amounting to what proportion of this vote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $63,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the rate?

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Mr. Chairman, I heard you announce the fact that the item had reference to public buildings, but in this corner we have not been able to hear a single word since that announcement. We are here to discuss public affairs and if we cannot hear what is going on, then we ought to meet in a chamber in which we can hear. It is simply impossible two-thirds of the time for members at this end of the House to tell what business is being transacted at the other end.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The particular item before the committee is a vote of $90,000 for lighting, including roads and bridges.

Mr. GOOD: If hon. members would only realize that there are others in the chamber who would like to hear the questions they ask besides those to whom those questions are addressed, the proceedings would be much more satisfactory. There are hon. members back here who tell me they have not heard one-quarter of what has been going on, and it is really too bad. It is simply scandalous that such a condition should prevail, and we who are expected to participate intelligently in the discussion of public affairs should be able to hear what hon. gentlemen are saying. I wish to protest although I do not see why it should be necessary to do so. There would be no cause for protest if hon. members would only bear in mind that there are other gentlemen in the chamber besides themselves for whom they ought to have some consideration.

The CHAIRMAN: I may remark that the difficulty lies not so much with hon. gentlemen who are discussing the items under consideration, as in the fact that there is an incessant conversation in an undertone among hon. members themselves all over the chamber.

Mr. GARDINER: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman? What are the duties of a chairman?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have not yet had an answer to the question I asked regarding the rate.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The lighting rate is 5 cents per kilowatt hour for the first thirty hours, monthly use of installed capacity, and 2.2 cents per kilowatt hour for the next seventy hours, and ½ cent per kilowatt hour thereafter for monthly use. There is a discount upon

bills paid within thirty days of 12 per cent if the transformer in the building is owned by the company, and 15 per cent where the transformer is owned by the Government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I know that hon. members could not hear the minister, I will simply say that the bargain made last October appears to be a very provident one and I hope it will not be altered for the worse by the Government.

Item agreed to.

Heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $385,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is a decrease which, I presume, is owing to the reduction in the price of coal. To what else is it to be attributed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There has been a marked reduction in the price of coal.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What else accounts for the reduction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is all.

Item agreed to.

Departments generally—char service, including $100 to E. Snowdon for firing noon gun, $385,000.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): There should be something more descriptive than the mere word "generally".

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is required for char service in the cleaning of offices in government owned and rented buildings in Ottawa for the year 1922-23. It also includes $100 to E. Snowdon for firing the noon gun. The details of the expenditure are: supervision, $1,920; Foremen, $7,420; charmen $47,120; charwomen, $307,767, and contingencies, $20,772, making a total of $385,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Are these people under the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Repairs, furniture, grounds, street cleaning and maintenance, $700,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What accounts for the reduction here? I presume it is mainly because the furniture is new.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Apparently $700,000 was the amount expended last year, and that is what we are asking this year.

[Mr. J. H. King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does not the minister hope to secure a reduction? I would think there might be a reduction, due to the lesser amount of repairs required now.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I imagine the repairs would be the same from year to year. There may be some decrease in wages.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Repairs to good new furniture will not be as extensive as repairs to furniture many years old.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is also the supply of new furniture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But the new furniture is all supplied.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is not supplied in my room yet.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is supplied from this vote.

Item agreed to.

Rideau Hall (including grounds)—improvements, furniture, maintenance, etc., $60,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount spent last year was $58,000.

Item agreed to.

Rideau Hall—allowance for fuel and light, $19,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why is this more than last year with the price of coal going down?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote of $19,000 is for the payment of the annual amount to His Excellency the Governor General for fuel and light required at Rideau Hall, including the military secretary's cottage. The $19,000 is paid directly to His Excellency in four payments. The increase in this appropriation was made upon receipt of representations from His Excellency that the sum of $17,000 was inedequate. The matter was referred to the chief architect, who on the 9th February, 1922, submitted the following report to the deputy minister:

Replying to your memo of January 12th with regard to the increase of the fuel and light allowance for Rideau Hall, I attach a report from Mr. Croll, in which he states the cost for the year ending April 30th, 1921, to be as follows: Coal, $15,379; wood, $512; gas, $1,553; light, $1,622; electric bulbs, $225, making a total of $19,292.

Mr. BAXTER: The question is not strictly in order, but I should like to know where the coal is obtained for these buildings.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is being supplied from our own Canadian mines. Last year I believe it was supplied largely from the mines in Minto, New Brunswick.

Mr. BAXTER: I am delighted to hear it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Up to very recent years the coal supply came from the south, but the policy of getting Canadian coal was inaugurated two years ago.

Item agreed to.

Telephone service, $93,600.

Mr. CARROLL: Are the telephone and telegraph services of the Public Works one at the present time?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We have a branch of the telegraph and telephone service. This item is not connected with that service.

Item agreed to.

Dominion Public buildings—Dominion Immigration buildings—repairs, furniture, etc., $18,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: How much of this is for furniture?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This vote is required for indispensable repairs and renewals to buildings at all immigration agencies throughout the Dominion, and for furniture and so forth which may be required during the year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year $34,441 was spent.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What will not be necessary this year so that the $18,000 will be sufficient?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Out of the appropriation of $45,000 for 1921-22, $30,000 was provided for the supply of bunks at the immigration buildings in Halifax, St. John, and Quebec, as requested by the Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Colonization and Immigration in a letter dated 5th February, 1921. That accounts largely for the decrease this year.

Item agreed to.

Fittings and general supplies and furniture, $185,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How much was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year we spent $169,705.

Mr. STEVENS: Does that item cover all the public services throughout the Dominion or only those in Ottawa?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It covers the public services for the whole of Canada.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Are these furnishings replaced from year to year? I imaging that most of the members who are familiar with the debate on the necessity for economy must be somewhat startled when they observe the elaborate furnishings which have been brought into this building during the last two or three weeks. I doubt whether some of the furniture ever will be used, and a good deal of it I think we could very well get along without until these buildings are completed at any rate. We had an item of $185,000 last year, we have another item of $185,000 this year for fittings, general supplies and furniture, and a few minutes ago we passed an item of $700,000, the greater proportion of which was also for furniture, the minister informed us. There must surely be a limit to the purchasing of furniture. We have been told that $30,000 was spent last year for bunks. I think we ought to have some information as to whether sufficient bunks have already been supplied, or what the limit is to be.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): These bunks were supplied during last year—my hon. friend was a member of the House when the appropriation was voted—and were used in the immigration sheds throughout the Dominion. This vote is for fittings, supplies, furniture, filing cabinets, adjustable rollers, bookshelves, steel drawers, etc., for public buildings throughout the whole of Canada. The amount spent last year was $169,000. The appropriation this year is made on the recommendation of the department which has the matter in hand, and must be the judge.

Mr. MANION: Throughout this country in past years there have been built by both governments expensive and elaborate public buildings in different towns and cities. I admit that in the capital city, such buildings should be in keeping with the dignity of government, but in some towns and cities it seems to me they are too large and too elaborate and might well be subdivided in order to afford more space for use as public offices. I have in mind some cities, including my own, where there are immense buildings for the Customs D•

partment while other branches of the public service are spread over the city in rented quarters. It has been my impression that not only in my own city but in others, there would be plenty of room for other departments if these large buildings were further divided up. I am not blaming the present Government in the least, for most of these buildings were erected years ago; but in some of the customs offices I have seen there seemed to be enough room to provide for the needs of cities five or six times the size of those in which the buildings were situated. Possibly the minister would do well to carry on the work that was taken up by Mr. McCurdy, who, I happen to know, was looking into the possibilities of co-ordinating or bringing together some of the different offices of government. Of course, I would not like the minister, in return for my suggestion, to carry out the idea in my city alone.

An hon. MEMBER: Use that for a starting point.

Mr. MANION: No, not even as a starting point. But I would be quite willing to see my city taken with the rest of the cities in anything which is done in this connection. I think the minister would be well advised to carry on the work that Mr. McCurdy started to do, but which he did not have an opportunity to complete.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be very glad to give that matter consideration. It is advisable wherever possible to bring these various services under one roof. My hon. friend suggests that he would like any action taken with respect to his city to synchronize with similar action in others. We will bear that in mind.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): In view of the surplus last year of $16,000 would it not be possible to cut this item this year? The price of fittings, supplies and furniture should be coming down like the prices of other things.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount of $169,705 is the amount expended, so far as the department knows, up to March 31 of this year. When the accounts are complete we may find that sum augmented. I would not think it advisable to cut the estimate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There would be no accounts coming in after this for fittings, general supplies, and furniture. It is inconceivable that the department would not know now the actual expenditure of last year, and if the minister looks at the year before he will find additional reason why the vote shold be reduced this year.

Mr GOOD: Do the Dominion public buildings include the public buildings in Ottawa, or only those outside the city?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Only those outside Ottawa.

Item agreed to.

Dominion public buildings—heating, $420,000.

Mr. STEVENS: Can we get some particulars in regard to this item? I assume it is for heating accounts outside of Ottawa.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount is required for the purchase of fuel, etc., for heating the public buildings throughout the Dominion outside of Ottawa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): $450,013.72.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister explained that owing to the reduction in the price of coal he was able to effect a reduction in the estimate for heating in Ottawa from $540,000 to $385,000, or about forty per cent. Why can he not do the same in this case? Coal has gone down elsewhere, certainly, just as much as here. If only $450,000 was spent last year, he ought to be able to get on with $300,000 this year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): 35,500 tons of coal at $9.55 per ton would amount to $339,000; wood, $25,000; removal of ashes, $12,000; heat, gas, $3,500; steam heat, $25,000; fuel oil, $3,450; contingencies, $11,600. That makes up the $420,000.

Mr. STEVENS: What does the minister mean by steam heat? Is not the other fuel used for that purpose as well?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In some localities we are able to purchase steam from a central heating plant.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the minister going to continue to purchase in quantities, or is he going to revert to the old process of patronage in coal?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The purchases will be made through the Purchasing Commission, in quantities as required, I suppose, in the various localities.

Mr MEIGHEN: By contract and tender, as before?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would say yes

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Has the minister any information as to the relative difference between the cost of coal heat and of steam heat, as referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens)? I have in mind the city of North Battleford, which I suppose is one of those that have a municipal heating plant and a number of big buildings.

Mr KING (Kootenay): I am not sure we have the information as to relative costs, but I believe North Battleford has a contract for steam heating from a central plant.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has given us the price of coal this year, $9.50. What was the price yast year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year, $9.55.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If it was only $9.55 last year, $9.30 or $9.50 this year is far too high.

Mr. LOGAN: I find in a return which was brought down at my request on the 20th of April last, that coal was imported from the United States for use in federal buildings as follows: in 1918-19, 28,973.91 tons, at a cost delivered of $318,850, or an average cost per ton of $11; in 1919-20, 32,646.81 tons, at a cost delivered of $327,941.65; in 1920-21, 52,279.58 tons, at a cost delivered of $821,748.55, or an average cost per ton of $15.71. In other words, while the Public Works Department imported in round figures, 29,000 tons of American coal in 1918-1919, at a cost of $319,000, or an average cost per ton of $11, this tonnage increased for the year ending March 31, 1921, to over 52,000 tons or nearly double the quantity, at a cost of nearly $822,000, or nearly treble the cost in 1918-1919.

The leader of the Opposition has spoken to-night of some Canadian coal being used in the public buildings in Ottawa. Very little could have been used, because under his government and its predecessor the amount of American coal imported for the use of public buildings jumped inside of three years from 28,000 odd tons to 52,000 odd tons per year. Is it the policy of the present Minister of Public Works to discontinue using American coal in federal buildings where Canadian coal can be procured at a decent price?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: When that was done in 1920-1921, Canadian Companies were not in a position to supply the coal. Was not Canadian coal bought last year for the public buildings?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Of course it was, and what was the proportion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Replying to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), the date he stopped at was the date up to which there was an ample market for Canadian coal elsewhere. In Ottawa the policy was established—I cannot give the exact date, but certainly all the time I was Prime Minister, and I think before—of buying Canadian coal rather than American coal because the prices were so comparable we could do it. So I was right in what I said. The time came when the market for coal overseas was exhausted, and what did the late government do? We pressed on the railway companies to buy Canadian coal to keep the men employed. They, of course, resisted because the price was higher, but we stood behind the company and paid the excess price out of the treasury of Canada in order to keep the men employed to the utmost extent we could during that hard period. That was the course the late government pursued in all these things, and I think it was right. What is more, I would do it again. I believe we ought to use Canadian coal. There is a limit, of course. You cannot go very far above the market price at which you can get coal elsewhere, but we can afford to do something in order to extend further the market for coal produced in our own country.

10 p.m.

Mr. LOGAN: The hon. gentleman's argument would be all right if his facts were right, but perhaps he does not know quite as much about the coal trade as we who come from the province of Nova Scotia. I can tell him that when he purchased 52,000 tons of coal in 1920-1921, as compared with 28,000 tons in 1918-1919, the bottom had then dropped out of the coal market and the miners of Nova Scotia were walking the streets.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not last year.

Mr. LOGAN: The bottom dropped out of the coal market in 1919, after the armistice in 1918, and in 1920-1921 coal was an absolute drug on the market and our miners in Nova Scotia were unable to secure employment. It may be hard to explain why in that year the amount of coal imported from the United States was almost twice as much as the amount imported three years before.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know that we will gain much unless we get the real facts. They ought to be here. I asked the minister how much Canadian coal was bought last year for use in Ottawa, and how much American coal.

Mr. LOGAN: The figures I am quoting are from a return brought down to the House, so there cannot be any doubt as to the correctness of the figures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member gave the figures for 1920-1921. What were the figures for last year?

Mr. LOGAN: It was in 1920-1921 that we had a lack of coal orders in Nova Scotia. I am as anxious as the ex-Minister of Finance to hear the reply of the Minister of Public Works. The ex-Minister of Finance has rather intimated that this is not a matter of importance.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I never said any such thing. I think it is a matter of importance, and it is important that we get the facts.

Mr. LOGAN: The amount involved may not be stupendous, but the principle involved is a very important one. In my humble opinion the time has come in this country when we must establish a Canadian national coal policy, and it must be the rule of this Government, not only for its public buildings, but for the railways, to purchase coal mined in Canadian mines. Look at the item before us. The government of Canada, for the year ending 31 March, 1921, bought over $800,000 worth of American coal for use in its own public buildings. Do hon. members think the United States of America would buy Canadian coal to use in their public buildings? At Washington they would almost sooner burn wood than Canadian coal.

We need in this country more Canadianism and more devotion to Canadian industry. We preach the doctrine, which is all right in itself, to buy Canadian goods made in Canada, but we often forget to buy coal produced in Canada. It is one of our natural products. Upon it depends a large amount of the revenue of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and yet we will find that, even down in some cities in the maritime provinces, large quantities of American coal are being brought in, and burned and very often burned by those who are preaching the loudest "buy goods made in Canada".

[Mr. Logan.]

This is in my humble judgment, a most important matter, although only involving perhaps a few hundred thousand dollars. At the same time, it is important in principle that it should be established in this country that we should patronize Canadian home industries, particularly those that are producing from our natural resources. We had a statement made here not long ago, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Pictou, (Mr. Macdonald) in reference to the amount of American coal burned on Canadian railways, and I think the answer was "about a million tons per year". Do hon. members realize the fact that down in the province of Nova Scotia—and I presume this remark applies to the western country as well—about two thirds of our collieries are idle, that men are walking the streets looking for work, and at the same time the government of Canada is buying a million tons of coal per year for railway purposes? According to this statement, for the year ending 31 March, 1921, we burned a million dollars worth of coal in public buildings. This is not Canadianism, and not a policy which will build up Canada, particularly that part of Canada which depends so largely upon the production of this very important product of our country.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I entirely agree with my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) in the principle he has enunciated. The late government went so far as to practically pay premiums for Canadian coal, and they were criticized for it in this House. I am amazed at one statement my hon. friend makes. He tells us that down in the maritime provinces American coal is being burned. If it is true that any one of our public institutions is burning American coal where Canadian coal could easily be got, the least my hon. friend can do is to give the facts to this House. Let us know what the institutions are and where they are, because frankly I am amazed to hear the statement.

Mr. LOGAN: I think the hon. member may have misunderstood me. I did not say the government of Canada was buying coal for use in maritime cities from American sources. I said American coal was being burned in those cities by people who were preaching very loudly the "made in Canada" doctrine. I was amazed not long ago to pick up a Halifax paper and to see that they congratulated, I think, the

school commissioners for having purchased a very large amount of coal, but when I came to consider the kind of coal it was, I found it was American coal being burned in the city of Halifax, in that province which depends so much on the production of coal. What we need in this country, in reference to coal and in reference to many other products of the country, is more Canadianism, and we should patronize Canadian industries as far as possible. There may be cases where it would be too expensive to bring in Nova Scotia coal, say to central Canada. That is another question, but, as far as the portion of Canada east of lake Superior is concerned, there should be no coal purchased by the government of Canada for use on the railways or the public buildings, except coal produced in a Canadian mine by Canadian miners.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have only one word to say, and it is not in criticism of the hon. gentleman. I admit, without going into the facts—for I cannot get the facts—that I do not understand just why that increase took place. There may be some explanation. It may be there was some additional use for anthracite coal, which is not produced in the maritime provinces, and it may be that, as well, there was increased consumption for some special reason in those parts of Canada to which there cannot, of course, be access for maritime province coal. I want to impress upon the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) that the last government went as far as they could. You can go too far, I know, but we did not go too far. Hon. members are criticizing us for not going far enough. We went so far in the purchase of Canadian coal as to pay a premium for it. I cannot give the figures, but I am sure the Finance Minister will correct me if I am wrong. We went to the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, in order that the workmen of the maritime provinces might do business. We had to stand for criticism from hon. members on this side of the House for doing it, and we had to defend ourselves, but I have learned to know the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) well enough to say he would have stood up and stated what he thought was right, no matter on which side of the House he happened to be.

Mr. McBRIDE: I fully agree with the sentiments expressed by hon. members, but I do not think they have gone far enough. I think they should advocate a tariff on fuel oil, so that our mines in Canada would have a better chance to give steady employment to our miners.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I am glad that the hon. member for Cumberland registered so strongly in favour of Canadian products. However, before this subject was introduced, there was a question asked to which a distinct answer was not given. The contrast was made between heating the Ottawa public buildings and the Dominion public buildings, and before an answer could be given another question was put, and, to my mind, at least, no clear explanation was given as to this difference. It seems that the heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen of the public buildings at Ottawa, shows this year in the estimates a reduction of $155,000—that is $540,000 reduced to $385,000. I presume there has not been much reduction in the salaries of the engineers, firemen and so on. Then we have the plain item for heating Dominion public buildings. The vote last year was $450,000, and this year $420,000 is asked, a difference of only $30,000. I would like to have some explanation from the minister as to that.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The decrease in the item for public buildings in Ottawa is principally due to a very material reduction in the price of coal. In 1921-22, the estimate provided for the purchase of 13,500 tons of bituminous coal at $15 per ton, and 11,400 tons of anthracite coal at $17 per ton, making a total of about $379,000. In 1922-23, the estimate is for 25,890 tons of various kinds of coal, at a cost of $230,000, an increase of 990 tons and a decrease in cost of about $148,000. There is also a large reduction of $18,800 in the allotment for wood. For the past two years, owing to the uncertainty of the coal situation, a large quantity of hardwood was secured; but now that conditions are becoming more stable, the only wood that will be required for the next year is a supply of kindling wood. Besides those two reduced items, there is a reduction of $3,072 in the contingent appropriation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister has not yet told us how it is that he cannot extend the economy in coal to other points where he is buying coal.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would point out to the minister that, on the one hand, on a basis of $540,000 last year, there is a reduction of $155,000, and on the other, on a basis of $450,000 last year, there is a

reduction of only $30,000. The statement that he has given has not explained that, at least to me. In a word, how is it that we can save $155,000 on $540,000, and only $30,000 on $450,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the explanation given regarding the Dominion item will be satisfactory. As regards the estimate, $420,000, outside service, I have cited the items making that up and the quantity required, namely 35,500 tons. I imagine that the departmental officials must have a fairly accurate knowledge as to the tonnage of coal that is required. The requirement is a yearly one, and it would not vary very much from year to year.

Mr. RYCKMAN: That would make no difference, because it should be relevant in either case.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This appropriation is largely due to the use of bituminous coal where anthracite coal was previously used. This scheme necessitates the purchase of a much greater tonnage of coal than in the previous year, but at a much reduced price. In 1920-21, the quantity was 31,216 tons; in 1921-22, 35,000 tons, practically the same quantity as we are asking this year, namely 35,500 tons.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister is entirely losing the point as regards what we desire to know, and that is why it is costing just as much to buy coal this year as it did last year in connection with these outside points. We all know how the price is down. The minister has shown how it is down in Ottawa.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The price of coal in 1920-21 was $13.09; in 1921-22, it was $9.55, and from present indications I do not think the price of coal will be much less this year. We are estimating it at $9.55 this year.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister is estimating it at the same price although there is a difference in Ottawa. What is the reason why, when there is a difference in Ottawa, the minister cannot get it outside of Ottawa? Is the real difference not this, that last year the government insisted on using Nova Scotia here and got a proper price for it? I wonder whether the deputy could not just tell the minister whether the fact is or is not that last year we burned Nova Scotia coal and got it at a cheaper price, and that is available this year. Is that not the fact?

[Mr. Ryckman.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is a fact.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why cannot we have it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Last year we had an appropriation of $540,000 for heating public buildings in Ottawa. This year we are asking $385,000, which item, I believe, is passed. There is a comparison now as to the expenditures between the two items, the Outside Service and the Inside Service. I have given the information as I have it here. The decrease is principally due to the price of coal. The price of bituminous coal last year was $15 per ton, and anthracite coal, $17 per ton.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Apparently we cannot get the information.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): You will get the information.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It does not make much difference whether we get it or not, so long as the minister gives his pledge. Is he going to continue to buy Nova Scotia coal for the government buildings this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is nothing very startling about the policy of the late government in connection with coal purchases. As regards Canadian coal being used in public buildings throughout Canada, I may advise the hon. gentleman that it will be the policy of the Government to utilize Canadian coal where it can properly be used. Coal is not produced in Ontario, and there is the question of shipment to that province. My hon. friends will realize that the matter will undoubtedly be dealt with in the interests of Canada.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not asking that. We are dealing with this Ottawa item. As my hon. friend has admitted, we did burn Nova Scotia coal here last year. Is it his intention again to invite tenders from the Nova Scotia dealers and give them the business next year. There is no trouble about carrying it into Ontario. I am asking only in reference to Ottawa.

Mr. LOGAN: Will the minister tell me how much coal was burnt in the public buildings in Ottawa last year?

Mr. BOYS: May I ask the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), a question regarding the purchase of coal in the United

States in 1920-21 to the extent of $800,000, as mentioned by him. What kind of coal was that? Was it bituminous or anthracite, and could it have been purchased in Canada?

Mr. LOGAN: I want to get an answer to the question I have asked the minister?

Mr. BOYS: The minister is looking up the information, and I thought that while he was doing so I might ask the hon. member this question.

Mr. LOGAN: The return brought down in answer to my motion does not specify how much bituminous or how much anthracite was imported into this country. Now, I submit, that there is no necessity for importing any American coal for public buildings and government railways in Canada east of lake Superior, because bituminous coal, which can be used in the heating of all furnaces, can be purchased in Nova Scotia and in New Brunswick. The coal that was purchased for Ottawa by the late government was bought in New Brunswick and not in Nova Scotia. I make that statement by the way. Coal can be purchased in Nova Scotia at the present time, delivered on the government railways, at about $5.50 a ton. The Government owns the railways; they own railways running throughout the province of Ontario; and if they would carry coal at cost from Nova Scotia they could deliver it at the eastern end of lake Superior in competition against American prices. But they cannot do so if they charge the regular cost of transportation on coal. A few years ago the Government of Canada carried coal from Nova Scotia to the city of Montreal at $1.60 a ton. They increased the rate from $1.60 to $3.80. We contend that that is an excessive freight rate, but they would never suggest that it was the exact cost of transportation and my contention, even in opposition to what has been intimated by the minister, is that there is no need for this Government to buy any American coal for use in Ontario if they will only buy it in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick and transport it at actual transportation cost. They can buy a million tons of coal to-day in Nova Scotia delivered on the government railways at $5.50 a ton, and good coal at that.

Mr. BOYS: I am not criticizing for one moment the purchase of coal in the maritime provinces; quite the opposite. But to reach an intelligent conclusion regarding the criticism offered by the hon. member (Mr. Logan) with reference to the $800,000 expended on coal in the United States, it is necessary to know whether that coal was anthracite or bituminous coal. If it was bituminous, then the criticism might be well founded; if, on the contrary, it was anthracite, there was no ground for the criticism. And the same argument would apply to the discussion on some of the other items.

Mr. LOGAN: I contend that there is no necessity for buying anthracite for public buildings, and that is why I want the minister to tell me how much anthracite was bought last year for use in heating public buildings in Ottawa.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have the information. There were purchased 163 tons of anthracite.

Mr. HANSON: I am informed that the late government let a contract to a company in my constituency for supplying all the coal used in the public buildings here, and I understand that the contract price is lower still than that named by the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). I believe that coal is being loaded in New Brunswick, under contract made by the late government for the heating of public buildings in Ottawa, at as low as $5.25. I am glad the minister is laying down the policy which he has stated. It would be a great benefit to the district I represent and, incidentally, to the district he himself comes from. I do not see the necessity for buying anthracite coal, because in the lower provinces the use of anthracite in large public buildings is being entirely discontinued.

Mr. MARTELL: I wonder if my hon. friend from Cumberland means that coal should be transported by the railways at rates affording special consideration to the coal operators?

Mr. LOGAN: Any government coal bought from the operators in Nova Scotia for the use of the Government should be transported at cost. It is not giving any advantage to the operators.

Mr. MARTELL: I received telegrams about a fortnight ago from people in my constituency complaining that American soft coal was being sold in the town of Windsor at about $4 less per ton than Canadian coal produced in Nova Scotia. Now, I claim that the railways of the country ought to be run on a business basis, and

if you are to give special consideration to coal produced in any part of Canada the people generally will be taxed in consequence. Coal is not entitled to any greater consideration than any other commodity produced in the country. My reply to my own constituents was that the object was to get coal at the cheapest possible price and not at the expense of the public at large, and that they had to put up with it, and I was very glad that they were able to get coal for $8 or $9, as against $15 which has been charged during the past few years. My advice to the Government is to buy coal where it can be purchased at the cheapest possible rate. If that is done the Minister of Railways will be able to administer the railways of the country as a business proposition. If the railways give special concessions to coal it will mean so much more of a deficit; and I repeat that it will be the part of wisdom for the Government to procure their coal where it can be got at the cheapest price.

Mr. HANSON: I should like my hon. friend to go down to Pictou and Springhill and some other places down there, and preach that doctrine at election time.

Mr. MARTELL: I am not afraid to preach it.

Mr. HANSON: I am sure you have not the courage to do it.

Mr. MARTELL: I have the courage to practise whatever doctrine I preach, and if you come to my constituency and advocate that any special concession should be made in favour of any coal company in Canada at the expense of the consumer I will run against you. I will even go into the old Tory county of York and run an election there against the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HANSON: No one is advocating any special concessions in favour of coal sold to the public. But the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) contends that the Government in hauling its own coal for public buildings should do so without a profit, and he is quite justified in that contention.

Mr. MARTELL: The Government should be run on a business basis and the railways should not be hewers of wood and drawers of water for anybody. They are public utilities which are supposed to serve the interests of the people, and nothing should be done whereby the taxpayers can be mulcted in unjustifiable costs. I repeat that coal should be got at the cheapest price no matter where it comes from.

[Mr. Martell.]

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am quite sure the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) is amazed when he finds the tremendous amount of anthracite tonnage —163 tons—which the late government imported into Ottawa. Of course it was an exceedingly small amount. There was a reason for it: the late government was very sincere in trying to bring about a condition that would enable as much of our own coal as possible and our money kept in the country. Among other things we looked into the changing of our furnace equipment so that we could use bituminous coal, and in that way help our own coal mining industry and our own unemployed. City by-laws, of course, make a good deal of trouble in some instances, but I dare say we will be able ultimately to use still more of our own coal. Perhaps the minister can tell us what percentage of maritime coal was burned here in Ottawa.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of maritime bituminous coal we burned 23,745 tons.

Mr. LOGAN: How much coal was burned altogether?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A total of 25,607 tons.

Mr. LOGAN: Where were the 2,000 tons purchased?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: It was 1,300 tons.

Mr. HANSON: Was that purchased by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): By tender. The requirements last year were: 23,745 tons of bituminous coal; 163 tons of anthracite coal; 1,530 tons of coke; 169 tons of peat; making a total of 25,607 tons of fuel.

Item agreed to.

Lighting, $195,000.

Mr. LUCAS: What accounts for the increase of $15,000 in lighting?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of this increase $12,500 is due to the necessity of supplying lamps to all buildings throughout Canada occupied by the Department of Militia and Defence.

Item agreed to.

Rents, $1,250,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Why this increase in rents at the present time when we are supposed to be cutting down services and dismissing employees.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The increase of $120,000 is due to the inclusion of rents for the Militia Department amounting to $185,000. These are included at the request of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Does that mean that the Department of Public Works is now carrying a part of the expenditure of the Department of Militia and Defence?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How much is the Militia Department helped out altogether?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To the extent of $185,000.

Mr. MARTELL: Were these buildings rented by the government previous to December last?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They were rented by the Militia Department.

Item agreed to.

Harbour and river—Nova Scotia—Baddeck—repairs to wharf, $3,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Mr. Chairman, it is Friday night, and judging from the the deserted appearance of the benches on both sides I think that most of the members have gone to catch their trains. I imagine the House generally did not think the Opposition would be quite as easy as they have been with the Minister of Public Works in allowing so many estimates to go through in the last few minutes. In view of the progress we have made and of the lack of attendance, I would suggest that the House might adjourn.

Mr. LOGAN: Does the ex-Minister of Finance desire that we postpone consideration of the Nova Scotia estimates until some Opposition members from that province get here?

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Not at all.

Mr. LOGAN: You would have to wait about ten years for any of them to get here.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will go ahead.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Then let us hear what is going to be done at Baddeck. What are the repairs to the wharf there?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The appropriation is required to renew the deck of the wharf which is badly decayed and unsafe.

Mr. HANSON: Where is Baddeck?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Down in Nova Scotia.

Mr. HANSON: What is the trouble there?

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall have much pleasure in telling my benighted brethren across the way where Baddeck is. Baddeck has figured prominently in the literature of this country, and any gentlemen who have never heard of it before must have sadly neglected their education. The ex-Minister of Finance need not worry himself to find out why this or any other public work in the province of Nova Scotia needs to be repaired, for the simple reason that during the ten years that he and his party were in power they absolutely allowed these public works to fall into decay, and now they require to be put into a proper state of repair. We are doing the best we can with the remnants of the moneys that our predecessors left in the treasury to make good their dereliction of duty. The wharf at Baddeck is a very good one; it is practically a part of the Intercolonial system. One of the termini of the Intercolonial is a place called Iona, and a very excellent ferry runs between Iona and Baddeck. This wharf has been neglected and is now badly in need of repairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this a wharf at which subsidized boats call?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, quite a number of subsidized boats call there. The steamer Marion, plying on the route between the city of Sydney and Whycocomagh, calls there, and there is a subsidized steamer called the Bras d'Or, a new boat, which calls at Baddeck. Other boats which come from Halifax and go through the St. Peter's canal make some calls at this wharf. It is the only wharf at Baddeck which is capable of accommodating them.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: In view of the lucid information given by my hon. friend, I withdraw my opposition to the item.

Item agreed to.

Big Bras d'Or—repairs to wharf, $1,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Would the hon. Solicitor General enlighten us with regard to this item?

Mr. McKENZIE: This is also a public wharf, and somewhat the same conditions apply. The hon. ex-minister was in Bras d'Or not very long ago and possibly went

through the lakes; he knows the route of the steamer Marion from Sydney to Whycocomagh, a distance of about 80 miles. There is no railway in that part of the country and this boat calls at wharves, just as trains call at stations.

Item agreed to.

Cow bay (Port Morien)—repairs to breakwater, $4,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is proposed to be done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is proposed to renew the crib work at the outer end of the breakwater, which was washed away. The average length of the work required is 125 feet and the average width 40 feet.

Item agreed to.

Digby—repairs to pier, $5,000.

Mr. HANSON: What is proposed to be done at Digby? The Government have a large pier there; I did not know that it was out of repair at all.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is required for repairs and renewals to floor and fenders, annually necessary on account of wear and tear.

Mr. HANSON: Is it proposed to spend the whole amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Inverness—repairs to pier, $11,300.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: How is this sum made up?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The proposed work will consist of repairs to the eastern pier. Repairs to cribwork are necessary because the outer end of the eastern breakwater has been partly destroyed, on a length of 210 feet and a width of 18 feet, 55 feet having been damaged on a height of one foot to 5 feet, 105 feet totally destroyed, and 50 feet damaged on a height of 3 feet. The amount required for this work is $2,650. Then there is close piling on 335 feet of channel face, $2,285; construction of a seawall 300 feet long, $965; repairs to pile, brush and stone work, $5,356.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is this a place where you have frequent destruction by the elements?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is there a railway there?

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. CHISHOLM: Perhaps I can give my hon. friend the information he desires. This pier is at the terminus of the Inverness railway. The undertaking was commenced some years ago over $200,000 being spent in an effort to complete it. For the last ten years a little money has been spent there annually, but each fall the storms would carry away all the work that had been done because it had been commenced too late in the season. This appropriation is to repair some of the destruction done last fall. When this is completed and the necessary dredging done, we will have a very fine harbour there, one of sufficient depth to facilitate the carrying on of the fishing industry in that locality. It is mainly for the purposes of the fishermen.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: From what the minister says, the elements are always breaking down these works. Is the pier in a wrong location, or is it so placed that it is unnecessarily exposed to the elements?

Mr. CHISHOLM: For the last ten years the work has never been done at the proper season. In 1910-11 a good deal of work was done, but since then it has only been partly carried out and always at a season of the year when any substantial work was impossible. Every year during that period I have in this House called the attention of the minister to the fact that it was useless to spend money there in the fall of the year, and I say the same thing to the present minister. If it is his intention to finish this work, the only time to do it is in the early season; otherwise it will be destroyed.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Will this amount finish the work?

Mr. CHISHOLM: It is to finish the work that was undertaken.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Do I understand that when this money is expended we shall hear no more of Inverness?

Mr. CHISHOLM: There are annual repairs.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I am not speaking of annual repairs—unless you have annual washouts, which apparently you do in a lot of these little harbours Will this $11,300 complete the whole undertaking as planned?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Joggins, repairs to breakwater, $1,200.

Mr. HANSON: Is there a breakwater at Joggins, away up there at the head of the Bay of Fundy? It is beyond reason a breakwater should be required there. It is not out on the Atlantic, and hardly on the Bay of Fundy. It is on a very dirty river, if I recollect correctly.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a breakwater at that point to protect the shipping pier of the Maritime Power, Coal and Railway Company. Schooners and costal steamers playing between St. John and other Bay of Fundy ports load and discharge produce and merchandise at that place. It is a general utility wharf.

Mr. HANSON: It seems to be a breakwater to assist the Maritime Power and Railway Company. How long has this breakwater been built, and what steamer runs between St. John and Joggins? I do not think there is one myself.

Mr. LOGAN: I happen to know the locality pretty well. This breakwater is a combination breakwater and wharf. It has been used for the last twenty-five years.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Since 1879.

Mr. LOGAN: As usual, I was well within the mark. There is a most important trade carried on between Joggins and the city of St. John. All the goods that go into that part of the county of Cumberland go by water from St. John and are landed at Joggins. It has been used all these years, and, incidentally, the breakwater is a protection to the little harbour in front of the coal company's coal pockets, but that is merely incidental. The wharf is used for public purposes and has been for forty-three years. The hon. member for York-Sunbury was hardly born then.

Mr. HANSON: Is there a steamer running between Joggins and St. John?

Mr. LOGAN: A steamer runs down the Petitcodiac river, calls at Joggins, and goes to St. John. Quite a schooner trade is carried on there. In the summer months you will find four or five or six schooners right inside that breakwater engaged in the coast trade.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: The minister will have the engineer's report showing the amount of traffic done at that point.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): All I have as to traffic is what I have read. Schooners and coastal steamers plying between St. John and other Bay of Fundy ports load and discharge produce and merchandise at that place. The repairs are urgently required. The daily output of coal there is 870 tons.

Mr. HANSON: Not a ton goes from this wharf.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Our information is from the district engineer.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Is any other trade done at this wharf besides that in coal?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): General produce and merchandise.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What does that consist of, and what is the amount of the trade?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not that information.

Mr. HANSON: There has never been any coal shipped from this wharf. I think the repairs are for the wharf of the Maritime Coal and Railway Company.

Mr. LOGAN: This breakwater was built twenty years before the Maritime Coal Company came into existence. There is no coal shipped over this breakwater at all. It is used as a wharf for coastal schooners, and is in front of the Maritime Coal Company's own wharf near its coal pockets. This combination breakwater and wharf is not for the accommodation of the Maritime Coal Company, but for the accommodation of small schooners and the small steamer that calls there, and for the accommodation of the town of Joggins with nearly two thousand inhabitants. It serves a large section of that part of the country, with a population of from five to ten thousand people.

Item agreed to.

Margaree harbour—repairs to breakwaters, $26,000.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: This is a large item. What is the explanation?

Mr. CHISHOLM: This is another monument to the indifference and folly of the late government. Three years ago a certain amount of destruction was wrought there by the storms. I told the minister at the time from my place in the House that about $800 would make the repairs, but this was neglected. Next year about $3,000 would have done the work, but not a dollar was spent, and the breakwater was allowed to

11 p.m.

go until finally it became necessary to expend $26,000, and I venture to say that it will be necessary to spend four or five thousand more.

This is perhaps one of the most important little harbours in eastern Nova Scotia. It is the only medium of transportation for a population of about 10,000 people. There is a large fleet of boats runing in and out of this little port, and there are now three steamers plying along the coast, making five calls a week at that port. I could not give the exports and imports, but they are very substantial indeed. The point I wish to impress not only in criticism of the late government but for the guidance of the present Government with respect to works along the coast, is that this work should be done early this season. If not, we will be coming back for an item of $40,000 next year in addition, because the balance of the work will be gone. This is an old work dating from before Confederation.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I would like to get the exact facts from the minister. He will know the traffic in and out.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is an important fishery harbour, and is also the commercial centre in many respects for the adjoining agricultural district. Three subsidized steamboats call at this port, and as the nearest railway station is 20 miles distant, most of the freight is transported by water. The village has a population of 1,000.

Item agreed to.

Port Hood, repairs to wharf, $12,300.

Mr. HANSON: Tell us something about this.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This is a revote of $3,000, to complete work now under contract with Mr. T. B. Morrison. The work consists of cutting down to 2½ feet above low water the wrecked portion of the pier, 325 feet in length, and reconstructing this part with fully ballasted native timber crib work, 20 feet in width, to height of ten feet above low water, or to the level of the covering of the adjoining portion of the pier head. Amount required $2,800.

The second item is to rebuild the pier head of the breakwater, carried away by January, 1922, storms from low water in sections 50 ft. x 37½ ft. and 40 ft. x 25 ft. to close pile the outer end of the wharf with creosoted timber, renew part of covering and replace ballast in several bays of work, amount required $9,800, making a total of $12,300.

Item carried.

Shelburne, repairs to wharf, $4,500.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What is that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): To renew the planking on the wharf and some guard rails. I will give the quantities. They are as follows:

73 M ft B.M. 4" plank at $30	$2,190 00
10½ M. ft. B.M. square timber at $33	346 50
Iron and spikes	375 00
Labour	1,450 00
Contingencies	138 50
Total	$4,500 00

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King for the adjournment of the House.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: What business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The first item of business will be concurrence in the reports of Committee of Supply, and putting the Supply Bill through the different stages. Then, as mentioned earlier in the day, we will take up the motions of private members that appear on the Order Paper, beginning with No. 23, relating to oleomargarine, and, when that has been disposed of, we will take up the other motions in the order in which they appear.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Has my hon. friend considered whether or not we shall have any choice as to how those motions are to be taken up? Is that not left entirely in the hands of private members? Are they not to be taken in their turn? I would have thought so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I spoke of it this afternoon, and asked if there was any objection, and I understood the House was unanimous. I presume anything the House may agree to will be permissible.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: I do not know. Perhaps the House did come to an agreement. I was not here at the time. If we had to come to any agreement, I would have thought that we would have agreed, at

least, to give preference to the motion for redistribution. I would have no difficulty in agreeing that my hon. friend should give preference to that motion on Monday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I mentioned, in answer to the hon. gentleman who asked the question, that that motion would be taken up at a later time, but the Government would like to fix its own time for it. I wish also to mention to my hon. friend—and I mention it now so that hon. members will know—that on Tuesday we will go on with the estimates on naval service and continue with the militia estimates.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Monday, May 15, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

SUPPLY BILL

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): At the previous sitting of the House I intimated that it was very desirable that we should to-day have concurrence in the reports of Committee of Supply which we have already had, in order that we might complete a Supply Bill with particular reference to closing the accounts of the past year. I would ask for the unanimous consent of the House to take those formal proceedings to-day, and if there is no objection I move that we take up Government Orders.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): I know of no special reason for objecting to this other than the absence of the former Minister of Finance (Sir Henry Drayton), and I would not press that objection if it is going seriously to inconvenience the Government; but if not, I would suggest that the matter stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING: I am quite willing to concur in the suggestion of the right hon. member. I have no desire to press the motion unduly.

Motion stands.

NATURAL RESOURCES OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister), laid on the Table correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta since July, 1920, respecting the transfer of natural resources. He said:

I am bringing down all the correspondence which I am able to find.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. D. D. McKENZIE (Solicitor General) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 92, to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said:

The House will remember that two resolutions with regard to amending the Dominion Elections Act were introduced this year and accepted by the House. Both of them have reference to section 29 of the present Elections Act. One has special reference to the removal of the disqualification of certain women voters, a matter which has been very much discussed in this House and with which hon. members are familiar. The other has reference to continuing the qualification of a voter, male or female, who may have moved his or her domicile or residence within two months before an election. Those are the two principal matters dealt with in this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EMPIRE DAY AND ASCENSION DAY — ADJOURNMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. R. J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should be glad if the Prime Minister, (Mr. Mackenzie King) would inform the House whether any arrangement has been made in connection with the holidays next week. Usually the House has not sat on the 24th of May, and there is another holiday on the following day.

Mr. BUREAU: We never sit on Ascension Day.

Mr. MANION: Will the Prime Minister say what the intention of the Government is in the matter?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I shall move that when the House adjourns on Tuesday next, the 23rd instant, it shall stand adjourned until the following Friday. Wednesday and Thursday will both be observed as holidays.

Mr. ARTHURS: Why not include Friday too?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As regards Friday, the Government, I think, would like to carry out the wishes of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Not Friday, no.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Apparently there is a difference of opinion on the question.

GRAIN TRADE

JUDGMENT OF MANITOBA COURT OF APPEAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Some time ago an hon. member called the attention of the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin) to a decision of the Court of Appeal of Manitoba on the question of federal jurisdiction in the matter of the grain trade. That decision was of a very serious nature and the Minister of Justice stated at the time that he was securing information as to its effect before determining what course the Government should follow. Since then some two weeks or more have elapsed. If the decision goes to the extent that it appears to go, there will be cause for action on the part of Government and Parliament, unless the whole supervision of the grain trade is to remain in the most precarious position. I now call the attention of the Government to the matter again. Although the Minister of Justice is absent, I hope we may have a statement on the subject from the Solicitor-General or the Prime Minister.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As soon as the Minister of Justice returns I will ask him to make a note of the remarks just made by my right hon. friend.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edwin Dixon Weir.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry James Bristol.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florant Brys.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catherine Rudd.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Norman Edward Harris.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maria Amy Drury.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Frederick Naylor.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 82 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Yallowley Jones Conalty.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 83 (from the Senate), for the relief of Telesphore Joseph Morin.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate), for the relief of Daisy Mary Nicholson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

THE CANADIAN TRANSIT COMPANY

House again in Committee on Bill No. 52, respecting the Canadian Transit Company, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

On section 2—Head office:

Mr. McBRIDE: I took exception to this bill the last time it was before the House and asked that it be referred back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines. When it was before that committee I did not consider that it received either the time or the attention to which it was entitled. As I said before, the word "Canadian" in the name of the company lends a certain prestige to the concern; and I notice in the press that another corporation is to be known as the German-Canadian Company. Now, I think that if this company desires to have whatever advantage may attach to this special designation it should have its head office in Canada and should be Canadian in fact. I do not see why it should have the title "Canadian" and hold its meetings in other countries. I would like an explanation of this before the bill is passed.

Mr. RANKIN: The home of the company is in Windsor where its head office is situated, although it is true that a great many shareholders and some of the directors live in Detroit. For the accommodation of those shareholders it has been deemed advisable to hold some of the meetings in that city. The same practice, I may observe, prevails in connection with the Niagara Bridge Company, some of the meetings of which are held in Niagara, Ontario, and some in Buffalo. There is nothing derogatory of the national dignity of this country in the matter; it is purely a question of courtesy to the shareholders and directors who reside out of Canada. The amendments which are proposed have been found necessary to facilitate the business of the

company in different ways. I repeat, the company has its head office in Windsor, and its place of business is in this country. I can see no objection to the passage of this bill.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not think the explanation is entirely satisfactory. The name of the concern is the Canadian Transit Company, and all its meetings should be held in Canada.

Mr. CARROLL: The company is already incorporated and this bill is simply to amend the original act to facilitate the shareholders in transacting business on the American border. We are not giving the company a new name, and, as my hon. friend (Mr. Rankin) has explained, the head office is in Windsor.

Mr. HANSON: Notwithstanding that statement, I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that a subsequent section in the amending bill provides that the company shall be taken out of the provisions of the Railway Act 1919, under which the meetings of the company should be regularly held in Canada. The section to which I refer says:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of the Railway Act 1919, any general meeting of the share holders of the company, whether annual or special, may be held elsewhere than at the head office of the company; and may he held at the city of Detroit, in the state of Michigan, one of the United States of America.

I do not know what the practice of this House has been in the past, but it does seem to me that companies organized under Canadian jurisdiction should be Canadian in fact as well as in name and should be amenable to all the laws of this country. In the absence of some very much better explanation than that which has been given by the sponsor of this bill, I submit that this section should not carry.

Mr. MARTELL: So far as I understand the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Rankin), this section is simply to provide for the shareholders holding meetings in Detroit as being the more convenient centre. The head office of the company still remains at Windsor notwithstanding anything in this amending act, and of course all the books of the company will be kept there; in a word, everything pertaining to the company will be in Windsor, and the company will continue to be amenable to our laws. As a matter of courtesy and convenience this amendment is necessary to legalize anything that the shareholders might do at any meetings called in the city of Detroit, where the majority of them reside, and simply gives what I term extra-territorial jurisdiction.

Mr. MacLAREN: As Detroit is very near the border it is consequently very near many Canadian towns. If, for instance, Windsor were the city designated for the shareholders' meetings, it could hardly be said that it would be any inconvenience to either the directors or the shareholders to attend there. This would save time and would ensure all meetings being held where I think they should be held, in Canada.

Mr. ARTHURS: The whole purport of this bill, so far as I understand, is to designate where the head office shall be. There is no question in my mind that the company should not be allowed to have its head office nor to hold its meetings in Detroit.

Mr. FIELDING: Was this point considered by the committee which examined the bill? If it was, and they gave their deliberate judgment in favour of the amendment, I would be inclined to accept it. If it was not considered by the committee, there may be good reason to refer the bill back to them.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The question was considered by the committee, and I do not think there should be any objection to the amendment. It is only a matter of business after all. You have got to make it convenient for the shareholders to attend meetings, and undoubtedly for the majority of them Detroit would be the more convenient centre. We have the same thing at Niagara Falls. The Bridge Company can hold its meetings either in Niagara Falls, Ontario, or in Niagara Falls, New York, but as a matter of fact the shareholders generally meet in Buffalo, that being the most convenient point for the majority of them. The same thing will apply in this case, Detroit will suit the convenience of the majority of the shareholders of this company. I think the clause should carry.

Mr. McBRIDE: I do not think this bill got proper consideration by the committee. It was a special committee, they had to send whips out to get a quorum, and the committee sat less than twenty minutes. In my view the bill did not get the consideration it was entitled to.

Mr. CRERAR: What is the nature of the business of this company; is it international in character?

Mr. RANKIN: It is a company to build an international bridge between Windsor and Detroit, which will be one of the most important international structures undertaken in many years, and it will probably result in great benefit to both countries. The clause was fully considered in committee and passed. There is nothing in this bill except a few simple amendments. I do not understand why hon. gentlemen should object to this clause if it will expedite the business of the corporation, as it undoubtedly will.

Mr. CRERAR: How long has the company been in existence?

Mr. RANKIN: Since 1921. The head office is in Windsor and will remain there; that is the whole thing. This clause is to facilitate the business of the company and to show good-will towards the Detroit shareholders and directors.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I know the gentlemen associated with this company, which is formed for the purpose of building an international bridge between Detroit and Windsor. There are a great number of American shareholders, and the principal directors, including Mr. Hiram Walker, live in Detroit. It is a matter of convenience to these gentlemen to have the meetings of the company held in Detroit. I think that is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. CRERAR: I am asking merely for information. The majority of the stockholders and the directors, I take it, live on the American side, although the company was incorporated under a Canadian charter?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I think that is so.

Mr. CRERAR: In that case I can see no objection to the bill.

Mr. McCONICA: I happened to be a member of that special committee, and while I am not fully advised as to this bill, I understand it was carefully considered, the solicitor of the company appearing before the committee and explaining the purpose of the bill. As I recall, two companies were usually formed for such a purpose as this,—the building of an international bridge. There will be an office on the Ontario side and one on the Michigan side. It was held that certain amendments should be made to enlarge to some extent the powers of the company, and to extend the courtesy to the American shareholders of allowing them to hold their meetings on either side as they might see fit. The majority of the stockholders in this international bridge are supposed to live on the other side of the river; but there is no danger of the bridge being moved away, no matter where the meetings are held, and it seems to me that if we want an international bridge it makes but little difference where the stockholders hold their meetings providing we have control of the Canadian company, which we will at all times have. I think the committee were fully advised as to this measure when it was under consideration by them.

Section 2 agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk)

MESSRS. FISHER AND OUGHTON

Mr. CLARK:

1. Has the law firm of Fisher and Oughton acted on behalf of the Dominion Government as custodians of alien property in the city of Prince Rupert, British Columbia?
2. Did the said firm act in the case of property of M. Thorsch, an Austrian, and was said firm ordered to hand conduct of this case over to the law firm of Williams and Manson?
3. Is the Attorney General, the Honourable A. M. Manson, a member of the firm of Williams and Manson?
4. Was the firm of Fisher and Oughton ordered to hand over all papers in connection with enemy property to Williams and Manson?
5. Is there a record in the department concerned of the fact that one of the partners of Fisher and Oughton was a returned soldier who suffered a permanent disability as a result of wounds received in the late war?
6. If the above change has occurred, when and why was it made?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Messrs. Fisher & Oughton, of Prince Rupert, acted as law agents on behalf of the Custodian of Enemy Property.

2. The said firm of Fisher & Oughton acted on behalf of the Custodian of Enemy Property in effecting a sale of certain property, the property of M. Thorsch, an Austrian. By telegram dated 25th February last Messrs. Fisher & Oughton were instructed, take no further action on behalf of custodian, and by letter dated 16th March last they were requested to hand

over to Messrs. Williams & Manson all the papers in their possession.

3. Yes.

4. Answered by 2.

5. Department has no information.

6. The change referred to was made as set out in answer to question 2. It was made for the purpose of improving the efficiency of the administration of enemy property.

PENITENTIARIES

Mr. CHURCH:

1. How many inmates are there in the penitentiaries of Canada of the ages of sixteen, seventeen and eighteen?

2. Were any complaints received by the Department of Justice about the practice of sending such youthful offenders to these institutions?

3. Does the Government propose to provide a better method of dealing with these youthful inmates and a more suitable institution for them?

4. Are any negotiations pending with the Government of the provinces to provide better detention place for them on a modern jail farm plan?

5. Does the Government intend to amend the act or regulations, to enable the Superior Court or assize grand jury, to inspect these institutions in the public interest, while the sittings of the high court are being held in the municipality where such institutions are located?

6. Has the Government any objection to such an inspection as suggested?

7. Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a special committee to consider prison reform, or what action in the matter does the Government purpose to take this session or in the coming recess of Parliament.

Sir LOMER GOUIN:

1. Inmates 16 years, 18; inmates 17 years, 63; inmates 18 years, 82.

2. Yes.

3. The Government will give careful consideration to the matter.

4. No.

5. No.

6. Yes. The superintendent, the inspectors and all the wardens have objections to inspection by grand juries, but have no objection to admitting them as casual visitors, or in special circumstances.

7. The intention of the Government will be disclosed in due time.

Mr. R. B. VEIT—Mr. BLAND

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is there an employee by the name of R. B. Veit in the Customs Department, at Ottawa?

2. If so, at what date, month and year, was he appointed?

3. In what capacity and at what salary?

4. What was his salary on the first of April of the respective years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922?

5. At what date, month and year, was he classified?

6. In what class and at what salary?

7. What was the total amount of back pay he received up to the first of April, 1922?

8. Is he related to Mr. Foran, Secretary of the Civil Service Commission?

9. If so, what is the relationship?

10. Is Mr. Bland, the Assistant Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, related to Mr. R. R. Farrow, Commissioner of Customs?

11. If so, what is the relationship?

12. At what date, month and year, was Mr. Bland appointed?

13. In what capacity and at what salary?

14. What was his salary on the first of April of the respective years 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922?

15. At what date, month and year, was he classified?

16. In what class and at what salary?

17. What was the total amount of back pay he received up to the first of April, 1922?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. No, but the inquiry apparently refers to A. E. J. M. Veit, an employee of this department.

2. August 1, 1908.

3. Preventive officer, $900 per year.

4. 1st April, 1918, $1,550; 1st April, 1919, $1,680; 1st April, 1920, $1,800; 1st April, 1921, $2,400; 1st April, 1922, $2,520.

5. Classified—effective April 1, 1919.

6. Senior entry checking clerk—salary $1,680.

7. $363.35.

8, 9, 10, 11. No official information.

12. Permanent, 27th April, 1909.

13. Clerk 2B, $800.

14. 1918, on military service; 1919, $3,060; 1920, $3,240; 1921, $3,660; 1922, $3,840.

15. April 1, 1919—Assistant Secretary, $3,060; February 1, 1921, Assistant Secretary and Chief Examiner, $3,660.

16. Answered by No. 15.

17. 1919-20, $960; 1920-21, $355;—$1,315.

Dr. B. A. LE BLANC

Mr. JONES:

1. When was Dr. B. A. Le Blanc, M.P.P., appointed as Port Physician at the port of Arichat, Cape Breton?

2. Is he still in the service?

3. If not, when was he dismissed from the service, and what was the reason for his dismissal?

4. Is there any record of a complaint made as to his services?

5. If so, what is the nature of said complaint and by whom was it laid?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. May 13, 1912.

2. No.

3. Services terminated on May 1, 1922. An increased efficiency is sought by the appointment of another physician.

4. No.
5. Answered by No. 4.

"ESSENCE DE L'ERABLE"

Mr. McMASTER:

1. Is the Government aware that a complaint has been laid by the grocers of Montreal through their solicitor, Mr. Aubé, against the Radio Manufacturing Company for the manufacture of an essence sold under the name of "Essence de l'Erable"?
2. Is it a fact that the manufacture of this product is in contravention of the statute, Chap. 57, 11 George V?
3. In view of this fact, has any complaint been brought before the Government that the inspectors concerned have been charged with a dereliction of duty?
4. Does the Government propose to hold an investigation into this matter?

Hon. Mr. BELAND:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

Question No. 33 is substantially the same as that which I have just answered.

Mr. SPEAKER: Question No. 33 dropped.

REFUND OF DUTIES ON STEEL RODS

Mr. ANDERSON:

1. Has the P. L. Robertson Company of Milton, Ontario, made any claim for the return of money paid as Customs duties on steel rods, in 1913?
2. If so, what action has been taken by the Government in this connection?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Yes; claim made for refund of duties paid on steel rods entered in October, 1913.
2. Payment of $80.40 made March 13th, 1914.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY

Mr. HANSON:

1. Has the Government, or any member thereof, agreed with the Government of the Province of New Brunswick, or any member thereof, to take over from the Province of New Brunswick the Saint John and Quebec Railway, now being operated by the Canadian National Railways?
2. If so, what are the terms under which said railway is being taken over?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

NAVAL OFFICERS

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. Has the Naval Service Department a Naval Council on the same footing as the Militia Council?
2. If so, who are the members of said council?
3. Do they receive any additional salary in this connection?
4. What are their respective salaries?
5. If there is no naval council, who nominates and promotes the naval officers?
6. Is the deputy minister of the Canadian Naval Service an officer of the said service, or does he come under the Civil Service Commission?
7. Are most of the officials naval officers having the same standing as those of the Militia Department, or do they come under the Civi Service Commission as in other departments?

Hon. Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Answered by No. 1.
5. The Minister of the Naval Service.
6. The Deputy Minister is a civilian official as defined by the Civil Service Act Section 46.
7. There are seven commissioned naval officers at headquarters. All other employees at headquarters are civilians appointed under the Civil Service Act.

FUEL QUESTION

Mr. CHURCH:

1. Is it the intention of the Government either now or during the recess of Parliament, to hold a thorough inquiry into the fuel question in Canada?
2. What action, if any, does the Government intend to take to aid in reducing the cost of coal to the Canadian consumer?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING:

1. The question of future fuel supply in Canada was the subject of inquiry by a special committee of the House of Commons in the last session of Parliament. Under the circumstances, another inquiry at present is deemed unnecessary.
2. Such action as may be deemed advisable in this matter will be made known in due course.

L'ASSOMPTION AND MONTCALM EXCISE OFFICERS

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What are the names of the officers of the Excise Department for the counties of L'Assomption and Montcalm, and where do they reside?
2. What are the names of the persons who were dismissed from this service since the twenty-first of September, 1911, to January, 1921, and what are the names of those who replaced them?
3. Who recommended said dismissals and appointments?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU:

1. Oliva Gariepy,—L'Epiphanie. Jos. Adolphe Pariseau,—St. Jacques de L'Achigan. Joseph J. Gareau,—St. Roch de Achigan. Chas. E. Pauze,—St. Lin des Laurentides.

2. J. A. Bouin, replaced by Paul Ethier, L'Assomption. Paul Ethier, no successor,—L'Assomption. M. Granger, replaced by J. A. Pariseau,—St. Jacques de L'Achigan. J. H. Lafortune, replaced by J. J. Gareau,—St. Roch de 'Achigan. H. Locas, replaced by O. Brien,—St. Lin des Laurentides.

3. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How many Generals are there on active service in the Canadian Militia?
2. How many are there in Ottawa?
3. What are the respective salaries, including allowances, of each General stationed at Ottawa?
4. How many Colonels, Lieutenant-Colonels, Majors, Captains and Lieutenants are there at Headquarters, Ottawa?
5. How many non-commissioned officers and privates are employed as clerks or messengers at Headquarters, Ottawa?
6. What is the total amount paid in salaries to the above-mentioned officers and men?

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. How many military districts were there in Canada during the year ending March 31st, 1922?
2. Where were they located, and what is the rank of the Commanding Officer of each district?
3. What were their respective ranks on March 31st, 1914?
4. What number of officers were on the General Staff of each of the said districts during the year ending March 31st, 1922?
5. What is the rank, and what are the respective duties of each of the said officers, including the Commanding Officer?
6. What number of non-commissioned officers and privates are employed as clerks in the offices of the General Staff of each of the said districts?
7. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men were employed in each of the said districts, during the year ending March 31st, 1922, in connection with the Medical Corps, Engineering Corps, Pay Corps, Army Service Corps, Veterinary Corps and Military Stores, and of what rank were these officers?
8. On what date did the new schedule for salaries and allowances come into force?
9. Who is authorized to fix the schedule for salaries and allowances of the Militia?
10. What is the maximum salary, including allowances, for Colonels, Lieutenant-Colonels, Majors, Captains, Lieutenants, non-commissioned officers and privates, of the permanent militia, according to both the new and old schedules?
11. What are the salaries, including allowances, of Generals who are stationed at Headquarters, Ottawa, according to the new and old schedules?
12. What number of privates were in the permanent Militia on March 31st, 1922?
13. What number of Generals, Colonels, Lieutenant-Colonels, Majors, Captains and Lieutenants, were on active service in the Canadian Militia on March 31st, 1922?
14. What is the strength of a company and regiment of the Militia in peace time?

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What are the names of the postmasters, and the location of their offices, in the county of l'Assomption and Montcalm, who were dismissed from the service from the twenty-first of September, 1911, to January first, 1922, and what are the names of persons replacing them?
2. Who recommended the dismissals and appointments?

RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. McQUARRIE:

1. How many civil servants in Canada are receiving salaries of eight hundred dollars and less per annum?
2. How many are receiving nine hundred and sixty dollars or less?

Mr. SPEAKER: When this question came up the other day the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) asked that it stand as an order for return. Rule 37, subsection 4, reads as follows:

> If a question is of such a nature that in the opinion of the minister who is to furnish a reply, such reply should be in the form of a return, and the minister states that he has no objection to laying such return upon the table of the House, his statement shall, unless otherwise ordered by the House, be deemed an order of the House to that effect and the same shall be entered in the Votes and Proceedings as such.

My opinion was that this subsection applied and that the minister was at liberty to ask that the question stand as an order for return. I have since consulted the law officers and clerks of the House on the subject and have gone into it deeply, the more so because it seems that the wording of the subsection is very clear. Subsection 3 leaves it to the discretion of the Speaker to have declared as a notice of motion any question which may entail a lengthy answer, and subsection 4 leaves it to the minister himself to say whether the question covers such a wide range that it might properly, in order to avoid its remaining unanswered and appearing on the Order Paper from day to day, stand as an order for return. As I have stated, I have consulted the law officers of the House and they concur in my opinion. My ruling is, therefore, that the question in the present instance should stand as an order for return.

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Ouimet:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, letters, tenders and other documents, exchanged

between the Government and Hector Chevrier, regarding the contract for carying the mails between Rigaud and St. Redempteur, Quebec?

Mr. Seguin:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, memoranda and other documents, regarding the establishment of a Tobacco Experimental Station at l'Assomption, Quebec, and the purchasing of the college farm for this purpose.

ORIENTAL IMMIGRATION

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and documents, since January 1st, 1922, that have passed between the Government of Canada or any Minister, or any of its officials and the Government of China, or the Consul General of China, or any other person representing the Government of China, relating to the further effective restriction of Chinese Immigration to Canada.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): If my hon. friend has in mind the reference I made, in the course of the debate the other evening on oriental immigration, to interviews that had taken place between the Government and a representative of the government of China on this matter, I would say that the negotiations to which I referred were in the nature of personal interviews which I have had with the Chinese Consul General, Dr. Tsur, during the last two or three months on two or three different occasions. They have all been in the nature of personal interviews, and there is no correspondence to be brought down.

The same remarks would also apply to the next motion:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and documents, since January 1st, 1922, that have passed between the Government of Canada, or any minister, or any of its officials, and the Imperial Japanese Government, or the Consul General of Japan, or any other person representing the Imperial Japanese Government, relating to the further effective restriction of Japanese Immigration to Canada.

These matters in the opinion of the Government are more effectively dealt with by personal negotiation wherever possible. We happen to have in the Dominion at the present time as representatives of China and Japan respectively, two gentlemen who are very capable of conducting negotiations, and the Government is taking advantage of their presence to discuss these matters with them. I presume my hon. friend will not wish to press these two motions, seeing there is no correspondence.

Mr. STEVENS: If I understand my hon. friend correctly, there is no correspondence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No correspondence.

Motions withdrawn.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. A. W. NEILL (Comox-Alberni) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that in the best interests of the Dairy Industry and of the public generally, the manufacture and importation of Oleomargarine should be discontinued in Canada after September first next.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this question divides itself into two branches: one, the relation of oleomargarine to the dairying interests of Canada, and the other, its relation to the general public. Agriculture as we all know, is the basic industry of Canada, and dairying is the second most important branch of that industry, so I need make no apology for dealing with this question.

To begin at the very genesis of the subject we are asking for protection for the dairying interests of Canada—and I use the word protection not in its fiscal sense, because we are not asking for fiscal protection, but merely for that form of protection that the ordinary citizen is entitled to in his everyday relations, the kind of protection that a man says he is entitled to when he finds that his house has been broken into and he claims the protection of the law. This is the kind of protection we are asking for in this instance. You may call it preservation, if you like, or protection in the dictionary sense.

If it is proved, or can be proved, that oleomargarine is a correct substitute for butter, and can be made more cheaply in Canada than butter, then by all means let us change this resolution and prohibit the sale or manufacture of butter in Canada. That is logical and in thorough accord with economic laws, but it cannot be so argued, and it cannot be so proved. Oleomargarine is not a substitute for butter. It is a deceptive counterfeit, and intended to be sold as an imitation of butter, and not as a substitute. Whilst we are on the subject of the tariff, I might mention that the vegetable oils which form a large portion of oleomargarine pay a duty of 17½ per cent ordinary; that is, if they are brought into Canada and used in the manufacture

of a paint, say, they pay 17½ per cent duty; but when entering into the manufacture of oleomargarine the duty is rebated, and the vegetable oils come in free. Not only that, but oleomargarine itself comes in free when imported from the United States. Although we have a duty on butter we have no duty on oleomargarine. There is a very small duty on butter, something equivalent to 5 per cent ad valorem, as compared with 33 per cent on textile products. In addition to allowing oleomargarine to come in and compete with butter, we allow the small quantity of butter that is embodied in oleomargarine to come in free. So the dairying interests are hit in both respects: the competition of oleomargarine coming in free and of vegetable oils coming in free, and of the butter in oleomargarine, which is a very small amount, also coming in free. The government returns since the importation and sale of oleomargarine were authorized some years ago, show that there is a marked tendency to encourage the importation of oleomargarine rather than its home manufacture. While the amount manufactured has decreased very greatly, and so has the amount imported, the amount imported has decreased to a lesser degree than the amount manufactured. In other words, the trend of trade is not to manufacture this article in Canada, but to import it entirely from the United States. So we are asked by those who are opposing this resolution to build up for the benefit of a United States industry the sale and manufacture of oleomargarine to compete with our own product of butter. Hon. members will bear in mind, I hope, the attitude of that same United States as regards our products. They have just put a prohibitory duty on butter going into the United States.

It may be a matter of interest to know that the customs have this difficulty confronting them to-day. The manufacturers of kitchen compounds, such as crisco, manufactured of lard and vegetable oils and brought in openly as such have to pay a duty. They have been applying to the customs to be allowed to bring this stuff in free because they say: "This is the same as oleomargarine, and oleomargarine is the same as this." But because they are honest and call the thing a kitchen cooking compound, they have to pay a considerable duty on it, while the so-called oleomargarine comes in absolutely free. Oleomargarine was prohibited from entering this country thirty-six years ago, and I have no doubt it would still be under prohibition if it had not been for the circumstances arising out of the late war. In December, 1917, I think it was, the war was on, and there was urgent necessity to conserve butter as it was needed by the men at the front. Accordingly, it was found necessary to ration the people of Canada. Butter was very scarce, exceedingly scarce, and it was also, naturally, dear. An Order in Council was passed in that month, in that year, allowing the introduction and sale of oleomargarine. That it was entirely and exclusively for that reason I shall show by a quotation from Hansard. The then Minister of Agriculture, now the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar), in speaking to the subject quoted the Order in Council under which oleomargarine was allowed to be first used in Canada and these are the words of the Order in Council:

> Such regulations to be enforced and to have effect for the period during which the present abnormal conditions continue, the conclusion of such period to be determined by His Excellency the Governor General in Council, as provided in the regulations, and as a war measure only.

I would emphasize that oleomargarine was introduced and allowed in Canada in 1917 as a war measure only. Those are not the remarks of the hon. member for Marquette, but the exact words of the Order in Council. At that time very strong opposition to the proposition developed from the agricultural interests of Canada. The former member for, I think it was, Vaudreuil-Soulanges, now a senator, was one of those who headed the opposition; he presented a petition signed by twenty-seven thousand of his and other constituents against it. Resolutions were also brought in from eight hundred agricultural societies in eastern Canada and—very naturally—they strongly opposed the introduction of oleomargarine. However, the government of the day, and the then Minister of Agriculture, represented what the necessities of the day and of the hour were. There was the war situation, the scarcity of butter and its extremely high price; and an appeal was made to the patriotism of the dairying interests of Canada to stand back and allow this article to be introduced. The opponents of the proposition—without bringing the matter to a vote—withdrew their opposition, and the thing passed on the distinct understanding that the admission of oleomargarine was a war measure only and would be withdrawn as soon as the conditions referred to ceased to exist. Now the

importation of oleomargarine was a matter of good faith on the part of the government. I submit, the war is over now, and those war conditions no longer exist—some war conditions exist, but not those in question—and as a matter of good faith to those men who sacrificed their interests on the occasion referred to, it is up to this House and this Government to implement the bargain entered into in good faith at that time, and restore the situation to where it was before.

Now as regards the other two aspects of the situation at that time—the scarcity and the high price of butter—what do we find to-day? Instead of the scarcity that then existed there is an enormous surplus. No section of the trading community responded to the plea, the demand, the request, of the government to produce more and more like the dairying interests did; they have produced to such an extent that to-day there is a large surplus that has to find a market in some foreign country. That surplus cannot find a market in the United States for a prohibition has been put upon its admission by the very country we are now being asked to benefit by allowing the admission of oleomargarine. Our surplus of butter must seek a market in Europe or elsewhere; but there is no question whatever that there is to-day—and there is a prospect of it being for a long time to come—a large surplus of butter in Canada that must be disposed of; and when there is a large surplus of any article in a country it is idle to say that that article is scarce; so that aspect of the subject can be considered disposed of.

Then we come to the question of prices. That I know is one that can be argued from every point of view. I simply make the statement and will leave it to other members, more personally familiar with the subject, to deal with the question of dairy products and the prices at which they are now being produced. I am credibly informed that dairy produce to-day is generally selling throughout Canada at a lower price than the actual cost of producing it. Therefore, we find that the war conditions—the fact of the butter being needed at the front, the scarcity, and the high price—have all passed away; and it is now left to us to observe good faith with the farmers of this country, and in view of the present abundance of butter and the existing low prices to put the trade back to where it was in the year 1917. So much for that branch of the subject, and as regards its relation to the dairying interest I think I have made out at least a plausible case.

4 p.m.

Now, as regards the relation of this question to the general public. The outstanding feature of oleomargarine is that it lends itself to pretence and fraud. It does more than that; it demands pretence and fraud because these are the very bases of the conditions of the trade. The successful manufacture and sale of oleomargarine depends entirely on how nearly it can approximate and pretend that it is something else than what it really is. The object is to make it look like butter; the object is to make it taste like butter; the object is to give it the same colour as butter; to put it up in a package similar to a package of butter and, as far as possible, by every available device, make it appear to be butter. It may be asked: If it really does look like butter, tastes like butter, smells like butter, and is coloured like butter, is it not as good as butter? But that is not the point. Chemists are so expert to-day that they can make anything taste like something else. We have only to go to a hospital here and find nurses administering the well-known medicine called castor oil, beloved of our youth. The nurses, to-day, before you take that dose will slip a little capsule into it and the taste of castor oil is gone. I remember the Canadian Pacific hotel in Vancouver being prosecuted some years ago for serving duck out of season. The game warden was alert, and had dinner at the hotel, and kept a portion of the bird served to him which he said was duck, as did also a number of friends. The hotel management was prosecuted and when the chef—of course being in British Columbia he was a Chinese—was asked what had been served he said: "I catchem veal I heap savey make him taste all the same, duck". In this instance the chef made the veal served to taste exactly like duck. So it is with oleomargarine. When you are told that it tastes like butter, that it looks like butter and has the smell of butter, it by no means follows that it has the same food value as butter.

As regards the matter of the colouring I would like to quote again from Hansard—the question was very thoroughly debated last year and the year before. During the debate one hon. member whose constituency I forget—stated that a special committee investigated the question some

years ago. Apparently this hon. member had taken part in it, and he asked one of the witnesses, the manager of one of these large manufacturing companies, a question. They were talking about oleomargarine and the witness had said that he bought June butter as much as possible because June butter is of a higher colour. He explained that the reason they bought June butter to mix with this oleo mess was because it was of a higher colour and made the product look a little more like butter. Now the hon. member in question asked of that witness this question:

> Is it not a fact that you realize that if it was sold without any coloring it would be unsaleable?

The manufacturer in reply to this question said:

> It would not be so palatable, it would be like using lard.

So that is the situation: If it were not for the little admixture of butter and the colouring that is put into it to make it look like the same thing, to use oleomargarine would be like using lard. That is not my opinion; that is the sworn evidence of a manufacturer of oleomargarine himself.

Mr. HARRIS: Was that a manufacturer in Canada or a manufacturer in the United States?

Mr. NEILL: That particular man was a manufacturer in Canada. The trouble with oleomargarine is that it is a sickly white looking mess, it has not even approximately the appearance of butter, and the great effort therefore is to make it look like butter. In the United States, where the trade has got a regrettable hold on the public the manufacturers went to the government and said: If you will allow us to colour our oleomargarine—not to put in any other valuable ingredient whatever but just to colour it—we will voluntarily pay you ten cents a pound of an excise duty. This is an industry going to the government and offering, for this simple little concession, to agree to pay an excise tax of ten cents a pound, or nearly 50 per cent of the cost of production, provided that they are allowed to do—what? Only to put a little, simple, harmless colouring into this stuff. Why? Was it to make it more palatable, wholesome, or valuable? Not a bit of it—it was to make it more fraudulent, to make it look more like butter than it did before, if presented to ignorant or uninformed people. But this colouring did not add anything to the value or to the food content; it simply made it look more like butter. And for that privilege they were able to pay a high excise tax.

Mr. EULER: Colouring is often added to butter itself. Does that make butter any more palatable?

Mr. NEILL: I do not quite see the bearing on the question; but as a matter of fact I will leave it to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) to deal with that. I am of opinion that colouring is not allowed to be added to butter.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Yes, it is.

Mr. NEILL: It is not added to butter in the dairying district that I represent. More than that, I find in Hansard a statement that colouring is not added to butter. That would appear to be borne out, because we find the manager of this factory saying: "We made it a special object to buy June butter because that was more highly coloured." If I am wrong in that respect, I am wrong; but that does not affect the question of the colouring of oleomargarine. I am not aware that any agricultural industry ever offered to pay the Government 10 cents a pound for the privilege of colouring.

Mr. LADNER: Does the hon, member suggest that oleomargarine is coloured in Canada? Does he not know that the regulations prohibit that?

Mr. NEILL: Yes. I was not talking about oleomargarine in Canada; I was talking about oleomargarine in the United States, and I was endeavouring to show that they were so anxious to be allowed to make it look more like butter that they offered this inducement. In Canada, they are not allowed to introduce any colouring into oleomargarine, I quite admit, and I am well aware of that; but let this resolution be defeated to-day, and it will be only a few years before they will be making to the government of Canada the same proposition as they have made successfully to the government of the United States as regards paying an additional tax if they are allowed to colour oleomargarine. Oleomargarine in Canada is not at present coloured except by butter being added to it.

Mr. GOOD: The hon. member has stated that this offer which has been made by

United States manufacturers has been made successfully. Has he ascertained it to be a fact that the United States Government has added an excise duty of ten cents a pound for the privilege of putting in colouring?

Mr. NEILL: I take all my information on this point from Hansard of last year, and if it is not correct, it ought to be. As a matter of fact, it is correct; the United States Government accepted that offer and imposed that tax. But the manufacturers endeavour to evade it in this way: When a man buys, say a thousand pounds of oleomargarine, they send it out uncoloured, but they send a package of colouring along with it, so that the man can add the colouring. As regards Hansard, it was stated definitely last year that that was the law in force in the United States.

In regard to the matter of standards, in the United States—and again I am quoting Hansard, I hope correctly—they have a strict standard which must be lived up to in the manufacture of this product. In Canada, I think it is an absolute fact that there is no standard whatever. I have in my hand literature which I will deal with later on, which talks vaguely and beautifully about the contents, but which does not tell us what the percentages of the ingredients are. Again I quote from Hansard. Somebody gave evidence before this commission as to how the analysis of different samples of oleomargarine varied, and this is the answer:

> It was found that the content of tallow in oleomargarine varied as widely as from 22 per cent to 47 per cent and lard varied from 6 per cent to 28 per cent, vegetable oil varied from 15 to 49 per cent.

Does that not open a very wide field for every kind of fraud? How does the poor man, about whom we hear so much, know, when he is buying oleomargarine, whether he is getting a brand with 49 per cent of vegetable oil, or only 15 per cent? When we compare that with the strict governmental rules under which butter is made, handled, stored and sold, we wonder why so much favour is accorded the manufacturer of oleomargarine.

Oleomargarine contains butter and milk to a certain extent. That fact is very widely advertised in their propaganda, but we are not told how much butter or how much milk it contains. Great stress is laid on the fact that it contains butter and milk —and the only decent thing about it is that it contains butter and milk. Some months ago I went into a store in the lower part of the town—not this town—where poor people would naturally stay, and I asked for a pound of oleomargarine. As it was being put up, I apparently hesitated, and I asked whether it would not be more profitable for me to pay the extra spread on butter; but the man assured me with emphasis that there was no need for that; that this was practically 75 per cent butter. He may not have known that he was lying; he may have been told that; but if I was an uninformed man and was told that I could get this stuff at twenty cents cheaper and that it was 75 per cent butter, I would be likely to say: "That is good enough for me." That shows how easy it is to deceive the public in an article like this. In other articles the deception would be apparent. No doubt that man had a reason for trying to sell me oleomargarine, because he was making a bigger profit out of it. That may account for the circular distributed amongst us from the Retail Merchants' Association advocating that they might be allowed to continue to sell oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is manufactured in Canada by a very small and close monopoly; and naturally, under those conditions, while butter is made by hundreds of thousands of people and sold by thousands of stores, and the price is well known, the competition keen and the profit small, when you get an article on which there is a monopoly and it is sold by itself, the profit is great, and it is more profitable to sell oleomargarine than butter. The hon. member for Vaudreuil-Soulanges (Mr. Boyer) last year in the debate, stated that the spread between the cost price and the selling price of oleomargarine at that time was twenty-five cents. I understand the spread in this town to-day between oleomargarine and butter is as high as twenty cents. That may be only a piece of rather astute propaganda, because they know that this matter is coming up. I have it on the authority of no less than the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) that last year the spread in Ottawa between oleomargarine and butter was only seven cents a pound. I find that also in Hansard.

The difficulty to distinguish between the two leads to the greatest difficulty in the detection of fraud in connection with oleomargarine. In the United States, thousands of cases are brought up every year, and they are not able to convict more than a very small percentage of those who are guilty, on account of the difficulty of being able to detect the fraud. It was only last

year or possibly two years ago, small as the trade in oleomargarine is, that 2,000 pounds of it were seized as near to the city as Montreal. It was being sold as butter. That also, I get from the politician's Bible—Hansard. It would take, not an army of inspectors, who come in contact only with the operations in the factories, but an army of detectives to ferret out every instance of this fraud, because they would need to go into all the stores, the cheap restaurants and the boarding houses; for the Government statistics show that these are the people who most frequently buy oleomargarine. That is the sort of trade the manufacturers of oleomargarine cater to. Those who suffer are the poorer people who are less well informed, less able to investigate the respective merits of this spurious article and genuine butter, and whose physical condition makes them less able to afford to buy an inferior food. They are the ones who are most likely to be imposed upon. Amongst the many regulations which have been vainly framed in an attempt to cope with this situation is the one that requires a card to be posted in every eating house where oleomargarine is sold. That has been the law since December, 1917. We in this House are a body representative of all the people throughout Canada. Now, I wonder how many hon. members can rise in their places and declare that they have seen such a card, printed in inch-and-a-half letters, in any public eating place. I have never seen any such placard myself, although I have been given oleomargarine to eat in some of these places. Earlier in the session a friend said to me: "If you are down on Chinese cooking I would advise you to go to such-and-such a restaurant; they advertise all 'white' cooking". I thought it would be a change, for once at any rate, to eat something that no Chinaman had cooked, and so I went to this place to which I had been directed. But when the girl who took the order passed through the swinging door on her way to the kitchen I saw my old friend Wong Fung Choo,—the same fellow I have seen at every restaurant between here and the Pacific. He was back on the job again. The only attempt which this restaurant made at serving white cooking was to put a white suit and a white cap on Wong's head. But I was sufficiently familiar with my old friend to recognize him under this disguise. The restaurant has since been burned, my friend Wong, I trust, along with it. It is about as easy to stop the fraudulent sale of oleomargarine as butter, as it is to prevent the importation of Asiatics under a "gentleman's agreement". The parallel is exact, and we in British Columbia know how easy the latter problem is.

There is another aspect of the butter situation,—this is a dry subject, even if it is greasy. There is a substance in butter which is known technically as the vitamines. There are three classes of vitamines, but the principal one is that which is soluble in fait; I think it is called "soluble A". That vitamine is composed of a substance which is derived from leaves. If one could eat about four pounds of leaves he would be able in that way to obtain the proportion of vitamines essential to health. But one could not conveniently do that, and so nature has provided the dairy cow as a means of furnishing this indispensable element. The dairy cow eats the leaves and through the milk and butter which we get from her we obtain the vitamines that are absolutely needed for the proper growth of children, especially young children, as well as for young people of fifteen and sixteen years of age, and invalids. I desire to be perfectly accurate, because I know that there are able men coming after me who will try to tear my argument to pieces. I will admit frankly, therefore, that vitamines are found to a very limited extent in beef suet. The proportion, however, is so small as to be negligible; and when the contention is made that oleomargarine contains vitamines it is nothing but a mere pretence. It would be equally true for one to say that the ocean contains gold, because nearly all salt water contains some gold; but the gold content is so infinitesimal that no sane man would contemplate the ocean as a gold mining possibility. And so with regard to the presence of vitamines in oleomargarine. In dairy products, on the other hand, vitamines are found in abundance, particularly in butter and cheese. Now, I have a great deal of evidence which I shall not undertake to read. It was given before that special committee and was also submitted by members of the House last year, and it all goes to show that dairy products are absolutely necessary if you want to develop strong vigorous children. The lack of genuine butter and other dairy products is responsible for the nervous and neurotic condition of so many children. It is this lack of proper nourishment that causes the dis-

ease known as rickets. Good butter is also much more easily digested by invalids and children. You can imagine what oleomargarine is like when a manufacturer of this substance said that if it were not for the little butter in it it would be like eating lard. And that, certainly, would not be acceptable to a weak stomach, as I happen to know,—I have a weak stomach myself; and when I am eating oleomargarine I need no card with letters of any size to tell me of the fact. By the way, when I say that I have a weak stomach I am speaking physically; I am not referring to my mental or political stomach which has long since got enured to any diet; so that politically I can swallow anything.

I have been trying to make my remarks as brief as possible commensurate with the importance of the subject under consideration; but I shall read an extract or two before I conclude. In the Hansard to which I have referred allusion is made to a number of experiments—as a matter of fact they were demonstrations—carried out in hospitals, orphan homes and gaols, to show the respective merits of oleomargarine and butter; and in every case it was proved that the most economical, from the poor man's point of view as well as from that of the authorities, was the dairy product. There is only one other matter to which I shall refer now, as I shall have an opportunity later to answer any counter arguments that may be advanced. There has been an intense and expensive propaganda—lobby work—in connection with this matter during the last few weks. I know I should hate to pay the printing bill. It has even gone beyond the circulation of printed matter; the subject has been treated in editorials in the newspapers. I have in my possession an appeal, apparently sent me by mistake, asking me to deal with the question editorially if I thought fit to do so; and I see that some people have thought fit to take it up editorially. Reading some of these editorials, I have recognized in them so striking a resemblance to the printed propaganda of the manufacturers that it is almost too much to believe that they were written by the editors themselves. They follow almost word for word the printed matter circulated by the manufacturers. I would ask hon. members where they think the money is coming from to pay for this propaganda. The rules and regulations surrounding the manufacture of oleomargarine are of such a restrictive character that they practically preclude all but two firms from manufacturing this commodity. It is impossible, to all intents and purposes, for any one else to manufacture it. There are just these two corporations manufacturing oleomargarine here and importing it, into Canada, although possibly more than the two import it. One of these firms is a big American concern, while the other is supposed to be Canadian. They had four factories operating when they first started, and last year they turned out together, by the government returns, 1,900,000 pounds odd, or about 230 tons each per factory. Any one who knows anything about running a factory will realize what a substantial loss must have been incurred in connection with such a small output as 230 tons a year, unless one of two conditions obtained: either a very big profit, or the expectation of an enormous profit in the future. The consumption of oleomargarine in Canada dropped, from the year 1918—only four years ago—from 13,000,000 pounds annually to 3,000,000 pounds odd. So that you can see that, with the equipment originally installed, a heavy loss must have been incurred unless they made an enormous profit or expect to make that profit in the future. The object of this propaganda therefore must surely be to recoup the manufacturers for these losses by seeking to create a larger demand for this product once they can get it thoroughly established in Canada.

Now, it is a well-known doctrine, both political and legal, that when you have a bad case you should abuse your opponent, and when you have a weak case you should misrepresent facts, seeing that you cannot be worse off anyway. I want to read some of this propaganda and explain briefly how very misrepresenting it is. Any propaganda that has to misrepresent plain facts must surely be fundamentally weak. We find, in an article that has been in the hands of all hon. members, and of which I have received copies, a statement as to what oleomargarine is composed of.

> It is made of—
> A, pure, highly refined beef and pork fats;
> B, creamery butter and fresh milk;
> C, other vegetable fats.

I will show you what they say about the creamery butter and fresh milk later on.

> Oleomargarine is 75 per cent the product of Canadian farms.

I have read that statement in a great many newspapers lately, and no doubt this is the source of its origin. Oleomargarine is not made of 75 per cent of the product of Canadian farms. The product imported last year from the United States was 1,300,000 pounds of oleomargarine; the amount manufactured in Canada was 1,900,000 pounds. Of the total product only 68 per cent was manufactured in Canada. And yet we are told that 75 per cent of the oleomargarine manufactured in Canada is 75 per cent the product of Canadian farms. But it is not true to say that 75 per cent of what is manufactured in Canada—which is only 68 per cent of the total—is made out of the product of Canadian farms. Still less is it true that 75 per cent of all used in Canada was the product of Canadian farms. That is utterly ignoring the large and ever-decreasing amount imported; but while decreasing, it is not decreasing so rapidly as the manufactured stuff. We find another statement:

Growth accessories are found in oleo oil from which oleomargarine is prepared.

That is one of those subtle half-truths which are partly true and utterly false. There is so small, so fractional a quantity of growth accessories in oleo oil as to be negligible. A small amount is found, yes, but it is not comparable with the amount found in butter.

There is an undoubted demand for oleomargarine by a large body of Canadian consumers.

Very well, we will take their own figures, not the government returns, which differ, I may say, from this statement. Their own figures will tell you what the demand was. In the year 1918 the total consumption, supposing that all that was brought into Canada and all that was manufactured here was eaten, was 13,997,000 pounds, practically 14,000,000 pounds. That was the year of war when butter was scarce and high. In the year 1921 it was 3,200,000 pounds odd. It has dropped down from 14,000,000 to 3,000,000 pounds, and yet we are told that there is "an undoubted demand for oleomargarine by a large body of Canadian consumers." Divide 3,200,000 pounds by the population of Canada, and I do not think it can be shown that there is a very heavy demand for oleomargarine at the present time.

An hon. MEMBER: During that period of reduction has there been any further restriction against the use of oleomargarine?

Mr. NEILL: No; that is the first suggestion I have heard of any further restriction. Reason No. 13:

Over 1,000,000 pounds a month are now consumed in Canada—proof of its acceptability.

That is 12,000,000 pounds a year, is it not? And yet last year the government returns shows that the total amount imported and manufactured—not consumed—was only 3,200,000 pounds odd. Yet the manufacturers make the bare, bald statement in order to pervert the minds of the readers of this pamphlet that over 1,000,000 pounds a month is being consumed. An argument based on grounds so far removed from the facts is calculated to discredit many more of the arguments contained in this pamphlet, for it is always safe to judge the unknown by the known. Further on there is this statement:

Provision should be made to protect the public from fraud in connection with oleomargarine and all other products.

It is too costly, and they know it cannot be done.

No legislation should limit the legitimate manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

I may say that no legislation should limit the manufacture of jemmies and other house-breaking tools; but their manufacture is forbidden by law. But what are you going to do with them if their manufacture is legitimate? What are you going to do with oleomargarine when it is manufactured? You are going to use it for an illegal purpose—to palm it off as butter.

It is in common use in Australia, New Zealand and the United States.

This is in deep, bold, black letters. That is only one-third true and two-thirds false. It is not in common use in Australia, it is in use to only a limited extent; and it is not in use in New Zealand at all. It is not forbidden, but it is not in use. I suppose it can be said that it is in common use in some parts of the United States. They tell you what oleomargarine is made of:

1. Oleo Oil—

They tell you how nice oleo oil is, but they do not tell you whether 22 per cent or 44 per cent comprises the ingredient.

2. Neutral—lard,—

They do not say whether it is 6 per cent or 48 per cent which contains lard. The third ingredient is milk. They say:

Milk—the fats are churned with milk under the most rigid sanitary inspection.

But they do not tell you how much milk is used. You can guess at it.

4. Butter—finest creamery butter containing no artificial colour is used.

Dairy butter is not good enough for them, only the "finest creamery butter containing no artificial colour is used." "It contains no artificial colouring." That is where I got my information about Canadian butter containing no artificial colouring. If my statement is incorrect, it is only one more misstatement contained in this pamphlet. Let me tell you what they say in another part of this propaganda. They are talking about oleomargarine, and they say:

The whole is churned in milk and a small percentage of butter is used by some makers.

This is not my propaganda, it is not even Hansard, it is by the same people, the Canadian manufacturers of oleomargarine. They say, "a small percentage of butter is used by some makers." But here they get busy and say, "the finest creamery butter containing no artificial colour is used." "Some" butter is used by "some" people.

We find that these products are mixed together and churned. No Sir, they are not churned, because I take again the word of the manufacturers here. The products are mulsified, they are made into an emulsion, the same as in the manufacture of soap—the process is identical, and the result is very little different. Churning is a process by which you draw out of something, such as milk, butter fat. You could churn this stuff until doomsday and you would not produce any more satisfactory stuff than you put into it. They say that the whole mixture is made

—into a palatable form from those fats, which, although quite wholesome, could not otherwise be used as a spread-for-bread.

It must be palatable if, as stated, it is "like eating lard." Then we find this statement in regard to food value:

The British government a few years ago made tests of the calorie value of oleomargarine, and, as a result, they adopted it for use in government institutions.

But, Mr. Speaker, we know that British margarine is very superior to the Canadian or American product. It is made under strict regulations and has to conform to a high standard. If they found it of so high a standard why did not they quote the tests imposed by the British Government? The manufacturers of oleomargarine are not modest. They would have quoted the blue book, but they do not. They say:

The British government found it highly satisfactory.

Further on we find the following:

Tests of the energy-value of oleomargarine made recently by a competent authority resulted interestingly. Calorific value in separate fats showed many brands averaged 3,710 calories per pound.

But they do not tell you who the "competent authority" is. Would it not have been a good thing to tell you who made those tests? We also find the following:

Oleomargarine should sell under its own name and on its own merits. It should not be allowed to trade on the name of any other product.

Absolutely correct. I say, "amen" with all my heart. Neither let it trade upon the appearance, taste or colour of butter. Let it sell on its own basis as a cooking article. We are told further on:

Oleomargarine came into existence because of a shortage of palatable, edible fats and oleomargarine has thrived because the production of these has never kept pace with the growth of population.

The production of butter fats in Canada has more than kept pace with the growth of population, and oleomargarine cannot be said to be "thriving" when its consumption dropped from 14,000,000 pounds to 3,000,000 pounds in four years. I think that is an exaggeration, to say the best of it. Later on we find quotations from various gentlemen, from worthy and admirable members of parliament who made certain remarks in the House last year on this subject, and extracts are given from Hansard. But, curiously enough, all these gentlemen quoted are speaking in favour of oleomargarine—Mr. Michael Clark of Red Deer and four other hon. gentlemen. But why did the manufacturers not say that thirty-five pages of Hansard are full of the remarks of people who are not in favour of oleomargarine? Why did he not tell you, if he wanted to put it fairly and honestly, that the government of the day, strongly entrenched as they were with a good majority behind them, could have put through any bill they liked? It was brought down in the form of a bill in the name of the Minister of Agriculture, and when that hon. gentleman introduced it he said: We are going to pass this bill. But the pressure was so great, exerted as it was by members on both sides who were united in objection to the measure, that the minister rose in his place and

said: Boys, we will pull it out, if you will only be good, and we will put it in for one year only. So he withdrew his bill in deference to the measure of opposition that developed in the House, though he could have put it through if he had liked. That is a fair statement of the facts in that connection.

Now, I wish to quote one more passage from this pamphlet, and it is the gem of the whole collection. They wind up with the production of opinions by experts. You all know that you can get an expert's opinion on almost anything; you can get one medical man to swear that a man is insane and you can get another to swear that he is not insane. This pamphlet, this propaganda, quotes four experts—all, no doubt, very estimable men. Here is one of them:

> Dr. H. W. Wiley, the noted pure food authority of the United States government, in 1900—

That was eleven years ago, wasn't it?

> —testified before the Agricultural Committee.

I do not know what committee is referred to. He testifies as follows:

> In all my extensive analysis of butterine or oleomargarine, nothing objectionable or deleterious to health has ever been found, and oleomargarine, as made to-day, is pure, palatable and more nutritious than butter.

The most extravagant assertion of the maker of this dope is out-Heroded by this one—that oleomargarine is "more nutritious than butter." Now, I will give you Mr. Wiley's comments on this same subject as quoted in the House and found on Hansard at page 934. The name is given in this case as "Dr. Harvey Wiley"; in the pamphlet from which I have just quoted it is given as "H. W. Wiley"; I assume that the same man is referred to. I quote from page 934 of Hansard as follows:

> Dr. Harvey Wiley stated in a recent issue of Good House-keeping: "As far as I am concerned, I should never give my children nut margarine, oleomargarine, or any other margarine, as a substitute for butter. Butter contains a vital principle necessary to the growth of children which none of its substitutes possess. I should never give children nor grown persons in my family food products containing a preservative such as benzoate of soda.

I wonder which remark was made first; has the mountain come to Mahomet, or Mahomet to the mountain? That, I think, will cast some doubt upon the evidence of experts, when you find them saying a certain thing at one time and quite another thing—as is alleged—at another. Now, when witnesses in a court of law are proved to be incredible on several important points, their evidence is thrown out on all points. You often hear a judge say: I do not believe that witness; I have found him so incorrect on so many points; he may be trying to tell the truth but he is evidently unable to do it. We will give our friends the benefit of the doubt; we will say this propaganda was formulated in ignorance—perhaps it was; at any rate, I submit that it is not worthy of credence. I submit that I have produced evidence that will commend itself to the judgment of hon. members, and, with the facts which will be brought out by other hon. gentlemen more conversant with the technical branches of the subject than I am, will convince the House that we ought to keep faith with the farmers and go back to the conditions as they existed in the year 1917.

Hon. S. F. TOLMIE (Victoria city): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and to the compliments which he has paid to the manufacturers of oleomargarine. I think, however, that in one or two respects his statements are subject to correction.

The hon. gentleman said that the spread between the price of butter and the price of oleo at the present time—in this city to-day the price of creamery butter is 48 cents; of animal oleo, 28 cents, and of vegetable oleo, 24 cents—was due to propaganda. Now, I know the gentlemen interested in the manufacture of oleomargarine; they are reputable citizens, and I think the hon. member ought to have proof before he makes statements of that kind. This spread, as in the case of nearly all manufactured articles, is due largely to the cost of ingredients used in the manufacture, and to other business conditions which vary, as all know, from time to time.

With regard to the cooking compounds, I may say that practically all these compounds are now made in Canada; the oils used therein are imported in their crude state, duty free. I might point out, too, that oleomargarine is not the only thing that is used to "humbug the public"—if that is done. There are many other things that can be twisted about in the ordinary channels of trade to deceive the public. I do not think anything has been done in connection with oleo in that respect which is not done in other lines, as I hope to prove a little later.

The hon. gentleman has suggested that the English margarine is very much super-

ior to that which is produced in Canada, due, as he says, to close inspection. I do not think that the English inspection can be any closer than that which is applied in Canada. The work is carried on only in certain licensed establishments under the close supervision of our Meat Inspection Branch, a branch of the Department of Agriculture which has established for itself a very high reputation. Every movement connected with the handling of all the materials used in the manufacture of oleomargarine is subject to the most careful inspection.

If we were to follow out the desire of the mover of this resolution we would simply take away from the people of Canada the privilege of purchasing a wholesome food which is manufactured and sold in practically all other countries. It is a food that was used by our soldiers throughout the war, and whether it contains a high percentage of vitamines or a low percentage, certainly the Canadian troops did not lack "pep" when they met the Germans. Moreover, the hon. gentleman would place entirely in the hands of the dairymen the manufacture of a material which is used as a spread for our bread and for many other purposes. Now, the dairymen are a very reputable lot of people; the dairy industry is one of the most important in the country; I am a dairyman myself. But I do not feel that the dairymen have the right to demand as much protection as is asked for by this resolution; I do not think the Canadian dairymen really need it. If the butter makers of the United States can make butter at a profit notwithstanding the sale of oleo in that country, surely the Canadian dairymen can do likewise.

There is no question at all about the wholesomeness of this article, which has long since been accepted all over the world as a useful food product. The dairyman prepares his butter from milk products, and he has the right to colour that product and make it look like June grass butter all the year round. The beef men should have the same privilege in the matter of marketing to the best possible advantage the oil obtained from the beef. I may say that the by-products of the ox play a most important part in the price paid to the farmer for the living animal. All farmers who are producing beef cattle will agree that the price of beef cattle has gone down very largely in late years, due to the fact that the by-products have fallen in value. If this resolution should pass and no legislation be brought down to extend the period during which the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country shall be permitted, then the oils obtained from some 600,000 head of cattle passing through our inspected abattoirs every year would have to find a market somewhere else. That is one reason why the manufacture of oleomargarine should be permitted in this country, under careful inspection.

Again, I submit that it is preposterous that we should take away from the poor men of this country the privilege of buying oleomargarine if they wish to do so. By "poor men" I mean those who are working for the smaller wage—for salaries which, perhaps, permit them to make a living only by the careful exercise of economy—men with large families; men who have heavy expenditures to meet throughout the year. I say it is preposterous that we should take from these men the privilege of buying a wholesome food article like oleomargarine if they wish to buy it. The force of this statement is accentuated by the present scarcity of work throughout the country; there is hardly a city in Canada which has not had a long bread line of unemployed during the last few months.

Oleomargarine does not interfere with the production of first-class butter, but it does check to a certain extent production of the lower grades of butter, those grades that our Department of Agriculture is making a strong effort to have the farmers leave alone altogether in favour of a better quality. It has been well proven, too, that no one will buy oleomargarine if it is possible to buy butter at a reasonable price. This is clearly shown, I think, by comparing the figures for the last few years. In 1918, oleomargarine was manufactured in Canada, to the amount of 10,483,179 pounds, with 3,494,622 pounds imported, making a total of 13,977,801 pounds. In 1921 we manufactured 3,780,392 pounds, and imported 2,057,035 pounds, making a total of 5,837,427 pounds, showing a falling off between 1918 and 1921 of no less than 8,140,374 pounds, or something over 60 per cent. That shows that as the price of butter went down from the highest peak, the consumption of oleomargarine decreased to a very great extent indeed.

In 1918 we manufactured 93,298,348 pounds of creamery butter, and in 1921 that had increased, in round figures, to 111,000,000 pounds, an increase of 17,701,652 pounds, in spite of this awful com-

petition from oleomargarine. The total consumption of butter in 1921 is estimated by our dairy branch of the Department of Agriculture at roughly 240,000,000 pounds, as against a consumption of oleomargarine of 5,837,427 pounds, or slightly over 2 per cent, and certainly not any competition to be alarmed at. This shows that during this period the manufacture of creamery butter has made very substantial gains over the manufacture of oleomargarine, and it is another indication that the people will not willingly buy oleomargarine if good butter is to be had at a reasonable price.

Some of the most important dairy countries are the largest consumers of oleomargarine. In many of these countries in Europe, the high priced butter is shipped to other countries, and oleomargarine is consumed at home There is no country with a greater reputation for butter perhaps than Denmark, where in one year the population consumed 44 pounds of oleomargarine per head.

One of the best gauges of the prosperity of the dairy industry is the price of dairy cows. That gives you a good line on the prosperity of the business and the sale of dairy products. During the years when the largest quantity of oleomargarine was imported and manufactured in this country, we found the prices of dairy cows perhaps the highest on record for very many years.

What is oleomargarine? It consists of oleo oils and of edible beef fats. Let me say that these fats are secured from the carcasses of animals slaughtered in inspected establishments. No other fats are permissible except those imported accompanied by a certificate to that effect. There is a division between the edible beef fats and the non-edible beef fats. Oleomargarine also contains neutral lard, which is also secured under inspection; fresh milk from cows that have been tested with tuberculin, or milk that has been pasteurized; butter that is free from rancidity and is of first-class quality; vegetable oils, imported into this country from the United States principally, accompanied by a certificate from the Bureau of Chemistry at Washington—in fact, our Minister of Agriculture can ask for any certificate he wishes that will appear to cover the situation. In addition to these other ingredients, oleomargarine contains a small quantity of salt. Nut margarine is made entirely from vegetable products, and is churned with fresh milk. As I have already pointed out, all these articles are manufactured under the very strictest inspection and must be accompanied with proper certificates when imported into this country.

I must admit that when I first heard about the manufacture of oleomargarine, I pictured this material being gathered in the ordinary country slaughter-house and I was rather in favour of not permitting its competition with the dairy products of this country. However, after having an opportunity to investigate the matter thoroughly by visiting the establishments where oleomargarine is made, and after making a very careful inspection, in which I was aided by the experience I have gained in my profession, I entirely changed my opinion. I find that generally, in fact, altogether, the conditions under which oleomargarine is prepared and these fats are secured, under careful and constant inspection, are decidedly better than the conditions that prevail in the average dairy barn in this country.

In connection with our regulations governing the manufacture of oleomargarine, the dairyman has been very carefully protected, as well as the consumer. In the first place, this article is not permitted to be manufactured except in licensed establishments where inspection is carried on. No colouring matter is allowed to be added in the manufacture of oleomargarine. No colouring matter is permitted to be sold or given away with packages of oleomargarine. No mixing of butter with oleomargarine is permitted by anybody without a license, which means that the business is confined to these establishments. They are not permitted to use the words "butter," "creamery," "dairy," or the name of any breed of cattle on the package or in any advertising. The labels and brands must be approved by the Minister of Agriculture. Here is one of the packages with the word "oleomargarine" plainly showing. Here is another one in which the material is put up, and on the material itself the word "oleo" is stamped in very large letters. Careful record is kept of all oleomargarine sales by all our wholesale dealers in this material. They are compelled to sell only in the original packages. The importation and manufacture of oleomargarine is entirely under the supervision of our Veterinary Director General and his efficient aggregation of inspectors. The Dairy Commissioner takes care of sales within the country and the use of oleomargarine.

Let us see what have been the results from the enforcement of the law. We find that in 1919, there were eight convictions for infractions of the oleomargarine law, as against 111 for the sale of bad butter. In 1920 there were twelve convictions under the oleo law and 126 convictions for the sale of bad butter. In 1921 there were fourteen convictions for selling oleo against the law, and 126 for selling bad butter; showing that the producers of good butter have no reason to fear the manufacturer and dealer in oleo so much as the man who produces bad butter in competition with it. This indicates—

Mr. WARNER: Could the hon. member give the number of firms that were selling oleomargarine alone compared with the number that were selling butter alone?

Mr. TOLMIE: I could not give my hon. friend figures in that form. I presume that in a great many of the grocery stores it is the usual thing—it is pretty usual in our country—to sell both oleomargarine and butter. The figures I have given indicate that it is much easier to control the sale of oleomargarine under the present law than it is to control the sale of butter produced in many establishments where constant inspection is not carried out.

I quite agree with the previous speaker in one or two points. I think we should certainly impose a duty on oleomargarine coming into this country; and I think we might even go further and fix a standard for oleomargarine. I understand that some of the European manufacturers now deodorize the oil obtained from the British Columbia whale and use it in the manufacture of oleomargarine. I am told the work is done so completely that no fishy flavour of any kind attaches to the resultant product. In this country the manufacturers confine themselves exclusively to the use of the vegetable and animal oils obtained from our killing establishments throughout the country.

Mr. STANSELL: Are all these oils obtained from the killing establishments in our own country?

Mr. TOLMIE: Some of them are imported from the United States. When so imported, they are accompanied by a certificate from the Bureau of Animal Industry at Washington. As perhaps my hon. friend knows, these certificates are exchanged between our Health of Animals branch in Canada and the Bureau of Animal Industry in the United States; each country accepts the certificates of the other.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to take up the time of the House any longer than to say that I feel that this material being healthy in its nature, should be permitted to be sold in Canada. Those who desire to buy it should have that privilege if they wish. But we should carefully protect by inspection the manufacture and sale of such commodities so that there will be no interference with dairy produce, and I think my figures prove that the trade in oleomargarine has not at present any such effect. The by-products, as I have pointed out, play a very important part in the sale of beef animals within the country, and on this account I think we should permit the sale of oleomargarine in Canada, as its sale is permitted in other countries. I may say that I am a dairyman, engaged in the dairy business at the present time on the Pacific coast. I am also a breeder of pure bred cattle, and perhaps if I were to oppose the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country I might make a good many friends among the dairymen. At the same time, however, I think that in this House we should take a broader view of the subject. Personally I feel that oleomargarine is a good thing to have in Canada, that it is for the benefit of the great mass of the people. Under the circumstances I propose to forget my attachment to the dairy industry for the present and oppose the resolution.

Mr. LEWIS: Can my hon. friend give us any explanation as to why the Danish farmer sells his butter to Great Britain and is in such poor circumstances that he has to eat a substitute for that butter? Also does my hon. friend suggest that the Canadian dairy farmer should do the same thing in the case of his family?

Mr. TOLMIE: I have no suggestion to offer as to how the Canadian dairy farmer should best act in the interest of his family; I have one family and I feel that is about all that I can take care of. I think it is generally understood that the Danish farmer sells his butter to Great Britain and eats oleomargarine because he wishes to pocket the difference in the price of these commodities, which is very substantial.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): The question of prohibiting the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada has been debated

in this House for several sessions. I am of opinion that a good deal of time thas been wasted because of the fact that each succeeding session witnesses a repe-
5 p.m. tition of the arguments of the session before; and for that reason I rise to-da , more than perhaps from any other motive, to suggest that on this occasion we settle once and for all the question of whether oleomargarine shall be made and sold in this country. To my mind there are only two real factors governing the case, and they are these: Is oleomargarine a wholesome product, is it a fit food for the people of Canada? That is one consideration. The other: Is oleomargarine sold for what it is, and not represented as being something else? If we can establish that oleomargarine is a wholesome product, and that it is not sold under misrepresentation, then I contend that it is a legitimate article of commerce, and that this Parliament should not interfere with its manufacture and sale under proper safeguards. So far as I have heard, the mover of the resolution has not made out a case showing that oleomargarine is detrimental to the health of the consumer; in fact, I think it is pretty generally admitted that such a claim cannot successfully be made. We have had the testimony of the Dominion Analyst that oleomargarine is a wholesome commodity. Last year, and again to-day, the ex-Minister of Agriculture testified as to that, and I have a very high regard for his opinion. Oleomargarine is made under license, it is manufactured in government inspected institutions, its sale is surrounded by all sorts of safeguards. At the same time I would say this: If the sale of oleomargarine, in so far as misrepresentation is concerned, is not yet sufficiently safeguarded, as my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) would indicate, I would be quite in favour of passing such further restrictions as will ensure that the interests of the people shall be adequately protected. It is not even suggested seriously that oleomargarine is ever sold in Canada for anything other than what it actually is. The ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) has just exhibited cartons or packages in which the product is sold, and I do not think any one could possibly mistake oleomargarine for anything else. It may be true that in restaurants, and other eating places, oleomargarine is sometimes passed off as butter; but as was stated by a previous speaker, it is doubtful whether misrepresentation and deception obtains to a greater extent in the sale of this commodity than it does in the sale of many another article which might be named. The only argument against the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine is that its prohibition would be for the protection of the dairy interest. In other words those who favour this resolution want the sale of oleomargarine stopped in order that more butter may be sold, and sold at a higher price. Now, I say, with all deference to the opinion of those who differ from me, that if that is not a special plea for a particular interest, a plea that should not be countenanced by this parliament, then I would like to be shown a more glaring example. I am very sure that all of us, especially now that the farmers have so many difficulties to contend with, are very anxious that they be permitted to carry on their activities under the most favourable conditions. Personally I sympathize with that view; but surely Parliament is not going to accept the principle that it is justified in destroying any industry, any legitimate Canadian industry, which permits the great mass of the people of Canada to buy a wholesome article at a lower price than the price of butter, in order to benefit and add to the profit of any other industry. I think that is an absolutely unassailable position to take. This Parliament is not justified in destroying one legitimate industry for the purpose of assisting another legitimate industry, important as the latter may be. If we accepted such a principle, where would it lead us?

I am going to draw a few comparisons. Some may say that they are far-fetched; but I do not think so; I believe they are on all fours with the proposal made to prohibit the manufacture of oleomargarine. For example, if we can wholly prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in order to benefit the makers of butter, why should not the man who produces lard, the raiser of hogs, the owner of a packing house, object to the sale of vegetable compounds, oils and products that now enter into cooking and baking in the home? The argument is just as good for the one as for the other. Why should the manufacturer of silk stockings not object to another man being allowed to make cotton stockings, because it hurts his business? If people can afford to buy only cotton stockings why should they not be permitted to do so?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Or paper ones.

Mr. EULER: If anyone in Canada can make serviceable stockings of paper, I

would be quite willing to allow him to do so, so long as people who are buying those stockings would know what they were buying.

Mr. BROWN: So, in the case of paper boots.

Mr. EULER: As regards paper boots, the people of Canada did not know what they were buying at the time.

Why should not the manufacturer of the fifty-seven varieties that we hear and read so much about in advertisements, come to this Parliament and ask for a law prohibiting the housewife from canning her own fruit, pickles and preserves? The prohibition would be just as logical in the one case as in the other.

Then we are told that oleomargarine is an imitation, and merely because it is an imitation it is a reprehensible thing to allow that to continue.

Mr. LEWIS: Will the hon. member suggest that a cotton stocking is not a stocking and that a silk stocking is?

Mr. EULER: Not at all. The point which I am endeavouring to make is that, if you are going to destroy one industry because it is hurting another industry, you are wrong. Therefore, I say that the silk-stocking manufacturer—and this is merely by way of a homely illustration—is quite as much justified, because his business is being interfered with by the cotton-stocking manufacturer, to raise an objection. Merely because an article is an imitation is not necessarily a reflection upon it, so long as the people who buy the imitation know what they are buying. We have that constantly in commerce. You go to a fur store, and you are a better expert than I am if you can distinguish some of the furs sold under one name or another. But if a person is buying a class of fur coat, knowing that it is merely an imitation of another class of fur coat, I do not see why there should be any objection to that person being permitted to purchase it, so long as she, because it is nearly always one of the gentler sex, knows what she is buying. We might say that concrete cement, is an imitation, or a substitute, if you like, for stone, and a very good one, and just because it is an imitation or a substitute is no reason why we should not use it. Cotton is very often used in place of wool, and a very good article it is.

The hon. gentleman who moved the resolution spoke of vitamines; he said the butter contains a large percentage of vitamines and that oleomargarine does not. I am not sure whether he is correct in that or not; but surely he will not argue that, because there are no vitamines in oleomargarine, the people who are buying oleomargarine are necessarily not going to get their vitamines in some other form. He will have to devote his attention to many another prohibitory measure. I read the other day that potatoes contain a very large proportion of vitamines. These vitamines are located immediately under the skin of the potato. If you peel it as most housewives do, you lose all the vitamines. I propose that we also pass a resolution prohibiting housewives from peeling their potatoes and thus force the men to eat them whole. I sometimes go into a restaurant in which, opposite the various items of food, there is to be found the number of calories or heat units that each one of these foods produce. I think bacon tops the list. Would the hon. gentleman, therefore, argue that we must all eat bacon to the exclusion of veal, beef, eggs, cereals, meat and all the rest of them? It is entirely absurd to argue along that line. If that principle were recognized, we would be obliged to have a food inspector at every man's table to see that we are eating only those things which have the proper number of vitamines, calories and so on.

The hon. gentleman also stated that there can be no great demand for oleomargarine, because of the fact that, whereas we consumed some 12,000,000 pounds some few years ago, last year we consumed only 3,000,000 pounds. If he is correct—and I have no doubt he is—his difficulty is going to settle itself in a very short time. If people bought only 3,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine last year, that shows that they prefer butter or that they can afford to buy butter. But if there are still some who like to buy it, why should the Parliament of Canada take away from them the right to do that? Such a course amounts to prohibition. I am not speaking of prohibition in its ordinary sense; but even in the prohibition of liquor, the chief argument we heard usually was that it was a detriment to the people who use it and to those who are dependent upon those who use it. That may or may not be a fair argument; but even in that case, many people set up against it the argument of personal liberty. I am not going to discuss that at all; but as regards oleomargarine, the excuse cannot be

made, that it is harmful, and, therefore, we should not have prohibitory legislation with regard to it.

Butter, it has been said here to-day, is at present being sold at 48 cents a pound and oleomargarine at 28 cents a pound. That in itself constitutes a very important reason why those people, who cannot afford to pay 48 cents a pound for their butter, should not be deprived of the opportunity and right to purchase that which satisfies them and which is the best they can do under the circumstances. But I would go a step further than that; I would say that, even if oleomargarine costs more than butter and it is wholesome and I want to buy it, no man has logically a right to interfere with me if I want to buy oleomargarine and to pay for it. That is merely the right of the individual, and I think that is the issue at stake in this resolution more, perhaps, than any other.

I would be very much surprised to hear my hon. friends, who are directly, not angularly, opposite, support this resolution, because it is protection in its worst form. It is more than protection; it is prohibition. Tariff protection, if I may say so, is directed usually only against the foreigner. The manufacturer who wants tariff protection in this country desires as much as possible to shut out goods coming from a foreign country. On the other hand, if this resolution passes, we shall prohibit our own Canadian people from engaging in a certain industry, producing an article which, it is admitted, is a legitimate article of commerce. That would be the grossest and most unjustifiable interference with personal liberty that might almost be imagined. The law prohibiting oleomargarine should have been repealed long ago —not merely suspended from year to year. It was passed as long as thirty-six years ago. Well, it is about time it was repealed, and I would say that the Government, instead of again debating whether they should suspend this prohibitory law for another year, should make up their minds about it and repeal it absolutely, so that it shall not be necessary next year to repeat this performance, and do the same thing the following year and the year after that. For the reasons given I am definitely opposed to the resolution. I trust the law will be repealed and this vexed question settled once and for all.

Mr. H. A. STEWART (Leeds): I propose to support the resolution introduced and so ably discussed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill). He has gone into the subject so exhaustively that very little remains for me to adduce in support of the reasons he has given to the House. Undoubtedly hon. members have been recently supplied with literature presenting the arguments on behalf of both interests in the matter. The arguments that have been submitted in support of the permission to import and manufacture oleomargarine have been amplified in the literature that has been sent to us. It is said that oleomargarine is manufactured and imported under the strictest regulations. Apparently it is; but I wish to emphasize the difficulty of enforcing regulations of this kind and the possibility, indeed the probability, of their being evaded, besides the opportunity that is presented to those who sell this inferior article of representing it as being equally as good as butter. It is claimed that it is a wholesome article. I do not dispute that. It is said that it is a legitimate article of commerce. That cannot be disputed either, for it has been made so by the laws of our country. It is also said that many countries permit the sale of it; and that, too, is true. And we are told, further, that it is made largely from the products of the farm, although there is a difference of opinion as to the exact quantity of animal products that are used in the manufacture of oleomargarine.

My objection to the manufacture and sale of this article does not rest upon the ground that it is an unwholesome foodstuff. I place my objection on the broad ground of protection. I am a believer in protection for every industry in this country—protection for the manufacturer, protection for the labourer and protection for the farmer. I believe that any one who enjoys any of the benefits in his particular line must be prepared to concede that there is some disadvantage and some handicap in another line. Now, the farmer and the dairy interests of this country need protection against anything that unduly interferes or competes with their products, and they certainly need protection against the free importation of this article. They therefore need protection against the manufacture of it as well. I wish to read a resolution passed by the National Dairy Council of Canada at its meeting held in Winnipeg on January 31st last. That resolution, dealing with the question of oleomargarine, reads:

> That owing to the depressing conditions of dairying, the present low prices of butter fat, the importance of stimulating and encouraging

an increase in the production of cream on the farms in Canada and the difficulty of securing suitable markets, both domestic and foreign, for the butter at present manufactured in Canada, the National Dairy Council of Canada is of the opinion that no further encouragement should be given the importation, manufacture or sale of oleomargarine by the Parliament of Canada. And that this council urgently requests the Dominion Government to refrain from introducing any legislation dealing with oleomargarine at the next session of Parliament.

That resolution comes from an organization representing the dairymen of Canada. I think it may be accepted as their considered opinion on the subject, and frankly again I want to state that my attitude towards this matter is based upon the ground of protection to that vast industry. There is no industry in the country that is more exacting than agriculture, and that requires a greater effort at the hands of those engaged in it. There is no industry that, perhaps, in years past, has yielded so moderate a profit, and the men who are engaged in it to-day feel that they should have protection against the importation of this inferior substitute, because it is inferior. That is the ground upon which I place my objection to the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine.

Now, the hon. member who spoke last (Mr. Euler) said that we should not destroy any legitimate industry in this country. Well, as I understand the facts, this industry was established with the distinct notification and the clear knowledge that it was only a matter of permission granted during, and by reason of, the war. From its inception the unequivocal understanding was that it might be terminated at any time. So that in connection with this industry there is no vested right which can be advanced in argument against any action which Parliament might think it wise to take in the matter. I said I was in favour of protection. I have heard a good deal in this House about the disadvantage in connection with high freight rates; and I sincerely hope that some way will be found to overcome the obstacle which the farmers in the West have to contend with from the present high freight rates. I believe that they should, if possible, be protected against the great handicap of distance under which they labour. And I would point out to my hon. friends on my left that they might, and indeed fairly should, consider that as a feature of the principle of protection. I should like to see the coal producers of the maritime provinces protected against the same handicaps of distance and, if possible, some concession given them in the matter of rates in order that they might have a market for their product in the West.

I do not think I need elaborate this question; I have made my position clear. I believe the dairying interests of the country should receive very careful consideration at the hands of Parliament. It has been correctly stated that the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine in the past was intended to be permitted only during the war and because of war conditions. Those conditions have disappeared and the industry finds itself confronted with shrinking markets. It has a surplus of products, and the markets of the world are to a certain extent demoralized. Prices are falling and the conditions that existed when this permission was granted no longer prevail. We are back again where we were before that permission was given.

The House should take this question into its very serious consideration from the standpoint I have urged, namely, the principle of protection purely and simply. I believe in protection for every industry in Canada. The farmer is entitled to protection in this matter, and others should be prepared to concede it to him. I hope that the resolution will meet with the approval of the House and that any legislation necessary to implement it will be brought down in order that the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine may be prohibited, at least until it is found that conditions generally are such as to render it advisable, in the interests of the public, to permit the operation of the industry. I know there is a great difference of opinion in this House upon the subject, but I urge that the interests of our dairy and general farmers should receive favourable consideration, and that they are entitled to that fair measure of protection which the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of this product would give them.

Mr. A. T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): In the interests of dairy and mixed farming in my constituency I am heartily in accord with this resolution. We are encouraging mixed farming and dairying in my part of the country as much as we can, and it is undoubtedly true that the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine is, to a certain extent, destructive of our farmers' efforts to raise more stock and more dairy products.

The subject matter of this resolution has been before the House for the last five or six years, and when, the first year after the war, the question of continuing the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine was considered, although, I believe, the majority of the people's representatives were opposed to such continuation, they felt that it would perhaps be better to extend the period for another year when conditions would be about normal.

No one can expect to make this House believe that any article containing a mixture of tallow and oil with a small amount of milk or cream is a good substitute for butter. I was amused to see the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) produce a package of oleomargarine. The exterior looks fine, but, Sir, I do not believe he ever examined the inside of similar packages. I purchased a package on one occasion to satisfy my curiosity. I found the contents to be a greasy, oily looking mixture which I could not believe was fit for human consumption. But it is pressed on some poor people. I would not like to see my people use such a substitute for butter. I always like to see a poor man use good, substantial food, and not these unsatisfactory substitutes.

In stock raising we have to use the milk from our cows. I ask hon. members, would it be right for us to throw away the cream, as we would have to do, so that oleomargarine may take the place of our butter? I think not. Now that we are getting back to normal conditions there is no longer any necessity to import or to manufacture this stuff at the expense of our dairy and stock raising industry. Therefore I am strongly in favour of doing away with the further importation or manufacture of oleomargarine, and I shall have much pleasure in supporting this resolution.

Mr. E. A. MUNRO (Fraser Valley): Mr. Speaker, the main argument in favour of the continued importation and manufacture of oleomargarine seems to be changing ground somewhat. It never was considered equal to butter for its food value, but it was thought advisable to encourage its use as a cheap substitute for our poor people. I would ask, where are the poor people in this country? A good many of us have heard our Progressive friends describing the hard conditions that at present exist in the prairie provinces. Personally, I believe what they have told us. You may ask me why. I reply, simply because I am a farmer. But you have got to convince a good many people besides farmers, as you will find out before you get through here. Therefore I am sympathetic when my friends from the prairie provinces ask for the re-establishment of the Wheat Board with all its original powers. But, mind you, I am consistent, for while I am ready to grant my Progressive friends that assistance so far as I am personally concerned, still I consider it to be a form of protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. MUNRO: I repeat, I consider it is a form of protection, and more, it is an interference with personal liberty to a certain extent. Nevertheless, governments have taken similar action in the past, and why should they not do so in this instance, if you people are in the condition you say you are, and I believe you, because whether farmers are grain growers or dairymen, their condition is very unsatisfactory. Therefore I am sympathetic and I am going to stay with you.

I may be told that I am dealing with the grain issue instead of the dairy issue. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how many grain growers are in the dairy business. I presume that many grain growers have some milk cows. Now, just to show what condition the dairymen find themselves in out west, I am going to read a newspaper clipping from the Financial Post of February 24, because I take it that when the dairymen and grain growers come down to this House and ask for protection they need it, and need it badly. But the dairymen in question have not come down and asked for any special legislation. Here is the despatch, sent from Edmonton:

> This province will produce 18,000,000 pounds of butter in 1922, and 25,000,000 in the year following, according to an estimate of the Alberta Dairymen's Association. This will be 100 per cent increase in two years, and as prospects are now it is thought not too high a mark.

Listen to this:

> The dairymen have gone on record as favouring an increase in duty of from 3 to 6 cents a pound on butter coming in from New Zealand, which is Alberta's chief source of competition.

Is that protection? I do not say they are wrong; but we in British Columbia need it even worse than you do, because we get your butter from the East; we get the New Zealand butter from the Coast: we get Chinese eggs; and a whole lot of things like that, all of which makes it very interesting for us.

Mr. CRERAR: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that New Zealand butter sells in Vancouver in competition with butter manufactured at home there? It is rather remarkable.

Mr. MUNRO: Why, New Zealand butter is all over Canada; it even goes to New York. Some reference has been made to the poor people and how necessary this oleomargarine is to them. Well, judging from the story we have heard from the Progressives, the poor people are not confined to the towns and cities; I never heard a harder-luck tale in my life than we have heard this session on the floor of this House, and it can be duplicated over and over again. We have the pioneers living on their farms in lonely, secluded places, going to the grocery store with a few pounds of home-made butter in order to obtain the necessities of life, while many so-called poor people living in the town and cities, move about on the bright and cheery streets, and attend the moving picture shows and the theatres while the orchestra plays: "Pack up your troubles in your old kit bag"; "We won't go home till morning", and so on.

It is alleged that oleomargarine is a substitute for butter. Does the price of butter in this country justify the sale of oleomargarine as a substitute? I am a dairyman; I have been at the job more steadily, perhaps, than the ex-Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Tolmie), and I do say that butter is being manufactured in our country at a loss to-day. If it were not for the fact that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association had access to a market in Vancouver whereby we can supply whole milk at prevailing market prices, we would go out of business. We are just marking time. Just to give you an example, last year the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, a purely co-operative concern owned by the dairymen of the Fraser valley, produced 143,000 pounds of butterfat in excess of the production of the previous year; yet they received $500,000 less in money. Wages were also cut last year by $50,000. At present the dairymen are not making one cent profit; at the rate they are selling now they cannot pay taxes and live unless other commodities drop accordingly; yet some people say that the dairy industry is not being injured by the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I was talking to some Ontario men the other day—farmers, practical men who have made good. They told me that they were having a hard time in getting along; that they did not know how they were going to get through the present difficult situation. I met another man the night before last who had recently visited the scene of his early life on the farm, the place where he had farmed for years. He told me that he never saw so many farmers up against it in his life. He said: "They are all trying to borrow money, not knowing how they are going to pay it back."

We hear a good deal about the value of our home markets; almost any hon. member will wax eloquent in five minutes when he comes to talk on that subject. Now, is it a reasonable suggestion that the sale of oleomargarine in this country will build up a home market for dairy products? You know it will not build up a home market; if it would, do you think the dairymen of this country would send a resolution such as was read by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart)? Did the hon. member for Leeds not read a resolution of the British Columbia Dairymen's Association?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): It was a resolution of the National Dairy Council of Canada.

Mr. MUNRO: Well, it was approved by the British Columbia Dairymen's Association at their annual convention held at Chilliwack in February last. This resolution read as follows:

> Whereas the dairy industry is becoming one of the most important branches of Agriculture in the province of British Columbia;
>
> And whereas the present low prices received by dairymen for all dairy products make it necessary that the market for dairy products both at home and abroad should be stimulated and enlarged in order that those in the business may be suitably remunerated;
>
> And whereas the admission of oleomargarine free of duty into this country from the United States, while there is a high duty on Canadian butter entering the United States, and the sale and use of oleomargarine as butter, often without the knowledge of the purchaser, are unfair and injurious to the manufacturers of butter in Canada;
>
> And whereas the price of butter is now so low that it is within the means of all who desire it;
>
> Therefore, the British Columbia Dairymen's Association, in annual meeting assembled, is of the opinion that the admission and manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada should be discontinued, as its use is now detrimental to the best interests of the country;
>
> And that a copy of this resolution be sent to the honourable the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada and to the federal members of all constituencies in the province of British Columbia.

Some hon. members try to convince the House that it is not at all a serious mat-

ter for the dairy business if the sale of oleomargarine is permitted in Canada. But who knows the dairy business best, the men actually engaged in it, or those who have never had anything to do with it? I submit that the men who have been engaged in this business for a long time know the most about it. The convention of the British Columbia Dairymen, to which I have referred, was one of the largest gatherings of its kind that has been held in British Columbia, and I have read the conclusions which they seriously arrived at, and which they have submitted to hon. members of this House.

I contend also, Mr. Speaker, that if the Government permits the continued sale and manufacture of oleomargarine in this country they will be taking a course inconsistent with both federal and provincial government policies in the matter of assisting in the establishment of creameries. Why, I believe that the federal government had a travelling creamery go about the country —I shall be glad to be corrected if that is not right. I know that in the province of British Columbia the government are spending a lot of money to assist pioneers in different parts of that new country by buying up good stock, putting it in there and sending out instructors to give the people a start in the business. They realize its relationship to successful pioneering and farming. Is the Government going to take the trouble and incur the expense of instructing these people in the making of good butter, the handling of milk, and that kind of thing, and at the same time permit the manufacture of a substitute like oleomargarine to take its place?

With regard to the argument that the manufacture of oleomargarine should be permitted because we have so many poor people, I would like to ask hon. members this question: Have we so much poverty in the towns and cities of this big new country of Canada, with its population of 9,000,000, that we have to import a substitute for butter from the United States? Is anybody willing to take the position that we cannot supply our own people with good butter; that we must import a cheap substitute? Shall we take that position when butter is selling at such a low price that the dairymen are working for nothing, and we are looking for a market in which to dispose of the large surplus dairy products which we cannot consume at home? It seems to me that the argument is ridiculous. If it ever had any justification, it was during the war, but conditions now have come back to normal and we do not need to continue something which was adopted as a war measure. We dairymen differ from our friends the Progressives to this extent: we are asking that we go back to pre-war conditions; they are asking that we continue war conditions. We want to go back where we were. We did not ask for this thing; it was brought in, as it was alleged, in the public interest; now we want to return to normal conditions. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that butter is being manufactured under cost price, and any further depression of that market will simply have the effect of injuring the industry to that extent, if not of wiping it out altogether. I may add that these are the things that are driving the producers from the soil and swelling the ranks of the poor people in the cities. Instead of robbing Peter to pay Paul, we should encourage the so-called poor people in the towns and cities to go out on the farms and make butter for a change. Many people seem to think that when you get a piece of land your troubles are at an end; it would be the finest thing in the world if we could get these people on the land and let them see whether or not their troubles are no more.

Another argument advanced in favour of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada is that this article is used in other countries. But Canada, for the most part, is in its pioneer stage; it is a new country. The dairy industry is not so well established in this country as it is in older countries. Here we have labour conditions against us. It has been the policy of this country for a great many years to protect the young industries of Canada from outside competition by a tariff or a subsidy. The system of protection, based on this principle, is recognized and in force to-day, and I say that if protection is the policy of this country at the present time, the dairying industry is entitled to protection under the tariff just as much as any other industry in Canada. Do those who oppose this resolution argue that because the United States trades in oleomargarine, Canada should also be prepared to follow the example of the United States and give to the Canadian farmers and dairymen a Fordney tariff? Let me here point out that the following states on the other side of the line have passed laws prohibiting "filled" milk: New Jersey, Colorado, Utah, California, Oregon, Wisconsin, Ohio, Maryland and New York. What about following that example? I ask again, are you prepared to go as far as the United States have gone and give our Canadian farmers

and dairymen a Fordney tariff? If so, I say as a dairyman you can pave your streets with oleomargarine, so far as I am concerned.

In conclusion, I would call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that the last census of Canada points out certain things, one of which is that we are not holding very many of our prospective settlers who come to this country. The mesh of our colonization and land settlement schemes seems to be too large, and these prospective settlers are slipping through it and are lost to us. Apparently the evidences of peace and prosperity on the farms in this country are not sufficient to persuade these people to stay.

There is still a greater tragedy taking place, Mr. Speaker. We are not holding our own sons and daughters on the farms of this country, even though those farms be improved and represent the toil and savings of a generation. It is always a hard thing for fathers and mothers to watch the trunks being filled as their sons prepared to leave the old farm, but there is a harder thing still, and that is that we have no sane argument to offer to induce them to say at home on the farm. Poets write and fools rant about the back to the soil movement, but as a matter of fact, the secret of the migration from the farms can be told in four words—long hours, and low pay. There is no line of farm work—and I speak with knowledge because I have been on the farm all my life from fifteen years up—that can hold a candle to dairying for a form of slavery. You have to be up at five in the morning to milk the cows; you work all day providing for the cows in the winter and doing a thousand and one other jobs, and at five at night you have to milk the cows again. You may say: Get somebody else to do that work; but as soon as you talk milk to a man he begins to look for the road. I have had men come to me who I knew were good milkers, and they would want $3.50 a day and a house built for them, and then they would say, "I do not know how to milk," and I knew they had been milking for years. Men who can milk and are willing to do the work are demanding all the milk is worth. You cannot trust a greenhorn to do your milking, and an experienced man can practically make his own terms.

Furthermore, dairying to-day is an expensive business. Municipal authorities and governments are constantly making the sanitary regulations more strict, which means that you have to provide costly equipment to produce good milk. Then there is the expense of constant replacement of pure bred sires. You have frequent losses, and never know when another is going to occur. Last year a little disease, of a very common kind, in my herd meant a loss of $1,000 to me, and I could not recoup myself. I had to go through the form of milking these half-dry cows all summer and pay men to do it. I got a letter from home only the other day saying that a breeder of pure bred Jerseys had had sixteen high-priced animals slaughtered because of tuberculosis. He will get some compensation from the government, it is true, but not enough to begin to square himself. It will take him years to make up that loss. This is a business that is becoming harder and harder to carry on, because of the aversion of all classes of men to milking. You mention milk to them and they will not work for you. It simply means,—and I know the farmers in the House will bear me out,—that you have to do the work yourself. I heard of farmers on the prairie last fall who were nearly crazy over their crops with so much to do, and who would try and persuade one of the hired men to milk, but they would all try and get out from under it, one after the other. Young men do not want to milk cows and the old men are worn out at the job. What is going to happen when the old men die? They who have camped on this job and done the work no matter how long it took or how much they got for it? What is going to happen when these men drop out, and the modern man starts operations and is up against the modern idea of six or seven hours a day, and time and a half for overtime, and has to provide for depreciation, overhead charges and interests on his investment? That is where we are headed, and you will be sorry, Mr. Speaker, when that day comes, that you did not eat more butter when it was cheap.

The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has said some rather peculiar things in his speech this afternoon. He seemed to think that imitation was all right, but I would suggest that imitation is a rather dangerous thing, and I will give an example. Toadstools and mushrooms, for instance, are very much alike, but if you eat a toadstool for a mushroom, the results are very disastrous.

Mr. EULER: Would you say a toadstool is an imitation of a mushroom or a mushroom an imitation of a toadstool?

Mr. MUNRO: The points of similarity are so great that either might be an imitation of the other. The hon. member also spoke of paper stockings. I submit this as a farmer. We do not ask for paper stockings, but what happened last fall, when we were paying two prices for stockings not much better than paper? The farmers had wool hanging on the poles in their barns, and they could get hardly anything for it. I submit, when you talk about paper stockings, that the manufacturer who gets 30 per cent protection should be content to furnish socks at decent prices or have that tariff reduced.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. L. J. LADNER (Vancouver South): Mr. Speaker, we have heard presented the strong features of each side of this case with respect to the importation into, and manufacture in Canada of oleomargarine. Many arguments have been adduced, based upon the interest of some particular section of people. The views of the National Council of Dairymen have been presented on the one hand, and the views of the organization in support of oleomargarine have been urged on the other. But I submit that we must find some guiding principle that should actuate the Government in this matter, we must consider principles of public policy rather than the demands of political expediency. Some hon. members may be influenced through opinions in their constituencies; it may be the influence of the Dairymen's Association in one particular section, it may be the influence of the manufacturer of oleomargarine in another locality. Therefore the views of these hon. members are coloured by what they see behind them or what they anticipate in front of them.

I suggest that the only proper way to determine a question of this nature is to consider, in the first place, what the functions of government are in relation to it. In my own opinion there are two functions the government should bear in mind. First, they should make sure that oleomargarine is a pure food; that it is not a food which contains chemicals or ingredients that are injurious to health. The second, is that the government should make sure that the people will not be deceived, that when they buy this particular article they will know exactly what they are buying. To venture beyond this, Mr. Speaker, is to undertake an exaggerated form of paternal legislation.

It might be asked if a government can tell the people that they can or cannot use oleomargarine—perhaps I am repeating the argument of some hon. members but it will bear repeating—why can they not also enact laws that people shall eat three meals a day, or that they shall drink milk instead of water, tea or coffee? It may be asked why cannot paternal legislation cause the adoption of such regulations as will require the farmers to feed their cows on clover, or their horses on clover and timothy and hay instead of on timothy and hay and sometimes straw? Further, it may be asked, why cannot it be provided that people shall eat No. 1 fresh butter instead of imported butter from other countries, or that they shall eat ordinary butter instead of the oleomargarine which is the subject of the present discussion? I submit that what should guide us in coming to a conclusion in this matter should be the national consideration of what is best in the general interest and welfare of the people; and that the functions of a government, as I said before, should be directed to inquiring whether this particular food is pure and whether the people are being deceived in any particular with respect to it. When hon. members allow considerations beyond these to determine their attitude, I submit they are not founding their decisions upon the right premises.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to some of the considerations in support of the importation of oleomargarine into Canada and its manufacture here. In a circular issued by the Retail Merchants Association of Canada, a very large organization, they tell us:

> Having a trained knowledge of our business, we stand ready at all times to express our opinion, when requested, as to the quality of the goods selected, and in the case of foodstuffs to advise as to their healthfulness, etc.

Then the circular proceeds:

> The members of our Grocers' Section who sell oleomargarine, before recommending it, made exhaustive enquiries as to its manufacture and the ingredients contained in it. The Chief Analyst for the Dominion Government was consulted and pronounced it a perfectly good food, and he stated that it contained no harmful ingredients. On each package is stamped the approval of the Department of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada, and our retail grocers and general store merchants thoughout Canada, therefore, feel perfectly justified in stocking it and offering it for sale. If our customers did not want it there would be no sale for it, but our experience shows that

they want it, and, in our opinion, seeing that it is a non-injurious and palatable product, and that it contains nothing that is unhealthful, they should be allowed to buy it if they so desire and no law should be passed to prevent them from having it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that is the real point of this discussion: if the people want to buy oleomargarine why should they not be allowed to do so? The only reason why it is proposed they should be denied the privilege of buying it, is because one section of the community believes it will be prejudicial to its best interests. The strongest argument that I have heard in support of the resolution came from the hon. member who said, "I base my contention entirely upon the question of protection." But this is not a question of protection. The resolution proposes to prohibit entirely the importation into, and the manufacture of the product in, this country; and so even the argument of protection has no foundation in fact so far as the merits of this case are concerned.

Mr. MARTELL: Does not my hon. friend think that the dairy industry has as much right to ask for the protection of the importation or manufacture of oleomargarine, as the shoe manufacturers have to ask for a tariff in order to keep shoes from the United States and other countries out of Canada?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member apparently misses the exceedingly important point involved: he does not distinguish between prohibition and protection. If this resolution asked for the imposition of a tariff on oleomargarine I would say it would come within the consideration of reason; but when it declares that, although oleomargarine as a food is good, people shall not use it, I cannot understand how the parliament of any free country could seek to impose its will to that extent upon the public.

Mr. MARTELL: Why any protection on anything?

Mr. LADNER: The hon. member is getting into a very wide field when he considers the question of any protection on anything. I believe before Parliament prorogues, that question will be pretty fully discussed and all kinds of arguments will be advanced. That, however, has no reference at all to the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the House. In my opinion, the question is a very simple one. As I was saying, an organization that is supporting, and that desires the right to purchase, oleomargarine in the stores is the Great War Veterans' Association in different parts of Canada. This is a resolution passed by the Toronto branch:

> Be it resolved that the Great War Veterans' Association, Toronto district and York county command, urge the Dominion government promptly to take steps to assure the continued manufacture and sale of oleomargarine so that housewives may be enabled to continue freely to purchase oleomargarine for their families if they so desire.

The National Council of Women also wish to be permitted to continue to exercise that right, and I am informed that a great number of organizations in different parts of the country desire to have that right. I should like hon. members, who are opposing the merits of the contention submitted on our side, to direct some attention to the point whether it is within the functions of a government to pass such paternal legislation as will prohibit people from buying in any store a product of this or any other kind which is pure and which people want. That is the whole point of this discussion, namely how far is Parliament going and to what extent is it entitled to pass legislation of that kind?

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): The hon. member speaks about prohibition and protection. Was not his object, when he advocated the prohibition of Asiatic immigration, the protection of Canadian labour?

Mr. LADNER: I cannot conceive that it would be easy to impose a tariff in the sense of the human equation on Asiatics coming into this country. That is largely a social problem, whereas this question is largely an economic one.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly express my opinion in support of the proposed resolution for the prohibition of the sale of margarine in this country. I already had occasion, last session, to expound my reasons for opposing the manufacture and sale of this product. At each session, some member deems it his duty to introduce a resolution to prohibit such sale. That alone would suffice to show that such legislation is not sound, that the act which was passed some years ago, allowing the sale of this product, is unwarranted, and that there is no general wish for its maintenance, on the part of the people of this country. Such being the state of public opinion, it should be dispensed with.

I think the time has come,—since that legislation is about to lapse—to remind the

Government that it is the wish of our farming community, of our agricultural societies, of the settler and of the farmer, that the manufacture and sale of this product should become a thing of the past, as far as I am concerned, I do not think it should exist. In fact we are asking very little when we request that this transitory legislation, which is on the eve of lapsing, be discontinued; we ask for a return to the statu quo, we ask, on behalf of the farmers, the same legislation they had in former years.

Previous to the late war, which compelled us to enact special legislation in order to supply needs which circumstances required, we existed without this butter substitute, without this famous margarine which certain countries got in the way of consuming and that we always look upon with horror in this beautiful agricultural country. There is no reason whatever to maintain a product of this kind in Canada. Agriculture is the principal industry of the country, and we do not need, I repeat it, to have recourse to this detestable legislation which was enacted in times of hardship, to permit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that it was during the sad days of the great war, when we lacked sufficient products in this country to feed our own people, when the European markets were wide open to us, when our products were sought and sold at exceedingly high prices, it was then that it was considered expedient, but only for a limited time, to adopt transitory legislation, so as to allow for a year or two and no more, the sale of oleomargarine. On the eve of this act lapsing, the advisability of maintaining it was discussed in this House; there was then question of continuing it for two years; protests were voiced in this House; we did not want it maintained for the excellent reasons then brought to bear and which still hold good to-day, and we asked that, instead of enacting a new law for two years, it should be re-enacted for a year only. Presently the act will lapse and that will be the end of it.

We have nothing to ask for; we must simply abide by the acknowledged fact and let that enactment become null and void so as to return to normal times, those good times during which we lived before the war, having none of these ephemeral laws, none of these makeshift enactments. Let us allow that legislation to lapse and we shall witness once more that heyday of prosperity we enjoyed before the war. We want no such legislation as existed these last years in order to bring back upon the market that substitute for butter which is not needed in this country, because we have that good farm product in such quantity and of such quality as will satisfy our needs—in such large quantities as will allow us to place it upon foreign markets, and to let the whole world know the fair name of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that some honourable members should ask for the maintenance of such an enactment. I regret it, I say, because this is a time in the year when everything seems to get a new lease of life; the beautiful countryside is verdant once more, and in the fields the farmer's hand throws out the prolific seed. The tiller needs encouragement and we, lawmakers, must not stand up and say to him that the most splendid product from his farm, the product of the dairy industry, will not have a free scope as formerly and that we shall have it compete with an inferior article. He needs encouragement, that farmer, when he holds in his hand and spreads the seeds of wheat which bring wealth to this country; he wants us to stand by him and support him in that most important dairy industry, and tell him: Now, farmer, carry on as in the past.

The dairy industry is still the greatest source of wealth in our land. It is that industry we are developing in this country and in my beloved province of Quebec, where our public men have devoted the best part of their time towards securing the success of an industry that has built up Quebec's reputation. It is to that industry that have devoted themselves men like the present minister of agriculture in that province, the Hon. Mr. Caron, a model farmer, who has favoured it with all his might, all his heart, who has brought it to a high degree of perfection and who wishes that it be the foremost in his province. Were we to tell him: You have followed the wrong path; on that industry we shall graft as a rival a substitute for butter, we shall place upon our market, upon the table of our fellow-citizens that substitute for butter which is called oleomargarine and have it to compete with that splendid product. Such a course would be an unfortunate blunder on the part of this House. We ought to look after the farmer and encourage him. The farmer was the pioneer in our country. He certainly deserves our support and the best encouragement we could give him would be

to repeal such an enactment which opens our markets to oleomargarine as well as to butter.

Hon. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure): Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to say a few words on the question before the House, representing as I do an agricultural constituency in which is made about the best butter to be found in the province of Quebec. The future prosperity of this country rests almost wholly on its agriculture, and anything that this House can do should be done to encourage a return of population to the farms, because unless we can build up this basic industry I see no hope for Canada in the future. Since 1882, the province of Quebec has developed a magnificent market, abroad as well as at home, for butter and cheese. By the statistics for the year 1920, I observe that the output of butter brought a return of $23,000,000 odd and cheese over $13,000,000. There are 1,800 factories distributed throughout the province of Quebec, and the making of butter and cheese is probably the most promising of all our industries. The splendid donation made by the province of Quebec at the outbreak of the war of half a million dollars' worth of cheese was a great stimulus to the industry, to which it attracted considerable attention.

I should consider myself recreant to my duty if I did not vote against the continuance of this attempt to foist upon the country a product which I do not think the people want. It was allowed as a substitute during the war and there is now no further need for the manufacture of it. Those who can buy butter at any reasonable price do not care for oleomargarine. I do not think that any man going into a store would buy this article if he could get butter at a fair price. People had to buy oleomargarine during the war because the price of butter was very high, but now prices are all reasonable and they can afford to get the genuine product.

We should give the farmer every encouragement possible. He does not enjoy the protection which the manufacturers and the capitalists are given; and, furthermore, he has to contend with weather conditions and markets. The markets of the United States are now closed against him, and the farms are all suffering from an exodus of the rural population to the cities. Thousands of people have left my constituency, and the same is true of other places in Canada. We must make the conditions of rural life attractive so that these people may be induced to return to the farms. In the province from which I come particularly, there is no more promising industry than the dairy business, and I therefore feel it my duty to support this resolution. I congratulate the hon. member who introduced it (Mr. Neill) for the very fair and complete manner in which he laid the question before the House.

Mr. WILLIAM F. CARROLL (Cape Breton South and Richmond): The speeches on this question have been very brief and I hope to follow the example set by other hon. gentlemen. I do not personally like oleomargarine. I had the misfortune of being obliged to eat it for some considerable time and I know something about it. As I understand the question before the House, however, it is not a matter of taste but a question whether or not we should permit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country. I take the ground that a person who can afford to buy butter will buy butter, while those who are unable to buy it will buy oleomargarine. So that I fail to see the force of the argument that the manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada is going to injure in any way the dairy interests of the country. The hon. member who so very ably presented the question to the House said that there was a great deal of sham and fraud about the manufacture and sale of this article. Well, we are all more or less in the hands of those who sell us anything we eat or anything we wear. For example, how many people out of the 8,000,000 or so who inhabit this country are able in the fall of the year to clothe themselves in the very best of woollens? A very small percentage. Indeed, very many people in Canada are obliged to wear underclothing which is not made of wool at all. No doubt they would like very much to be able to get the real article, but they cannot afford to pay for it, and because they are bound to get inferior clothing we might as well say that they are the victims of fraud and sham perpetrated by those who sell them the cheaper goods. Again, there are a great many different grades of shoes, and sometimes we find them with soles that are made of paper instead of leather. Nevertheless, there are people who buy shoes of this kind because they cannot afford the more expensive grades.

An hon. MEMBER: Should these manufactures be protected?

Mr. CARROLL: I am not considering the question whether there is too much protection or not enough protection. I am not arguing from that standpoint. Now, if the people of the country do not wish to eat oleomargarine there is no duty whatever imposed upon them to eat it. If they can pay for butter they will certainly not buy oleomargarine; but if they are unable to buy butter and are perfectly satisfied with a substitute, why should they be hindered from procuring it? I do not see how they can possibly injure the dairy interests by buying oleomargarine when they could not buy butter in any case. I am not speaking for my own constituency in this matter. For once, in my life, at all events, I may speak from the broader and more national point of view. I do not think that there are ten pounds of oleomargarine used in the constituency I represent, although it is one of the largest industrial constituencies in Canada. But if there are people in this country who desire to use oleomargarine as a substitute for butter or for cooking purposes, I do not think that this Parliament should deprive them of that right which they should enjoy as free-born Canadians. I shall vote against the resolution for these reasons and for many more which I could state.

Mr. AIME M. DECHENE (Montmagny) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, on every occasion when this question was discussed in this House I had the honour to take part in the debate, and my firm attitude of the past, on this question is the one which I intend to maintain this evening, in other words, to oppose the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. It is therefore a pleasant duty for me to support the resolution of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and to ask all our colleagues to join us in our effort to remove from the market of this country, a certainly inferior product which has not the value attributed to it; for after all, oleomargarine and other products of the same nature have but a very small value. It may be eaten with bread, as for instance on a slice of bread which we give to children, though devoid of the most nutritious constituents found in butter; but it cannot be used in a very palatable way to cook food. We all know that when oleomargarine comes in contact with heat it disintegrates immediately and a tallow smell is given out which is very disagreeable; this explains why no one likes to consume hot food prepared with oleomargarine. It however finds a ready sale, under the disguise of cheapness, with the people who think they are economizing by using, instead of butter, oleomargarine, an article of inferior quality.

During the war, we were forced to allow the use of a substitute owing to the high cost of the dairy products such as butter and cheese. This was a war measure, one which should have been repealed immediately after the armistice; but, in order to meet the wish of everybody, the government of that day thought it prudent and wise to continue this legislation for a few months more. Last year it seemed absolutely decided that we would, this year, see the end of such legislation; however rumours are spreading which forecast a further continuation of this legislation for some time to come. This would certainly cause considerable harm to the dairy industry of this country. Some twenty years ago, dairying was very little thought of, not only in this country but in the foreign markets. The problem was solved by encouraging the dairy industry and prohibiting the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine and other such products. Ever since the dairy industry has had full scope, it has progressed considerably. Our products have acquired a great value. In the past they were considered of inferior quality in the market, however, to-day they are highly appreciated, not only in Canada but in foreign markets. The Department of Agriculture observing that the greater part of the population was interested in the success of the dairy industry, established these past years, competitive examinations following courses of instruction in butter-making. The result of these competitions is published yearly. That of last year showed that we had made considerable progress in the manufacture of butter. Every year, since this co-operation has been established, there is a marked improvement. Now, that we are in a position to meet competition from Denmark and New Zealand, and to compete against them on an equal footing in the British, French and Belgian markets, we seek to obtain permission, in Canada, to sell substitutes. Having laboured for twenty years to improve his herd, having faithfully followed the advice of the Department of Agriculture, at Ottawa, and of the provincial agricultural departments, the farmer will behold all his work reduced to nought; now that he is on the eve of securing a market

and establishing a good reputation, while his industry is becoming remunerative, he will find that we allow the sale of products which are substitutes, simply imitations, and therefore bound to be a very unfair competitor.

Some of the hon. members who spoke this afternoon or this evening said: "You will ruin an industry and the capital invested will prove a loss." According to the manufacturers' own figures, there has been manufactured, during the year 1921, 3,780,392 pounds of oleomargarine in Canada, and according to the same source, 2,057,035 pounds were imported. On the other hand, there was more than $199,000,000 worth of butter and cheese produced amongst 3,258 factories. Should we, by continuing this year this legislation help to develop an industry which would compete and ruin the one we already have? It is all very well to allow, in this country, the development of as many industries as possible, however, on the other hand, we should take the necessary steps, not to ruin those which our rural population have established within the past twenty or twenty-five years, on a basis which does credit to Canada. We had in the year 1920, about 3,258 factories making butter and cheese. How many oleomargarine factories are there? I think, we could say, without fear of contradiction, that they are no more nor less, but side lines of the large packing establishments of this country and that they alone really benefit by them. They tell us, on the other hand, that if they are not allowed to manufacture oleomargarine, they will be at a loss to dispose of the by-products of the steer. I see, by their own figures, that they have imported from the United States a quantity of vegetable, mineral and even animal oils in a greater proportion than what is manufactured in this country.

So as to enable them to import a few thousand pounds of mineral or animal oils, that can be produced in their present industry which is deserving of encouragement, should we also allow them to create a monopoly and jeopardize the industries already established? I contend, Mr. Speaker, that we would then be working towards demolishing what we have built with so much perseverance upset the calculations of the farming community. Do you not believe that, if one of these days, the farmer realized that the sale of oleomargarine and its by-products, or any kind of oil mixed with butter, proved a serious competitor in the market, that he would do as many others have already done and say: "Well, there is already very little money in farming, I shall give up the dairy industry. I shall discontinue rising at half past three or four o'clock in the morning to milk the cows, I shall not retire to bed at eight or nine o'clock, at night, after having again milked the cows and given the necessary care to the herd, thus I shall give up competing against the sale of all those vegetable and other oils, which are imported from the United States. Why so much worry to supply certain privileged ones, with a few pounds of butter, when the large manufacturers of this country, themselves, favour American industries by importing hundreds of thousands of dollars worth, nay, several millions, of their products in preference to our own.

A young man brought up on the farm with his father would naturally come to this conclusion: "Conditions on the farm are so bad, the farmer is so poorly encouraged that he is not even allowed to retain what he has to-day, moreover unfair competition is being brought to bear to annoy him, I shall therefore follow the example of other young men, go and live in the city." Thus we shall again be working to depopulate the rural districts in the interest of large cities. If you wish to keep our young men on the farm, give them a chance to lay something aside for themselves. Otherwise they can not be blamed if they move to large centres, to work as labourers, and walk the streets at half past seven or eight o'clock at night.

Some one said, a few minutes ago: "That there was a market for oleomargarine therefore we should produce some for sale". This reasoning struck me as being false, because any dealer, any man who is acquainted with the ways and means of selling a product to others, can sell them any thing whatever. We know to-day that it is not the value of the goods themselves which render them marketable, but rather that man who is a hustler who sells them. Place the best article in the hands of an ordinary commercial traveller he may have very little success but place an article of little value in the hands of a man of experience, and you will see how quickly he will dispose of it. Why? because all depends on the salesman, the article itself plays no part in the transaction. Because a product is saleable, is that a sufficient reason to allow its sale to the detriment of good products which should have the first place on the market?

The price of butter and cheese, at the present time, is very nearly what it was before the war. Any labourer or salaried man whatever could at that time purchase butter. He had enough money to do so. Yet, his salary was rather less than it is to-day. If he earns more money now, if his income is greater, should he not therefore have the means to purchase the butter which his fellow-countrymen are manufacturing and which would help the farmers to hold their farms, since the latter are obliged to pay the high prices demanded by labour.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of the agricultural population of this country understand, as we do, that it is necessary to immediately suppress such an industry before we allow it to develop. Those who have invested capital in the manufacture of oleomargarine, of butterine or other substitutes for butter, knew what they were doing. They knew that it was an industry bound to disappear with the war, just like that of ammunitions. To-day, then before this industry develops, why not prevent any further expense, but immediately prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I believe that in this manner, we shall prove to the country that we really wish to do something to help farmers to improve their present condition. Let us give everybody a chance, and we shall never regret having done our full duty in this as in many other circumstances. Let us pluck out the thorn before it causes any serious injury.

Mr. J. L. BROWN (Lisgar): I think it would be unfortunate if this debate closed without those who sit in this corner of the House making themselves heard. I cannot claim that there is perfect unanimity among the organized farmers of the prairies in this matter, but I think I can enunciate the principles that from the very beginning have lain behind the organizations which we represent—principles which we have not consciously departed from. I know it is being urged in some quarters these days that we are not true to our principles in making our request for the Wheat Board. I can only say that in so doing we have not, consciously at least, departed from our principles, as we certainly would be departing from them if we were to support the resolution submitted by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill).

The resolution most distinctly declares that it is being advanced in the interest of the dairy industry—and, of course, it is added "the public generally." The hon. member might just as well have left out those words as his argument in favour of the resolution from the standpoint of the "poor consumer." The hon. member would have been perfectly consistent if he had done so, for he is already on record to the effect that in his view protection is simply a local matter, and that he is prepared to be protectionist or free trader according to the location in which he is placed. Therefore when he spoke of looking after the interests of the consumer, I say he might just as well have saved himself the trouble, for in view of his previous statement no one will believe him.

Two arguments are being advanced in favour of this resolution, arguments that should be kept distinctly apart, but instead of keeping them separate the hon. member has rather mixed the two together. When he was speaking I could not but wonder if his association with the Chinamen had made him as expert in camouflaging a situation as he said the Chinamen are in camouflaging the kind of meat they place before their customers. If that is true it is unfortunate, and it certainly affords one more reason, in addition to those already given, for the exclusion of Asiatics.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, two arguments are advanced in support of this resolution, one from the standpoint of the consumer—the "poor consumer," who is to be protected from something he might eat that would do him physical harm. On this point I do not presume to have an opinion. I know nothing about oleomargarine, I have never eaten it to my knowledge; but we have testimony from a great variety of sources that this product when manufactured under proper supervision is not unwholesome, and I am prepared to accept that evidence as perfectly valid. If it can be shown that the consumption of this product is detrimental to the health of our people, well, we will be moved to consider the advisability of restricting or even prohibiting its sale. But that is not a question which I wish to consider from the standpoint of the farmer; it is a question that must be settled by those who are specially competent to deal with it along these lines, and on that account I do not presume to have an opinion on it, I am, as I said, content to accept the opinion of those who are competent to deal with that phase of the question. We might say this,

however, that even the layman can easily understand that the manufacture of this product must be surrounded by certain safeguards. That is evident on the face of it. If those safeguards are not sufficient, if the restrictions already imposed upon the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine are not what they ought to be, then by all means let us impose further restrictions; but so far as interfering with its sale, I cannot see my way clear to adopt such a position at this time.

Now, let us consider it from the standpoint of protection to the dairy farmer. Our organizations—I am speaking of the farmers' organizations—have been built upon the principle of no special privilege. Those who sit in this corner of the House were elected on a platform containing a plank in favour of the free importation of foodstuffs, and for my part I have no intention of going back on that principle. Let me say a word to the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) who has advocated protection for the farmer. He advocated the discontinuance of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine purely from the standpoint of protection; therein being a protectionist he was, of course, perfectly consistent. But if he has been able to find out how the farmer is to be protected, it is something that we have not been able to find out yet. My interest in political affairs began in the election of 1878, when Sir John Macdonald introduced his national policy, and I remember well the arguments that were then advanced in support of that policy, that the farmers must have protection. The poor farmers of that day were deluded, and many of them are still labouring under the delusion that it is possible to protect farmers although the great bulk of their exports find a market in foreign countries. From the standpoint, then, of consistently maintaining our principles, I feel that I for one—and I know there are many who feel like me—must oppose this resolution. I do not think, even if we admitted that principle, or were willing to violate our platform, that the protection sought would really be of any value to us. I think that argument can be maintained in this as well as in other connections, that when we have to compete in the markets of the world with our foodstuffs it is not reasonable to suppose that this trivial protection could be of any value to us. Even if I were convinced that the discontinuance of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine could be of any value to farmers, I would still, from the standpoint of the principles that have placed behind our organization, be compelled to vote against this resolution.

When I come to discuss these matters before the public and to urge our position on other questions, I want to be able to say to the labouring man: We will pay you good wages, but there must be no loafing on the job; we want an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. And I want to be able to say to the manufacturer: You must stand on your own feet just as we have to stand on our own feet. Therefore on this question of the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine I do not propose to lower the flag under which our farmers' organizations have marched during the last twenty years.

Hon. W. R. MOTHERWELL (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, like nearly every other subject of debate, there are two sides to this question. I freely and frankly admit that at the outset, but I propose to take one side and try to show cause why the resolution should be sustained. The history of oleo dates back to 1867, when an eminent French investigator discovered how to make cheap butter out of the natural fats and oils. Ever since it has been used as a substitute for butter.

I am not going to take exception to those who put up a plea for the poor man's butter, but let us investigate to what extent it has been used, and to what extent we might be able to compromise probably with that plea and make some advances in the direction of meeting those demands. The extent of the manufacture and importation of oleo during the last three years goes to show that its consumption is directly related to its price and the price of butter. For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1920, the consumption of oleo in Canada amounted, in round numbers, to nearly 15,000,000 pounds; in the fiscal year ending March 31, 1921, it was nearly 11,000,000 pounds. Last year, when real butter, through the drop in price, came within the reach even of many of the poorer people, the consumption of oleo was reduced to 3,250,000 pounds. This shows that when conditions return to normal or nearly normal, the demand for oleo decreases accordingly, and presents a justification for the course taken in 1917, when the price of retail butter ran up to 70 cents or more, and it was regarded as a hardship upon the people to be obliged either to purchase butter at that price or do without it. It was at this time that the prohibition

of importation and manufacture of oleomargarine was removed, and it has never since been re-established. I realized something of the difficulty which would be involved in removing a law of
9 p.m. this nature once it had been enacted and vested rights had become established. Accordingly, in 1917 I opposed the importation and manufacture of oleo, believing that the reasons for doing so were not sufficient and that there would be difficulty in reverting to former conditions.

So long as we have in force another prohibition which is effective with regard to the production of butter in Canada, it seems to me that we should be making a mistake in permitting the importation and manufacture of oleo. I refer to a prohibition which was enacted in 1886 by the government of that day and continued in force in its earlier form until 1903. In that year the dairy industry—which was a struggling one in those days; it was not as well established as it is now—was given further encouragement in the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of renovated butter. The idea was to enable the dairy industry to get upon its feet, because it was not an easy matter to start that industry in Canada. Some people take the ground that dairying is an industry indigenous to this country. But it is not so indigenous to Canada as it is to many other countries with which we have to compete; not so indigenous as to make it unnecessary for the legislators of 1886 and and 1903, in order to give it a fair chance, to prohibit the manufacture and importation of oleo as well as the renovation of dairy butter by mixing it with creamery butter, thus deteriorating the quality and discouraging the creamery industry. So long as that prohibition upon renovated butter prevails it seems to me we are moving in the wrong direction; we are putting the cart before the horse. Now, some people take the ground that renovated butter is objectionable, but not half as much objection can be urged against it as was urged some years ago against the introduction of oleomargarine. I find on discussing this matter with my fellow members that a great many of them are not aware that a prohibition upon renovated butter was enacted in 1903 and exists to this day. The effect of this prohibition is most strongly felt in connection with dairy butter made in the frontier districts of Canada in places remote from creameries. Those who make it are poor people; their facilities are not the most ample, and though the butter is not manufactured under unsanitary or unclean conditions, it is produced in primitive surroundings and without proper storage. It is put on the market in the ordinary country store; it goes to the retail store, then to the wholesaler, then to Winnipeg or Calgary. Finally it is banished from the country. It is not permitted to be renovated and find a market in Canada; it has to go to St. Paul, climb over the 8-cent Fordney tariff wall, pay the freight rate to St. Paul—and you can imagine how much the man on the frontier gets for it when it goes through that procedure.

I have before me a summary of the quotations on butter and oleomargarine in the Minneapolis market of the 8th of this month. At that time the retail price of creamery butter was 40 cents a pound—it varied from 40 to 42, but I give the low figure in each case; renovated butter was 32 cents, a difference of 8 cents; oleomargarine was 25 cents, or 7 cents cheaper than the renovated butter. I am persuaded, Mr. Speaker, that if the renovation of this butter were permitted in either Calgary or Winnipeg the result would be to save the freight rate to St. Paul, to save the 8 cent duty imposed by the Fordney tariff bill which would make at least a saving of nine cents, and to enable this product to sell in Winnipeg at the same price as oleo. That is only an estimate, but I think it is a fair one. I do not think the price would be above that of oleo, but even if it were two or three cents more, it would still have many advantages over oleo. It is not merely three or four per cent butter fat, as oleo is; it is 100 per cent butter fat and has 100 per cent content. Those of us, then, who feel solicitous on behalf of the poor man and are desirous of giving him cheap butter should be willing to give him real butter manufactured in Canada. Remove the restriction; let this butter be renovated and we will kill two birds with the one stone; we will come to the relief of the frontier man who to-day can hardly get a living price for his dairy butter; we will let that butter come within seven cents of being worth as much as first-class dairy butter. At the same time we will help the poor people who have to buy this necessary article of diet. Let us take that course rather than let the by-products of the big plants of Canada or of any other part of the world enter into competition

with the honest dairy cow of this country. I am prepared, if my colleagues will agree with me, to take that prohibition off by legislation this session, as a means of giving real relief; as a means of giving butter which is not 2 per cent butter—some of my friends here claim that they have had enough 2 per cent—but 100 per cent butter with 100 per cent food content. Then, if we subsequently want to throw on more brakes with a view of taking action affecting the dairy industry in the West as well as in the East, that will be a matter for consideration.

Now I am going to take up a number of the arguments that have been made in favour of oleo. We have heard of the poor man's butter and of the greater food value of oleo. I always used to hear it claimed that oleo was of lesser food value than butter, but let us suppose that it just evens up, that there is an equal number of calories in butter and oleo. That depends, of course, on who takes the sample. If you have butter with a large water content, and oleo with a small water content, the analysis will show to the advantage of oleo, but if the samples are taken fairly and show an equal number of calories, that, after all, is only one factor in the analysis. It shows the energy, the heat property, but it does not show the assimilative power of the human system to make use of these articles. Everybody knows that butter is not only more palatable than oleo, but more easily digested and assimilated. There is no comparison between the two articles in that respect. How many of us here, if given the choice, would take oleo? Not one.

Then it is said that it is contrary to free trade principles to prohibit the importation of oleo. Here I find myself strangely aligned to-night; but we want enough votes. I find myself aligned with my protectionist friends, I like them for one thing; they are at least candid, even if they are wrong, but in this instance they happen to be right.

I hear the argument made by some that they do not believe in prohibition of anything. Others say that they do believe in prohibition because they want to prohibit this article. I am not going to be forced into the position of being a protectionist, nor do I think it is necessary, because in the sense in which we usually use that word this is not protection at all. Why? Protection means a tariff or tax on some commodity to encourage the production of a similar commodity in our own country.

[Mr. Motherwell.]

Is a cow similar to a packing plant with which you are asking it to compete? Not at all. There is no comparison, so the question of protection does not arise. I take the ground that the prohibition of the manufacture and importation of oleo is not protection at all in the sense in which we usually use that term, because the things competing are different. It is a cow competing against a packing plant, and not only the packing plants of Canada, but of the entire world. If that be so, the question of protection does not come in.

The other evening we discussed a question where there were two classes of the same species competing with each other, and to that extent it was like against like. That was the question of the exclusion of the Asiatics or the restriction of their immigration. Every man in this House, if I recollect aright, took the ground that they should either be excluded or their numbers restricted. In that instance it was man against man, the yellow race against the white race. It was admitted by everybody that the competition was unfair, and that is what I claim in this case. The comparison in the case of the Japanese versus the white race was more justifiable because the two classes competing were both men made after the same pattern, and recognizing the same Creator. The competition was unfair. We all recognized that it was unfair. Every man in the House who acquiesced in or voted against that resolution recognized the unfairness of certain kinds of competition. We can do that without being charged with being protectionists. Would you have a game-cock compete with a utility barnyard bird and call the competition equal? Would you have the Japanese compete with the white man in British Columbia and call that competition fair? So if exclusion or restriction in that case is justifiable, it is much more justifiable that the good dairy cow should not be asked to compete against the immense packing plants of this continent. I am just as much a stickler for free trade, and for as little restrictions on trade, as any other man in this House, but there is such a thing as absolutely unfair competition and this is a case in point—and unfair competition is something that we have all recognized should not exist.

Another argument is that people should have the right to eat what they want. Anybody who takes that ground must also go a step further and say that people should be able to drink what they like. We have lots of precedents in Canada, we

have seven out of nine provinces that say you cannot drink what you like. Whether that is right or wrong, that is what we have said. Consequently we have a precedent before us.

I want to refer to another prohibition and this raises an important point. If we permit oleo to be manufactured and imported how many steps will it be from that to the permission of the importation and manufacture of filled milk and cream? Just one. In fact, we have it now. Somebody put a question, and a very proper one, on the Order Paper the other day asking if we were going to legislate against filled milk and cream. I inquired into the matter through my staff, and we found that it had obtained more or less of a foothold already in Canada. However, until we knew what we were going to do with oleo, it was thought we had better let the matter stand because the two questions were on all fours. Oleo is in many cases almost entirely made of natural fats, and in other cases of vegetable oils, and in nearly every case there is from two to five per cent of butter fat. The oil is injected into the butter fat to make the article appear like butter. But in filled milk and cream the butter fat content is taken out from the milk and the cream by the separator, in the usual way. Then the sweet skimmed milk is filled again with other vegetable oils as a substitute for the natural butter fat taken out, and there you have filled milk, with the natural oils taking the place of the butter fat. The same is true of filled cream.

In the United States they permit the manufacture of oleo; the business is established there. I am not criticising these older countries at all, but although this oleo business is established there, nine of the states have prohibited the manufacture and sale and importation of filled milk and cream. That is what is happening right at our door. The question is shall we put in the thin edge of the wedge by recognizing oleo, for if you recognize oleo you are going to have great difficulty in stopping the importation and manufacture of a similar product, except that it applies to milk and cream instead of butter. Where are you going to draw the line? Are we going to let great vested interests establish themselves in this country for the purpose of making filled milk and cream? Should we not rather nip it in the bud now? I am not complaining of the lobbyists who have been around here for the last two or three weeks with their propaganda on behalf of the manufacture of oleo; I have no objection to that at all, but the farmers are a little too busy just now looking after other things to come here to Parliament and look after their own interests. They are at a disadvantage in this respect, and the moment a vested interest grows up in this country, either by legislation or by common consent, there is a lever that you find it pretty hard to work against.

And so I say, if this privilege is extended to oleomargarine we shall have the same thing demanded in the case of filled milk and cream. As a matter of fact in the answer which was given to the deputation referred to by myself on behalf of the Government I said there was no legislation at present; but if it was found that the Public Health Act, the Pure Food Act, and the health laws of this country did not protect the public, then legislation might be required later. That was our answer and I do not see how there could be any other answer to this because, to all intents and purposes the same principle is involved. Nine states in the American Union say to the public "You cannot consume this filled milk or cream". And yet it has a considerable food content, it is of considerable value as an article of diet; but it is deemed not to be in the public interest in the United States that the dealing in this article should be recognized by law and established; that is the point.

Mr. BRISTOL: I am very ignorant about this matter. In the United States is oleomargarine prohibited by law?

Mr. FIELDING: Hear, hear; that is the question.

Mr. BRISTOL: If not, why prohibit oleomargarine in Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, I was pointing out that this question was on all fours with the other one alluded to. But I may say that in the United States the dairy industry is well established. It is older than ours in Canada—and I will deal with that aspect in a moment—and certainly the competition is not as disadvantageous there to the dairying interest. But when we come to Canada it is a horse of another colour. In both cases the principle is the same but I think we should draw the line here. The question has been asked: If a person wants to eat oleo why should he not be allowed to? To that I reply: If we want to drink anything why should we not be allowed to do so? But seven provinces

of this country have prohibited intoxicating liquor; and nine states of the American Union have passed a prohibitory law as to filled milk and cream.

Mr. JACOBS: Would the eating of oleo set a person drunk?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No it would not, I hope not at all events, but it would be deleterious to the chief corner stone of agriculture, the live stock industry and especially dairying—there is no question about that. It would be discouraging to every man that milks a cow and knows what it means to hunt after them; it would be discouraging to those men who have been putting up with the vicissitudes of dairying. I want the House to remember that it would take very little to put men out of dairying. It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back, and we do not know that this is not the last straw. We do not make sufficient butter for home use in this country because we import supplies. That raises a very important question. We do import and we feel the competition very keenly. But are we asking for protection against importations of butter from Denmark or New Zealand? I know some men who have taken a stand all their lives against protection, but in the peculiar position in which they find themselves in the dairy industry to-day, beset by difficulties on all sides, they have actually proposed that we raise the protection on butter. I have diligently, and I hope as consistently, refused to agree. I have said "No" and I continue in that stand. We are not asking that the duty be raised on New Zealand or on Danish butter, although we could find a lot of people who supported the Liberal policy in the past who would to-day support the raising of the duty on American butter in retaliation for the Fordney bill. However, we are not doing that, we are not asking for such a thing; but if the fair play asked for by the dairymen is not granted I know that a demand for better treatment will come from many sources, sources that are not dreamt of to-day, and which will be hard to resist because it is not fair to subject our dairy industry to this competition.

I might say while I am on this subject that oleo has been used for many years in the Old Country as well as in Denmark and Holland. That does not mean anything to them except as a source of revenue. Look at the situation of those countries compared with ours. All that Denmark and Holland have to do is to put their butter on the boat, run it two or three hundred miles, or a little more, across the North Sea, and up the Thames, and they are right in the heart of Old England—one of the best markets in the world, in fact the world's market for butter—with practically no expense for transportation. And then in those countries you have an industry that was established hundreds of years ago, whereas we have practically only just started in this country. And then another thing, is that in Denmark and in Holland the people are frugal, thrifty and industrious, and for business reasons they choose to eat oleo and sell their high class butter. That is what a lot of our people do not even want to do. We used to do it fifty years ago, but it is not done to-day except to a very small extent. There is no comparison between the situation of dairying in this country and the situation of dairying in these European countries. In other ways they are situated advantageously as compared with us. Take their climate, take their pasture lands, take the comparatively few months of the year they have to feed their dairy cattle as compared with ours, and a dozen other things I could mention in which they have the advantage of us. If we were so situated, and the dairy industry in this country had been established for hundreds of years, you would not hear very much talk about prohibiting oleo in Canada either.

Take New Zealand and Australia. While oleo is not prohibited in those dominions it is very little used, at least so I am informed by the members of my staff. New Zealand, on the other hand, has also a favoured climate and a comparatively short stabling season. It puts its butter right off the grass into British Columbia in competition with our winter made butter, and we have a hard struggle competing with it and yet we do not ask for a higher duty. And you tell me that that is protection? Why it makes one think one might as well have the game as the name. Still we are not asking for higher protection, I do not even think of suggesting it; but I do ask that we reconsider this question now after having tried it for several years merely as a war measure.

Now, we are asking for fair play and the restoration of the conditions that existed prior to 1917. The governments of both the old time parties were wedded to that system. The old Conservative government of 1886 brought the law in. The Liberal government of 1903 supplemented it by

further legislation against the renovation of dairy butter. In 1917 oleomargarine was admitted as a war measure and to-day we are talking about its prohibition entirely. I would go further, Mr. Speaker, and say that if dairying was developed all over Canada in the manner in which it is in the eastern provinces we might not say so much about oleomargarine; but in western Canada to-day the dairy industry is in exactly the same condition that prevailed down here forty or fifty years ago.

Let me address myself in a kindly way to the eastern provinces. All that we ask is the same kind of fair play that you enjoyed during all the years during which your industry was put on the map. I know something of farming conditions in eastern Ontario; I know what they were before the dairying industry was established. I took part in the establishment of it as a boy; and I know this much—it was dairying that put eastern Ontario on the map. I believe to a large extent it has done the same thing for Quebec— although there it is not the only factor—and for some of the maritime provinces. Dairying developed in Ontario when not only oleomargarine but renovated butter was prohibited. To-day there are four new provinces in the West. From the east you are sending us your banking institutions; and your lecturers who go out to the West tell us that we should not be farming exclusively along the lines of grain growing, that our land is becoming depleted of fertility. Then, when we think of taking your advice—and it is good advice although perhaps given a little prematurely, but still with good intent—and we start out into dairying, you come along and propose to hold back from us that measure of fair play that the dairy industry enjoyed in all these eastern provinces during past years. I know the hon. member for George Etienne Cartier (Mr. Jacobs) does not believe me. He comes from a city; but before I have finished my remarks, he will at all events see the other side of the question, however he may vote.

Mr. JACOBS: Is there in the world any country which prohibits the manufacture of oleomargarine?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Not that I am aware of. Is there in the world any country that professes to be a dairy country so disadvantageously situated as Canada is, with no market?

Mr. FIELDING: Such cold winters.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is the cold that makes one do one's best; a cold country makes the men in it. The reason why we have the men we have is because we have to fight against the natural advantages of other countries; but we do not want to be overburdened as we will if the sale of oleomargarine is to be continued.

Everybody knows the advantages which New Zealand possesses, and the Argentine is also becoming a competitor. All these countries have short feeding seasons in the winter and they all have water transportation. The Amazon and La Plata run into the heart of South America; they tap that country on all sides, and whether the product be wheat or cattle or butter, it can be transported by river and ocean to the various other countries of the world. Our chief competitors, Holland, Denmark, Ireland—another country on the water—New Zealand, Australia and the Argentine—you cannot mention one of them so disadvantageously situated as Canada, especially on the plains of the West. Look which way you will, to the West or to the East—to the West you have high freight rates that paralyze trade and to the East long freight hauls, and the West is working under more or less primitive conditions, just at the very period that it would expect to receive the succor and support that this legislation afforded to the East for such a long time in its pioneering stages.

It has been said that every country permits the sale of oleomargarine, and I have discussed that point. If you give this country an opportunity to get established for one-quarter of the time that other countries have been established, we shall then not ask for this small measure of support to the dairy industry in this cold country of ours. When anybody makes light of the cold or the long winter, let him feed stock and thus realize by experience the expense of feeding stock in the winter, and then let him make good butter under such conditions. We are overcoming that tremendous handicap, but we do not want any further handicaps imposed on the dairy industry.

The argument is advanced that vested interests are involved. I have not a thing to say against the packers; I know they are having a hard time of it at present, and if there were about half as many of them as there are now, there would be some business for them all. I have nothing but sympathy for them; but when they knew that this legislation was only to be temporary as a war measure, they should

not have invested any substantial amount of money in capital expenditure. I do not think they have spent very much money in the establishment of buildings. The plea is advanced that capital is locked up, and while I have no doubt that some capital has been invested in this way, I believe a great deal of it can be used as it was used prior to the manufacture of this article in 1917. Some people never miss an opportunity of having a crack at the packers, but I am not going to take that attitude at all. I take the opportunity of saying that possibly some of their places which are used at present for the manufacture of oleomargarine can be used instead for renovating our butter, thus creating an industry indigenous to the country. There is a home-made article that can be made into a better article of consumption than any oleomargarine I ever saw.

The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie), made a comparison between the convictions made under the Oleomargarine Act and those under the Dairy Products Act. The convictions for the manufacture of some kind of spurious butter, that is butter with too much water in it or something of that nature, numbered 126 and the violations in regard to oleomargarine numbered 14. But if you work that out on a percentage basis, the number of the violations in regard to oleomargarine, if you take the quantity of butter into consideration, was greater than the number of violations in regard to butter by 30 per cent, so that point is not well taken.

I have not said anything against oleomargarine as an article of consumption; I have said not one word against the sanitary conditions surrounding its manufacture. As a matter of fact, I do not think we can consistently take such an attitude. At one time we could; but as the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) said, a reasonably good article is being put on the market in packages plainly marked. There is a strict prohibition against putting it up otherwise, and it is inspected at every point. That is all well and good and all true; but nevertheless the information which I have received from the members of my staff in the Dairy branch goes to show that, while this is all performed religiously up to the mark, one-half of the oleomargarine that is purchased, is used, not to spread on bread, but for baking purposes, for which any of the other ingredients now on the market could be used. On the other hand, a considerable proportion of that which is used for spreading on bread is used in boarding houses. It is purchased just as it is described, legally enough; but colouring matter is procured at an adjoining druggist, and the oleomargarine is coloured to look like butter and is put on the table as butter. Thus a man thinks he is getting a cheap butter is paying just as much for it as if he were eating real butter. I asked Mr. Ruddick why a tab could not be kept on this, and he said: "We have not a sufficient appropriation to keep the necessary mass of inspectors who would be required to prevent this masquerading of oleomargarine as butter." Every respectable dairyman will tell you that. Notwithstanding all the precautions that have been taken,—and some speakers have said that if there were not enough restrictions more should be put on—there are some things that it is simply impossible to put sufficient restrictions on to prevent violation of the law, and this seems to be one of them. It is a simple proposition for any one to buy oleomargarine perfectly legally, and then to get colouring matter to mix with the oleomargarine, which is then put on the table as butter and not as oleomargarine at all. Of course, we cannot take too strong exception to oleomargarine on that ground, and I refer to it mainly because the ground has been taken that it is not used in a masquerading capacity for butter, but it is. That is not an unanswerable argument, because practically every law in the world is evaded more or less.

I might refer briefly to some of the reasons pro and con. The first legislation in regard to this matter was passed in 1886, and it is interesting to read the first act and to see what it amounted to. It reads:

> Whereas the use of certain substitutes for butter, heretofore manufactured and exposed for sale in Canada, is injurious to health; and it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture and sale thereof: Therefore, Her Majesty by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—
>
> 1. No oleomargarine, butterine or other substitute for butter, manufactured from any animal substance other than milk, shall be manufactured in Canada, or sold therein, and every person who contravenes the provisions of this Act in any manner whatsoever shall incur a penalty not exceeding four hundred dollars and not less than two hundred dollars, and in default of payment shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding twelve months and not less than three months.

That is the original law. While I do not think our present law is quite as severe as that, yet the main principle of it was observed up to 1917. Canada in spite of her disabilities has grown to be an outstanding dairy country which is prepared to compete, so far as the tariff is concerned, with any other dairy country in the world. And she has done that. I have a very interesting communication from Mrs. Elizabeth Shortt, President of the National Council of Women, resident in this city. I will not read the letter nor my reply, but she has been doing useful work, from her standpoint, in enlightening the public on the subject. Then there is a letter from Mr. James A. Calder —this is not the real Calder—manager of the Saskatchewan Creameries Company, Moosejaw.

An hon. MEMBER: Any relative of the "real" Calder?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No relative; this is a creamery man. This gentleman has one of the leading creameries in Saskatchewan, if indeed it is not the leading one, and he speaks strongly all through the letter with reference to the disabilities imposed on dairying in the West, at a time when hundreds of thousands of people are turning in hope to this industry as against exclusive grain growing. And now they are faced with this extra disability. When I go West after this session, as I hope to, and tell the people what we propose to do in connection with dairying, and inform them that it is our hope to do something in the way of encouraging silos, the growing of corn and sunflowers and the putting in of what are known as trench silos, that will look very good; and then some guy in the audience will say: "That's all very well, but do you expect me to compete against oleo"? I suppose I should have to reply: "Yes, unfortunately. I was opposed to it myself, but the House decided that we should encourage the manufacture and importation of oleo, and of course the Government had to take the responsibility for what was done." The man would say, naturally, that he had some hesitation about going into dairying. He might say that he came to this country to get away from chores night and morning and thought he could make some money growing wheat and also in taking up dairying. And he will add that the Government the people expected so much from had put this permanent disability on the industry—because it is no longer a war measure—so that the struggling dairymen were unable to get along. What can I say in reply to such a representation? I have no answer at all.

I have a resolution regarding filled milk. The gentleman who sends it sees a cloud on the horizon no bigger than the proverbial man's hand, in the shape of filled milk. He says that whereas an industry has developed in the United States for the manufacture of a substitute called "filled milk", whereas this and whereas that, therefore "don't you do it, because it will get you sooner or later". Those, of course, are not his words. I am paraphrasing his language. And there is a resolution passed by the National Dairy Council with regard to oleomargarine. I believe the member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) read that.

Now, for the first time to-day I heard a dairyman expressing himself in favour of the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, and that was the member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). Every single authority I have been able to get in connection with dairying has been opposed to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, and while there may be other dairymen like my hon. friend from Victoria city I have never heard them voice approval of this article.

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member for Victoria City does not make his living by dairying. He only tinkers at it.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I am a dairyman in a sense too.

Mr. NEILL: Perhaps only tinker too.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Well, while perhaps I may not be exactly a dairyman, I may say that in the pioneer days of the Northwest Territories I was kept out of the poorhouse by dairying, and it was home dairying too. Later on I was associated with the industry in an administrative way, and have been privileged to help start dairying in Saskatchewan. But if you are going to compel the industry to face this disability, while it may not be ruined thereby, you will greatly discourage the people in southern Saskatchewan and southern Alberta who are just trembling on the brink to-day. They do not exaggerate the hard-luck story, but there is no doubt about the fact that they are on the very brink of the precipice and it is questionable whether or not they can be placed in a position of safety again. Certainly,

they cannot be put on their feet by exclusive grain growing; that is too precarious. It must be by some form of live stock industry, and nothing will bring quicker revenue than dairying. With that hot country, capable of growing corn and sunflowers as fodder, and with the policy of the provincial governments of providing dairy cows, all that is needed is to create a desire on the part of the people to combine these circumstances to establish a life saving industry that will put them on the map again.

Mr. BRISTOL: Is it domestic oleomargarine manufactured in Canada, or the article manufactured in Chicago, that gives trouble to the dairy farmers of Saskatchewan?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Both. One is largely vegetable and the other animal fat. It really does not matter which kind is sold, but the imported article is more objectionable.

Mr. BRISTOL: It occurred to me that transportation on the imported article might affect the price in eastern Canada.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: You might put an embargo on imported oleo, but that would afford an element of protection to the man who made it at home. I thought of that alternative, but it only got me into difficulties.

Mr. LADNER: Does the minister suggest that the price of butter is affected by the use of oleomargarine manufactured in Canada?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: The consumption of butter is.

Mr. LADNER: I am asking about the price.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I shall answer the question in my own way. Dairying was the branch of agriculture that stood up the longest after the war, and for that reason people are going into the industry more than ever the world over. It is the one safe line of agriculture, and because of that we are going to have great difficulties not only in securing markets but in holding them. Consequently, anything that deprives the dairyman of the home market is a detriment to the industry; and to the extent that oleomargarine is used as a substitute for butter it will lessen the demand for the dairy product. I do not say how much it is likely to interfere with the price, but oleomargarine will certainly interfere with the market for butter. Every country is seeking markets, and that is the story in Canada. The situation is very acute, and at all dairy conventions in Canada since New Year's, it has been the same tale from East to West: We must hold what markets we have by improving the quality of our product, and at the same time endeavour to get new markets for disposing of it.

I will now refer to some of the arguments that have been advanced during the course of the debate. As I said at the outset, there are two sides to this question, and I am prepared to make a compromise proposition rather than insist on those who think as I do having our way, or those who think opposite having their way. I believe in a free-for-all such as this we are speaking our real heart's opinion, and if that be so, as I am sure it is, then if we can come to a compromise whereby the man or woman who wants cheap butter can get it without prejudicially affecting the youthful, incipient dairyman, then I think such a compromise would be a very commendable one. That is what I appeal for.

The hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie) spoke of the effect that either the manufacture or non-manufacture of oleo would have on beef cattle. From inquiries I have made I find that only 10 per cent of the tallow generated in our beef cattle goes into oleo. Of course, if oleo were freely manufactured it would gradually require a greater supply of tallow, but at the present stage the consumption of tallow does not amount to any appreciable volume.

Then the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) said that Canada is not justified in destroying one industry in order to build up another Now, Mr. Speaker, is it fair to say that the manufacture of oleomargarine is an industry when it was permitted to be established on grace and to meet a temporary condition only? The manufacturers were permitted to manufacture oleo to meet the scarcity of butter due to the heavy export demands during the war. They knew at the time that the manufacture had its limitations, and they deliberately engaged in it. The very fact that its importation and manufacture was extended for one year last session shows that the industry was always regarded as of a purely temporary character, and there can be no doubt that those who engaged in it recognized its limitations. Consequently

it cannot be said that we are destroying any industry. It was a catch piece of business for the occasion, and the manufacturers took their chances at the time they started to make oleomargarine, and they will have to take their chances if its importation and manufacture should be discontinued. But if those same manufacturers are permitted to manufacture renovated butter, part of their loss of business may be made up, and this renovated butter will make a very good substitute for oleomargarine. The hon. member took the stand: You have no right to interfere with me as to what I want to eat. Well, I have pointed out that if he takes that ground, it logically follows that we would not tolerate our right to interfere with him in what he drinks. If he insists upon perfect liberty in one direction he must naturally insist upon it in the other direction; the two go together.

The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Stewart) supports the resolution because, he says, it means protection to the dairy industry. That is an attitude I cannot agree with, and I have given my reasons. However, if all my hon. friends immediately opposite who do honestly believe in protection see protection in this proposal, why, we will welcome every one of their votes on this occasion.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Munro), who is something of a philosopher, said: The young men will not milk; the old ones cannot, as they are broken down. So when they die, what are we going to do? I suppose the answer again is: Eat oleo. But that is not sufficient. Undoubtedly the young men do dislike milking cows. We have so many attractions—we have our fine, inter-urban highways; we have our high-powered cars; we have our barrel of gasoline, and all we have to do is turn the tap and fill the tank of the car; we have a baseball match down the line; we have a nice road, and we have a nicer girl, if you like, across the way that the young man wants to take to the baseball match. How can the dull routine of dairy farming stand up against such a temptation, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McMASTER: Away with the girl!

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Away with the Ford!

Mr. MOTHERWELL: On top of all that you are going to let oleo have a chance. Is it any wonder that our dairymen are alarmed now? As my hon. friend said, the younger people do not want to milk cows—and there is not a man across the way who has raised a family but knows that. I do not know how we are going to change the tastes of our younger people. We have got to get back to hard work again, Mr. Speaker. We have got to recognize the virtues of honest toil faithfully performed even in milking cows. There is no question about that. My hon. friend says, let the hired man do it. There is about one in twenty hired men who will milk, that is all; the rest will tell you to milk the cows yourselves—they will tell you something else worse than that sometimes. Now, you have got to do it yourself or have some member of the family do it for you. With the young men refusing, and the old ones going out of business, we have got to the point where every little discouragement, no matter how slight, is sufficient to turn the tide against dairying in this crisis we are going through. Do not make any mistake now. I am not jesting about this. I know the hard, insistent, exacting work connected with dairying, and I know if you add one more discouragement it will be just enough in many instances to turn the tide against dairying.

The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) remarked that the introducer of the resolution might as well have left off the latter portion of his speech. I do not think so. If it can be established that dairying is going to be discouraged by the introduction of oleo, and you are going to strike at the chief cornerstone of our agricultural interest, then I say that all Canada is affected. There is no question about that. We can only plead for the dairy industry to the extent that it is interwoven with the general industry of the country.

Mr. BROWN: I think the hon. minister misunderstands my argument. What I suggested the introducer of the resolution might as well have left off was his argument that margarine was deleterious to the consumer.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: I do not know that he made that plea, Mr. Speaker, but it is the general public weal that we must take into account. In just the same way when my hon. friend of the party over the way at an angle of forty-five degrees, asked for a wheat board—and we hope we will get some kind of a wheat board, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Yes, that sounds better than dairying. Now, can any hon.

gentleman who advocates a wheat board turn down this proposition? After all, it all depends on whose ox is gored. We may as well all admit—with the exception of the hon. member for Victoria City—that we are selfish, and that we cannot help seeing any question but from our own particular viewpoint. But I see this question from the viewpoint of one who has been charged for the time being, Mr. Speaker, with the duty of administering the Department of Agriculture over this vast country, and I cannot for the life of me see this question from any other standpoint than that the introduction of oleo at this time is a discouragement to one of our basic industries, and if you discourage dairying—

Mr. IRVINE: Will the hon. minister support the wheat board on the same principle as he is supporting the prohibition of oleomargarine?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: No, the illustrations are not parallel. They are along the same lines, but not exactly the same.

Mr. IRVINE: The hon. minister makes them parallel by saying that if the people sitting at an angle of 45 degrees opposite advocated a wheat board they ought to advocate this on the same basis. The application to the minister's argument, therefore is evident.

Mr. MOTHERWELL: It is rarely that you can get exact parallels in this world. This is not a parallel, any more than the Japanese question is a parellel. The one deals with cows, the other with men; in the case of my hon. friend it is the Wheat Board. But in the case of the Wheat Board my hon. friends are asking for something of especial interest to themselves. If a thing is in the public interest; if the interest of an industry is locked up with the public interest, then it is good business to advocate it, and that is what I am endeavouring to do in connection with the dairying industry. An hon. member has put this note in my hand:

> Oleo lessens the number of cows raised and therefore starves the soil and hurts mixed farming in general.

That is true. In the older countries of the world the people are so much concerned about the fertility of the soil that they do not use mechanical power on the land because it is non-productive of fertilizer. I had the pleasure of visiting Europe eleven or twelve years ago, and I asked the older farmers there why they did not make more use of mechanical power. They use all

kinds of animal power, even to native oxen from the Carpathian mountains, proceeding on the principle that every hoof of live stock which can be obtained and maintained should be kept on the farm. So it is with the dairying industry; every additional hoof kept on the farm results in increased fertility of the soil. I know that may not appeal to western men; the question does not affect us there as yet. In fact, our difficulty is to get our manure piles taken from the barnyard with the least possible expense, though in the older sections the fertilizer is being used on the land as it should be. But the amount of live stock in the older parts of the country will determine to what extent the fertility of the soil will be maintained and increased.

Some hon. members have had the advantage of discussing this matter in the House on several different occasions. More than half the members of this Parliament are new members—I am one of them—and to those new members the subject is not a worn out one as it may be to hon. gentlemen who have been here for some time. There is an honest difference of opinion on this question. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that if we apply the brakes at all we should start with renovated butter? I am prepared to advocate the removal of the restriction in that regard, which would result in the liberation for sale in our own market, at approximately the same price as oleo,—of 1,000,000 pounds of real butter which is 100 per cent fat and has 100 per cent food content.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House deals with oleomargarine, not with manufactured butter, and I propose to confine my attention to the resolution.

Once upon a time there was in this House a Liberal member who was a strong free-trader, representing an agricultural constituency. One day somebody suggested by resolution that encouragement should be given to the raising of hogs. My friend, the Liberal member, strongly supported the resolution, and after that he became known as the man who was a free-trader in everything except in pork. I am afraid that my good friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has disclosed himself to be a free-trader in everything except in butter. In most matters, especially those relating to agriculture, I defer to the views of my friend and colleague the Minister of Agriculture, for I

know he is master of the subject, while I know but little about it. If I thought that the question at issue was that of the dairying industry I should not speak at all. But I do not think that is the question. I am obliged to follow in this matter not the leadership of my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, but the leadership of the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie), who, I say, made a speech to-day which, in my judgment, has not been and cannot be answered. If I thought the people of Canada for the most part were fools; if I thought they were lacking in intelligence; if I thought they were incapable of judging for themselves of what they wanted and where they should get it; if I thought they needed that tender guardianship which we provide for children and Indians and lunatics—why, in that case I would vote for the resolution; because this resolution simply says that the people of Canada are not to be trusted to decide for themselves whether or not they will buy a commodity which the whole world accepts.

Canada is the only country in the world, so far as I know—the only country claiming to be civilized—which does not allow the use of oleomargarine. Just when we began to forbid it, I do not know. When I came into the government more than a quarter of a century ago there was no question about oleomargarine. It was on the prohibited list and there it remained until quite recently, during the war. In all that time nobody ever thought anything about oleomargarine, because so long as good butter could be obtained at a reasonable price, nobody wanted oleomargarine. And that is the condition to-day; the people of Canada will not buy oleomargarine so long as they can get
10 p.m. butter at a fair price. If there has been a development of the oleomargarine business it simply has been because a very considerable percentage of our pepole have not had the means to buy butter and they have bought oleomargarine rather than not have anything at all.

Now, why in the world should Canada set itself up as a judge against the rest of the world? You are all familiar with the old story of the juryman who held out against all the others and who said afterwards that he had never met eleven such stupid men in his life as those fellows who sat on that jury with him. So it is that we are setting ourselves up against the civilized world if we adopt this resolution.

The only question here is this: Is this a commodity which can properly be dealt with; is it wholesome and safe and clean? The Minister of Agriculture says: "If you are going to admit the right on the part of the people to eat oleomargarine, you must logically admit their right to drink whiskey." But if my hon. friend had had a good case he would not have used that argument, because there is all the difference in the world. I think my hon. friend is one of those who regard whiskey not only as unwholesome, but as a poison. At all events, according to him, the great majority of the people condemn whiskey because it is unwholesome, because it is wicked to drink it, because it is damaging, morally, physically and every other way. Will my hon. friend say the same of oleomargarine? If he cannot do so, then where is the analogy? It goes to pieces.

Then, my hon. friend says that the hon. ex-Minister of Agriculture is the first dairyman he has met who has opposed the object aimed at by this resolution and has favoured the admission of oleomargarine. The minister says that all the dairymen of the country are asking for it. Well, if you call a dairyman's convention and ask their opinion on this matter, of course they will say, "Shut out oleomargarine." If you move a resolution to increase the duty on butter, they will probably vote for that too. Does my hon. friend ever read the reports of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in which that body advocates high tariff? Does my hon. friend regard that as conclusive evidence that they ought to get it? It is just as good evidence as he adduces to-day when he says the dairymen's association passed resolutions in favour of prohibiting the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine.

Do not forget that this is a commodity which the whole world uses. It is not a poison; it is not unwholesome. Perhaps in the early days of oleomargarine it was a cheap and nasty production, and there may have been good reason for putting it on the prohibited list. But to-day the conditions are different. My hon. friend himself admits that oleomargarine is manufactured under severe restriction and inspection which guarantees its cleanliness and its production under sanitary conditions. It is a good thing in its way. It is not as good as butter; we do not pretend it is, but it is not unwholesome. If it is a wholesome commodity, if the wide world treats it as an article in which you can

trade, in the name of heaven why shall we in Canada say we cannot trust our people to know whether or not they want oleomargarine?

I do not think there is a sound argument used from beginning to end against oleomargarine. I deny that there is competition between butter and oleomargarine. They are two distinct products, and if you provide that the oleomargarine shall be distinctly marked and labelled—and the ex-Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Tolmie) showed us a sample to-day plainly marked, plainly labelled—there is no chance in the world of any one being imposed upon by getting oleomargarine in the shape of butter, unless he is very dull and wants to be imposed upon. Every shop that sells oleomargarine has to sell it labelled as such.

Oleomargarine is used by the poorer people of this country to-day. It is nonsense for my hon. friend to talk of giving them cheaper butter. We do not want cheaper butter. We want the dairyman to get a good price for their butter but inasmuch as it is a fact that many of the poorer people in this country cannot buy butter even at its moderate price to-day, surely we are not going to deny them, especially those in the cities and towns, the right to get a substitute so long as it is sold under its proper name; and in that case it cannot be a competitor with butter. I insist that they are two distinct products, and there is no real competition between them at all.

There were many points raised by my hon. friend that I should like to speak to but I shall not enlarge upon them to-night. The whole question is this: Here is a commodity that is traded in by every country in the world except Canada. Surely there is no reason why it should not be traded in in this country, unless our people are lacking in the intelligence that we believe they possess. It is because I believe they are intelligent, because I believe they are able to know what they want and able to make a distinction, because I believe they are not going to be so easily fooled and humbugged into having oleomargarine palmed off on them as butter, that I am going to oppose the motion made by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill).

I was surprised to get a certain piece of information from the Minister of Agriculture to-night. I have always understood that Canada was a dairying country. I have been down in the eastern townships of Quebec and have heard eloquent speakers declare that there was no finer agricultural, grazing, or dairying country in the wide world than those eastern townships of the province of Quebec, but to-night I learn from my hon. friend that that is a mistake. It is a country in which the dairying interests are in such a perilous position that at any moment they may be destroyed by the butter which is being brought up from the Argentine. I have a better opinion of Canada as a dairying country than my hon. friend, but I do not want to argue that question. I simply say that oleomargarine, whatever it may have been in the old days, is now an article of commerce which every other civilized country in the world recognizes as such, and I can see no earthly reason why the Canadian citizen shall be told, in effect, that he is not intelligent enough to distinguish between oleomargarine and butter when he goes to the grocery shop.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (South Oxford): The question of the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine first came up during the early days of the Union government. Previous to that time, we did not have oleomargarine in Canada, and there was a distinct pledge given at that time, when it was admitted owing to war conditions, that when the war terminated and those conditions passed, the act would cease to exist. Since that time, however, it has been extended from year to year, and some have been advocating that it should be made permanent. Among those I believe was the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I think his criticism of last year and of two years ago was that the act should not be simply extended for a year, but be made permanent.

I listened with a good deal of interest when I came into the House to-night to the address of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell). I was somewhat in doubt as to just what policy the Government were going to pursue on this question, for they have undoubtedly discussed it, and as I listened to the eloquence with which the Minister of Agriculture dealt with the question I wondered if he was going to live up to the reputation he has been establishing during the last few weeks in Parliament and in the country. After listening to the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government to-night (Mr. Fielding) who, I would imagine, has given us the policy of the Government on this question, I can picture in my mind the Minister of Agriculture turning another sharp cor-

ner just about as quickly as he has turned some others during the past few days.

I do not think that the fate of agriculture or of the dairying industry depends to any great extent upon how this question is determined. We have heard the Minister of Finance refer to oleomargarine as a wholesome article of food, and point out that no one has shown it to be anything else. It is somewhat singular that although we now have a Department of Health connected with the Government, there is not a member of the Government, nor was there of the late government, who could inform this House just what constitutes oleomargarine—not one. I have asked the question repeatedly, and I have been unable to find any one who was able to give us that information. "Oh," they say, "it is manufactured under strict supervision in the abattoirs in this country, and there are a number of veterinary inspectors who are looking after this matter." But what about our Department of Health? Why are they not looking into this article of food for human consumption?

The plea has been made repeatedly in favour of oleomargarine on behalf of the children of the poor in this country. Mr. Speaker, it is on behalf of the children of the poor in this country that I am arguing here to-night against allowing oleomargarine to be imported and disposed of in this country as it has been in the past few years. It is surprising how many people you find who like to get something for nothing. Milk fat differs from all other fats in that it contains certain life-giving substances that are essential for promoting the growth of the young. It appears that an all-wise Creator has placed this substance in the milk fat of all animals, and that it is not to be found anywhere else. Yet some clever people, realizing that this is a food product absolutely essential in promoting the growth of the young, have got the idea that if they can only get some cheaper commodity and be able to dispose of it under the plea that it is a wholesome food and will take the place of butter, they are going to make a whole lot of money out of it. That is about the size and substance of the arguments in favour of oleomargarine.

The Minister of Finance says that every country in the world except Canada permits the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I say there is no country in the world that gives these people the same privileges and freedom with regard to the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine that they have in Canada—not one. In France they will not even permit it to be sold at the same shops with dairy products. Yet in this country you find this stuff advertised in all the market reports in the dairy column. Why should that be the case? If it is not a dairy product, why should it be advertised as a dairy product in this country? They say they are going to sell oleomargarine on its merits. Then why should they be so anxious to put it up in pound prints of exactly the same size and shape as butter, and make it look like butter, and churn it in milk to give it a butter flavour? It is also mixed with butter, not only two per cent of butter, but in some cases as high as thirty-three per cent. Why should that be the case if this is a wholesome food? It is because they know it adds to the value of the article. I have spoken consistently against oleomargarine ever since it was permitted to be imported and sold in this country. It was one of the first-born children of the late Minister of Agriculture, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). He has upheld the manufacture of oleo in this country; he was responsible for the enactment of regulations such as they have in no other country where this stuff is used. I will quote from these regulations and then ask you whether you think the dairyman has a grievance or not. Here is one example:

> No person other than a manufacturer of oleomargarine shall mix oleomargarine and butter.

Why should the packing houses have a special right to mix oleomargarine and butter in this country? The regulations further say:

> Oleomargarine shall not be manufactured in Canada in any premises used as, or connected with, a butter factory.

Now the butter manufacturer is subjected to the most stringent regulations not only by the municipal and provincial authorities, but by the federal government, in order to ensure the wholesomeness and the purity of his product and to standardize it. Notwithstanding that, the federal government grants a license to some of these packing companies, who manage to get their ear, permitting them to use highly coloured June butter—as was admitted in sworn testimony given before a committee of this House—to colour the tallow and oil and make it look more like butter. Because we have it on the strength of the sworn evidence of the manager of the Harris

Abattoir in Toronto that unless that was done the stuff would taste like tallow and the people would not buy it. Consequently these packing houses buy highly coloured June butter in order to mix with their product. The privilege was granted as a war measure and there was no complaint heard from the farmers of this country. An Order in Council was passed, under the War Measures Act, commandeering all the butter that was being manufactured in the creameries of this country from September 1, 1918, down to a certain time. Now there were twenty-five million pounds of butter in the cold storage warehouses in Canada at that time and in the hands of the oleomargarine manufacturers there were 3,622,830 pounds. The butter that was being turned out by the dairymen of Canada was commandeered, but the oleomargarine manufacturers and wholesale dealers were left in charge of their supplies.

These are some of the things I have objected to in the past; and when the hon. member for Marquette was Minister of Agriculture I directed his attention to a number of the injustices which I considered the dairymen of this country were suffering.

I have endeavoured to be consistent in this matter although I have had to criticise those with whom I was associated politically, and I intend to be consistent whether what I advocate agrees with the policy of my associates or not. Nor am I taking the stand I do because the county from which I come is interested in this matter to any great extent, because the great majority of the farmers there are purchasing their butter instead of manufacturing it, although the county is one of the most noted dairy sections in the whole Dominion. I ask hon. members whether they consider it is a good thing that an old established industry, like the dairy industry, should be jeopardized to the extent that butter making has often been in the past by reason of legislation enacted by this Parliament. For it must be remembered that the future of western Canada, as well as the East, as the Minister of Agriculture has pointed out, depends wholly upon the live stock industry. We have induced thousands of returned men to settle upon farms; yet in the fact of that certain hon. members would pass legislation to deprive these men of their means of livelihood; because that is exactly what it means.

I did not hear the arguments which were advanced early in the afternoon with reference to this matter. But I have heard some of the reasons advanced by the manufacturers of oleomargarine for continuing this policy, such as are contained in the circulars which have been diligently sent out by them. They claim to be using Canadian products for the manufacture of oleomargarine, when the fact is they are importing most of their stuff and paying practically no duty on it at all. Let me give you some idea of the quantities brought in for eleven months of the past year; they were all the figures I could obtain at the time I received this information: Lard compound, 335,161 pounds; oleo oils imported —and the manufacturers say " Oh but look at the splendid market afforded here for the oleo oils from our beef cattle"—1,731,005 pounds; cotton seed oil 348,583 pounds; cocoanut oil 219,132 pounds; peanut oil 125,889 pounds; butter oil—I do not know what that is; I believe it must be something of the kind that the Minister of Agriculture calls renovated butter—823,558 pounds; salt 279,634 pounds; the total of all commodities imported was 3,862,962 pounds.

These went to make up the oleomargarine which was manufactured in this country during eleven months of the past year. A slight duty was paid but 99 per cent of such duty paid during the past year has been returned to the manufacturers. The amount of such drawback allowed to the two manufacturers interested was $388,345.53. The Canadian oleomargarine manufacturers enlarge on the market their industry creates for beef fats, and other articles of the kind, in this country; but when they make such importations, as I have shown from the United States, it puts a different complexion on the matter. Their claim is not well founded. It is a deliberate attempt to introduce a system into Canada that is not in the interest of agriculture because it concedes to these people privileges that those who are engaged in agriculture do not possess.

Furthermore, these manufacturers import articles upon which there is practically no duty. There is a duty of three cents a pound on butter under the British preference and a duty of four cents a pound on butter imported from other countries. During eleven months of the past year we imported butter to the amount of 5,805,422 pounds. Of this quantity 2,036,471 pounds came from the United Kingdom under the British preference. These imports had an advantage over the butter that

came in from the United States of one cent per pound. From Australia we imported 287,724 pounds; from New Zealand 2,148,752 pounds; and from the United States 1,332,210 pounds. These are some of the things that are happening right in our own country. We are appointing trade agents, and doing everything possible to find markets for the products of this country; and yet instead of endeavouring to build up and stimulate some of the industries that are natural to, but are lagging in, Canada we are working vigorously in the opposite direction.

I am not going into these questions in detail to-night because hon. members who were in the last, and the previous parliaments, know what my views are in these respects. I must say, however, I am more than surprised that at this late date, after the extent to which this stuff has been coming into Canada, with all the facilities we have, our Health Departments are not able to give us any information as to the food value of this article. No one will contend that it can take the place of butter or butter fats, notwithstanding the agitation which is being put on foot and which had its origin in this city of Ottawa about the time that the war was very bad; when conditions apparently justified something being done along that line fats were permitted to be utilized in this way while we had not a sufficient supply of butter. I might read some of the resolutions which have been passed by some associations in this city, although that is something which I do not like to do. I know, however, that the activities which have been shown during the past few months by certain associations throughout this country, have had their origin in this city amongst those who are not so vitally interested in agriculture as many other people in this country are. In 1919, resolutions were passed in this city, and the members of these associations endeavoured to get into touch with the various branches of these associations throughout the country so as to have them write to their member and to the Government advocating that the sale of this stuff should be legalized permanently. Let me read one resolution which was passed in Ottawa. This is taken from the Ottawa Citizen of April 14, 1919:

> It was moved by Mrs. Adam Shortt and seconded by Lady Pope,
>
> That whereas fat is an essential food for human beings, and that children deprived of it suffer not only from malnutrition in the present, but are permanently injured in physique; and whereas, there is not enough butter in the country to supply everybody if margarine were banished; and whereas, butter is so high a price that thousands cannot have butter, because of the cost; and whereas, margarine is a butter substitute of equal caloric value with butter; and whereas, margarine has been allowed in the country under the War Measures Act, which comes to an end with the signing of peace;
>
> Therefore, be it resolved that we women of Ottawa do now appeal to this federal Government now considering child welfare, to permanently legalize margarine in Canada, in order that children may thrive and not decline and that consumers be not deprived of their legitimate right, as in other countries, to have margarine for domestic use.

And so on including arguments which have been advanced in support of oleomargarine.

Is it a wholesome article of food for children? I have in my hand some evidence to the contrary, not furnished by dairymen's associations or any one interested in dairying. Probably this has been referred to by some previous speaker, and, consequently, if I am repeating something which has been said before, it goes only to strengthen previous arguments. This reads:

> When oleomargarine was admitted to Canada as a "war measure" (and subsequently continued as packer's and produce dealer's measure) the children of Canada were betrayed to an insidious, relentless enemy. Chief among those betrayed were the children of the lower strata, where money to buy genuine butter, might be as scarce as the inclination to spend the extra cent or two a pound for it.
>
> There is plenty of evidence to show how insidious is the enmity of oleomargarine to childhood—how it imperceptibly stunts the growth of the child, and prevents its development, at the same time apparently providing a satisfactory and necessary food element.
>
> The eye is deceived, but not the body. The profits accrue to the packer-manufacturers and the distributors, but a toll of under-nourishment is taken from the children who eat it, in order that these selfish profits might be made.
>
> The city of Rochester recently had a noteworthy experience in connection with the use of butter and oleomargarine in an orphan asylum.
>
> In this asylum the practice has been followed for years of weighing every child at regular intervals. Because of the high prices of butter, the management substituted oleomargarine on January 1, 1917, and supplied it to the children for six months. At the end of this time, results were so unsatisfactory that butter was replaced in the ration. Here are the weights of seven children over four periods of six months each:
>
> The first six months, while butter was fed, these seven children gained 23.75 lbs.
>
> For the next six months, while butter was still being fed, the seven children gained 44.25 lbs.
>
> For the next six months these children were fed oleomargarine in place of butter, the diet being otherwise the same. The result was a loss of 9.5 lbs.

In the next periods, butter was again replaced, with the result that, in the following six months, the children made a gain of 56.87 lbs.

This official report from the city of Rochester is one of the strongest indictments of oleomargarine we have ever seen and it comes, not from the dairy interests, but from a city organization. The class that would stand to gain most from the suppression of oleomargarine would be the growing children.

It is on behalf of the growing children and the working people of this country, the people who are putting their good money into this spurious article, that I am speaking to-night, and not on behalf of the dairymen, because, as time goes on these people will realize that this commodity cannot take the place of butter and people of good judgment and sense will see that their children are supplied with the genuine article. In the meantime, however, is it the duty of the Government to permit this stuff to continue to be sold and not to have it inspected? I would have thought one of the first steps that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) would have taken would have been to see that the medical authorities of the Department of Health made a proper analysis of it, so that he might have been in a position to-night to inform this House as to the true food value of this commodity. This has not been done, and, consequently, we do not know even yet what the food value of this article is.

I opposed it in the past because of the regulations which were enacted giving these people the freedom which they have. What right have they to purchase butter which has been manufactured under the strict regulations to which I have referred, to take it into a packing house and to mix it up with cottonseed oil and other vegetable fats, to churn it with milk, to go to all these pains in order to deceive the consumer and to sell it under butter's trademark, because that is what they are doing when they put it up in a package in imitation of butter? Although the wrapper may indicate that the content is oleomargarine, when it is stripped off the wrapper, when it is cut up into blocks and put on the tables of boarding houses throughout Canada, how are you going to detect it? It is said that you canot detect it from butter; that it is wholesome. It may be wholesome, but we do not know how wholesome it is. It is possible a grown up person would not feel the injurious effects of it; but as regards the young and growing child, never yet has anything been discovered that can take the place of the qualities that milk fat contains. People may attempt to imitate, and they may eventually discover something that will take the place of butter; but so far nothing has been discovered that can take the place of milk fat. Consequently you will find that some people will be anxious to put some spurious article on the market, and I contend that the poor of this country, because it is the poor and not the wealthy people who are buying this stuff, have suffered more as the result of this policy and will continue to suffer more than any one else.

No doubt other hon. members desire to speak on this, and I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the House; but I want to re-emphasize the fact that dairying is not such a profitable industry as some people would like us to believe. In Ontario, dairying has been established for many years; in fact, the first cheese factory established in the Dominion of Canada was established in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. Cheese manufacturing had its headquarters there for many years, and the town which is my home town is possibly better known in the Old Land as a result of the exportation of cheese and dairy products than any other town in the Dominion. I refer to the town of Ingersoll. The late Edwin Caswell, of Ingersoll, was one of the first exporters of cheese in this country.

During the last few years a census has been taken of the farms in the county of Oxford and also of the farms in the county of York by the provincial government with a view to establishing the actual cost of dairy products in this country, and I am going to point out very briefly the result of that census. In the county of Oxford, it was shown that the cost of producing 100 pounds of milk was $2.94, and in the county of York, it was $3.32. The price received in Oxford was $2.81 and in the county of York $2.85; or, taking everything into consideration, there was a loss of 13 cents per 100 pounds in Oxford and 40 cents per 100 pounds in York. These figures were obtained after careful investigation of upwards of 100 farms in each of these counties, an endeavour having been made to find out, by as minute an analysis as possible, what the actual cost of production was and what they were receiving in return. Now, these are some of the things that the dairymen of this country have through experience very well fixed in their minds, and when associations that have nothing to do with agriculture or dairying pass resolutions such as have been passed in this city and elsewhere, beseeching the

Government to see that this article that is manufactured by farmers is allowed to be incorporated with the cheap commodities imported duty free and turned out by these manufacturers and placed on the markets of the country, it is apparent that their chief plea is a fraud from beginning to end and should not be countenanced by any government. So long as I am engaged in any industry I shall feel that I am entitled to the same consideration that is accorded every other industry; and anyone who advocates the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine as at present permitted undoubtedly shows a contempt for dairying and agriculture generally.

I do not think that this commodity should be allowed to be sold in Canada; but certainly if you permit the sale of oleomargarine here the imported article and the commodities which go to make it up should be subject to a customs tariff just the same as other things that are imported. Furthermore, it should be manufactured and placed on the market on its merits. No attempt should be made to deceive the public by mixing it with butter and churning it in milk. I believe there are vegetable oils in the oleomargarine sold in England, which is entirely different from the commodity that is placed on the markets in this country. In some countries they do not allow oleomargarine to be put up in quantities of less than 10 pounds, whereas in Canada we allow them to put it on the market in pound prints identical in shape with dairy products.

Now, I have referred to a few of the objections I have to the continuance of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine. I heartily support the resolution, and I trust that the sale of this article in Canada will be prohibited. If, however, the Government do decide to permit its manufacture and importation, they should impose a tariff upon it like anything else, because it should not receive special privileges over an old-established industry like the butter industry. The fact that oleomargarine may have 25 or 30 per cent, of butter fat incorporated in it, and 15 per cent of milk, is no reason why it should be allowed to compete with genuine butter.

Let us do something at least to show that we are in sympathy with those men who are labouring under great difficulties at the present time;—I refer to the returned soldiers who have gone on the land. Many of these men, with the limited experience they had, have been tempted to go into dairying and the live stock industry. And the country depends more on the butter industry than upon anything else. It is only by the manufacture of butter that we can hope to establish a successful live-stock industry in Canada. I heard an hon. member the other night—I think it was my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Millar) —bemoaning in very doleful tones the condition of the farmers in western Canada. He pointed out that the land was becoming impoverished and was producing six bushels per acre less than a few years ago. Well, what can you expect? We listened to the provincial Minister of Agriculture from Saskatchewan, Hon. Mr. Hamilton, the other day, before the committee on agriculture, endeavouring to prove the contention that we should have a wheat board in this country by the fact that the income of the average farmer in the province of Saskatchewan from a 320 acre farm was, I think, about $1,200 less than his expenses. To my amazement, the only two things the farmer had to sell were wheat and oats. It struck me that such a man was not much of a farmer. Any one can go to Saskatchewan and on fertile land grow wheat and oats as long as the land retains its fertility. But there comes a day when it will not be so responsive, and the only method of keeping the soil fertile is by going into the live-stock industry in conjunction with other farming. This has been demonstrated time and again, not only in Canada, but throughout the world. People need not think that they can go on taking from the land forever without putting something back, without exhausting its fertility. This is the chief cause of the trouble to-day. In many of the old provinces much of the land has become impoverished and it is no small task to bring it back to a state where good crops can be grown. I think it will be one of the greatest misfortunes this country has ever experienced if we follow the course advocated and pursued in the past and put all our lands under cultivation, neglecting live stock and dairying. We should develop this industry in conjunction with the cultivation of the soil. To-day it is imperative that we should establish the dairy industry on a sound basis, and we cannot hope to do so if we allow and handicaps to operate it. I therefore support the resolution.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): The subject matter of the resolution under consideration by the House this afternoon and evening is not by any means a new one.

Indeed, it is a hardy annual that has appeared every session since I came to the House five years ago; and I agree entirely with the view expressed by the member for South Waterloo (Mr. Euler) this afternoon when he said that he hoped we should be able on the present occasion to make a final disposition of it. I have a particular interest in this matter, Sir, because of the fact that the first job I had after I became Minister of Agriculture in 1917 was to draft the regulations—assisted, of course, by expert men in the department—covering the sale and manufacture in, and the importation into Canada, of oleomargarine. These regulations were passed at that time under the War Measures Act for the reasons stated by my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) this afternoon. In 1918 another Order in Council was passed extending the regulations and in some respects making them rather more stringent than before. In the autumn session of 1919, when the power of the government to act under the War Measures Act had lapsed, parliament passed legislation extending the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine for another year; in 1920 parliament considered the matter further and again extended the period for another year; the same thing happened the following year, and now in this session we are once more considering whether or not this legislation shall pass out of existence or be continued.

I am opposed to the motion of my hon. friend from Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), and I am opposed to it for the very reason that my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) supports it. I believe I have stated before in this House that the gentlemen who believe in the principle of protection in fiscal policy could consistently believe in protection to the dairy industry in this way. I do not believe in the fiscal policy of protection, I do not believe in protection at all for that matter in trade, and consequently I am opposed to the resolution.

I agree entirely with my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), in his observations on the contribution to the discussion made by the hon. member from Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). I submit, too, that his arguments have not been answered, and that they alone constitute sufficient reasons for this House to continue the legislation in question.

The argument of the protectionists in matters of fiscal policy is that it is necessary to build up your home industry. Our

[Mr. Crerar.]

friends who argue against the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine take exactly the same position. I am at one with the remarks made by my hon. friend from North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) this afternoon when he described this motion as embodying the most vicious kind of protection. And it is the most vicious kind of protection, for the reason that it not only prevents the importation of a necessary and useful article of food but it entirely prohibits its manufacture at home. If protection can go any further than that, I am at a loss to understand how it can be accomplished.

Now, frankly, I was astonished—astonished, Mr. Speaker, is a mild word for me to use—at the speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture this evening. Why, Sir, I can throw my mind back over a number of years and recall with what eagerness I used to listen to him when he preached the sound gospel of freedom and of liberty in matters of trade, and I was amazed, indeed, I was grieved to see him haul down the flag of liberty by the most specious pleading that could be indulged in and ask for protection of the grossest form for the dairy industry. My hon. friend must surely have fallen into bad company. I hope it is only a temporary lapse, Mr. Speaker, and that he will in due time return to the true faith, which he understands as well as any man in this House.

When we come to a consideration of the merits of this question, what do we find? It has not been successfully argued, nor can it be successfully argued in this House or out of it, that oleomargarine is not a wholesome food. The whole weight of evidence shows it is a wholesome food. It is made from animal fats, excellent foods in themselves, blended with vegetable oils that are also excellent foods in themselves, and no evidence of a reliable character has been adduced to show that oleomargarine is not a suitable and valuable food product. Now, if it is a food product of value, and if it can be secured a little cheaper than the higher grades of butter, why should any one in this House or out of it seek to deprive the people of a wholesome food by absolutely prohibiting the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine? That argument cannot be successfully controverted, except as my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture tried to do this evening by the most specious pleading that could possibly be attempted.

If we take the history of this article throughout the whole civilized world we find there is not a country to-day but is using it—that permits its manufacture and sale. Now, I am convinced that if the various civilized countries are doing this, it is because oleomargarine has a food value. I have no belief in the arguments advanced that its continued importation and manufacture will destroy our dairy industry. It cannot destroy that industry. Reference was made this evening to Denmark's position in regard to oleomargarine. What was her position? It was not, as my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, stated, that Denmark has for hundreds of years been engaged in the dairy industry. If he will study the history of Denmark he will find that sixty, seventy or eighty years ago there was no peasantry in Europe more impoverished than that of Denmark, and that there was no country in Europe more backward in agriculture than Denmark.

Mr. WARNER: Has it been oleomargarine or butter that has helped Denmark?

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend from Strathcona had waited for a moment I would have satisfied his eager curiosity in that respect. Denmark built up her agriculture largely on her dairy industry. It is common knowledge that the average Danish farm is about ten acres in extent. Nowhere in the world has agriculture been carried on so intensively as in Denmark. They built up a splendid dairy industry. But if my memory serves me right, for the last thirty or thirty-five years Denmark has permitted the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine, and yet her dairy industry, now the finest in the world, has been built up alongside the competition of oleomargarine.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Do you know of a country outside of Canada where dairy products are permitted to be mixed with the other constituents of oleomargarine? It is not allowed in Denmark.

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that that is not relevant to the particular question we are discussing. I will deal in a moment or two with the point raised by my hon. friend from South Oxford. That is the position that has been taken by Denmark in regard to the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine. There is not a country in the world, I repeat, that has not permitted its manufacture and importation.

There is one other question: Has the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine injured our dairy industry? My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture knows that as far as the exportable dairy products of Canada are concerned they have been mainly in the form of cheese. Prior to the war Canada exported annually 180,000,000 to 200,000,000 pounds of cheese, which found its main market in Great Britain. The cheese industry was developed in Ontario and in the neighbouring province of Quebec rather than the butter industry, and it is only in comparatively recent years that the latter industry has been developed in this country. But has it withered and failed under the competition of oleomargarine? Not according to the trade figures, because I find that in the last four years the butter exports of Canada have been well up to the mark. In 1917 we exported almost 8,000,000 pounds of butter; in 1918, almost 5,000,000 pounds; in 1919, 13,500,000 pounds; in 1920, 17,500,000 pounds, and during those years we have been using oleomargarine.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would the hon. gentleman give us the exports for 1921?

Mr. CRERAR: I do not know that I have those here.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: About 9,000,000 pounds.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, it goes up and down.

Mr. CARROLL: Perhaps my hon. friend would give us the imports of butter into Canada.

Mr. CRERAR: I have not those figures, but I have the imports of oleomargarine. In 1918, they were 2,262,000 pounds; in 1919, 4,000,000 pounds; in 1920, when we had a big export in butter, a little over 6,000,000 pounds.

There is one other point which I would like to bring to the attention of my hon. friends who support the motion of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni—and I would like the Minister of Agriculture to give some thought to this aspect of the question. If Canada is going to develop a dairy industry, it cannot be developed on the home market alone. No industry in Canada can be developed soundly if it is dependent only upon the home market, and that is one of the reasons, Sir, why

I do not believe in protective tariffs. If, then, we are to build up our dairy industry, we must build up our exports of butter in the face of oleomargarine competition in every country in the world. Do my hon. friends who believe that the Canadian dairymen and butter producers must be protected against oleomargarine competition at home forget that they must face that competition when they get into the outside markets of the world? The whole thing is illogical, absolutely illogical and inconsistent.

I am as great a believer as any one in the possibilities of the development of the dairy industry in Canada. Our country is splendidly located in that respect. It is only a matter of time, and not a very long time, either, when our neighbours to the south of us, the great American Republic, will come to Canada for their foodstuffs in increasing measure. I have mentioned it to the House before, but it is a fact worth recalling again, that more than two-thirds of the 106,000,000 people that constitute the United States proper live in incorporated towns and cities, and no part of Canada is better situated to supply the densely populated portion of the United States with dairy products than Ontario and Quebec. As that population grows, as the United States becomes a food-importing country, you will have in that country the greatest and broadest possible market for the dairy products of these provinces. If that market is not sufficient, we are only a few thousand miles from Great Britain, perhaps the greatest single consumer of imported dairy products in the world.

If my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture and the Government desire to develop this industry, I submit it cannot best be done by preventing the sale and manufacture of a useful food product that can be supplied to some of the people of Canada at a lower price than butter. But they can best do it by promoting sane methods of marketing our agricultural products, and by assisting in the development of refrigerator services in the shipment of those products to the markets of the world. These are means by which the Government can legitimately assist the development of an industry of this kind. The waste that goes on through short-sighted methods of marketing, the loss that occurs through deterioration in quality, particularly of such perishable commodities as butter and cheese, can scarcely be estimated. It was for that reason that when I was in the Government a few years ago I urged my colleagues to undertake the erection of an up-to-date cold storage warehouse in Montreal in order that there might be provided at that great port the means whereby these perishable products could be kept in condition until they were placed in refrigerated space in ocean vessels and sent in the best possible condition to the markets of Europe. By these means, if we proceed intelligently, we can assist the dairy industry in the greatest possible way —far better and to a far greater extent than we can by attempting to stimulate artificially a market here at home by preventing the importation and sale of oleomargarine.

I am rather at a loss to know what the policy of the Government may be in respect to this matter. If I am to judge by the rather remarkable speech delivered by the Minister of Agriculture this evening, I would not have very much hope that they will follow the path of wisdom in the matter. I trust however, that on a little more reflection my good friend the Minister of Agriculture will see the error of his ways. I wish just to assure the Government that if they bring in legislation at this session of Parliament providing for the importation or manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada, they will have my hearty support in that action.

Now, one thought in respect to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I do not know to what extent butter is used in the manufacture of oleomargarine. I do lay this down: that it is the part of wisdom for the Government to see that suitable regulations are enforced for the protection of the public health; to see that only healthful ingredients enter into the manufacture of oleomargarine and that only a pure food product is imported. That is quite properly the function of government. But once you surround the manufacture and importation and sale of this article with proper safeguards, then I submit that the interests of the country will be best served by allowing it to be sold, always as oleomargarine, not as butter—let the people know what they are buying. The business interests of this country will be safeguarded in that way and a sound policy established, and, I trust, permanently followed.

Let me repeat, in closing, that I hope the Government will bring down legislation to make this thing permanent. We

do not want any special privilege to dairymen or to any one else in this country. I have full confidence that the dairymen of Canada can stand up against the competition of oleomargarine; the facts of the last five years prove that beyond any question of doubt. I am against special privilege to dairymen, just as I am against special privileges to manufacturers in the way of tariffs, and for this reason if for no other I will oppose the motion proposed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. J. L. STANSELL (East Elgin): Mr. Speaker, it requires some degree of courage to support a resolution after it has been so vehemently denounced by my esteemed friend the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). I do not profess to be the judge that he is either of sound judgment or of stupidity, but I do believe I know something about the dairy industry and the manufacture of butter. I was pleased to hear the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) inform the House that it was he who was responsible for drawing up the regulations governing the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine. If those regulations had been as carefully drawn and were as strict as those governing the sale of butter, I am not sure I would have raised my voice in protest at this time, but they were not so. I do not know in what respect my hon. friend has been associated with farming, but he confessed to the House to-night that he did not know what the Canadian exports of butter were for the last year, he did not know what the imports were, and if I heard aright a question this afternoon, he did not know that a large quantity of New Zealand butter was being consumed in Canada. If that is the fact, he is not the highest authority on this subject, in my estimation.

Mr. CRERAR: If my hon. friend will permit me he is not quite doing me justice. I gave the export figures in my remarks to-night.

Mr. STANSELL: For this year.

Mr. CRERAR: Not for the present year, but those figures can be secured from the blue books in a few minutes.

Mr. STANSELL: I was referring to this year's figures. I have been very much interested in the arguments put forward here to-night and the different views expressed on this question which is of intense interest to the House and the country. It is a question that should be settled one way or the other, and I am very glad it has been approached in the way in which it has, for I believe that, as hon. members, we ought to respect each other's opinions. If this were a matter on which the arguments were all on one side it would have been settled years ago, but good arguments have been made to-night both for and against the resolution. Possibly I was most favourably impressed by the speech of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) who probably said everything that could be said against the resolution in the way of argument, and said it in a very logical and clear manner. He is quite consistent in the attitude he takes. It has been said that his arguments have not been answered here to-day. The hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) has also put up a very strong argument for the other side, and in some respects his argument has not been answered.

I do not propose at this late hour to take up very much time in giving figures or going over ground that has already been covered by former speakers. I shall simply summarize in a brief way my views on this question. The question before the House is whether after September next the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine in Canada shall be permitted or not. I have received representations from opposing interests, and I think it is only fair in considering this subject that we should realize where requests for this legislation have come from. I do not think I can do anything fairer than to present the arguments that have been submitted on each side, because we can depend upon the interests affected to put up the strongest claims possible in support of their own argument. I think hon. members in common with myself have all received a copy of the circular issued by the Canadian Manufacturers and Importers of Oleomargarine. It is only fair that we should consider the financial investment of those who are desirous of having this privilege of manufacture and sale continued. Considerable money has undoubtedly been invested, and I have no doubt that the manufacture of oleomargarine is carried on in a clean manner, subject as it is to government inspection. It must be remembered, however, that when this investment was originally made, it was well understood that the manufacture of oleomargarine was permitted only as a war measure and the money was invested on that under-

standing, knowing the risk involved in the venture.

On the other hand, I have been asked to oppose the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in this country by the following interests: the National Dairy Council representing The Ontario Milk and Cream Producers' Association; The Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario; The Dairymen's Association of Eastern Ontario; The Dairymen's Association of the Province of Quebec; The Montreal Milk Producers' Co-operative Agricultural Association; Canadian Milk Distributors Association; Canadian Ice Cream Manufacturers' Association; The Western Canada Ice Cream Manufacturers' Association; Canadian Creamery Association; The Western Dairy Manufacturers' Executive; Milk Condensaries; The Provincial Dairymen's Association of Manitoba; The Provincial Dairymen's Association of Saskatchewan; The Provincial Dairymen's Association of Alberta; The Provincial Dairy Association of British Columbia; The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association; The New Brunswick Dairymen's Association; The Nova Scotia Dairymen's Association; The Prince Edward Island Dairymen's Association; Milk Powder Manufacturers; the Holstein-Friesian Association of Canada; Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association; Canadian Jersey Cattle Club.

When such a number of organizations all over the length and breadth of Canada present their views in this way, representing the capital investment that they do, I think it is only fair that we should give reasonable consideration to their claims. If we were to consider this question from the standpoint of the money invested, I think all hon. members will agree that the investment and the labour employed in the dairying industry, is entirely out of proportion to the money invested and the labour employed in the oleomargarine business; the balance is nearly all on one side, that of dairying. It has been interesting to follow the arguments as to what extent protection enters into this question. I should like to give what in my opinion is the principle of protection. I cannot agree with some of my hon. friends to my left, who are sincere in being free traders and are opposed to the principle of protection. Possibly at some time in the future I may be able to agree with their views, but conditions at present are briefly these: We are, whether we believe in it or not, and whether we like it or not, under a protective policy at the present time, and if I may venture into the realm of prophecy, it will be some years yet before the hopes of my hon. friends to my left are realized and this country does absolutely without protection. The very fact, as has been pointed out by some of the speakers, that this is a cold country, with climatic conditions that do not obtain elsewhere, makes it necessary in my opinion to have at least some measure of protection for our industries, to develop a home market. Now, if I understand the principle of protection, in whatever form it may come, it is state aid granted to a certain section of our people, who, apparently, are not able to help themselves, to the extent that is advisable in the interest of the country. For the manufacturers the most natural form of protection is a protective tariff. For our friends from the west, who are not very greatly impressed with the idea of a protective tariff, the only protection that strongly appeals to them is compulsory legislation for the marketing of their product, wheat. Now I must say that I admire their beautiful inconsistency when they state that they do not believe in protection at all. But this is a particular form of protection adapted to their needs. Call it what you like; it is a form of protection adapted to meet the needs of the farmers of western Canada. I must say that I have a good deal of sympathy with the ideas put forth in support of that proposition. Nevertheless if that is the only kind of protection that is to be tolerated in Canada then my sympathy for my western friends begins to ebb very rapidly. I think it is realized that no matter in what part of Canada we may reside we have as much right to interpret the conditions there as to our own best interests, as those who reside in any other part of Canada have to interpret the conditions which affect them. Reference has been made to a request recently presented to the House from British Columbia. In that province they have a problem which they deem most important. I refere to the oriental problem. It has been dealt with in various ways, but in the opinion of British Columbia, exclusion or prohibition is the correct solution. I am not prepared to dispute that position; the representatives from the province should know what form of protection is best adapted to the needs of British Columbia. Naturally the dairymen's associations, and the producers of milk and the other articles manufactured from it such as cheese and butter, believe in

a certain kind of protection which is adapted to their industry. I listened carefully to the manner in which this was characterized by the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). He described it as a pernicious form of protection, and in so doing was ably seconded by the hon. member for Marquette. Possibly that is very nearly a correct description; but personally I must say that I do not like the words "protection" or "prohibition" nor the words "exclusion" or "compulsion." Nevertheless in the laws governing this country there are embodied very many of the principles that can be designated as either one or the other, we must submit to certain restrictions for the general good. Therefore, even if we apply the term protection to the dairy industry; if we go even further and call it "pernicious protection," in my opinion protection as applied to the needs of the farmer has not so often erred on the side of generosity that we cannot, in this instance, afford to give them the benefit of the doubt. If this is pernicious protection we might well afford, considering the condition of the dairy farmer at the present time, to make a little step in that direction.

Let us for a moment consider the composition and the value of this article. It must be remembered, as I pointed out at the beginning of my remarks, that if I am engaged in the dairying industry and producing butter I am subjected to regulations that are very stringent. If, by any means whatever, I get more than 16 per cent of water incorporated in that butter—and I assure you, as one who spent some years in the manufacture of butter, that it is a very difficult thing to regulate—I render myself liable to the laws of the country. It is the same if I incorporate in that butter anything but pure butter fat, allowing only for the smallest fraction of impurities, such as a slight amount of mineral matter. If there is any thing beyond that I render myself liable. Yet in connection with the manufacture of oleomargarine there are no such restrictions. If it is clean it may contain any quantity of water, and almost anything else; there is no law or regulation governing it. If this article was composed entirely of materials produced in Canada, and was manufactured and sold only on its merits, I could not have the courage to rise and say a word against it. The claim has been made for oleomargarine that it consists to the extent of 75 per cent of Canadian products. That is not exactly borne out by the facts because in a return that was asked for some time ago in this House and brought down, we were told that a total of 3,862,962 pounds of various products were brought in from foreign countries and used in the manufacture of oleomargarine—products imported practically free of duty. We have also been informed that the total quantity of oleomargarine manufactured during 1921, the latest year for which I have returns, was 3,780,000 pounds; while the quantity imported was 2,057,000 pounds. What, may I ask, is wrong about that? Just this: It is a form of competition that no other industry in this country would tolerate for one moment. We are protected, as manufacturers of butter, to the extent only of from three to four per cent of duty and possibly that advantage is wiped out entirely by the exchange rates. We are shut out entirely from the United States market by the high rates imposed on our products. Is it fair that any of our manufacturers should go to that country and import from there the raw materials they need to the extent to which they do, make that importation practically free of duty, and place their product on the market in competition with our butter, not on its own merits but so camouflaged by the addition of a portion of butter as to make it palatable and more nearly resemble the article it competes with. I am quite willing, as I believe other farmers in this country are, to admit into Canada articles that do not benefit us but may be needed for some other industry. All that we desire is a favourable consideration of the problems confronting the men who are at present engaged in the dairy industry. I am fairly conversant with the condition of that industry in Ontario and I tell you that the situation of those men is anything but rosy. I have that on the authority of some bank managers who tell me that never in their experience has the situation of the dairy farmers been so critical as it is now, and that collections are almost impossible. Surely other interests should be prepared to sacrifice a little in order to grant the protection needed for the dairy industry.

Something has been said by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) about the composition of oleomargarine and its food value for growing children. Let me tell the House that if the interests of the growing children of our country could be eliminated I am not sure that I would say anything in favour of this resolution. A large proportion of our po-

pulation, and I refer to the children, are not in a position to protect themselves in this and some other respects. In all experiments that have been made from whatever source, the results as given by the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) have been found to apply, and no one has made any attempt to refute his argument. It is admitted in this pamphlet which I hold in my hand—and I think I am fair when I use it for illustration—that "growth accessories" are found in the oleo oil from which oleomargarine is prepared, and it is stated that they have been discovered in animal fats. This pamphlet does not state to what extent they have been discovered, but it goes so far as to say that they have been discovered in butter fats and animal fats. This pamphlet also states that they are present in the milk with which oleomargarine is mixed in the process of manufacture. That is correct, and that is the very method by which this gains its appeal with the consuming public, namely, by representing that it is equivalent in value to butter. If butter or milk were not used to any extent in the manufacture of oleomargarine, these "growth accessories" or vitamines would not be found to any great extent. Therefore, oleomargarine cannot be compared with butter for the use of growing children.

As regards cost, oleomargarine may be cheaper than butter; but as regards actual food value, I am free to state that the poor man whom some hon. members seem to be so much interested in, if he would spend the same amount of money on butter and spread it a little thinner, would have more value than he would by investing the same amount of money in oleomargarine at a cheaper price. If we are to make any mistake at all, let us make that mistake on the side of protecting the children, the rising generation.

One of the main reasons advanced by practically every speaker is that other countries permit the sale and use of oleomargarine. In my opinion, that is the poorest argument of all, because I am sure we, as Canadians, are sufficiently wise to be able to take care of ourselves regardless of what other countries may do. If we look to the country to the south of us, to a certain extent at least they tolerate, lynching; but we do not tolerate it in Canada, and would not do so for one moment. We do not propose to imitate them in that or in many other things. If we look over some European countries, there are many conditions that prevail amongst their peoples who, we are told, consume so much oleomargarine, which conditions we do not want to find amongst our Canadian people. We might take, for example, the Swiss who have no navy, and I believe in Canada we are coming dangerously near to that state of affairs. These arguments about other countries do not appeal to me. We surely can afford to stand alone if necessary.

It has been stated that this is a poor man's food. I have studied this question for some years, and I have heard the argument that you must not take away from the poor man the material that he needs for a spread on his bread when he is not in a financial condition to buy high priced butter. This argument has its appeal; but in every case where this argument has been presented to me, I have asked what the particular person advancing the argument did himself and without exception the reply is: Oh, we use butter for our family; it is just for the labouring man that we want the substitute. In this country I do not believe in two standards; conditions should be such that the labouring man should be entitled to a pure, healthy and beneficial food just as any other class in this country. It is only because of lack of information that an appeal like this carries any weight. If every family in this Canada of ours was sufficiently well informed as to the comparative merits of butter and oleomargarine there would be no sale for oleomargarine to spread on bread. Oleomargarine, has not, as I have pointed out, the particular life giving growth accessories as described in this pamphlet, that butter has. Butter also has peculiar value as a brain food. Surely hon. members have met many people who do not use sufficient butter. I do not, of course, refer to any hon. member in this House because it is quite evident that we have all been well supplied with that particular kind of diet. I am acquainted with some people who are sufficiently poor in this world's goods to come within the class spoken of and I have not been able to find that that class of people demands oleomargarine.

Mr. DICKIE: We have been told that 3,800,000 pounds of various substances are imported into Canada for the manufacture of oleomargarine. We are also told that 3,700,000 pounds of oleomargarine were manufactured in Canada. We are told that a great deal of butter goes into this oleomargarine. How are we going to squeeze

our butter into 3,700,000 pounds of oleomargarine if we import 3,800,000 pounds of other substances which go into the manufacture of oleomargarine?

Mr. STANSELL: In the first place many of these materials are brought into Canada in the raw state and are refined to some extent which process would reduce their volume. I might say also in all fairness that I am giving not figures obtained from other sources which are available and which I have considered, but the figures from a pamphlet which I have in my hand supplied by the oleo interests. The figure of three million pounds odd refers to the manufacture of Canadian oleomargarine. The two million pounds odd refers to the importation, but strange as it may seem—and this is also given in this same remarkable pamphlet,— it is stated that the consumption of oleomargarine in Canada is 1,000,000 pounds per month. I do not vouch for the accuracy of these figures; they are there to speak for themselves. I cannot explain them. My contention is that when we in this Parliament as representatives of the Canadian people decide to encourage the feeding of the young and rising generation on an article of such an inferior quality to butter as oleomargarine, we are taking a step that, to say the least, is entering a road leading in the wrong direction. If we follow it to its logical conclusion it will only be a step until the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) will be justified and we shall be asked to provide a home market for this article known as filled milk which at present we do not know but which will follow after the thin edge of the wedge has been inserted in this matter. Those are the reasons advanced why we should vote for the continuation of the sale of oleomargarine, namely, because other countries permit it and because we should think so much about the poor man's family.

The reason why I support the present resolution is because under present regulations the competition is unfair and it would not be submitted to by any other manufacturing industry in this country. I trust that other industries are sufficiently fair to give to the dairy industry that much needed form of protection that this resolution will provide. In conclusion, let me say what should, in my opinion, be the duty of the representatives of the Canadian people. It should be the duty of Canada's representatives to guard and develop, not a spineless, navyless, oleo-oiled, peasantry, but a healthy, strong, virile manhood and womanhood, able and willing to protect and perpetuate this country as a nation. And if in this way we can do something to guarantee the young and rising generation a generous supply of one of the best and most wholesome foods, then I submit we are taking a step in the right direction as legislators in this country. If I must choose, as I have to on this occasion, between the welfare of the manufacturer and importer of oleomargarine, on the one hand, and, on the other, the Canadian dairy interests and the growth and development of a healthy rising generation, I am forced to give my decision and the benefit of the doubt to the latter; and in doing so I believe I am doing what is best in the future interests of the country.

Mr. D. W. WARNER (Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is not a proper time of night to commence a long speech, but I think we are debating something which it is worth our while staying all night in order to decide rightly. The House seems to be very much divided; the different groups are broken. We are going to do very much as we please in this matter, judging by the way hon. members are talking all over the Chamber, some for and some against in every group. Consequently I feel quite at home in taking my stand in opposition to my leader (Mr. Crerar) in this group. I feel I am justified in doing so. If he had put in as many years milking cows, and if he knew the difficulty in connection with this work as well as I do, I do not think he would have made the kind of speech he delivered. I notice that most of the gentlemen who are talking here to-night in opposition to this resolution are not the men who take the milk pail and milk the cows. I have seen the difficulties of the dairy business right from the beginning of my business career. I know that it has had a hard time. I know, at the same time, that those who are opposed to this resolution are opposed to it from an honest conviction. At least, that is my belief. But, Mr. Speaker, I can hardly agree with them in the fine, delicate point they raise regarding the difference between asking for a compulsory wheat board and supporting the motion for the abolition of oleomargarine.

Mr. McMASTER: They are both unsound.

Mr. WARNER: I am bound to tell the House that I do not agree with those hon.

members if they are persistent in that attitude. I have not tried to convert any one in my group or in any other group to my ideas. I know, though, what the people in my constituency want, and I would not come here and misrepresent them in any respect in anything I do. But that is what I should be doing if I voted against this resolution. I know that I have a different constituency from those which some of my hon. friends to my left represent; and if we did anything that would make dairying harder for the people in my constituency we should be in danger of losing some of them. If I thought that the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine would be no more considerable in Canada in the future than it is at the present time, I would not occupy the time of the House expressing myself in favour of this resolution and opposing the importation and manufacture of this commodity.

Mr. CARROLL: What are the sales of oleomargarine in this country now compared with those of three years ago, taking into consideration the falling prices of butter?

Mr. WARNER: That question has been answered several times to-night, but I would say to my hon. friend that the conditions now are absolutely different. Furthermore, oleomargarine was asked for only as a substitute during the war, and the fact that the price of butter has come down is no doubt largely responsible for the diminution in the sales of oleo.

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

Mr. IRVINE: Perhaps I might ask the hon. gentleman a question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would ask hon. members not to interrupt unduly the member who has the floor. However, my eye first caught the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Irvine).

Mr. IRVINE: Does the farmers' platform not include the free importation of foodstuffs?

Mr. WARNER: I understand very well what there is in that platform, and I do not think that it has any application at all to this case. I am not aware of the need of oleomargarine in this country. I quite realize the difficulty which the dairymen are faced with, and if you prohibit the importation and sale of this article you will save the dairy business, and probably have cheaper and better butter. But if you encourage the use of any substitute for butter you lessen the demand for the latter to that extent. However, if people are going to misconstrue a platform to the detriment of an industry, then I think that platform should be changed.

Mr. STANSELL: Does my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) state that the Progressive party has a policy from which no member should dissent? If so, they are more partisan in their allegiance than either of the old parties.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. WARNER: Have I the floor again, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. MEMBER: Do not mind them.

Mr. WARNER: I am here to represent my constituency. I have been told that if I am narrow enough to represent one constituency and one constituency only, I am probably not big enough to make a good representative. Well, I will take that for what it is worth. But if I represent that constituency as it desires to be represented I feel that I am not only doing my duty but doing what is in the best interests of Canada that I should do. As I said shortly before hon. members began to bombard me with questions, I represent a constituency that is somewhat different from the constituencies which other hon. gentlemen represent. It is made up of small farms. The farmers make butter or sell cream and carry on a dairy business because they can do it better that anything else. They have a brush country which they have to clear, and they can sow grass on it and have a pasture so that they can keep a few cows before they are able to break much of the land. Many of them have been on the land for years and have got only 30 to 50 acres broken.

Now, it is one of the best districts in Canada; I except none. That district has not had a crop failure in the twenty-five years that I have been there. Those people are getting along in a moderate way; they are living, but they are not making money, and the dairy business is about the only thing that has kept them going. I know that to be so. Now, if you are going to do anything to make it harder for those people you will need a pretty good immigration policy to get newcomers to take the place of those people who may be forced to abandon their homesteads. We are talking of spending money to induce immigrants to come to this country. I say,

gentlemen, you will do more good by making the people prosperous that are here now, and you can do this better by giving them a good chance to make a success of the dairy business, than by spending money to get immigrants to come in and take their place.

My hon. friend from Marquette—my leader—mentioned that he wanted cold storage and lots of other things to take care of the dairy industry. We want them too, we are not objecting to them—neither are we objecting to the Wheat Board to take care of the wheat crop. Our leader suggested that in Denmark the dairy farmers are very prosperous. I have spent a good deal of my time in institute work, and I have been practically all my life trying to induce people to go into mixed farming, which of course includes a little dairying. In the course of my institute work I have learned that Denmark would not have been prosperous with the dairy business alone, if it had not been for the skim milk her farmers fed to their bacon hogs for the production of the fancy bacon exported to Great Britain where it fetches fancy prices. The Danish farmers are very favourably situated in regard to Great Britain and have the best of opportunities to put their products on the British market. I do not object if the people of Denmark want to eat oleomargarine and sell their butter to Great Britain at a higher price than they pay for the substitute; but we cannot do quite the same thing.

We have pamphlets here as part of the propaganda to further the interests of the oleomargarine manufacturers, and I have been approached to support the continued importation and manufacture of their product. Who is paying for that propaganda? The manufacturing interests, of course. And they do not expect to keep their production of oleomargarine at its present level, they are going to encroach on our dairy business more and more. The more oleomargarine that is put on the market the more butter it displaces, and the more profit will go into the hands of the big companies that already have a monopoly in this country, while the man who is out on the farm having a hard time to keep his homestead will have to get along with that narrowed market and to that extent he and his family will be so much worse off.

I am not going to quote facts and figures, it is too late to do so to-night. I have lots of them here, but it would be repeating what others have already said, and I have too bad a cold to talk at any great length; indeed, I would not have intervened in this discussion at all but for my keen interest in the matter. There are no two ways about it. As the Minister of Agriculture said, and as others have said, you cannot hire a man to work on a farm if you want him to milk cows. And I want to tell you that I do not believe the milking machine is a success yet; it takes a pretty good man to run one of those machines satisfactorily. What would we do in this country if something else were manufactured in the place of milk? The principle is the same. All day long we have been talking about how good oleomargarine is for adults to eat, but I have not heard one single member say that it was good for children—not one. We want our children, the poor man's as well as the rich man's, to have good, nourishing food, and for growing children there is not the slightest doubt in the world that oleomargarine is no substitute for butter. I suggest to my hon. friends on my left that if they will take the same money's worth of butter and spread it a little thinner they will get more benefit than they can ever expect to get from spreading this grease on their bread.

I know what oleomargarine is like; I had two kinds for dinner. I tasted and tested them pretty well. I do not like oleomargarine. If other people like it they are welcome to it; I do not object to their using it because I do not like it. But I do object to its continued importation and manufacture if it makes the dairy business harder for our farmers to continue at. We have spent milions of dollars at one time and another to try to get people to engage in the dairy business. My friend to the right read about twenty resolutions from twenty different organizations making certain requests. Who knows what is needed in this country in regard to the dairy business better than the men who are engaged in the business?

And I am not so delicate about saying whether this is or is not protection. If you have got to stretch your mind a little to keep your business going, why, you have got to do it, that is all. I cannot see that the granting of what this resolution asks for gives protection to the dairy business any more than a compulsory wheat board would give protection to the men who are raising wheat.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WARNER: Now, I will have this House understand that I am not opposing the wheat board. I shall continue to work for that wheat board and do my utmost to help get it. That is what we want. But I do want a chance for the dairy business; I want it to be treated in the same way, even on the same plane. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Brown), any more than I agree with my leader, that this is protection. We are not asking for protection, we are asking for a chance to live, and we know how hard it is to keep the dairy business alive. We understand it. Who knows better than those who are in it how hard it is to continue in the dairy business? I know I had to sell my dairy herd in 1918 because I could not get anybody to help me carry on the dairy business. And it was a dairy herd that I thought a lot of. In the course of my life I had built up two herds, and this one I had worked with since I came to this country. But if the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine is to be allowed to continue I do not think I will be the only man who will have had to go out of the dairy business. It is only the man who has a growing family that can engage in the dairy business, because otherwise he would have to hire men to help him, and he could not afford to pay the wages demanded under present conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker and hon. gentlemen, this is the reason why I am speaking in support of this resolution,—simply because I cannot draw the fine distinction that it is asking for protection, as stated by our friends to the left. I do not see that we will weaken ourselves in the least by asking for protection of this kind. It is not protection in the way that we understand protection, that is, as a tax on articles that we have to buy. These people have been paying taxes on the articles they have had to buy until to-day they have barely enough to live on, and now if you put a little more burden on them maybe you will lose more of these men the very first year than you will gain by immigration over a long period.

The returned men have been encouraged to go on the farms and they are now working under conditions that are absolutely intolerable. Many of them are living from their cows, simply hanging on, hoping that Parliament will do something to give them a fair chance. They are looking for a revaluation of their property so that they may go ahead and make the rest of the payments on it. I have had letters from the dairymen in my constituency, men who have not more than from 30 to 50 acres under cultivation, who support the other farmers in their demand for a wheat board. They have asked me to support that; I have done so, and I do not wish to misrepresent them on this subject by voting against the resolution. They want the support of the farmers all the way through for farmers' interests.

I do not understand this proposal as protection; I look upon it as a chance to make a living, to go ahead until things get better and we have an opportunity of clearing more land and making it available for farming purposes.

It is hard for hon. members to understand the conditions which prevail in these parts of the country unless they have been on the ground. I know what I am talking about, and I know that in many parts of Canada outside of my own constituency the dairymen are having a hard time to keep their business going. Let this House go slowly before it does anything which will make it harder for the dairy business to be carried on.

Mr. W. K. BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, you would think from the arguments which have been advanced during the course of this discussion that every country in the world has legalized the manufacture of oleomargarine. I want to tell you that in the United States its sale and manufacture has been legalized, but only under certain conditions. For ten years the agriculturists of that country fought desperately against the introduction of oleomargarine, and not until the population of the United States had reached the figure of 65,000,000 was the measure passed through Congress. But it was provided that no one could sell oleomargarine by retail without paying a license of $60 for the privilege of doing so. That condition prevailed until very recently; I do not know that it does not prevail to-day. If any change has been made, it has been made quite recently. Now, what was the condition? The payment of the license fee of $60 by the retailer made it impossible for him to handle that conglomeration known as oleomargarine, but it did not debar the wholesaler from selling it to lumbermen, miners, or construction men who did not use butter. No injury resulted to the dairy products, because those who ate oleomargarine under those conditions were not consumers of butter.

Some reference has been made to vitamines. Why, there are not as many vitamines in 100 pounds of margarine as there are in one pound of butter. Let us remember also that the late government put many returned soldiers on the land. These men paid an average price of $100 each for their cows and they are having a very hard time indeed to get along. The same condition prevails down in the country where I live. There is another point which is worth remembering: if the Government destroys the dairying industry of our country by permitting this legalized conglomeration to be brought in from a foreign country the business of hog raising, involving the production of bacon, pork and lard, is closely connected with the dairying industry. The sensible people of this country know very well that if they want anything to replace butter they can get shortening, cottolene, and even lard, for one-half the price of oleomargarine. Oleomargarine is often sold as butter. The ex-minister showed us a package to-day as an example of the beautiful lithographic work which is turned out by the oleomargarine people; but the farmer uses an ordinary piece of paraffin paper; he says he can afford nothing better. Now, I am a retailer, and I do not wish to destroy the retailers' organizations, but I have handled a litttle oleomargarine and I want to tell you that I never could sell it when I had any butter. It is easy enough to sell it at a profit of eight cents a pound, but when you retail butter everyone knows the price of it; it is quoted in the papers. If a grocer buys butter and gets two or three cents a pound on it, he is getting all the profit he can get because competition regulates prices, but he can make more profit on one pound of oleomargarine than he can on four pounds of butter.

There has been some talk of vested rights in this country, but I would point out that all the oleomargarine I ever bought was made in the United States; and I would prohibit that. If there are one or two factories in Canada which are manufacturing oleomargarine, they will not be put in a very desperate position if oleomargarine is prohibited. It is the duty of the Governernment to stand by the creameries and cheese factories throughout Canada which they have encouraged and in connection with which they have helped to establisn cold storage plants. Particularly should this be done at a time when the farmers of the country are having a hard struggle to get along. The Government will be seriously blamed if they do not proceed as they should in this line.

Mr. MARTELL: Down in Nova Scotia, particularly along the seashore, the people use molasses when they cannot get butter. Can my hon. friend tell me the relative value of molasses and oleomargarine?

Mr. BALDWIN: I have sold molasses and I have sold oleomargarine. According to my observation, I should say that one pint of Barbados or fancy molasses contains more food value than a pound of oleomargarine. That reduces oleomargarine to a pretty low level.

We have had debates in this House and pretty strong arguments on this subject; I have had a little hand in them myself. But I never characterized oleomargarine as strongly as some of the members of the late Government did. They said it was worse than soap, nothing but a mixture of grease. I do not intend to continue this debate or make it any worse than it is. I stand behind the Minister of Agriculture and I would guarante that every agricultural college in this country, every manager of an experimental farm, every man, in fact, who knows agriculture, would support this resolution.

Mr. ALFRED SPEAKMAN (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I would not get up at this time of the night were it not to correct one slight misconception which apparently exists in some parts of the House, and that is that this resolution is only being opposed by those who are not dairymen—by those farmers who are wheat raisers and by other people who know nothing of the difficulties involved in getting up early in the morning and getting out at night to milk cows.

Mr. BALDWIN: I have milked cows for fifty years.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was not referring to the hon. member. He is supporting the resolution. I am sorry to have to disagree for once in the whole of this session with my hon. friend and neighbour from Strathcona (Mr. Warner), but as I come from very much the same sort of constituency of small mixed farms, I thought it would be well to show that even the men from those constituencies were not unanimous on this question any more than any other party or group in this House. I am not going at all into the question of the food value or wholesomeness of oleomargarine as that has been

pretty well covered. I have never eaten oleomargarine, to my knowledge, and I know nothing whatever about it, but I want to look at the question from two angles.

In the first place, if oleomargarine is a good food, and I at least am convinced by the weight of evidence that it is a good and wholesome food when manufactured and sold under proper supervision, and if it is sold as oleomargarine and not as butter, and I believe with proper supervision and inspection that can be done, then the question simply is this: Will it ruin the dairy industry? That is not the only question but it is one. I do not believe it will. I do not believe that oleomargarine is going to be a factor which will enter very seriously into competition with the genuine dairy article. What do the sales of oleomargarine during the last year prove? They prove that oleomargarine is sold only when the price of butter is so high that a great number of the common consumers cannot buy it, and that when butter gets down to the point where the average man can afford it, he buys butter, and the sales of oleomargarine fall off accordingly. That is amply proved by the manufacture and import figures during the last three or four years. Taking that into consideration, I cannot agree with the idea that oleomargarine will enter so seriously into competition with the dairy industry as to put it out of business.

Mr. WARNER: Does the hon. member think I claimed we would be put out of business?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was not really answering the hon. member for Strathcona, but rather the definite trend of argument that had permeated the whole of this debate, not the argument of any one in particular. I think there was no doubt what the trend of the debate was. It was that the dairying industry would either be put out of business or be seriously hampered in its development. I contend that the point has not been proved that it would be either.

There is one point that has been raised by those opposing the manufacture and importation of oleomargarine with which I have some sympathy, that is, if it were proven, that oleomargarine was detrimental to the growing generation, if it could be proved that it was an unsuitable food for children, and that it lacked the necessary elements which go to produce healthy children, growing into strong adults. If it were nothing but a question between these children eating butter and eating oleomargarine there would be a great deal of weight in that, but it is a question of eating oleomargarine or dry bread in a great many cases. If the butter is within their reach, they will buy it. If they cannot buy butter, where does the force of that argument come in? Because I contend that any kind of fat, animal or vegetable grease, on bread makes a better balanced ration than bread alone. From the point of view of the health of the children, I do not think that point is well taken. That is all I intend to say on that.

I just wish to take a little exception to some things that have been said in regard to the protective element in this measure. To my mind, there can be no difficulty in deciding that it is protection. It is intended for protection. It is intended to enable the dairyman to sell his butter for a better price than he could otherwise obtain. It is intended to restrict the use of other things that might enter into competition with butter, and so enable him to control the market.

Mr. CANNON: If that is so, what is the difference between the dairyman's claim and the claim made by the western farmer for a wheat board?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I was rather expecting that question, and as a matter of fact, I intended to touch on it. I think myself there is all the difference in the world. What are the farmers asking for in asking for a wheat board? What is their idea in connection with a wheat board? Their idea is this: they have come to the conclusion, and I would not support the demand if I had not also come to the conclusion, that a wheat board would not increase the cost of bread to the consumer, that it would not entail one dollar of expense to the people, to come out of taxation. Granted these two points, it is simply a demand from the raisers of the wheat themselves, from those who would come under compulsion, that they be permitted to market their grain as they choose.

Mr. CANNON: How could the grain grower get more and the consumer pay less, or, at all events, not any more than he is now paying?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I am afraid at a quarter past twelve there is hardly time for me to enter into the merits of the wheat board, especially as that subject

may come up later, but I would say this, if I can give the information in two minutes time, that as a rule what the consumer pays depends on the price of flour, and the price of flour does not follow the price of wheat in its fluctuations up and down. When the price of wheat goes down, the price of flour may go down also, but a long way after, and when the price of wheat goes up, the price of flour goes up with it. But that question will come up later, and my friend will no doubt get all the information then that this side of the House can give.

Mr. CANNON: I am very anxious to have it.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I have pretty nearly lost my trend of my argument with having to think of the wheat board. I was speaking of the proposal contained in the resolution before the House as a form of protection. As I say, I cannot exactly understand how it can be looked upon in any other light. If, like my hon. friend from Strathcona, I could honestly see the matter in any other light than protection, my difficulties would largely disappear; but like himself I have to consider the question in the light of my own reason, and reach my own conclusions. I have to act, speak and vote in the light of those conclusions, and I cannot see that it is anything else but protection in its most violent and most aggravated form, because it simply is intended to enable the dairymen to control the market by cutting out any possibility of competition—along this line at least. Now as to that—

Mr. STANSWELL: How can we control the market when we already produce more than that market can take and have to export the surplus?

Mr. SPEAKMAN: I would ask my hon. friend how the manufacturers of any article can control the market for home consumption when they are sending exports abroad? If they can shut out competition in the home market in any line they can control that home market to a certain extent, no matter what they are selling abroad, and to the extent they succeeded in shutting out anything which might come into competition with butter they would expect an increase in the price of that butter. That I contend is absolutely protection. Because of that; because I have taken the ground always, and because the men whom I represent, who are dairymen very largely, have taken the ground always, that giving any one part of the population a privilege which is not accorded to all the population, that benefitting one portion of the population at the expense of the rest of the population, is bad business, I think I am perfectly consistent in opposing this resolution, and in advocating unrestricted trade as far as this particular article is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. T. J. STEWART (West Hamilton): I think it only right for me to read a resolution on this subject which has been adopted by the Local Council of Women, Hamilton. The letter forwarding the resolution says:

> You will find enclosed a copy of the resolution passed by the Hamilton Local Council of Women re-oleomargarine. When this subject comes up in the House, the Women's Council will appreciate if you will present their views on this subject as stated.

The resolution itself reads:

> Considering that oleomargarine has proved its worth in food value, and that it is a legitimate article of commerce, this organization of women urgently requests that the ban against oleomargarine be lifted for all time.

I wish to say that I think hon. members will agree with me that women are much better judges of the effect of oleomargarine on their children, and that more than ordinary value should be attached to a resolution of this kind coming from such a source. Now in the city which I have the honour to represent, 85, if not 95, per cent of the people are in favour of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine in Canada, although probably not more than 5 or 10 per cent of the citizens use that commodity to-day. The reason for such a large preponderance of opinion in favour of oleomargarine is that the popular sympathy goes out to the class of people who find it very difficult to provide adequately for their families at the present time when work is so very scarce. The majority of people are, therefore, very willing that the use of oleomargarine should continue, because the poor people who benefit by its use are unable to buy butter for their children. In many cases women have told me their hearts bled for poor children who longed for butter but could not obtain it, but for whom oleomargarine proved a fairly satisfactory substitute. The evidence given against oleomargarine has not been very

strong; the reasons against its use exist largely in the imagination of the speakers who have opposed it. What adequate reason exists for depriving of oleomargarine these poor children whose parents cannot afford to buy butter? I think we should be acting very cruelly towards that class of people if we were to adopt this resolution, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. W. C. GOOD (Brant): I would not rise at this hour if it were not to say a word or two in reply to the statement that has been made by several speakers that this is not a form of protection. I wish to distinctly state that I regard it as a very positive and aggravated form of protection. If we are going to prohibit the importation and manufacture of oleomargarine why should we not do the same in the case of lard, crisco, domestic shortening or anything else that, in any conceivable way, may be made a substitute for butter? It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) in referring to renovated butter made out no case for the support of the resolution, but rather presented very strong reasons for the establishment of conditions in Canada permitting the renovation of butter, and I am entirely in agreement with him in that regard.

I would also say that the case he made out with regard to filled milk is no argument in favour of the proposed resolution, but rather an argument in favour of the consideration of the question of whether or not it would be wise to permit the use of that article.

I do not wish to say anything more at this late hour. I shall vote against the resolution, and I might say that in that connection, that I have also had a great deal of experience in dairying in a practical way, and it has never changed my opinion one whit in regard to the principles involved in this particular resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Question, question.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member who moved the resolution is now about to conclude the debate. If any other hon. gentleman has anything to say he should speak now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Close it up quickly.

Mr. NEILL: It had been my intention to speak for three or four hours in the hope that those who were opposed to the resolution would have the good sense to go home. I think those who favour the motion are the more resolute—shall I say the more intelligent?—and therefore they would be more likely to stay. However, I have been committed to a pledge to cut my remarks down to ten or fifteen minutes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: That is too long.

Mr. NEILL: Thirty minutes I mean to say and if there are interruptions I may have to occupy forty-five minutes. I have condensed a great deal I had intended to say but there are one or two remarks I must offer. In reply to the last speaker who said that this indubitably was protection let me say this: If it is protection simply to prohibit oleomargarine what would it be if we were asking for a duty of eight cents a pound on butter coming in from the United States, as provided in the Fordney tariff bill in respect to imports from Canada? What kind of expressions would then be employed by hon. members on both sides to describe that form of protection? There is a great difference between a duty of eight cents a pound as specified in the Fordney bill, and the prohibition of this cart grease we are talking of now.

The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said that the exportation of butter in the year 1920 amounted to seventeen and a half million pounds and the importation of oleomargarine amounted to six million pounds. I think that amply proves the assertion I made earlier in the debate that there is no scarcity of butter in Canada, which was one of the three reasons given for allowing oleomargarine to be introduced. Out of the mouth of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) is it established that we have an ample surplus when we were compelled to make exports of 17,500,000 pounds. The hon. member says that shows we were not suffering much from the importation of oleomargarine; but if the 6,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine had not been imported into Canada, we would have had 6,000,000 pounds more butter sold locally. The hon. member remarked that it was a well known fact that you could not build up a market for any article to any great extent out of the home market alone. You cannot; we never denied

that; but is it not a fact that the home market is the best of all markets?

I wish to say, in order to disarm hostility, that I am not a dairyman myself. I am induced to take this step only by watching the struggles of dairymen in my district. Perhaps the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Brown) will not give me credit for this, but I have also some lingering desire to give the kiddies in this country some proper nourishing food.

Mr. COOTE: If this House were to pass this resolution and if we were to prohibit the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine, could the hon. member give us any guarantee that the kiddies about whom he is so anxious would get the butter?

Mr. NEILL: Absolutely. There is nothing else for them to get. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his treatment of this subject differed, I thought, very strongly from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell); but on this matter I think I must accept the mature judgment of the Minister of Agriculture. His long experience in the matter surely entitled him to be considered a master mind in this regard. I could not help thinking that the Minister of Finance rather what is called begged the question. That is to say, he made an assertion that such and such was the case without proof, and thus disposed of a great deal of argument. He said that it was not true that oleomargarine is an unwholesome product. Unwholesome is a matter of comparative degree; it depends what you call unwholesome. Oleomargarine is not unwholesome if it is in the kitchen; it is unwholesome when it is in a baby's stomach. It is not unwholesome of itself; it is made in a clean manner; but it is unwholesome in a person's stomach. Dirt has been described as matter out of place, and oleomargarine is unwholesome when it is out of place. Beefsteak is a very nourishing thing, but it turns an invalid's stomach and it is an unwholesome thing for that invalid. Lard—some hon. member called it a grease compound—when it is introduced into the stomachs of children and invalids is unwholesome in itself, while it would be thoroughly wholesome to cook the dog's food with or something of that kind.

Another statement made by the Minister of Finance is that oleomargarine is allowed in every country in the world. I must take exception to that because I have authoritative information from the department's own agent that it is not used in New Zealand at all and only to a very slight extent in Australia.

Mr. FIELDING: I did not say that it was used; I said that it was not prohibited by law so far as I knew, in any country in the world. I think that is correct. If I am wrong, I shall be happy to have my hon. friend correct me.

Mr. NEILL: I thought the hon. member said that it was used in every country. At all events I will make that correct. If it is not prohibited in every country, it is not used in Australia and New Zealand.

The last statement the Minister of Finance made was that those who would vote in favour of this resolution would do so on the assumption that the people of this country were not of sufficient intelligence to form a judgment as to what they should buy or not buy. Ever since the day Adam went into horticulture and Eve flirted with the devil have we not had laws of all kinds and have they not been for the protection of the women, the poor and the children? What are we here to-day for if we are not here to make laws to protect somebody from somebody else? If we are sufficiently intelligent to make our hand hold our head, let us go home and each provide himself with a battleaxe and go out on his own. Let me go into the three-card trick. I invite my hon. friends, more particularly of the Progressive party, to come and see me to-morrow and I can demonstrate to them that the marble is under this or that particular cup, and I will invite them to bet on it. Why should I be prohibited from doing that? Let them keep themselves; their intelligence should be sufficient, in the language of my hon. friend opposite: the same thing applies to bogus oil stock and many other things such as peddling confederate bills and other things we are legislating against. Law is made for the protection of the poor and helpless and that is what we are asking for to-day, as regards the secondary element of the resolution, the protection of the poor and ignorant.

Two hon. members spoke very highly of the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria City (Mr. Tolmie). To be candid, I followed his remarks with close attention and while this may be my misfortune, I could see only two points in his speech. One was the very unfair argument that convictions for selling bad oleomargarine were much fewer than those who were selling bad butter. In answer to that, is

the fact that twenty or thirty times as much butter was sold as oleomargarine and therefore, there were more convictions in the case of the former. Such an argument did not seem to require much answer. The other argument was apparently an endeavour to secure the support of my hon. friends to my left and it was put in a way that I do not think will appeal to them. I am not ashamed to appeal to them myself; but I will appeal to their heads and hearts and not to their pockets or stomachs as was done by the hon. member. He held out a threat or promise or bribe—you have beef cattle and the amount of money you will get for your beef fat will enable you to become rich and retire for life. I was glad to see it fail and as regards the small amount of oleo fat that is in a steer, that would not make you very much richer than you are now. Moreover, this has been in force now for four years and I leave it to hon. gentlemen to know how much their pocketbook has been increased in that time. The hon. member for Lisgar went into a discussion of the tariff; but I will keep away from that. We will not call it protection; we will call it prohibition if that will make my hon. friend any happier; we will call it preservation in the same way as we seek to protect the downtrodden wheat-grower by a wheat board.

Mr. BROWN: That was not my argument.

Mr. NEILL: We will not discuss the subject, as the man said. I recall the story of a man who did not go to church and the minister came along and said: "I have not seen you in church." John passed the subject off. The minister said again, "John, you have not been in church lately." The old Scotchman replied: "Weel, now, Mr. So-and-So, we'll no discuss the subject," and at this late hour, we will not discuss the question whether it was the hon. member for Lisgar or not. I will take it back as regards him. Some hon. gentleman made the remark anyway. The hon. member for Lisgar did discuss free trade. Free trade surely made Great Britain; it is a beautiful ideal, a beautiful theory. I believe in it as a theory; but I keep my theories in the clouds and my politics on the earth. Why, I would warn hon. gentlemen to my left that while this policy of free trade is an admirable one if you happen to believe in it, it is possible to run any theory to death, to pursue this fetish, this butterfly until it takes you over the precipice, until free trade becomes almost license. It was suggested this afternoon that free trade meant buying anything you like, and, I suppose, selling anything you like, whether it be oleomargarine or wheat, and drinking anything you like, and finally, in the last analysis, doing anything you like. That means simply one word—license, and that is free trade carried to excess. When I say that, I do not say that I shall not vote for the Wheat Board. I intend to vote for the Wheat Board, because, being in a farming community, I believe they have very hard times on the prairies and they require preservation just as we require preservation in the opposite ends of Canada in the dairying industry. The way my hon. friends to my left vote on this occasion will not make any difference with me.

I shall be very sorry to see my hon. friends from the prairies vote in any considerable numbers against this resolution, for I believe that they could not take any one single step more calculated to alienate the entire sympathies of all the rest of the farming community of Canada. I shall be sorry to see them do that, for I hold them in high respect and have a great belief in their future. I thought the day would come when they would form a party sufficient to dominate Canada both in numbers and in policy, but if they show any tendency to sectionalism there are those who would be only too pleased to observe it. I hope they do not show any such tendency. If they do they cannot logically expect sympathy from other farmers from Quebec or the east or the extreme west. It is said that they are too class-conscious. The trouble is that they are not class-conscious enough. They ought to join hand in hand with the farmers of Quebec and Ontario and the East and on agricultural matters consider every question from the one point of view of the farmers. As the politician in the Old Country said, we must all hang together or we shall hang separately. That is the attitude which I would urge my hon. friends to take. No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself. That is good Scripture and it is still true. We are told in the literature so often rehearsed this afternoon, and in these regulations, so numerous and hard and fast, but so easy to evade, that the manufacturers were not allowed to put anything on their labels suggestive of milk or butter or cows or any

animals on the farm. They were not allowed to put the name of any beef brand on their labels, but there is one of the labels in my hand. Does any hon. gentleman recognise the colour of that animal? I would not object to the colour of the steer which is pictured here, because it represents danger. But I object to the symbol on the label. It should not be a steer; it should be a nigger—a full big, dirty, greasy nigger with his bare feet treading out the vegetable oils in this article, which is sold under the guarantee issued in New York that it was properly made in the southern states. In fact, there should be two niggers upon the label, the one pedalling with his dirty feet and chewing tobacco, with all the habits the practice carries with it and the smaller one stepping airily into the vats to make the necessary repairs to any machinery that goes wrong. Put such a picture on the label and I shall be more willing to accept it.

I shall now refer to another point not introduced into the debate. I want you to think for a moment of the young girls of this country. I am interested in this phase of the question, because I have had girls of my own. Go into the country districts and look at the type of young women there. They are strong, vigorous, deep-chested women, with a complexion that they did not get out of drug stores. Then go into any town or city, from Vancouver to Ottawa and what do you find? They are small, stunted, anaemic looking.

Mr. McMASTER: Nonsense.

Mr. NEILL: And if you go into the restaurants, the cafes and the cafeterias and observe many of the young girls there you will get a fair idea of what they regard as a proper meal. I saw one the other day, a young girl of seventeen or eighteen, in one of these places, and I took notice of what she ordered. She asked for a fruit salad, a mixture of little bits of odds and ends, a small roll of bread with a tiny dab of butter, some coffee and some weird mysterious confection of no earthly food value, although costly. That is the town girl's conception of what is a suitable diet. The agricultural department's experts tell us what constitutes a proper ration for a cow and a horse, but the young boys and the girls in the city are not taught the faintest conception of what constitutes even a fair ration for themselves. They certainly do not get the dairy products that the growing people in the country get. It is not from lack of money; it is not from lack of salary; it is due to lack of sense or knowledge. These girls are well dressed, they swarm in the theatres and movies. So that the fault is not that they have no money. They could not get the proper nourishment in the things they buy, because these vitamines are to be found only in dairy products. I venture to suggest that the fine figure of my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Tolmie) was not grown without vitamines. He was brought up on a farm.

Mr. IRVINE: Will my hon. friend explain what a vitamine is?

Mr. NEILL: The hon. member should have been here this afternoon when I explained this point at great length. He must excuse me if I decline to do so again. However, I might briefly reply that a vitamine is something vital to the growth of young children and is found only in dairy products. Now then, all that is the matter with the women you see in the towns is that they are underfed and under-nourished. If my hon. friend from East Calgary (Mr. Irvine) who is a university man, does not know what a vitamine is, how can you expect a stenographer in one of these buildings to know? Do not make it any worse for these young girls just for the sake of big profits for these corporations in the United States.

Now, we come to the question which has been so well trotted out in this debate, the rights of the poor man to buy what he likes. How tenderly these poor benighted men are dealt with in this instance by the rich corporations! We must stand up for their inalienable right, given them by God to buy what they like. I represent a workingmen's constituency and although this motion has been on the Order Paper for weeks. I have not heard a single complaint from a workingman in opposition to it. The workingmen know what virtue there is in a campaign carried on in their behalf by the rich corporations in the United States. Is it for the benefit of the corporations or of themselves? Which is their real concern? The right to buy! Yes; their right to buy an imitation. I have a formula for producing a substitute for milk. It looks exactly like milk and tastes like milk, only it has not half the food value of the real product. And in years to come, when politics cease to support me, I am going into that business, if this resolution does not pass, and I will get the support of these same hon. gentlemen, who say it is all right to palm off this spurious stuff on

the country, to sell that milk substitute then. It will be all right to sell it to the public, if hon. members think that this resolution is wrong. That milk substitute is nothing but a little bit of chalk and a lot of water, but it is just as good as this oleomargarine. We hear a lot of talk about the inalienable "right" of the poor man to buy what he likes. Very well. Suppose we argue for a little while on his "right" to a decent living wage, his right to have such conditions as will afford him employment by which he may be able to earn enough money to provide for himself and his children the real article. Instead of legislating for the benefit of corporations in the United States, and calling it patriotism—a very shady sort of patriotism in my estimation—would it not be infinitely better so to legislate that employment might be abundant, work available, and in consequence dairy products brought within the reach of all? Would it not be better to do that and so keep alive that industry and build up a strong young race?

I started out with the assertion, which has not been contradicted in a single instance, that this legislation was introduced in 1917 for three specific reasons: First, it was a war measure; second, it was due to the scarcity of butter; and third, there was the question of high price. That is admitted; it has not been controverted. I asserted it in the most positive way and it is on the record, and Hansard bears me out when I say that the people of the country, through their representatives, made a bargain with the dairy industry that the importation and manufacture of this article would be abolished as soon as conditions in the country permitted. That has not been done. I asked, I have asked before, I asked this afternoon, and I ask the House again to-night to see to it that the pledge made then with the dairy industry shall be honoured, and that this war measure shall now be abandoned. It is for us now to keep faith with these people who are engaged in this industry.

The House divided on the motion of Mr. Neill, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs.

Archambault,
Baldwin,
Béland,
Bowen,
Cannon,
Casgrain,
d'Anjou,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Demers,
Denis (Jolette),
Denis, (St. Denis),
Desaulniers,
Duff,
Fortier,
Fournier,
Gendron,
Graham,
Hanson,
Hodgins,
Humphrey,
Hunt,
Jelliff,
Laflamme,
Lanctôt,
Lapierre,
Léger,
Logan,
Lovett,
Lucas,
Macdonald (Pictou),
MacLean (Prince, P.E.I.),
McBride,
McIsaac,
McKay,
McMurray,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martell,
Maybee,
Mercier,
Motherwell,
Munro,
Neill,
Ouimet,
Robb,
Robitaille,
St. Père,
Savard,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Stansell,
Stewart (Leeds),
Stork,
Sutherland,
Thompson,
Trahan,
Warner—57.

NAYS

Messrs.

Arthurs,
Bancroft,
Binette,
Bird,
Black (Huron),
Bristol,
Brown,
Carmichael,
Carroll,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chevrier,
Church,
Clark,
Clifford,
Coote,
Copp,
Crerar,
Davies,
Dickie,
Drummond,
Duncan,
Eliott (Waterloo),
Euler,
Evans,
Fansher,
Fontaine,
Forke,
Forrester,
Gardiner,
Garland (Bow River),
Good,
Halbert,
Hammell,
Harris,
Hatfield,
Hoey,
Hudson,
Irvine,
Jacobs,
Johnson (Moosejaw),
Johnston (Last Mountain),
Kennery (Edmonton),
Kennedy (Glengarry and Stormont),
Kennedy (Port Arthur and Kenora),
Knox,
Ladner,
Leader,
Lovie,
Maclean (Halifax),
Macphail,
McCrea,
McGiverin,
McKenzie,
McKillop,
McMaster,
Marler,
Milne,
Morrison,
Murdock,
Papineau,
Power,
Prevost,
Pritchard,
Raymond,
Reed,
Ross (Kingston),
Ross (Simcoe),
Senn,
Shaw,
Sinclair (Oxford),
Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Speakman,
Spencer,
Steedsman,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Humboldt),
Turgeon,
Wallace,
Walsh,
Ward,
Woods,
Woodsworth—83.

Mr. KAY: I was paired with the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Wilson). Had I voted, I would have voted for the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: I was paired with the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). Had I voted, I would have voted against the resolution.

Mr. TOLMIE: I was paired with the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau). Had I voted, I would have voted against the resolution.

On motion of Mr. Fielding the House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. Tuesday.

Tuesday, May 16, 1922

The House met at three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 93 to amend the Criminal Code.

He said: This bill is a short one, and the principal clauses in it contain amendments raising the ages of girls, in the case of indecent assault, from 14 to 16, and carnally knowing from 14 to 16; removing the words "of previous chaste character" in the latter case; and repealing an amendment inserted in the Senate in 1920 that in the case of seduction and for carnally knowing a girl between 14 and 16 the trial judge may instruct the jury that, if in their view the evidence does not show that the accused is wholly or chiefly to blame for the commission of the offence, they may find a verdict of acquittal. These provisions were all passed by the House of Commons last year but were rejected in the Senate. In addition to these there is a provision extending the provisions about bribing police officers to police commissioners; and one correcting a technical error with respect to section 244. This section imposes a penalty for the offences mentioned in the three preceding sections, but by an amendment some sections were added to the code and inserted in the middle of these three sections so as to raise a doubt as to the application of section 244. There is a provision to protect English hall marks on gold and silver; a provision to remove a doubt as to what the maximum penalty should be for stealing an automobile; an amendment to the section with respect to the carriage of animals by railways, to do away with the necessity of getting a written request from the owner to enable the railway to keep the animals the maximum time in the cars, that is, 36 hours; a repeal of the section giving the clerk and deputy clerk of the peace at Montreal and Three Rivers certain powers of justices—the repeal of this section has been requested by the Attorney General's Department of Quebec—a provision giving municipalities of Ontario the fines when they bear the expense of administering the law under which the same are imposed instead of paying them to the province as at present; and an amendment extending the provisions of section 1038, which enables certain penalties to be recovered by civil process, so as to make it include corporations.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

OPIUM AND NARCOTIC DRUG ACT

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of Health) moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider a certain proposed resolution concerning amendments to:

The Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, chapter 17 of the statutes of 1911, as amended by chapter 31 of the statutes of 1920 and chapter 42 of the statutes of 1921.

Motion agreed to.

GRAIN TRADE

JUDGMENT OF THE MANITOBA COURT OF APPEAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): Reference was made yesterday by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) to a question which was put to the Government some days ago in regard to a certain judgment which was rendered by the Court of Appeal of Manitoba in connection with the Canada Grain Act. As soon as I came into possession of the judgment and the notes of the judges I studied the case. I had a conference with my colleague the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Robb) and the member for Saltcoats (Mr. Sales), to whom I intimated my views of the case. They both requested an opportunity of meeting the members of the board before anything should be decided upon. I acceded to the request and was governed accordingly. The members of the board, I may say, arrived in Ottawa this morning, or last night. This morning they had a conference with the Minister of Trade and Commerce at which I understand, the member for Saltcoats was also present. They informed me a few minutes before the opening of the House to-day that they had not yet arrived at any final decision but would come to a conclusion during the course of the day. To-morrow, therefore, I hope to be in a position to make a statement to the House as to what decision the Government will take in the matter.

ASSINIBOINE RIVER FLOODS

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. HARRY LEADER (Portage la Prairie): I desire to call the attention of the House and of the Government to a matter of great concern to the province of Manitoba. I refer to the overflowing of the river Assiniboine. As hon. members have no doubt read in the papers, a great deal of land has been flooded in the constituency of Brandon, and the destruction has spread further east until now Portage la Prairie, which I have the honour to represent, is affected. I have no definite information as to the total destruction caused by the flood, but it will be seen from the press reports that considerable damage has already been done. Carcasses of horses, cattle and pigs, and the wreckage of granaries and outbuildings are to be seen floating down the river. Last night I sent a telegram to the editor of The Free Press at Winnipeg with a view to securing some information that I might submit to Parliament, but unfortunately I have not yet received an answer. However, as I have said, considerable damage has been done already, and perhaps there will be further destruction still. I would not bring this matter to the attention of the House if I did not think it my duty to do so. I believe that the federal government in the past has spent sums of money in building dykes along this river to keep back the flooding waters in the spring. I do not know how much they have spent for the purpose, but the fact is that they have expended money on this work, and I believe they assumed responsibility for the waters flooding the country. I have nothing to suggest, but I think it would be all right if the Government would—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I would ask the hon. member to kindly put his question to the Government as tersely as possible. There can be no argument on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. LEADER: The question I would ask the Government is this: Do they intend to do anything to alleviate the sufferings of those people along the Assiniboine river?

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I would inform my hon. friend (Mr. Leader) that the Government has already taken notice of the matter to which he refers. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. King) has had a report made by the officers of his department, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Motherwell) has already advised the provincial authorities that any officers of his department in the West will be available for such services as it may be in their power to render. The matter is receiving the attention of the Government; more than that I cannot say at the moment.

Mr. LEADER: I am pleased to accept the hon. Prime Minister's statement, and I hope he will be able to do something for those settlers.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE

The House proceeded to consider certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Annual Drill, $1,400,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: I think the Assistant Clerk read for annual drill the sum of $1,400,000. This is evidently a mistake, because we spent a busy day getting that item reduced by $400,000.

Mr. SPEAKER: Evidently the error is copied from the Votes and Proceedings. It shall be corrected.

Mr. CALDWELL: If this item is copied from the estimate there may be a possibility of similar mistakes occurring. The items are read so rapidly that it is impossible to follow them from the Estimates; one has to rely on his memory.

Mr. FIELDING: The clerk assures me that there is no mistake in the records; it was merely a mistake in printing.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE SUPPLY BILL

On the motion of Hon. W. S. Fielding (Minister of Finance) the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Gordon in the Chair:

Mr. FIELDING moved:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ended March 31, 1922, the sum of $9,623,792.61 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: The resolution we have just dealt with closes the accounts for the last year. I now move, with respect to the current year:

Resolved, that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of cer-

tain expenses of the Public Service for the financial year ending March 31, 1923, the sum of $88,517,204.53 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 85, granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively March 31, 1922 and March 31, 1923.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times, and the House went into committee thereon, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On Clause (2)—$88,517,204.53 granted for 1922-23:

Mr. CRERAR: How far does this carry us?

Mr. FIELDING: All the appropriations which have been adopted in committee are included in this bill. As a matter of fact, all that we desired to get was the special appropriation for the past year, but in some cases the reports were so blended that they could not be separated. Therefore we have included all the supplies voted up to the present time, but in the Supply Bill they are divided into the former year and the current year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We ought to have that bill. It has not been distributed yet.

Mr. FIELDING: I have never known one to be distributed, but if my hon. friend insists I have no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No.

Mr. FIELDING: My hon. friend is aware that the clerks make up these bills and we have to accept their assurance as to the bills being accurate; I have always found them so.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: In justification of the Assistant Clerk, I must inform the House that there was no error in the consideration of the resolution of Tuesday, May 9, 1922. If the words in italics are read, the House will see that the item is:

Main Estimates, five-sixths of the amount set forth below, less $400,000.

That is exactly as it was voted. I think I owe this explanation to the House in order to justify our worthy Assistant Clerk.

SUPPLY

NAVAL SERVICE

The House in Committee of Supply.—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Naval Service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of the Naval Service): Mr. Chairman, I want to make a short statement to the committee; it may help to guide its deliberations. Hon. gentlemen opposite will not, I am sure, attribute to me any considerable degree of modesty. In the course of the remarks I made the other day on the appropriation for the Royal Canadian Navy, I used these words:

I suggested to the officers that we could divide these ships, send one or two of them to the Pacific coast and keep one of them on the Atlantic coast. I had an idea that the Aurora could be used on the Atlantic, and this shows my absolute unacquaintance with the naval service and what a navy is supposed to do.

A little further down I said:

This, the officer told me, was absolutely out of the question; if we separated those ships and sent two of the destroyers to the Pacific coast, those destroyers would not do at all for the purposes of training by themselves and would be wholly unsuitable for the pelagic sealing protection.

Now, the Director of the Naval Service tells me that I was too modest about myself and too emphatic about him. I will not admit either, but I want to state the attitude which the Director of the Naval Service says he took. He strongly favoured the retaining of the squadron, and he insists that he did not assure me that he could not use any unit of this squadron to assist in carrying out the scheme that I had in mind. I understood his attitude as I stated it, but life is too short to quarrel about it, so I accept his word that I misunderstood him. Some day I may get him to accept mine that he misunderstood me, but not to-day. Now, I am pleased to announce to the committee that the Director of the Naval Service assures me that the first suggestion I made, or a portion of it, is practicable, namely, that one of the torpedo boat destroyers can be used on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic; that the volunteers for the naval service can be trained on these two destroyers, in gunnery, seamanship, and all lines pertaining to the naval service, so far as that training is carried out on a ship of that size. The corrected suggestion I have to make is this: I propose to ask the committee to sanction the use of these two torpedo boat

destroyers as suggested, instead of the two small ships mentioned in the outline of a few days ago.

I want to correct a little misconception which, I think, exists with regard to these trawlers. My idea of a trawler —and this, I suppose, would be the idea of most hon. gentlemen—would be that it is something in the way of a small fishing smack. These trawlers, however, are seagoing craft, 130 feet long, each carrying a 12-pound gun and manned by from twenty to thirty men. Some thirty or thirty-five of these trawlers were in commission on the coasts of Canada during the war, and rendered wonderful service. I am informed that our share of the patrol of the Pribyloff islands, involving work which we agreed to perform but which for several years we have not done, can be carried out by a craft of the nature I have described. The revenue cutters of the United States are not large ships. They are larger than these, but the Director of the Naval Service assures me that there would be no difficulty in having one of these so-called trawlers proceed to the seal fishing area and patrol those waters. In order that hon. gentlemen may understand that part of the undertaking with respect to the seal fisheries of the Pribyloff islands which we have not performed, I will read a memorandum which has been prepared on the subject:

On July 7th, 1911, a treaty was signed at Washington between Great Britain, United States of America, Japan and Russia for the adoption of means looking to the preservation and protection of the fur seal in the Bering Sea. Under the terms of this treaty the nations interested agreed to prohibit their nationals from engaging in pelagic sealing in the waters of the Pacific Ocean north of the 30° of north latitude. The nations interested undertook to carry on such patrol as would be necessary to enforce the terms of the treaty.

In August, 1910, the Colonial Office had asked if Canada could take part in the Bering Sea patrol and on October 22nd, of the same year, an Order in Council was passed stating that the revenue vessels of the Canadian Government on the Pacific coast were too small for this service, but that the vessels which it was proposed to obtain for the Canadian Naval Service could undertake the patrol and that as soon as the ships were built and equipped Canada would be prepared to send one or more of them to do patrolling within the limits specified.

On September 21st, 1911, the Colonial Office wrote to the Canadian Government stating that the British Admiralty were "prepared to arrange that a vessel of the Imperial Navy should carry out the patrol in the waters North of 30° north latitude and east of the meridian of 170° west longitude until vessels of His Majesty's Canadian Navy were available for carrying out this service."

[Mr. Graham.]

The limits suggested were those of the Canadian Pacific Station. The patrol was to be a joint one with the United States. Patrol of the Pacific Ocean west of the 170th meridian was to be carried out by Russia and Japan jointly.

After this date the British Admiralty maintained two sloops, the "Shearwater" and the "Algerene" on the Pacific station for the purpose of this patrol.

In May, 1914, the Colonial Secretary asked if the Canadian Government could detail H.M. C.S. "Rainbow" to undertake this patrol. The "Rainbow" had been out of commission for some time but she was prepared for sea, placed in commission and was sailing for Behring Sea when news was received that war was imminent. She was therefore detained and on the declaration of war took up her duties as a cruiser in the Pacific Ocean, and no British ship has attended to the Behring Sea patrol since that date, the patrol being effected by United States vessels.

Canada is very interested in the question of pelagic sealing and derives a considerable income from the killing of the seals on the Pribylof Islands. She should therefore take part in the patrol and have a vessel available for inspection of the Pribylof Islands and the killing grounds so as to ascertain for herself how the treaty is being carried out and what results are being obtained.

The revenue obtained in 1919 for Canada's share of the sales of skins from the Pribilof Islands was $266,000. Prices of skins have gone down and last year the amount realized was $65,000. In April of this year a sale was held which netted Canada $23,000. Another sale will be held in the fall.

It will be observed, therefore, that Canada agreed to carry on this patrol, or, at least, to inspect the work and see that it was properly carried out and that treaty obligations were respected; and also that we have a financial interest in seeing that this is done. The Director of the Naval Service assures me that this work can be performed and Canada put in a better position than she has been since the signing of this treaty in regard to her share of the patrol of the sea fishing areas in Behring sea.

Mr. MARTELL: I understand that under the Pelagic Sealing Treaty, which was negotiated in Washington, nationals of all parties to the treaty, such as Russia, Japan, United States and Canada, were to be prohibited from engaging in the seal fisheries. It was understood, however, that at certain seasons of the year a certain number of seals were to be caught and sold and the proceeds divided among the various parties to the agreement. How does the revenue derived by Canada from the sale of these seals compare with the cost of the patrol?

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, since the treaty was signed the patrol has not cost Canada anything, because she has not carried it out.

Mr. MARTELL: The treaty provided for it?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes; at any rate it provided that Canada should look after any patrol which the British admiralty engaged to carry out under that agreement. But, so far as I can ascertain, Canada has not undertaken that work, although she has been getting receipts from the seal fisheries.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Was not our share last year in the neighbourhood of $700,000?

Mr. GRAHAM: We can get the figures from the Department of Fisheries. I am told that from one sale that was held our share was $23,000, and that there is to be another sale this fall.

Mr. MARTELL: Has the Pelagic Sealing Treaty been denounced, or are we still working under it?

Mr. GRAHAM: The treaty is still in existence, and the United States is doing her share of the patrol work, and so, I believe are Russia and Japan.

As to the submarines, as I announced a few days ago, the Government's policy is not to retain the submarines in commission. The use of the submarine in warfare is a question about which there has been a great deal of discussion among the great nations of the world during the past few months. It was discussed at some length at Washington; it has been discussed elsewhere, and I presume that it will be discussed in the future at other places, perhaps at the Genoa Conference. I think it is well to point out to the committee now that this action of the Government has a pretty strong foundation. I admit at once that there are those who argue, and argue strongly, that the submarine for defence purposes is very useful, one reason that is advanced for its usefulness being that only a submarine with its hydrophone system can detect the approach of similar vessels, that vessels that do not submerge cannot perform this service. Nevertheless, it will be remembered that strong ground was taken at the Washington Conference by several representatives of the great nations, of Great Britain, in particular, as to whether the submarine should be retained at all. There were some, if I remember the reports of the conference aright, who favoured the total abolition of the submarine in future warfare. Others took the opposite view. I am pointing this out to the committee to show that, to use ordinary language, in tying up the submarines, the Government of Canada is following a very dependable lead.

In tabling a return to an Order of the House on the 11th of April last, containing the documents of the Cannes Conference, the Prime Minister said, in reply to a question by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar)—I quote from unrevised Hansard, page 902:

> I therefore beg to present:
>
> 1. Copy of Memorandum on Anglo-French relations and of the draft of the proposed treaty with France presented by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom to Mr. Briand at the meeting of the Supreme Council at Cannes, January, 1922.
>
> 2. Copy of Resolutions adopted by the Supreme Council at Cannes, January, 1922, as the basis of the Genoa Conference.

I find in the memorandum presented officially by the British government these words:

> The third is the question of submarines. His Majesty's Government make no condition of this, and they fully understand that the divergencies of French and British views on the subject may be due to different ideas of the uses which submarines can serve. The British opinion, however, based on four years' war experience, is that submarines are effective only against merchant ships and are ineffectual otherwise as instruments either of attack or defence.

I think that is about as strong language as could possibly be used in reference to the use of the submarine. So I submit for the information of the House, as it may help in the discussion of this item, that in putting the submarines out of commission the Canadian government is following the exact lead of the British Admiralty and its policy is in harmony with the official declarations of the British government's representatives gathered together in conference with the great nations of the world.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now that France and the other assembled nations at the Washington Conference have declined the British lead of abandoning the submarine, is it a fact that Great Britain herself has abandoned the submarine?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not say that Great Britain has, but that does not affect the argument that the submarine has been declared by Great Britain not to be a success, either in attack or defence, except against merchant vessels. This is a question that I suppose will be discussed more or less at conferences in the future.

I want to point out to the committee that this proposal, as announced the other day in the House, is not a finality on naval policy. There is no finality on naval policy

in the whole world to-day. The great nations of the world will probably meet several times again before they arrive at a conclusion as to the restriction or development of armaments, including the navy, and conferences will be held by the Overseas Dominions as to what share they ought to take. According to the report, such a conference was provided for at the conference held recently. The policy of the Government is along the lines and in accordance with the Naval Service Act passed in 1910. There is not a suggestion in it that is not contained within the paragraphs of the act of 1910. While all countries of the world are wondering at the present time what policy they will finally adopt for attack and defence, Canada is proceeding along safe, sane, economical lines, and when the time comes that a future policy is to be decided upon, we shall have a foundation on which can be built a naval policy worthy of Canada, if the Parliament of Canada decide on development.

I do not know that I need say anything more. I wanted to make this explanation about the submarines, the trawlers, and the torpedo boat destroyers, so that the committee would not be discussing the matter without knowing the full facts.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): The minister stated a moment ago that there was no finality about this proposal. Well, it is pretty near to finality. We would not have much further to go to make it final. I think the minister this afternoon has been in somewhat deep water.

Mr. GRAHAM: Where else should the navy be?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He has been labouring pretty hard. His statement this afternoon is not at all in accordance with the statement of policy which he made on Friday afternoon. He has undergone another change of heart, and a most radical one, and has laboured in pretty deep water this afternoon in an effort to explain it. It was not surprising to those of us who sit in this corner of the House. It was remarked on the streets of Toronto yesterday that we would have another flop here in naval matters; and I have no doubt in my mind that when the minister and the government read the Toronto Globe's editorial on Saturday, the process of changing heart and changing policies at once began, and we have the result of that change to-day. Now it is amusing for all members to sit and listen to my hon. friend's explanation this afternoon of the reason why he was going to abandon these two submarines. That is not the reason he gave on Friday. Why, on Friday the announcement he made to the House was that he was going to abandon the naval service and to go into the volunteer service. That was his reason for stating the policy which he then gave, but in the interval he has had to take up some communications that passed between the French government and British government on the programme that was laid down and discussed at Cannes; and he came to the House this afternoon with a radical change of policy simply because he found from his own friends and his own prominent supporters outside of this House, that the scrapping process which he announced on Friday afternoon was not going to meet with the approval of the rank and file of his party throughout the Dominion. I do not think it was very hard for my hon. friend to take a somersault, or for the members of the Government to take a somersault; they must be quite used to that sort of thing during the present session. It is a spectacle which has ceased even to amuse hon. members in this corner of the House under the conditions which have existed since the session opened.

Now what my hon. friend proposes is simply this: To take the five ships which were a gift by Great Britain to this country and which were accepted by it in good faith—

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To take those five ships and scrap them, save two which he says now he finds he can use as training ships.

An hon. MEMBER: Ships that were asked for.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would just as soon that my hon. friend did not interrupt me; he can reply to my remarks later if he wishes. I do not know whether they were asked for or not; we shall probably find that out as the debate goes on. The proposal now is to utilize two and scrap three. I do not remember that any serious objection was taken to the acceptance of these ships at the time they were received from the British government. I believe that when we did accept them it was on an understanding, either express or tacit, that we would keep them in commission, that we would operate them, that we would treat them as a nucleus of some kind of naval service which this country was going to establish at some time in the future. Away back in the year 1910, we who supported the

government of that day thought that we had settled a policy in regard to naval service in this country by adopting what was then known as the Canadian Naval Service Act. It provided for small beginnings. That was right enough. We were to build up a naval service in this country on the lines laid down in that act. It was to consist in the first place of the Royal Canadian Naval Service; that would be the permanent force of the navy. It was to consist, on the other hand, of a volunteer naval service corresponding to the volunteer militia which we have in Canada to-day. These were to go hand in hand; and I think we could all reasonably suppose that as time went on and the country developed, the naval service would likewise grow and develop. A change of government took place in 1911 and a new policy was adopted, or an effort was made to adopt a new policy. But the new policy, which consisted of the presentation of three dreadnaughts to Great Britain as a first contribution, never got through parliament. It did pass the House of Commons, but it never became law because the Senate, which is a part of this parliament, rejected that bill. So the matter stood at the outbreak of the war; and throughout the years of the war there was little or no development of any naval service in the Dominion of Canada as a purely Canadian naval service. But at the conclusion of the war did not the time arrive when we should take up the work again? We had a law on our statute book establishing a Canadian naval service. At the end of the war was it not reasonable to think that Canada would once more engage upon the work, taking it up from the very beginning? No one's ideas, no one's views on the subject were at all extravagant. All we intended to make was a beginning, and in making that beginning the offer of five ships suitable for our purpose, suitable for initial operations, the offer of five ships as a free gift came to Canada. We accepted the offer, and went on with our naval service policy based upon the act passed by this Parliament in the year 1910. There it is to-day. These five ships are in commission in the Canadian Naval Service, under our jurisdiction and our control, only forming a modest beginning for the purpose of training our young men, for the purpose of making a start or enabling us to do a little, or begin to do a little, of that which I think we should do in regard to naval operations within the British Empire, but particularly for the protection of our own country, our own harbours, our own coast; and our own fishing too, if you will. The expense is not very great,—two and a half millions I think was the total expense of last year. And yet the minister comes before Parliament on this occasion to say practically; "I am going to repudiate the policy which was accepted in 1910, when I was a minister of the Crown, which provided for the establishment and maintenance in this country of a Royal Canadian Naval Service, and I am going to devote myself to getting up instead a volunteer naval service. We will scrap or put out of commission",—I say, scrap—the five boats which we accepted from Great Britain in good faith with the idea that we would maintain them, and instead of that we will get a couple of trawlers of 470 tons—two trawlers on the Atlantic and two trawlers on the Pacific, and one other boat"—not one of the five according to the statement made on Friday last but one other boat which the minister then had in his mind's eye. But to-day he says he can utilize the two destroyers to take the place of these other boats, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, and that is going to be his establishment. Then he is going to train up a force of men on the principle of two or three weeks training a year; drill them in the armouries throughout the country; take them down to the ocean the first year and give them initial instruction; and take them down again the second year, give them a trip out on the ocean for a few days and teach them something about mine sweeping; and the third year I do not know what he proposes to do, but he is going to give them another holiday for two weeks, and in the interval some training in the armouries throughout the Dominion; and in that way he hopes to build up something in the nature of a naval reserve in this country. Why, I think anyone who sat in the House in 1910, and in subsequent years, knows that you cannot make a sailor by merely giving him two weeks' training a year for three years; you cannot make a naval sailor without a long continuous course of training; that is elementary. Training at brief periods for one, two, three, four or five years is not going to accomplish anything for you. A long, protracted and hard course of training is necessary, and unless we pursue such a course it is not going to result in anything. The hon. minister estimates that he can carry out this volunteer scheme at an expenditure of about a million and a half, while the greater scheme, which had

the approval of this House and the approval of the Admiralty, will only cost two and a half millions. The greater scheme is in itself a most modest one and is not expensive, but it may yield some results and may train some men. It may eventually amount to something and be of some real value to the country. But it looks to me as if it were going to be pure waste of money to spend a million and a half a year on a volunteer service such as described by my hon. friend on Friday last. I am not alone in that opinion. I read it in the Toronto newspapers, and I see it in the editorials in the Montreal newspapers. You might just as well throw your money in the ocean as to spend a million and a half on any such scheme as was outlined by the hon. minister on Friday afternoon. I think he has tried to improve his scheme between last Friday and to-day, because he knows it is absolutely unworkable. Well, what are we going to do? Are we going to spend a million and a half of money in playing at naval warfare, getting together a few naval volunteers in this country, and bringing them down to the sea for two weeks each year as a sort of holiday? It is not going to get us anywhere, or establish anything in the nature of a permanent naval service. I believe there is only too much in the criticism that it will be an absolute waste of money. Why can the minister not be content with the present programme? Where is the demand? In what quarter of the country is there any demand to change the programme? The hon. member from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has criticised the present arrangement very severely, and has said that it is a waste of money to spend two and a half millions on the five ships in commission. What will he say in regard to the million and a half the minister proposes to spend on the volunteer services, on the trawlers, and on the armoury drill and the like? I have tried to find where the criticism of the present policy is. I fail to find it in the press. If there is criticism in the country, it is that we are not doing enough, and that we reasonably should do more, but I have heard of no criticism inside the House or out of it, save only the words of the hon. member from Lunenburg, that the programme which we carried on last year and the year before should be at all reduced. Let the Government be content with that programme. I agree that it is not one of which we can boast very much, but it is infinitely superior to the programme which the minister brought down to the House earlier in the session. If the minister wishes merely to play at the naval game, let him form his naval volunteer force, and put out of commission these ships and his naval reserve. That is the scheme he has outlined, as I understand it, and to that scheme I am heartily opposed.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of interest both to the statement made by the Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham) and also to the statement made by the hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), but it is very amusing to me, and I am sure it must have been to hon. members, to hear the hon. member from South Wellington speak about the "flop" which the hon. Minister of Defence had taken since last Friday. I presume that word flop comes quite naturally to the hon. member from South Wellington, because if there is one flopper in Canada to-day that deserves the title, it is the member for South Wellington. I need not go into details in order to explain to the House and the country how and why. The hon. member deserves that title, because everybody knows the whys and wherefores of what happened in 1917. The hon. minister has told us that he intends to keep the two destroyers, one on the Atlantic coast and the other on the Pacific coast, for training. I do not object seriously to keeping those two boats for training, but if, as his Director of Naval Service told him, the idea was to keep the vessel on the Pacific coast for the purpose of protecting the seal fisheries, it seems to me he is going beyond what is necessary in regard to this matter from a naval standpoint. In my opinion, the matter of protecting the seal fisheries in the Behring straits comes entirely under the Fisheries Department, and should be looked after by one of the Fishery patrol boats.

The matter of the Canadian Navy, as has been said by the hon. member from South Wellington, is one in which the people of the country have been interested for a number of years, but it comes, in my opinion, with very bad taste from the hon. member from South Wellington to compare the record of the Liberal party in regard to their naval plan, either their past history or their present record, with that of the party with which he is now associated.

5 p.m.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I made no comparison.

Mr. DUFF:—or what happened the last few years in Canada in naval affairs. It might be well to review this matter in a very few words to show what both parties have done; in that way we can come to a conclusion as to whether the policy of the Liberal party, or the policy adopted by the Conservative party, is the better one. I have taken the trouble to look up the records of this House, in order to find what practical work was done by the government of this country previous to 1910 when the Naval Service Act was introduced, and I find that neither the Conservative government nor the Liberal government spent any money on what is known as the Naval Defence of this country. I need not go back very far. For instance in the year 1905-6, the year 1906-7, the year 1907-8, or the year 1908-9, there was not one dollar voted by this parliament towards the naval defence of this country. Although the hon. member from South Wellington says that I was the only person in this House who had criticised the navy and the naval expenditures, yet it seems to me that I should be more interested in the protection of the coast lines of this country than the hon. member for South Wellington or in fact any other member who lives in the interior of the country. I do not wish to say that they should not take an interest in this matter, but I think they will be the first to agree with me that those who live on the Atlantic or the Pacific coast are more vitally interested in the protection of those coasts than those who live in the interior of Canada. I remember during the years of the war, in the years 1918, 1919, when German submarines came across the Atlantic, when those submarines were within five miles of the Atlantic coast, we realized that it would have been very nice to have a navy. But we were not scared at all. The people who were born and bred on the Atlantic ocean are not so easily scared. The hon. member from South Wellington has said that I am the only one that has risen in this House and criticised the navy and deprecated the fact that so much money is being wasted, but it seems to me the members of the House and the people of the country will agree with me that I have more interest in the matter than the hon. member has in view of the fact that I live on the Atlantic coast, and represent an Atlantic coast constituency.

Neither the Liberal party nor the Conservative party spent one dollar on naval defence up to 1908-9. The Laurier naval policy was introduced in this parliament in the year 1910. I need not tell hon. members what that naval policy represented or what it meant, but the Liberal party endeavoured at that time to put an act on the statute book and to carry it out, in order to create a naval sentiment in this country. Although the Liberal party voted in this Parliament for a naval service, and purchased from the Mother Country two training ships, the Niobe and the Rainbow, when the bye-election came in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska in 1910, the very gentlemen who are now supported by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), aided and abetted by certain Tory newspapers in Quebec—English newspapers at that—went through the country and did everything possible to defeat the Liberal candidate, purely and solely on the question of Canada's share in the naval defence of the country. That is what happened. And yet the hon. gentleman rises in this House and throws taunts across the floor, endeavouring to show that we on this side are not interested in naval matters in Canada. It is a well known fact that leading men in the Conservative party sent telegrams of congratulation to the Conservative candidate—more truly speaking, the Nationalist candidate—in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, eulogizing him for the attitude he was taking in that campaign. Then what occurred when the general election came on in 1911? Did the Conservative party uphold the Liberal naval policy which was passed by this House in 1910? Did they go up and down the country telling the people that we ought to have a naval policy in Canada and that we should have ships on the Atlantic and the Pacific in order to protect the coast lines of this country and safeguard the avenues of traffic on the two oceans? Not at all. They did not utter a single word in favour of the naval policy in that campaign. On the contrary, the leading men of the party which the hon. member for South Wellington now supports toured the province of Quebec supporting the Nationalist candidates who were opposed to the naval policy of the Liberal party and of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. They told the people of Quebec that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier was elected and his naval policy was carried out their sons would be commandeered and carried across the seas to Japan, there to be disemboweled. And one of the men who conducted this sort of campaign was chosen as Deputy Speaker of the House, afterwards becoming a Cabinet Minister in the Conservative govern-

ment. That gentleman it was who gave utterance to the famous saying that in order to breathe the breath of freedom "it was necessary to shoot holes through the British flag." Yet these are the men for whom the hon. member for South Wellington is acting as spokesman, criticizing the Liberal policy with reference to naval affairs in this country.

What transpired after the election had taken place? They had to carry out their bargain with the Nationalists of Quebec, twenty-two of whom were returned to Parliament as a result of that campaign, which was one of the most dastardly campaigns ever carried on by a political party in Canada. Did they spend $2,500,000 in naval defence? Not at all. The Liberal party in 1910-11 expended $3,000,000 on naval affairs, and in 1911-12 they voted $3,000,000 again for the navy of Canada. But as soon as those gentlemen assumed office, to demonstrate just how much interest they had in the naval protection of our country on the Atlantic and the Pacific, in 1912-13 they reduced the vote to $1,600,000; in 1913-14 to $1,000,000; and in 1914-15 to only $1,000,000. Now, that is the naval policy they carried out. They had so little interest in naval matters that they reduced the vote in 1913 and 1914 by $500,000 more than the minister (Mr. Graham) is reducing at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: And that was before the war.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, one and two years before the war. The two ships that were purchased from Great Britain, the Niobe and the Rainbow, were splendid vessels, admirably adapted for training purposes, and they could have rendered very valuable service not only before the war but even during the war. But the Conservative government did not keep the crews on these ships after they had made their bargain with their Nationalist friends. They paid off the crews, and the Niobe was tied up at dockyard at Halifax, with two chains at her bows and two at her stern; and there were not sufficient caretakers left on board to keep the machinery in order. When the war broke out in 1914 this boat was moored to the dock, grounded on her beef bones, and it took six weeks after the declaration of hostilities to get her into any kind of shape to go to sea. As I said before in this House, and I repeat it with emphasis on this occasion, if the Niobe had been put into commission on the Atlantic, and the Rainbow on the Pacific coast, on the 4th of August, and if the telegrams that came from the Pacific at that time had been answered—and it could have been effectively answered had these ships been in commission—there would have been a sufficient number of vessels captured on the Pacific and the Atlantic to pay the cost of the war to Canada for the first year. But these people did not want to do anything for the navy. The Borden government did not want to do anything for the defence of the country, and no other conclusion could be arrived at than that they were afraid to break the bargain which they had made with the Nationalists. The war went on and we spent a great deal of money—some $30,000,000—on what was described as naval defence. I have no hesitation in saying that most of that money expended during the war on the Atlantic and the Pacific was wasted. In 1920, the Union government accepted five ships from Great Britain. Now, the people of the country were not consulted in regard to that gift. I do not blame the British government for having offered these ships to Canada; indeed, I think they are to be commended for having done so. But I do say that the ships were accepted by the government of Canada without the authority of the people, who were not consulted in the matter. Notwithstanding the fact that Parliament was then in session, the whole thing was done over the heads of the people's representatives. Is there any man within the sound of my voice, or in Canada, who will assert that since these ships have come to Canada they have been of any practical value so far as the defence of our coast lines is concerned, or in keeping the traffic lanes open on either coast? I do not hesitate to say that they have been absolutely useless for defensive purposes. They have served no good purpose in the last two years, and whatever money has been spent to pay the crews and keep these vessels in commission has been utterly wasted to the people of this country.

Mr. CARROLL: Does the hon. member know what the British Admiralty are doing with the same kind of ships which they sent to Canada as a gift?

Mr. DUFF: To use the words of the hon. member for South Wellington, they are "scrapping" them. I repeat that these ships, for purposes of defence at any rate, have been absolutely useless, and to prove that statement I have only to call atten-

tion to the fact that they have not spent three months on the Atlantic coast or on the Pacific since crossing the Atlantic. They have been wandering all over creation. They arrived in Halifax some two years ago, remained there about six weeks, and the first thing we read in the newspapers was that they were going to take a trip to the Pacific. They were fitted out at great expense to the country and proceeded down to the West Indies and through the Panama canal, and after a time we learned through the newspapers that they had arrived at Vancouver or Victoria. Now, that was a delightful trip. I have no doubt that most of us would have liked very much to be on board one of those cruisers or torpedo boat destroyers on such an extensive and delightful voyage. But I think every one will agree with me that that trip was of no practical benefit to this country. Those ships were not defending the Canadian coast line while on that trip, and consequently no one can argue that from the time they left Halifax for Vancouver until their return to Halifax two or three months later any practical results were obtained in regard to the defence of our shores.

Then during last winter did those ships stay on the Atlantic coast and do any particular service that enured to the advantage of this country?—and I need scarcely add that during the winter months we can use boats of this description on the Atlantic coast, poor as they are, for the weather there is very rough; men of the merchant marine, both those in the liners which cross from the Old Country to Nova Scotia and those in the sailing ships which ply to all parts of the world practically, have to make that coast in stormy weather during the winter months, and there are times when it might be very handy, if a wireless were sent from one part of the coast to another that a ship was in distress, to have these ships available to render aid. But where were they when they might have been of some service? For four months those ships were down in Barbados and Trinidad. In fact the officers and crews helped to open the Barbados legislature.

The winter over, those ships are now back in Halifax. But what work is there for them to do in regard to defending our coast line or keeping open the lanes of traffic? I say those ships are absolutely useless. And the question in my mind is not whether we should continue these ships in commission, but: Can we in our present financial condition spend sufficient money for the upkeep of a navy which will not be of any service for our national defence either on the Atlantic or the Pacific, or to keep open the ocean lanes for our merchant marine? There is the whole question. Will any sane Canadian say that one cruiser, two torpedo boat destroyers and two submarines would be of any service if war broke out between Canada and—what country shall I say?

Mr. LANCTOT: There is no country with which we can possibly be at war.

Mr. DUFF: I agree with my hon. friend, because we are a peace-loving people and are not going to seek an excuse for declaring war against any country. But if war did break out, what use would these five boats be to defend our coast line either on the Pacific or on the Atlantic? How would you subdivide them? Would you cut the Aurora in two and send one part to the Pacific coast and keep the other part on the Atlantic coast? The minister says that he is going to send one torpedo boat destroyer to the Pacific and retain one on the Atlantic. He can do that with those destroyers, and also with the two submarines. But what effective service could one destroyer and one submarine on either ocean render to this country? Absolutely none whatever.

My argument is the same to-day as it always has been—that if we cannot spend $100,000,000 a year in order to maintain a sufficient navy on both oceans to be ready for any eventuality, which is absolutely improbable, then it is useless for us to spend $2,500,000 or $1,500,000 for the purpose of pretending that we have a navy.

I do not think I need argue the point any further. There is the whole question in a nutshell. Many hon. members will recollect that when, two years ago, we were discussing the taking over of those five boats the then President of the Privy Council, Hon. Mr. Rowell, in reply to my contention that the ships were no good for defensive purposes, said: Oh, no, that is not what they are intended for. They are to keep open the traffic lanes so that shipping can move between the Atlantic and the Pacific with safety. And no less an authority than the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) supported the view expressed by the then President of the Privy Council.

No man who knows anything about marine matters will dare get up in Parliament or

on any public platform and state that these five ships can keep open the lanes of traffic for the fifty-seven different routes on the two oceans. If we want the ships necessary to keep open our traffic lanes, then let us be men enough to vote, not $1,500,000, but let us vote $100,000,000—if we can afford it. It is useless to vote only $1,500,000; we cannot afford to vote $100,0000,000. That being so, why do we not act like sensible business men, and without taking politics into account settle this thing on a business basis? That is the right and proper thing to do in the circumstances.

I submit that it is useless to spend $1,500,000 on these ships in view of the financial condition of the country, and in view of the fact that other national services are starving for government aid and cannot get it. Yet the previous government came to this Parliament and asked for a naval vote of $2,500,000, and this Government is asking for a reduced vote of $1,500,000—both votes being for something which is not of much benefit to this country. There is my whole argument, and I say that it is absolutely impossible to refute it.

I notice that while we are reducing our naval expenditures other countries are doing the same. I have in my hand a press dispatch from London, England, stating that the British government have cut down their naval expenditure to the extent of £16,000,000, or about $80,000,000.

Mr. LEWIS: What is the amount of their naval estimates to-day?

Mr. DUFF: I have not got that information.

Mr. LEWIS: That reduction does not mean very much unless we know what the appropriation was before and what it is now.

Mr. DUFF: I quite understand that that is a small reduction compared with the total naval expenditure of the British government, but I think it will be admitted that the very fact of that reduction being made proves that they realize the necessity for reducing their naval expenditure. Certainly if the British government feel justified in making that reduction, it seems to me that, as I said a moment ago, situated as we are, if we cannot afford to spend a sum of money that will give us something practical in the way of naval service, then it is good business for us to reduce our naval expenditure to a minimum.

I am very much afraid that whilst an overwhelming majority of people in this country are not favourable to naval expenditures of any great magnitude, a small minority do not share that very widespread view. A few days ago I read a press dispatch from London of a speech made by Lord Lee, First Lord of the British Admiralty, in the course of which occurs the following:

> Lord Lee pointed out that the Imperial Conference after a full, prolonged and intimate discussion of the naval needs of the Empire, had agreed that the maintenance of an Empire navy was the common concern of the whole Empire.

In other words, Lord Lee says that the delegates to that conference which was held in London last year agreed "that the maintenance of an Empire navy was the common concern of the whole Empire." So far as I am concerned, if that was agreed to by any delegates from Canada, I submit that they should not have done so without first consulting the representatives of the people in this House. It was bad enough for the then government to accept these five ships without consulting Parliament, which was in session at that time, but it seems to me it is worse for members of any government to go to the Old Country and agree with the British representatives and the delegates from the other Dominions that they would do something in regard to Empire naval defence without first consulting the views of our people through their representatives in Parliament.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am fairly well satisfied with the statement made by the Minister of Defence (Mr. Graham). In view of the fact that we have some sort of naval organization, I think that perhaps it is not right or fair that the whole naval vote should be cut out at once. I can understand that it might not be necessary for him to spend the $1,500,000 which he is asking for, and I suggest that in the interests of the people he should save any part of that amount which he can as the year goes on.

As to the proposal of the minister with regard to arranging for naval service training for two or three weeks each year, I must agree with the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), that it is impossible to make sailors in two or three weeks. The hon. member said, in effect, that the money would be wasted in any attempt to make sailors in that short time.

Mr. MARTELL: Does the hon. member consider that a sailor can be made at all on one of these ships? In order to get the proper training, would the men not have

to go on sailing ships, square-riggers, and so on?

Mr. DUFF: I think my hon. friend is right, to some extent. They do make sailors now on steam vessels, though they are not able seamen or as good as the sailors you make on square-riggers, fore-and-afters, and tern schooners. But I say you cannot make a sailor in three weeks. If the argument of the hon. member for South Wellington is good, that you cannot train a man for naval service by keeping him two or three weeks in an armory, on a training ship, or even by sending him two or three weeks to sea, either on one of these patrol boats or on one of these destroyers, then it seems to me the same argument should hold good with regard to the militia, and I am only sorry now we did not fight harder to get the militia vote for annual training further reduced. If you cannot make a sailor in two or three weeks, you cannot make a soldier in two or three weeks.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would succeed if he tried again.

Mr. DUFF: In making a soldier, or a sailor?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, in getting another reduction in the militia estimates.

Mr. DUFF: I am a very modest man. I will let the hon. leader of the Opposition read between the lines; he can come to his own conclusions. I believe, however, there is some merit in the proposal put forward by the minister in regard to a naval reserve. Some of the very best men who were in the British navy during the war, either on the fighting ships or on transports, were men who had been trained in the naval reserve. We all remember the gallant stand taken by the British army on the Gallipoli Peninsula. We remember reading in our newspapers one morning of the decision to abandon the peninsula. We read the vivid story of how these soldiers fought and backed their way down the hill fighting inch by inch, and when they arrived on the Gallipoli beach they found the boats there, ready to take them to the transport. We read that the sailors, naval ratings from the transports, were on the shore; they saw that the soldiers and their equipment were put on the transports. To the naval reserve was left the gallant task of firing the stores on the beach and being the last to embark; and these men had been trained in the naval reserve of England and the naval reserve of the small dominion of Newfoundland. If the minister, then, can work out some scheme whereby, at a minimum of expense to the country, we can train a naval reserve, the money will be well spent. I myself have a scheme in my head, Mr. Chairman, which would not cost very much money. We all remember that during the late war the Militia Department created a kind of sausage machine from which they ground out honorary colonels by the bushel. Now, I do not want the Minister of Defence to make me a rear-admiral for this suggestion, but I want to say this to him. We have on the Atlantic coast, and I think also on the Pacific coast, men who require practically no training; men who can be enlisted in a voluntary naval reserve at very small cost to the country. If the minister would like me to do something in this regard I could get anywhere from 5,000 to 10,000 volunteers in my own county to serve as a naval reserve on the Atlantic coast. These are the men who should be engaged; they do not have to be made sailors in two or three weeks, for they are sailors now. They have ploughed the seas ever since they were boys of twelve or fifteen years of age; they have gone fishing on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and during the war they braved the submarines in the bay of Biscay and in the Mediterranean, carrying foodstuffs to the people of Europe. These are the men, who in my opinion, are ready to do either the work they did before, or any special work in connection with the defence of their country. It is not necessary to spend much money on a naval reserve this year; the minister should go slowly and work out a proper scheme, and not be in a hurry to spend any more this year. But if the time comes when the minister thinks it necessary after mature deliberation to have a naval reserve, I say that in my county—and in this respect it is only like a number of other counties along the Nova Scotia coast—thousands of young men can be obtained by the voluntary system who will be glad indeed to give two or three weeks a year, or more, in order to be so trained that they may be able to serve their country if necessary, in her defence.

In conclusion I may say that I should be very glad to vote any sum of money which I considered necessary for naval defence, either on the Atlantic or on the Pacific coast. But I submit that either $2,500,000 or $1,500,000 devoted to the naval defence is almost wasted, even though it is given the name of money voted for the naval

service. Let us be reasonable and sensible in this matter; let us look at it from the plain, business standpoint. If we cannot do anything in the matter of naval defence with either $1,500,000 or $2,500,000, then why should we be talking across the floor of this Chamber just because we feel we want to make some point against the Minister of Defence on the ground of his having cut down the estimate? I say he should be congratulated for cutting it down, and, further, that unless he can propose a good scheme under which it would be necessary to spend money on a naval reserve, the minister when he comes before the House another year would follow a course approved by the people, not only of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but of the country generally, if he said: "I find it is not a practical thing to spend money on a naval service, so I have decided to cut the whole thing out". I say the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific would give the minister credit for doing what he thought was right in the general interests of the country.

Mr. McBRIDE: The hon. member (Mr. Duff) made the statement that one of the ships purchased by the Laurier government was chained to the dock at Halifax, by the late government when they came into power, and that the other was laid up at Vancouver. He said that if these ships had been in proper trim to go to sea when the war broke out they could have seized enough shipping to pay for the war.

Mr. DUFF: No, I did not say that.

Mr. McBRIDE: The hon. member said, if I am not mistaken, that if these ships had been ready for sea when the war broke out they could have seized enough shipping to pay for the first year of the war.

Mr. DUFF: Yes, the first year. The hon. member said the whole war.

Mr. McBRIDE: Then the hon. member said that so far as the five ships taken over by the late government were concerned, if war broke out they would be practically of no use.

Mr. DUFF: I said, for practical defence purposes.

Mr. McBRIDE: Would not these five ships that were accepted by the late government serve a better purpose than the other two tinpot boats that were scrapped? Let us be honest. The five ships that the late government accepted from the Imperial government, if they were in proper shape, would go a long way to defending at least the Pacific coast.

Mr. DUFF: You can have them on the Pacific coast.

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): The hon. member for South Wellington has said that he has not heard any criticism whatever of naval matters or of the grants to be made for the upkeep of the Canadian navy. I would like to say that there is a considerable body of opinion which has not been able to express itself through some of the Montreal and Toronto papers, which evidently are read by the hon. member for South Wellington. I would like to state further very frankly that so far as my constituency is concerned, I came here pledged to advocate national disarmament. That is not a personal viewpoint merely. It is the view of the people who sent me here, and I take it that the best contribution we can make in this House is to try to represent the opinion of the constituents who sent us here.

I quite agree that the expenditure of something like $1,500,000 on ships to defend the coast lines of Canada is a good deal like playing with the problem. I can quite appreciate the position that if you are really going to defend our coasts, you might rather have to spend $100,000,000. That is one thing that we should keep before us—the practical business side.

There is another aspect I should like to mention. We ought not to take any further steps in this matter until after the next Imperial conference and until after it is decided what the status of Canada really is. Some of us feel very strongly that we must not do anything whatever that would lead us into any sort of imperialism or draw us into responsibility for doing something over which we have not absolute control. We feel very strongly, a good many of us, that we ought not to be associated in any way whatever with any conferences which may possibly commit us to that from which we cannot very well draw back, but as to which we can have no final decision.

I am not at all sure concerning the reason for the acceptance of that gift of ships from the Motherland. I am not sure as to how much value they will be to this country. I happened to be in the city of Vancouver when that fleet came into English bay, and I know that a great deal was made in the papers of the event. It was suggested that this was indeed the

beginning of a real Canadian navy. The officers entertained and were entertained, and all that kind of thing, but there is a very large section of the people that since the Great War have ceased to be impressed by that kind of performance. It has been said on this floor to-day that the war is over, and yet there are members who have directed our minds back to 1910, and suggested that we ought to carry out certain policies which were proposed away back in that year. I submit that to-day we look out at the world with very different eyes from what we did in 1910. Surely the war has taught us some lessons, and among others that preparedness does not insure us against war, but that the surest way of creating and maintaining peace amongst the nations of the world is that we should indeed scrap our navies and our great armaments. You may laugh at such a position as that if you please. You may ridicule it; any hon. gentleman is at liberty to do that; but that is coming to be more and more the considered opinion of a considerable number of people in this, as well as in other countries.

Now that we have had a naval policy proclaimed at Washington, we are beginning to breathe a little more freely and feel that we can go on quitely with our business without undertaking any more of these tremendous financial obligations under which we have been labouring in the past. Surely we have an opportunity here in Canada of quitely reorganizing our affairs, not on the old basis, but on an altogether new basis.

The hon. member for South Wellington suggests that as the country grows, the naval service will grow and develop. That is precisely the militaristic point of view, according to which militarism is an essential part of any nation's life. From this standpoint we must always look forward to being able to defend ourselves by force of arms. I submit that that time has passed, that militarism is discredited, that the great world war, in which tens of millions of lives were lost and through which the whole world has been plunged into bankruptcy, has taught us that war is not effective, that militarism is a discredited weapon, and that we must look forward to the reorganization of our national and international affairs on an altogether different basis from that which we have had in the past. I would urge that we here in Canada very largely separated from other nations, and freer in that respect to work out our own affairs than most of the nations, should begin at once to stop naval expenditure and to recognize that it is only by the cultivation of international goodfellowship that we shall obtain any security from external attack.

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): Coming from a constituency which, in the days when shipbuilding was supreme in the province of Nova Scotia, built the largest wooden ships that were ever constructed in Canada, I feel it is my duty to rise and congratulate the minister upon a policy which will indirectly help in the very best possible way to bring back to Nova Scotia her commercial supremacy on the sea.

I was very much amused, as the hon. member for Lunenburg says he was, to hear the ex-Minister of Militia refer to "floppers." I am probably the youngest member in the House from the Maritime provinces, and while I have many sins to answer for, as I do not claim to be a paragon of righteousness, I am thankful that I do not have to answer to the atrocious charge of ever having been a "political flopper." I stand in this House this afternoon proud of the fact that I can support a Liberal Government, the true successor of the Liberal government led by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I followed the great Sir Wilfrid, as did all my forbears, and of him it can be said in the words of the poet Tennyson, he was a man

> "Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,
> Nor palter'd with Eternal God for power;
> * * * * * * * * * * * * *
> He never shall be shamed
> ...what ever record leap to light.

I stand here this afternoon supporting my hon. leader who is the successor of that great chieftain, Sir Wilfrid, and whose naval policy has been vindicated time after time since he first enunciated it to Canada. He is not like the ex-Minister of Militia of whom we could say, as Sir Walter Scott said of "Old Immortality":

> He delights in haunting ancient places and refreshing tombstones while the stream of life goes by and flowers bloom unheeded at his feet.

The hon. ex-Minister of Militia probably wants to get back to the days prior to 1910. Those were the days when my hon. friend had sound reasoning and peace of mind for he was standing for a policy which any reliable man in Canada would be pleased to uphold and advocate. But my hon. friend is sick at heart and has no peace of mind for he has shared in the vacillating measures which were adopted under the government of which he was a

member, from 1917 down to the end of 1921. The result is, that in order to bolster up a case against the excellent policy which has been enunciated by the present Minister of Defence he stands up and wobbles very much like a "land lubber" endeavouring to get his sea-legs while suffering from mal de mer caused by the bilge water from the pumps of the leaky ship of government which sailed Canada from 1917 up to December, 1921. We are not the only people that are making cuts in both military and naval matters. My hon. friend and colleague from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has stated that Great Britain herself is cutting down her naval expenditure by eighty millions of money. The great dominion of Australia is also scrapping the Sydney, a ship, I believe, which was built wholly and entirely for Australia and of which Australians were proud. I believe that pursuant to the League of Nations an agreement was entered into looking towards disarmament, and we in Canada should not wait for the other portions of the British Empire to lead the way. We in Canada should not ask to be shown what other portions of the British Empire are doing in order to do the right thing, because Canada is mistress in her own house. Canada will be governed by Canadians; and I am proud this afternoon to know that we have a Government which has the courage of its convictions, a Government which will listen to the dictates of the Canadian people and also has the courage to see that Canadians shall be properly led with a view to economy not only in commercial matters but in military and naval affairs.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair, and the House took recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

House again in Committee on Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

On section 1—Extension of time for construction.

Mr. McCONICA: When this debate was adjourned I was speaking to the amendment offered by the hon. member from Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael). I am a member of the Railway Committee, but I was absent on the day this bill was considered, owing to illness—the only day I have been absent. Therefore, I feel that it is proper that I should be permitted to state my position in regard to this amendment. As hon. members will understand, this amendment, applies to six branch lines that are under charter to the Canadian Pacific Railway in the two Prairie provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Two of these lines are within the boundaries of the constituency of Battleford. My contention is that it is time that the railroad should show a disposition to begin to construct these branches, and that something positive should be required of this company. The country to be served by these branch lines in every instance is very much in need of this construction. Some of them have been in need of it, perhaps, for years. People settled along the proposed line. The war came on, construction was referred, and the settlers have gone on year after year at very great inconvenience.

The time has come, I think, when Canada should arouse herself from the lethargy in which she is resting to-day. If we propose to build up this country, it is time for us to get busy. I consider it almost a disgrace that at this time there should be unemployment in Canada. It is too bad that we should lack railway facilities at this time, when we have great need of improvement; when the world is in distress and needs those things which Canada can produce, and when people are hungry, cold and houseless. We have abundant natural resources, and great forests, but our mills are idle and our fields are uncultivated and uncut. Now are we going to get busy? What put Belgium back into industrial activity? Because she went to work. What must Canada do? Go to work. There is a job for every man who looks for one, if things are properly conducted in Canada. There is no excuse for unemployment. It is a crime for the able-bodied men in this country to go without work for six days in the week. A longtime ago we were admonished that six days we should labour and do all our work, and on the seventh we should rest from our labours, because it is the Sabbath of our Lord. What does that mean? It means that we must observe the Sabbath, but it means a little more than that. It means that for six days we shall labour, and the man who loafs six days violates that commandment every day

of the six, and if he loafs on the seventh, he violates that commandment also, for he is pursuing his ordinary avocation on the Lord's day. I say that in that command we have an assurance that every man can find a job if he looks for it, and I do not know where there are more jobs than here in Canada.

I do not know anybody in better shape to begin to employ labour than the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is laying away its surplus. The people are needing the extensions. The labourers require employment and the people need the money. Let us start the construction, and the railway will get the tonnage and the people will get service. The people will get something to eat, something with which to clothe themselves and the wheels of industry will start. Now is the time, just as quickly as we can get at it. If we stand with our hands folded year after year, and let things go by, it will only be a question of a very short time until we go into bankruptcy. We need immigration in Canada. But we want something for them to do. We must improve the western part of the country if we desire to accommodate immigrants, and the way to improve it is to build branch railroads. We have plenty of trunk lines, but what do they amount to if there are no branches? It is the branches that bring business; they create the tonnage which makes the railroads profitable. I hope that hon. gentlemen will see the wisdom of providing that they shall go to work in earnest within two years and spend enough money to mean something. The Railway Act provides for an expenditure of 15 per cent, and that is the provision inserted in this amendment. I contend that it is a reasonable provision; otherwise the bill is substantially an extension of the charter for five years, and I do not believe that it is the intention that such an extension should be granted. I, therefore, sincerely trust that the House will see the wisdom of adopting the amendment.

Mr. McCREA: This is the third time that this matter has been considered by this House. It was dealt with by the special committee, who granted the extension asked for; so I cannot understand why hon. members should persist in opposing it here. It has been discussed throughout the entire time devoted to private bills on each of the two former occasions it has been before the committee in this House, and the object has been simply to obtain, if possible, a snap verdict. Now, I believe in the development of the country. But if I am rightly informed, as I think I am, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have seven or eight different branches in various stages of construction at the present time in the western provinces. True, the Canadian Pacific Railway is a strong and powerful corporation; nevertheless, it is hardly reasonable or fair that it should be asked to do too many things at one time. The hon. gentlemen who have been insisting on this amendment are very loud in their protests against high freight rates. They demand cheap transportation. As I have just remarked, it is true that the Canadian Pacific Railway is a corporation of considerable magnitude, and hon. gentlemen say that they ought to be able to proceed with this work because they have all kinds of money. I do not dispute the fact that they have sufficient money for operating purposes; but neither the Canadian Pacific Railway nor any other corporation, big or little, using sound judgment, is going to take the money which it has for operating purposes and put it into permanent investment in the construction of roads. What they will do, before starting upon the construction of this or ony other important branch railway, is to go and sell bonds, and I presume there is not a gentleman in the House, who has had anything to do with the financing of any concern, who does not realize that the present is a very critical time to sell bonds to advantage. If we force the Canadian Pacific Railway to go and sell bonds for the construction of this extension, probably at seven or eight per cent and running over a period of twenty, thirty or forty years, we shall simply be putting a burden on them that will react on the freight rates. If I am correctly informed, the extension that has been asked for in this particular case can really be constructed only by the Canadian Pacific Railway. It can, of course, be built by the Canadian National Railways; but, for my part, the National Railways have as many lines on hand as they can operate advantageously, and I would not by any means advise that they should undertake to build any extensions that can be built by anybody else. The Canadian Pacific Railway are simply asking for the usual extension, namely, two years to commence and five years to finish. If the money market should happen to take a turn for the better and they could get their money reasonably, so that they could carry on the construction now under way, they would probably take advantage of the circumstance;

because it is my belief that they are just as anxious to build the extension as the people are to have it. The conditions, however, are such that it is not wise on the part of this Government to try to place burdens on the Canadian Pacific Railway or, for that matter, or any other corporation that would compel them to go into the money market and buy money at this particular time, when they would have to pay an extremely high rate of interest for it. In the interest of the western farmers and, indeed, of the people generally, who expect and want cheap transportation, we should give the railways an opportunity to take advantage of the money market when it is favourable, and when they can get their money at a reasonable price. I think the Canadian Pacific Railway has a record in this country that ought to be a fair guarantee that they are not bluffers or slackers, and that they will do their work and do it to advantage, if given a fair opportunity. It is not to the advantage of the western people, nor any other community in the country, that we should force the railways to go into the money market at an inapportune time, because if they have to pay too much for their money the cost will eventually fall upon the people in higher freight rates.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to say a very few words in regard to the bill, which is practically on a par with what I might term a sister bill that was before the House a few days ago. Both of these bills —but I am speaking now more particularly of this one—were, I understand, fully considered and threshed out before the Railway Committee. Now, I do not wish to lecture the House at all, but I would observe that, with the large and well equipped committee which this House has for the consideration of private bills, such as the Banking Committee and the Committee on Railways and Canals, it would seem advisable, unless there is a vital principle at stake, that the decisions of a select standing committee should be accepted, for two reasons: In the first place, before that committee there appear the representatives of those who are interested. I understand, from the reports, that the Railway Committee gave this bill careful consideration. These very proposed amendments were considered by the committee, who decided to report the bill in its present form, or at least with the minor amendments referred to by the Chairman in reading the bill. In the next place, if we brought into the House these matters which are more or less in the nature of details, it would be desirable that the House should have before it in detail all the evidence and the reasons in support of or in opposition to them, just as in the committee. That is what should be done if the House is seriously going to consider from time to time minor amendments of this kind. Now, let us look for a moment at the amendments. As I understand the two amendments, one is to shorten the period of time from two years to one and from five years to three, for commencement and completion.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEVENS: Well, at all events, that is a matter of detail which the committee itself is more competent to determine than we are in this House, unless we are in a position to hear all the evidence. Now what is the situation? The section of the act which has been referred to by a good many hon. members—

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The hon. member is not speaking to the amendment. He is speaking on the question of time, which is not mentioned in the bill.

Mr. STEVENS: I had passed from that and got to the question of bonds, so that my hon. friend's objection is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN: The part of the bill which it is proposed to strike out reads:

> —if within the said periods respectively the said lines are not commenced or are not completed or put into operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the company by Parliament shall cease, and be null and void as respects so much of the said lines as shall then remain uncompleted.

The point of time has some relevancy to this particular amendment, as the hon. member will see.

Mr. STEVENS: I so understood it, Mr. Chairman. In regard to such an amendment, the details are certainly more familiar to the Railway Committee than they are to this House, and if the House is to be called upon to determine all matters of detail after a bill has passed through the committee, then I consider we ought to have the same information as was furnished to the committee.

But let me turn for a moment to the question of bond issue. There is a clause in the Railway Act, inserted there a few years ago for a distinct purpose; it refers to the expenditure upon a railway or a branch line of a proportion of the capital

stock or the bond issue of the railway company. That clause was inserted because we had a regular epidemic of railway charters. Individuals would get a charter for a railway, and then go out into the market and peddle it, hoping to secure some monetary advantage. This charter mongering, as it was called, became a veritable pest, so Parliament inserted in the Railway Act the clause to which I have referred. During the past few years that condition of affairs has almost, if not entirely, disappeared, and we have to-day but two great railway systems, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific—two enormous corporations controlling virtually all the railways of Canada.

This company and these branch lines are controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. There was only one criticism that I could direct at the application originally, and that has been taken care of by the committee, namely, the desirability of the Canadian National Railway having running rights over a portion of this line. That was provided for in the amendment now before the committee for adoption. So I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is desirable that we should accept the decision of the Railway Committee except where a matter of vital principle is concerned. I submit that in this case it is rather a matter of opinion after hearing all the evidence in the case which the Railway Committee had the advantage of hearing.

Let me take one further reference. In the course of this discussion some hon. members said that we should apply business principles in dealing with railway matters. We hear that opinion expressed very frequently, and in that connection from time to time the Canadian Pacific Railway is held up as an ideal business institution, which it undoubtedly is. But let us consider this point for a moment. The Canadian Pacific Railway with its enormous ramifications, and with its numerous railway extensions from year to year, cannot provide the necessary appropriations for those extensions in the same year in which it secures the bill for the purpose; it must plan a certain distance ahead. By the time this bill is passed a considerable portion of the season for construction will have passed, and in my estimation it is unreasonable, and has always been considered so, to ask any concern to commence operations within one year and to tie it down to that limited time with any sincerity of belief in its ability to fulfil the obligation.

I must say that this bill is satisfactory, both as regards the period of time and the bond issue, for these two matters are well cared for in the general act and in the method of procedure which has been followed so consistently in the past. Therefore personally I would feel very much disinclined to vote against the report of the committee which has given consideration to this matter after reviewing all the evidence.

Mr. MARTELL: In the Railway Committee I happened to be one of the supporters of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), and in the Committee of the Whole I also supported him, as I agreed to a great extent with what he was asking for. But this House has already twice defeated the motion of my hon. friend, and it seemed to me that on each occasion the majority of the members were in favour of granting this extension. Therefore why should we waste further time in endeavouring to hold up this bill? I have heard the matter debated pro and con, and I still have my own opinion in regard to it, but whilst I disagree with the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) that this House should be guided by the report of the Railway Committee, I believe that the House should be supreme and that we should have an opportunity of discussing this bill if we deem it necessary.

Mr. STEVENS: Would my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him? I said we should be guided largely by the committee in matters of detail.

Mr. MARTELL: Yes. But this amendment of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni having been twice defeated, I have only to say that although I voted for him on both occasions, I do not like this factious opposition, and as the majority of the House seem to be in favour of the bill, if the matter is pushed to a vote I shall reverse my former stand and vote for the bill.

Mr. GARDINER: I rise to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Carmichael). I do not believe that any hon. members, unless they have had actual experience of western conditions, can appreciate what railway communication means to settlers in western Canada. We have spent many millions of money to induce immigration, and those who have come to this country have been guided to western Canada, and placed on government land on the assumption and

the promise that railroad communication would be provided within a reasonable measure of time. Now, Sir, I can give from actual experience instances in some districts where the people have been ten, fifteen and twenty years on the land without railway communication, and they are anywhere from twenty-five to fifty miles from a railway. What use is it for this country to spend millions of dollars each year to bring in fresh immigrants when we have our old settlers leaving by the hundreds and thousands? I received a letter only the other day from a gentleman in my constituency to this effect:

> If I have two thousand bushels of wheat to haul to the elevator this year, it will take me sixty days in the fall to do so.

You can readily understand that if you take sixty days out of a man's fall work there is practically no possibility of his making a success of farming where he is a long distance from the railway.

I am going to give the House two examples in my own constituency where the Canadian Pacific Railway have not kept faith with the people. Any one who is conversant with the southern part of Alberta knows there is a railway constructed from Lethbridge east to Manyberries. That line was supposed to join up the Canadian Pacific railway in Saskatchewan. Construction was started at both ends, but a section in the middle is not yet completed. In 1916, I believe it was, these two pieces of railway were brought within twenty-eight miles of each other, and the roadbed has been built on something like fourteen miles of that gap. There are 12 or 14 miles of road-bed to complete, and 26 or 28 miles of the steel have yet to be laid. The work, I believe, was done in 1916. You can understand how the settlers feel there, especially those who live at the eastern end of the portion which runs from Lethbridge when they have to pay on the hauling of their grain back to Lethbridge and then by Medicine Hat on the main line of the Canadian Pacific. The people on the other side of the Saskatchewan border who have to get coal from from Lethbridge may have to pay freight on their shipments all the way around from Lethbridge to Medicine Hat and Swift Current and back again to within 110 miles of Lethbridge. Now, I maintain that is a condition of affairs that should not exist and that the House should take into consideration. In the same constituency this company have for some years had a charter for the construction of a road from a place called Leader in Saskatchewan to Pashley in Alberta. They built 25 miles of the line and this 25 miles has been running under construction for a number of years. Hon. members must realize that the construction company are running the trains over that 25 miles of railway, as the road has not yet been taken out of their hands; and the construction company in this case, I believe, is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. When any of the farmers in that district desire to use the services of this construction company for the hauling of a car of grain or other supplies a distance of 25 miles, the construction company charge them $40 or $50 for that service. It will be seen from these examples, therefore, that we in western Canada do not feel like letting bills of this kind pass without criticism. As a matter of fact, many of the members at this end of the Chamber were elected with a view to their protesting against this system which has been carried on in the past. We are here to protest against it, and that is what we are doing. The time is not far distant when the railway companies which are getting grants of charters will be asked by the House to put up some bond guarantee as an assurance that the lines in question will be constructed within the time stated in the charter. I am satisfied that we have in the past been somewhat too easy in granting those charters and I believe the time is now ripe when the members of the House should see to it that these companies live up to their charters.

Mr. CAHILL: When an hon. member moved in this committee a few days ago to refer a bill back to the Railway Committee I supported the motion because the amendment had been moved in the committee itself, and I thought it was only fair that the bill be returned to it for further consideration. But the purpose of this amendment is to amend the bill in Committee of the Whole rather than to refer it back to the Railway Committee. The amendment has some merit; I am quite ready to agree with my hon. friends opposite who say that the railway companies are getting a little advantage over the act in this particular clause. But that matter also was discussed in the Railway Committee. I had it brought to my attention after the previous bill was placed before this committee that some hon. gentlemen who were opposing it did not understand that the particular clause which was in the bill had the effect of over-riding the

Railway Act. But that circumstance does not occur in this case. My recollection is that no such amendment as is now proposed was moved in the Railway Committee. The clause was explained in the Railway Committee, and the committee adopted the bill as it is to-day—that is, with the amendment giving the National Railway the right to run over certain portions of the line. If this committee wishes to change the Railway Act or to over-ride the desires of the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National in a clause which they want to insert in the bill, they have a perfect right to do it, either in this committee or in the House. But as the member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has pointed out, the railway companies, the people who are interested, cannot appear on the floor of the House and argue their point; therefore, I support the bill not as proposed to be amended in Committee of the Whole, but as reported by the Railway Committee.

Mr. LUCAS: Subsection (a) of section 1 of this bill affects the constituency which I have the honour to represent. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) stated that this was a new charter. But this is not the case of a constituency in which the charter for the construction of a railway line has just been granted. I have a paper here from which I will read a heading in order to give you an idea of what the people of that constituency have been led to believe for years with regard to the construction of this line. The paper is dated at Edmonton, September 11, 1912, and it says:

> Construction to commence at once on Bruderheim-Whitford Lake Line.

Now, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are coming back to this Parliament and asking for an extension of charter. I may say that the announcement in this paper to which I refer has reference to the Canadian Northern, which previously had the charter. Owing to the subsequent financial condition of that road, however, they were unable to carry on and the government took the lines over; the Canadian Pacific then came along and secured a charter through this territory. In view of the fact that the Canadian Northern had the charter first, and in order to prevent duplication, a clause was inserted in that charter to the Canadian Pacific granting to the Canadian Northern certain running rights. The clause read:

> Provided that for the purpose of avoiding duplication of construction on that portion of the line west of Lloydminster, the approval of the route map may be made subject to joint construction or operation with the Canadian Northern Railway terms to be agreed upon by the companies or settled by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) tried to convince the committee to-night that the reason these railways were not being built was because of financial conditions. I have here a clipping, Mr. Chairman, dated March 1, 1920, in which the following statement of Mr. D. C. Coleman, of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was quoted:

> The railway companies are very much concerned at the moment over the possibility of a shortage of suitable construction and track labour during the coming year, but if anything like an adequate supply of labour is obtainable it is our intention to make a start on the Cutknife Northwesterly lines during the present year.

He made no statement as to difficulties on account of finances; he attributed them entirely to labour. I submit that the labour situation in the country to-day in itself constitutes an ample reason why the railways should start construction at the earliest possible date.

Now, referring back to that clause which has been inserted giving the National Railways and the Canadian Pacific joint running rights, I submit that is one of the reasons why the Canadian Pacific has held back the construction of this road. I have before me an extract from the Edmonton Bulletin of so recent a date as February 14, 1921, which also quotes some remarks made by Mr. Coleman. It states:

> The obstacle standing in the way of the completion of the Cutknife branch, Mr. Coleman explained, was the fact that settlement had not been reached between the C.P.R. and the Canadian National in regard to the latters application for running rights, over the branch from Lloydminster to Whitford Lake. The vital importance of the completion of this branch to the people residing in the territory it would serve was pointed out to Mr. Coleman, who promised that everything would be done by him to bring the matter forward.

Now, I am satisfied the objection has been overcome. The Board of Railway Commissioners have sat and given their decision, and if the matter cannot be agreed upon in a satisfactory way it could be brought to arbitration and ultimately settled by the railway commissioners.

In the district I represent the farmers are hauling their grain from twenty-five to thirty miles and almost every hon. member on this side of the House has been petitioned for his support when this matter

came before the House. I know the conditions with which the farmers there are confronted. It is one of the best farming districts in Alberta, and the Canadian Pacific have admitted that there is no deadwood in that line, but that it would be a paying proposition from the very start. I am not here to say anything against the Canadian Pacific. I think we ought all to be proud of what it has done. It has undoubtedly done a great deal for Canada, but at the same time I submit that it has been well paid for everything it has done. They are now asking for this charter. Well, there are always two sides to a bargain, and if the people of this country through their representatives in Parliament grant this company an exclusive right for a certain number of years to build that line of railway, then if another company came along to-morrow after this charter had been granted and offered to build a line of railway there, the Canadian Pacific would say, "No, you people are bound; you have given us a charter." I submit that it should work both ways, and that if the company gets an exclusive charter for a certain number of years, it should not be averse to putting up some guarantee or bond that it will carry out the undertaking.

I think the amendment is a very reasonable one. It does not curtail the time at all, but simply asks the company if it is acting in good faith that it will start construction within the specified time and be prepared to spend a reasonable amount of money. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edwin Dixon Weir.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry James Bristol.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florant Brys.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catherine Rudd.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Norman Edward Harris.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maria Amy Drury.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

[Mr. Lucas.]

SUPPLY

NAVAL SERVICE

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Naval service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate of last Friday, I made some very short comments on the Government's naval proposals, both as to their purpose and their extent, and by the sentiments I then expressed, though they followed immediately on the minister's address, I still abide. The minister to-day makes some alterations of importance as affecting some of the positions he took in his address of Friday; but as regards the general scope and purpose of his policy not of very great consequence. In the debate then, and now I am afraid, the Government will not have found among the hon. members of this House very much enthusiasm for its naval proposals. Of the hon. members who have spoken some are of opinion that the money voted, and the plans of the Government that the money is intended to realize, are such as to be of no value. Others oppose, because they do not believe in doing anything at all. The only thing there appears to be unanimity on, is that the money to be spent in accordance with the Government's plans will be wasted.

To get a comprehension of the question one does require to have in mind the history of this discussion in this Parliament and country for some years. The Government has not reviewed that discussion, although I think it should have. The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) has done so in a way; has done so in his way. I listened to him with interest, and there were some of his comments that were really worth noting. I thought, as he proceeded, that if he had not been so controlled by mad partisanship his common sense on this question would have had some show and might have triumphed.

The question arose first in this House in the session of 1909, when a resolution was proposed by Sir George Foster, now of the Senate. The debate I need not follow, for I do not want to be long. Suffice to say that owing to conditions, more or less serious, then existing, it was felt on both sides that unanimity was desirable, that possibly some sacrifices on both sides might

be made to gain it, and a unanimous decision was arrived at embodied in a resolution which I will not at the moment read but to which I will refer hon. members. It appears on page 3566, volume 2 of the Hansard of 1909. Summarizing that resolution, it said that Canada recognized her increasing obligation to take part in the common defence, of this Empire; that a system of periodic and regular contribution to a central navy was not the best system as a permanent policy; but that the House would approve of the creation—the speedy creation—of a Canadian naval service to meet the needs and purposes of the resolution. That was passed unanimously. The following year a Naval Service Act was brought into Parliament by the government of that day—a Naval Service, Act providing for the establishment of a Canadian naval service. Estimates for the purpose of carrying out that policy, aggregating, I think, the figures given by the hon. member for Lunenburg, $3,000,000, were introduced. The opposition of the day opposed that act. The opposition of the day took the ground that conditions had become more and more perilous; that it was evident we could not, under the terms of that act, develop such a trained force here in Canada as the act contemplated, build such a fleet here in Canada as the act contemplated, within such time as would be effective at all to meet the world situation that was impending. Consequently, the opposition suggested that in place of commencing this policy now—without at all opposing it, on the part of its leader at all events, as the right principle for a permanent policy —instead of spending our money that way, under those conditions, we should spend it by way of direct help in order that Canada might do something in time of real assistance to the Empire in the trouble that was felt to be approaching. The government's bill passed. The government, I understand, advertised for tenders for the building of ships. I do not know when the tenders were advertised for: I think in July, 1910, because the bill passed early in that year; but the general election came on the 21st September, 1911, and no tenders whatever had been accepted. In a word, there was nothing done, save the marking of time, up to election day.

Following the election, an Imperial Conference was held, attended by representatives of Canada. The Admiralty laid before the conference certain facts tending to show conference certain facts tending to show the necessity of the whole Empire becoming sufficiently armed as to naval defence.

Mr. CRERAR: What year was that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was in 1912. The Admiralty, as well, laid before the representatives of the government of Canada, and of the Empire, certain additional facts which they did not feel could be made public but which were disclosed to the leader of the Opposition of that day. Upon those facts—based upon the public memorandum, and, as well, upon the undisclosed details—the government came to the conclusion that the only thing that could be done that would in all probability be effective would be to make then such effective addition to the central navy as would enable it better to meet the contingency that it was feared was only too clearly impending. No one contended even then that the war that later came was any certainty, that it was inevitable in any way; but the conduct of Germany was such that there was reason to fear danger in the not distant future. The government, therefore, proposed to Parliament the provision of funds to construct three capital ships, those ships to be owned by the Dominion of Canada, to be at the disposal of the British navy, subject to recall at any time by this Dominion, and to add to its effective fighting strength; and proposed that in the meantime—while we made that expenditure which was estimated to be in the neighbourhood of thirty or thirty-five million dollars—definite action for the creation of a Canadian naval service might well wait. We took that course. I was not a member of the administration, but the government took that course in the belief that only in that way could effective assistance be rendered in time; but the leader of the government at no time in his public career ever made any assertion hostile to the idea of a Canadian naval service as a permanent policy for this country.

The opposition of the day opposed that measure. The opposition moved an amendment—Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved it himself—an amendment which, along the lines of the resolution of 1909, admitted frankly the responsibility of this country, admitted our moral obligation to co-operate in the matter of naval defence, but set its words against the terms of the government's proposal, and proposed instead the creation of two fleet units—one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific—under the Naval Service Act of 1910, in that way fulfilling, as they felt, the obligations of this country.

The arguments against that are the ones I have so very briefly set out, namely that it could not be done, the men could not be trained nor could the ships be built for the purpose, as it provided, in Canada, in any time that would likely be at all early enough to meet the emergency that was felt to be near. The government's policy was carried in the Commons and was defeated in the Senate. That debate was in 1913, and was perhaps the most momenous, from many respects, of any that ever took place in Parliament. In 1914, the year following, the war broke out. I am not making any boast as to the course the government pursued, it being vindicated by that war. If the war had never broken out, it would not have reflected upon the bona fides, nor upon the judgment of the administration. The fact is that the war did break out, and that if we had commenced in 1910 even, the creation of a naval service, under all the authorities that have had any experience in this matter, we could not have arrived at any effective service by the time the war did break out. Much less could we have done it if we had commenced in 1912 or 1914. However, in that position we confronted the struggle.

The next incident that took place of consequence was, I think, in the year 1918. I am not purposely omitting anything. I do not recall any consequential matter in the meantime. In 1918 the subject again came before the Imperial Conference. In that year the Admiralty presented a memorandum which I have not seen recently, but which, no doubt, is on record in this House, setting out the great advantages from a strategical standpoint of a central navy, and its great advantages, as well, from an economic standpoint. The representatives of the overseas dominions, however, felt that there were difficulties in the way of accepting the Admiralty's conclusions and putting them into realization in the dominions, because of strong local feeling there existing, and, as a consequence, there was presented to that conference, on behalf of the representatives of the overseas dominions, by Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, a memorandum embodying the conclusions of those ministers. That appears in Hansard of the 27th of April, 1921. I have no doubt it appears sooner, but in the debate of that day it was quoted by myself, and may be seen in the speech that I made then. That was a debate on the subject of my duty, when I should go later to represent this country at the Overseas Conference. I think it is of sufficient importance that I read that memorandum to this House. It is at page 2640 and reads as follows:

> The Dominion ministers, having considered the Admiralty Memorandum of May 17, 1918, on the Naval Defence of the British Empire, which was circulated to the Imperial War Conference, 1918, submit the following conclusions and observations:
>
> 1. The proposals set forth in the Admiralty Memorandum for a single navy at all times under a central naval authority are not considered practicable.
>
> 2. Purely from the standpoint of naval strategy the reasons thus put forward for the establishment of a single navy for the Empire under a central naval authority, are strong but unanswerable. The experience gained in this war has shown that in time of war a Dominion navy (e.g. of Australia) can operate with the highest efficiency as part of a united navy under one direction and command established after the outbreak of the war.
>
> 3. It is thoroughly recognized that the character of construction, armament and equipment, and the methods and principles of training, administration and organization, should proceed upon the same lines in all the navies of the Empire. This policy has already been followed in those Dominions which have established naval forces.
>
> 4. For this purpose the Dominions would welcome visits from a highly qualified representative of the Admiralty who, by reason of his ability and experience, would be thoroughly competent to advise the naval authorities of the Dominions in such matters.
>
> 5. As naval forces come to be developed upon a considerable scale by the Dominions it may be necessary hereafter to consider the establishment for war purposes of some supreme naval authority upon which each of the Dominions would be adequately represented.

That as I said, was presented on behalf of the overseas dominions. The war, of course, not being at an end, no definite step was taken. A year ago last fall, the Prime Minister of Great Britain suggested a further Imperial Conference, or rather a conference of Prime Ministers. The telegram of invitation suggested certain subjects inclusive of the discussion of the wisdom of renewing the Japanese Treaty, and year following, was broke out. I am other matters connected with foreign policies. Subsequently the Prime Minister of Great Britain suggested further subjects among others, the question of naval, military and air defence. The invitation of the Prime Minister was accepted. A debate took place in this House on April 27, 1921, the government having fixed a day on which members of the House might express freely their views as to what should be the course of Canada's representatives at the conference. In the course of that debate reference was made again to the memorandum I have just read, the terms of which,

upon the return of our representatives in 1918, were laid before the House, and as respects which, so far as my memory goes, there has been no adverse criticism in this Parliament. In the course of that debate the subject of naval, military and air defence came up. A motion was moved by the then leader of the opposition, the present Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King), embodying instructions to Canada's representative, that on no account was he to bind this country to any further naval or military expenditures. That resolution was resisted by the government on the ground that instructions to representatives at a conference were inconsistent with the very purpose and character of such an assembly; and that if that principle were followed by other countries, if their representatives were all to be shackled and bound in advance, then there would be no value in the conference. That resolution was defeated. In the debate I emphasized the view that there could not be any effective discussion of the naval question at that conference because, first of all, I was of the impression that the conference called was of the nature of a conference of Prime Ministers akin to the Imperial War Cabinet that had sat during the war, and that naval questions were more properly taken up at Imperial conferences proper, where matters affecting the dominions, in a domestic sense, came under review. Further, I expressed the view—and this was the argument which I emphasized repeatedly —that while the nations of the world were then groping, it was true, somewhat in the dark, but groping nevertheless, to come to some understanding by which the whole world burden of armaments could be reduced. I felt that until those efforts should have reached some fruition, and we would know what were to be the aggregate responsibilities thereafter of our Empire, we could not with advantage debate the question of naval defence. In the course of that conference, —though I am not at liberty to give the discussions, I am free to give the conclusions and such discussions as are revealed in the official document filed—a resolution was arrived at which, I may suggest, fairly well embodies the sentiments that I expressed in the debate in this House on the 27th of April preceding. That resolution I read to the House on Friday last. It is so pertinent that it should be read again.

> That while recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire to provide such naval defence as may prove to be essential for security, and while holding that equality with the naval strength of any other power is the minimum standard for that purpose, this conference is of the opinion that the method and expense of such co-operation are matters for the final determination of the several Parliaments concerned. And, second, that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming conference on disarmament.

Prior to the adoption of that resolution a prolonged debate had taken place on the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty. I may refer to a partial consequence thereof. Perhaps I should not use the word "consequence". Let me merely say that following the debate, after the debate, whichever way you choose to put it, the notable invitation came from President Harding for a conference on disarmament. That invitation was accepted with alacrity by Great Britain, following a most favourable reception at the hands of the conference itself. The disarmament conference, therefore, had been fixed, and in that way machinery was open by which there might be a consummation of the great longings of the powers that there should be some arrangement by which armaments could be reduced.

It is not out of place to interject here the observation that we get nowhere in these discussions by merely expressing an aspiration, a vague sigh and hope, that the nations may cease to do battle in the arbitrament of rights. We do not reach out any distance towards armament reduction by merely throwing down our own arms and leaving ourselves at the mercy of those who do not. The sane nation, the wise nation, the nation that deserves the right to that appellation, seeks to the utmost of its powers, by coming to terms of agreement with other great nations of the world to make it possible, compatible with its own safety, to reduce its weapons of defence and then manfully carries the burden so reduced. That is the course which this Empire has pursued. I venture to say that of all the nations of the world, of this day or of any previous day, no one has ever struggled harder than has Great Britain, in the years before the war and in the years since, to bring about this much desired result. And of all the nations of this Empire there is none that has contributed more sincerely and ardently, and certainly —without the lightest thought of boasting— more effectively than Canada has done to help the Empire towards that end.

The disarmament conference at Washington is the longest step that has ever been taken by the advanced nations of this world towards the practicable goal of dis-

armament. As a result of that conference, the possibilities outlined by the minister himself (Mr. Graham) in his speech of last Friday, have been arrived at. Great Britain is able to reduce her capital ships by, I think, twenty-three or twenty-four; and the United States, by the abandonment of projected vessels and vessels under construction, and by the scrapping of vessels prior to certain types, is also able to reduce her capital ship strength by, I believe, twenty-eight. The three great leading powers of the world, Britain, the United States and Japan—I do not omit France out of any feeling that she is not a great power, but her position is very much weakened by reason of the war, which we all undoubtedly deeply regret—came to a definite understanding as to ratio, an understanding which is the very heart and centre of the agreement arrived at,—that ratio being five, five and three in capital vessels, the complement or what might be termed supplementary vessels to be proportionate to the capital ships of each nation. That has been made possible as a consequence of the disarmament conference; therefore we know now the residuum, the aggregate responsibility for naval defence that rests upon the British Empire. We know now the point up to which we must go, and beyond which we cannot proceed. Therefore, we are in possession of the facts, to determine what are the duties of the Dominion in the premises, and what course it should pursue.

Now, the question arises: What is our duty? What is our obligation? Well, in the first place, I submit that we have an obligation. I do not know whether anyone disputes the fact or not. If anyone disputes it to-day, I am not aware of anyone who disputed it in April, 1909. The resolution unanimously agreed to in this House in 1909 acknowledged the obligation of this country. The very commencement of the resolution recited that obligation. But we do not need resolutions to enable us to understand our obligations. If in this world we receive the advantage of services rendered, it follows, I think, in the mind of honest people, that we should contribute either to those services or to their upkeep. That we do receive to-day and have received through all our history the advantages of the British navy as a great public service, there is no room for doubt —no room for dispute at all.

[Mr. Meighen.]

The hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) stated this afternoon that even in the late war, he, a citizen of Nova Scotia, residing on the Atlantic coast, had no fears at all. "Why," he said, "though the war raged around I sat there under my vine and fig tree and no man made me afraid." Why was that? The hon. member knows why it was. He rested in that security just for the reason that we all rested in the same position, just for the reason that many of the nations of this world, wholly independent of the British Crown, rested in like security—the reason being the strength, the power and the purpose of the navy of Great Britain.

While Canada was a growing nation we made no effort whatever to assist in that form of defence. We accepted the results with the feeling that we had some obligation to bear a share. But that feeling did not bring practical results; it was a matter of growth, of continuous and increasing realization, and the formal acknowledgment came in the resolution of this Parliament unanimously passed in 1909. Consequently we recognize the obligation. We do not recognize it as a contractual obligation; it never was, it is not such to-day. We recognize it as a moral obligation binding upon us.

The method by which we fulfil that obligation, whether by co-operation through the construction and manning vessels of our own, or by assistance to a central navy—is for the choice of the people of this country through their Parliament in the light of the best opinion we can gather. The method is for us to choose, the extent we are to go is for us to choose; always it has been so, it is so to-day.

There has been difference of opinion as to what method we should follow; there has been difference of opinion even dividing parties in this House, but on the part of Canadians worthy the name and regardless of party there has been no difference of opinion as to the obligation itself.

Now, I venture to suggest that with that obligation existing, we cannot do justice to our own people, we cannot do justice to the manhood of this country, we cannot do justice to the children of this country, if we as a nation lie under a manifest moral obligation and refuse to do anything towards its discharge. The nation that plays the part of a poltroon and sponger in the life of the world will find that conduct reflected in the moral character of its people and in the estimation in which it is held abroad.

Had it not been for the belief in the imminence of war I do not doubt at all that this country would without serious party division have come to an effective conclusion as to the right line of naval policy. The belief in the imminence of war, and the difference of opinion that that involved, had the effect of severing us as to the best method to be adopted. Now that the war is past and we are in a position to lay down the lines of a permanent policy, the reasons for that division have disappeared.

We have now passed every emergency that then threatened us, but that there is no possibility of any future danger surely those who profess the truth will not contend. When we see Britain taking upon herself the obligation she does; when we saw the United States, prior to that conference, entering upon a squarely designed programme to surpass all the nations of the world; yes, when we see France to-day, even by the press of to-night bringing down a programme of naval construction and maintenance, exceeding by $69,000,000 her programme of last year, it begins to dawn upon us that we may be a little premature in concluding that the great new social order has arrived, and that the possibility of war has gone.

The duty of this country to-day is to devise a method of carrying out its just obligation in the light of existing conditions, and the question before this committee is whether or not the proposals of the Government fulfil this obligation. I purpose to inquire very briefly whether they do or not.

It is necessary to say first, that after the war in 1920 the ships that we had during the war were manifestly unsuited by that time for any purpose at all. I do not wish to enter into any controversy now as to the value of the ships that were bought in 1910—the Niobe and the Rainbow. It would not be inconsistent with argument ot assume that they were of some value then, but, they were of no value in 1920, and even long before that year—that is, of no practical value as a nucleus for a navy, and virtually of no value even for training purposes. So putting aside matters of controversy that do not affect the issue now at all, let us come to 1920. Feeling that we necessarily must commence some training, knowing what the other dominions of the Empire were doing, knowing what the Mother Country was doing, we accepted from Great Britain a free gift, not of obsolete vessels at all, but of oil-burning vessels of the most modern type. We accepted the Aurora, built in 1914, an oil-burning cruiser; then we accepted two oil-burning torpedo destroyers, built in 1916, and two submarines, built either then or later.

I do not say there was an express undertaking with Great Britain, but as a matter of deliberate policy for ourselves we undertook to utilize those ships and to train upon them as best we could the personnel of a navy for this country. We undertook that and no more, because we felt that the time was coming, either through the League of Nations or otherwise, when the great powers would be able to agree to a reduction of armaments and thereby we would know what the obligations of the various nations were to be.

We started in this way, completed the complement of those vessels, and proceded to the work of training our young navy. The hon. member for Lunenburg endeavours to make fun of that navy. He says, "What use were those boats for guarding our seas? Why they took a trip down through the Panama canal and cruised around the west coast of Canada. They were not guarding our shores at all." He seems to think they were only utilized for joyrides for the seamen, or as spectacles for our population to gaze upon.

Now, let me put it to the hon. member for Lunenburg: Shores need to be guarded when they are attacked. Men need to be trained upon their ships when there is no attack—trained in time of peace for the purpose of meeting peril if peril comes. Does the hon. member think that the Royal Navy of Great Britain is strung around the British Isles watching for some hostile ship to fire a shot? Is the United States navy stationed at some short distance from the shores of that country, the ships a few flags apart, watching there for fear some hostile vessel may steam upon her shores? That is not what their navy is doing. Those navies were doing just what the navy of this country has been doing. They were training, they were steaming; they were proceeding to various portions of the world. The United States navy was doing that; the Royal navy does it continually. And I say this, without having looked at the records very lately —but I say it with considerable confidence: what we did was under recommendation as a good and effective way to serve the purposes for which the navy existed.

Mr. DUFF: Will my right hon. friend permit me a question, as he seems to address his remarks to me? Does the whole British navy and the whole United States navy leave the British Isles and the United States coasts respectively and go about all over the world?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know whether it does or not.

Mr. DUFF: Did not the Canadian navy do that?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very sure that more of the British navy does, than ever does of ours. This naval complement we accepted, of very considerable value—of certainly marked value for training purposes. That task and duty we fulfilled, abiding the day when we would know what the aggregate obligations of the Empire were. Now that time has come, and the Government of the day comes to Parliament and says that our full duty under those aggregate obligations is to spend a million and one half dollars to scrap one ship—the Aurora—or to tie it to anchor, lock it in the stable or hand it back; to scrap the two submarines, or hand them back. First of all their suggestion was to scrap the other two as well and establish in their place one ship on the west coast and one on the east, a small vessel on each, to be surrounded by two trawlers of 450 tons, these to constitute the naval service of this country,—the trawlers on the west coast to go up in the Behring sea to protect pelagic sealing. My hon. friend corrects me? He feels that it is quite the proper course for the Canadian navy to protect seals, but not to protect fish?

Mr. DUFF: If my right hon. friend will allow me, I said distinctly this afternoon that I did not think the Canadian navy should be used to protect the seal fisheries; that that was the duty of the Fisheries Protection service.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is right; he said that this afternoon. The minister said the purpose of these trawlers was to protect pelagic sealing around the Behring sea.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understood the minister to say so.

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say it was the purpose; I said that was one of the duties that one of these trawlers could perform. There is a marked difference.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, if it is, I would consider it was a purpose.

Mr. GRAHAM: Will my right hon. friend allow me, now, so that we can just put it straight? It might be one of the purposes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is all right. Is not the minister afraid that while these trawlers are up watching the seals in the Behring sea, the hon. member for Lunenburg will be standing up and objecting that our shores are not guarded at all?

Mr. DUFF: Do not worry a bit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A million and a half to train men, he says, for two or three weeks, partly on land, an hour a day, and partly on ships. They are to go out for a very few days, he says, and come back, and that training is to be merely by way of pastime during holidays; it is to take no boy or young man from his regular work; thereby we are to develop a naval service for this country. Does the minister know of any nation in the civilized world that ever adopted that plan to develop a naval service? I venture to say that even the little country of Switzerland never followed a course like that, though it lies in the lap of Europe, away from the sea, nestling in the Alps.

Mr. VIEN: There is no navy in Switzerland.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. They depend on other nations protecting them and I believe the hon. member for Lotbinière would have us follow the example of Switzerland and have no navy either.

What are the proposals of the minister tonight. A million and one half for two trawlers on one coast and two on another, these to be headed by one torpedo boat destroyer on one coast and one on another. There is to be no continuous training at all, though it is a fact, as the minister knows—and no one can know better, if he has consulted with his experts—that to develop a seaman for the purposes of a naval service you require not weeks, not months; you require years of continuous application. You require to make it a life work; otherwise there can be no naval service at all.

Now, what is the position of this country? The aggregate obligation of Great Britain, after you accept a reduction possible this year, as stated by the hon. member for Lunenburg—and that reduction is even more than the hon. member stated, but I know he did not intend to understate it at all—with that reduction as stated by the

hon. member, the aggregate obligation of Great Britain will be in the neighborhood of $400,000,000 upon a little over 40,000,000 people or approximately $10 per head for every man, woman and child of the population of those islands. That will be the residuum after she has exhausted her efforts, assisted by this country and by every other country whose assistance she could garner, to reduce this obligation to the very minimum.

Now the minister in his address the other night expressed more than once his belief in the necessity of reduction consistent with safety and with national dignity. Mr. Chairman I do not stand as much on national dignity as some men; I would have been fully satisfied if the minister had stopped with "consistent with safety". When a nation has armaments reasonably consistent with safety, then there is consistency with national dignity, at all events to suit me. When you go as far as necessary for safety under world conditions you have gone all the length you need go for the purposes of national dignity.

Britain feels that for the purposes of safety she must maintain, a single-power standard. She cannot afford to go below it. To do so—and she was recognized by all the nations of the world at Washington as being right in her decision not to go below a single-power standard—to do so she is called upon to expend in the neighborhood of $400,000,000. That is the position Great Britain is in. Great Britain be it remembered, until a very few years ago, being an island Empire, having responsibilities in every part of the globe—here and in the Southern seas and all over the world—Great Britain felt that in her peculiar position she could not be safe under less than a two-power standard. She was compelled to abandon that position some years ago. She adopted a 60 per cent defence standard—that is, over the next highest power, but for reasons good to her—doubtless owing in the main to the destruction of the German navy, Britain receded from that resolve and adopted a one-power standard. I am sure there is no citizen of Canada, there is no citizen of the dominions of the Empire, who would for one moment question the claim on the part of Great Britain that it is absolutely essential for her security that a one-power standard be maintained. Is Britain, in a naval sense, to pass to the standing of a second rate power? If she does, are we not affected just the same as the people of the British Isles? If Britain passes below the one-power standard and other nations in naval matters get ahead of her—these same nations being much stronger than she is in military organization—then where has the security of this Empire gone? Consequently, she is determined that a one-power standard must be maintained, with the acquiescence of every dominion of this Empire, and to do so she binds her people to an annual taxation approximating $400,000,000. That is the position of the Mother Country. What is the position of the other dominions? Australia has been expending on naval defence at the rate of $14,062,500; that is for the year before last; I have not last year's figures here. Fourteen million odd dollars for a population of five millions. New Zealand has been expending on naval defence $1,088,400 odd for a population of 1,200,000 people.

Mr. VIEN: Would the hon. gentleman assimilate the position of New Zealand or Australia to that of Canada in respect of naval defence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member means would I compare?

Mr. VIEN: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is this difference. We in Canada are nearer to Britain and nearer therefore to Britain's Royal navy, and on that account more secure. There is that difference all right. We perhaps if we are of the character to follow such a course, could rest with greater security on the back of the taxpayer of Great Britain. Australia has been spending for purposes of defence at the rate of $6.13 per capita. She has been spending for purposes of the navy $14,000,000 odd, or at the rate of about $2.80 per capita. The proposals of this Government are to spend in Canada $1,500,000, or at the rate of 17 cents per capita—$2.80 in Australia, and 17 cents in Canada, $2.80 in Australia for purposes of real training, for effective purposes, and 17 cents in Canada, wasted on services that cannot produce a man for the navy or an effective vessel for defence.

South Africa does not distribute between her naval defence and her other defences but her expenditure per capita for all defence is $5.55 as against Canada's for all purposes of $1.69. That is the difference between the Union of South Africa and the Dominion of Canada, though the Union of South Africa is a far younger nation than

we are, having progressed only ten or fifteen years in its national life, while we are in the fifty-fourth or fifty-fifth year of our national existence. That is how we compare with these other dominions.

Last year, even under the proposals then there might have been something in the criticism of the hon. member for Lunenburg that they were so low as to be criticisable on the score of ineffectiveness; no man with any knowledge of the subject could criticise them on the score of extravagance. But to-day the minister comes here, under pressure, I believe because I think I know the minister, and I would do him the credit of saying I do not believe these proposals reflect his mind, reflect his sense of Canadian manhood, reflect his sense of British citizenship—

An hon. MEMBER: Do not cry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That comes from the hon. member from Quebec.

Mr. POWER: I did not say anything.

Mr. LAPOINTE: Is the hon. gentleman referring to me?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, but I would be prepared to if the hon. member wants to say anything. I was referring to the hon. member for Quebec South.

Let me put the minister's position in the light of our obligations both within this Empire and before the world. If it is the British navy that makes us safe, is there not some obligation on the part of this country to do something to assist the British navy, either by some navy of our own or otherwise? Is there not? How does the minister argue his own mind out of that position? I do not think he does argue his own mind out of that position. I think the minister is under pressure from certain sources in this country, under dictation from them, that compels him to come down and present this miserable policy to the Parliament of Canada. His policy is the triumph of Bourassaism in this country.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Would the hon. gentleman inform the House and the country what sources he thinks are influencing the minister?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I thought I had pretty well, in the last sentence.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You made a lot of innuendoes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member has anything of importance to suggest—

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Do not play the baby. Answer the question.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What does the hon. member say? He cannot address those words to me. I will not adopt his style, or use the hon. member's term. Both are unworthy of Parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Why do you not answer the question?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did. I stated the section that I believed dictated this policy, that had triumphed in the determination of the Government to present this policy to Parliament.

Mr. GRAHAM: They did in 1911, but not now.

Mr. VIEN: It was your unholy alliance.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am glad to give hon. gentlemen the opportunity to cheer. In 1911 I know, and I do not seek to blink this at all, that there were opponents both to the naval policy of the government and to the naval policy of the opposition in this country, who did not want to do anything whatsoever. I am aware of that. I am aware they elected members to this House. But I am aware as well that their policy found no reflection whatever in the policy the government of that day brought down to Parliament. The hon. member laughs. Does he say that a policy of constructing and placing within the British navy three capital ships was a policy that reflected in any degree the wishes of those men?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): They kept you in power.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend has asked me a question and I suppose he expects an answer. The policy of those men he refers to was reflected in the fact that after 1911 the then government, with the aid of the anti-British refused to carry out the decision by Parliament to have a Canadian navy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I answer it was reflected in no such way, because the same element was even more determinedly opposed to the three capital ships than to the Canadian navy.

Mr. GRAHAM: And they were in the government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member knows that there were none in the government opposed to that course. The government stood as a unit for that course, and the government came—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What about Nantel?

Mr. MEIGHEN: —and proposed three capital ships. I am speaking of policies of governments, proposals of governments to this House. I want to reason this matter.

Mr. VIEN: You spoke of Bourassa.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say that this reduction at this time does reflect the triumph of that element in this country.

Mr. VIEN: Not at all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member says "Not at all". What element does it reflect?

Mr. VIEN: Common sense.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Common sense? Very well. The hon. member believes this is common sense; he is welcome to his belief. The hon. member then has not much confidence in the common sense of his late chief who, in 1913, proposed as a permanent policy of this country the establishment of fleet units on both coasts that would have cost sums transcending this ten times over —in actual upkeep.

An hon. MEMBER: That was before the war.

Mr. VIEN: The year 1913 and the years 1921 and 1922 are quite different.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know they are. I know they are quite different; quite different on the part of hon. members opposite too. There is this fact: In 1913—it is true it was before the war—but the policy was proposed by those who asserted that there was no such thing as emergency at all. I can bring the hon. member quotation after quotation showing that it was asserted time and again that they were laying this down not out of any fear of immediate conditions, but as an incident to the nationhood of Canada; that Canada could not assert in one breath that she was a nation with the responsibilities of a nation, and in the next breath assert that she would not make plans for naval defence. Such was the principle outlined by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and there was much to support that principle. The only reason it was opposed was this: We believed there was danger, and grave danger, and that if we waited to construct and equip fleet units we would really contribute nothing to meet that danger at all. As a matter of permanent policy this can be said for the course pursued by the then leader of my hon. friend: It was of a magnitude and on a scale worthy of this country.

Mr. VIEN: My hon. friend is wrong in this because the policy to which he refers was referred to by him and his associates as "a tin pot navy".

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, I agree. The policy of leaving the Naval Service Act out of operation virtually till September, 1911, and buying only those two little ships was wholly ineffective and was not improperly described as a tin pot navy policy; but the policy proposed by my hon. friend's leader in 1913, and I distinctly referred to the date, was on a scale and of a character which, had it not been for the circumstances as we believed, of emergency, was worthy of this Dominion and this nation.

Mr. MARTELL: Was not my hon. friend insistent against that policy, and was he not aided by the Nationalists?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For the reason just given I was against it. I certainly was not assisted.

An hon. MEMBER: The campaign was financed by your party.

Mr. MEIGHEN: So far as in my power I took care that there was no weakening in policy, out of deference to any section and I would like hon. members opposite to follow that course to-day. It is steadfast policy by governments that counts. It is the policy of this Government that I condemn to-night as unworthy of our country; as tending to put us in the position of free boarders within this Empire; as refusing to do what we ought to do, as an autonomous nation under the British Crown.

Mr. DUFF: May I ask the right hon. gentleman a question? just there? Is it not a fact that in 1911 when the Liberal party went out of power they had spent $3,000,000 that year towards the naval policy of Canada; and is it not a fact that in the 1912 session of Parliament the government led by Sir Robert Borden, of which the leader of the Opposition was a member, reduced that estimate to $1,000,000?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes that is a fact; or rather that is not exactly a fact, but what the hon. member seeks to bring out is true. The $3,000,000 was in the estimates in 1911.

Mr. DUFF: And the year previous?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have the exact figures. In 1910-11, the expenditure was $2,256,709; in 1911-12, $1,901,494; in 1912-13-14, $2,086,049.

Mr. DUFF: I am afraid the right hon. gentleman has added a number of items connected with the fisheries to that sum; they were all under the naval service. The amount I gave was the actual amount for the naval service. What the hon. gentleman has been giving is the expenditure for the naval service and for fisheries protection, to that his figures are not correct.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure of that.

Mr. DUFF: Well, that is the fact.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member probably knows that this includes fisheries protection expenditure?

Mr. DUFF: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, it will bring the amount down to less than what the hon. member says.

Mr. DUFF: If the leader of the Opposition will pardon me, what I want to say is this: The Liberal party, the last year they were in power, spent $3,000,000 for what is known as the Canadian navy. The Borden government the first year they came into power reduced that amount by $2,000,000, to $1,000,000, which shows quite conclusively that they were not in favour of a Canadian navy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is not correct. I am only correcting the figures for the purpose of accuracy, not for the purpose of defeating the hon. gentleman's point, because as he conceives it, it is right; They spent for all purposes in 1910-11, $2,256,709. Something less, but not so much less was spent in 1912-13, and in 1913-14 for that purpose. But suppose we agree there was less spent on the Canadian navy by the government of Sir Robert Borden than by the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier the reason was this: The government of Sir Robert Borden felt that we could not reach actual results in time that way, and that the right course was to do something immediate and effective, and therefore we proposed to build the three capital ships as part of the British navy. That is the reason there was a reduction in those estimates. But what I put to the hon. member is this: If it took to maintain the Niobe and the Rainbow—the little service that was got together in 1910—if it took $2,256,709 under the cost conditions that then prevailed, what does the hon. member hope to secure with $1,500,000 under the cost conditions that obtain to-day? The hon. member, however, is not inconsistent in his point; he says we cannot get anything.

Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear; very little.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I believe he is a better judge than I. According to my light I think it is worthless; but what I do not understand about the hon. member is this: He says that $2,500,000 last year was so small that it was ineffective and useless, but he says that he will support $1,500,000 although it is less than $2,500,000; and the reason is that he hopes the minister will not spend it. The hon. member nods his head.

Mr. DUFF: Quite right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I must compliment him on the strength of the party tie that binds him.

Mr. DUFF: I may say to the leader of the Opposition that I can split hairs as well as he can.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I do not know that voting for worthless expenditure is splitting hairs, but if such is the consummation of the art I decline to follow the hon. member to that end.

Mr. DUFF: I would not like you to follow me.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not care for my hon. friend to do so. If we are going to take this step I submit this to the minister: Let us drop the million and a half. What is the value of spending a million and a half in the way he proposes to spend it? If we cannot do something that is of some real value then let us do nothing at all. Do not let us pretend to be carrying our obligation when, in fact, we are not carrying it in any sense. Let me put this as well: If the Government believes the majority of the people of this country want us to follow this course and do nothing in relation to defence, then in the name of honour and of decency let us step outside of the field of Empire altogether and get on our own feet.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How can we stay and hold our heads up within the circle of the Empire and refuse to bear anything like a

commensurate share of the cost of the Empire's defence, as the other dominions are doing? Do not let any one say that I favour stepping out. No one values British connection more than I do. But British connection is of value and something to be proud of if we rise to its responsibilities, as well as accept its advantages. There are those who say, "Oh, we are in favour of British connection because of the traditions of Great Britain, because of this and that other glory of Great Britain", but who follow by the assertion that we cannot pay any money in discharge of the responsibilities that undoubtedly are incident to British connections, responsibilities far less than we would have had to discharge if we stood independent as a nation—far less than our corresponding obligations would be as an independent nation. "Oh" they say "if we do anything in the way of assisting, in national defence, that is Imperialism" and they turn in holy scorn from the very thought of "Imperialism". But they say "nevertheless though we do not do anything we want British connection", and they call that loyalty. That definition of loyalty I do not understand. I do not argue that we as a Dominion ought to assist on a scale commensurate with our population, either by way of service of our own, or assistance in any othre form. Great Britain has responsibilities in respect of crown colonies, and I do not think there are any anyway who would not acknowledge that her responsibilitiy per capita is justly greater than ours. Surely on the other hand no one will urge that 17 cents per capita for the Canadian people is fair assistance on our part, when the burden resting on England is something like $10 a head for the people of that country. I oppose the minister's proposal on the score, first in view of the plan he has revealed, and on the score that it is incompatible with the maintenance of the honour and self respect of this Canadian nation as an integral part of the Empire.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): My right hon. friend who has just resumed his seat has said, and I think quite rightly, that this question cannot properly be appreciated without some review of the history of the naval policy, and of the discussion which has taken place in regard to it. He says that the Government had not reviewed the discussion, though he thought they should have. I hope my right hon. friend did not feel that, after he had sat down, the last word would have been spoken, because, while he did review the discussion to a certain extent, he left some material parts untouched. Possibly, I may find it necessary to review this question a little more at length than would have been necessary had my hon. friend not sought to have the House believe that he was covering all aspects of it. He very properly went back to the resolution of 1909, which was unanimously adopted in this House as the basis of the naval policy. He said he would not read the resolution to the House, but would quote the substance of it. I noticed in his quotation a particular phrase, whether it had any significance or not I could not say, but I doubt if it will be found in the resolution itself. It was to the effect that this Parliament recognized an obligation in the nature of the common defence of the Empire. That was the expression he used. I am not saying whether that obligation exists or not, but I shall read the exact words of the resolution so that the House may have its exact terms before it. The resolution reads:

> The House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.
>
> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.
>
> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian Naval Service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial Navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire, and the peace of the world.
>
> The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.

That was the resolution accepted unanimously in this House, providing for the establishment of a Canadian naval service, and setting forth that whatever might be done in connection with the Canadian naval service should be in close relationship with the British Admiralty, and along the lines of decisions that had been reached at an Imperial Conference. The outcome of that

resolution was the act respecting the naval service, which was assented to on May 4, 1910. I have a copy of that act in my hand, and looking it over I think I am right in saying that it has in view four main objectives. The first is the provision for a Department of Naval Service and the administration of that department. The second makes provision for a naval reserve force. The third makes provision for a naval volunteer force, the organizing and maintaining of a force to be called the Naval Volunteer Force. The fourth provision, which is an important one, is that in times of emergency the naval service and the members of the naval forces I have spoken of may be placed by the Governor in Council at the disposal of the British Admiralty. That was the law passed in May, 1910, by the then Liberal administration. That law embodies the Liberal policy as it was stated at that time, and as we are standing for it to-day. There has never been a party which had greater reason to feel proud of its policy, more able to say that its policy had been vindicated by the facts of history at every turn, and that it was a wise and prudent policy in every particular, than the Liberal party in regard to its naval policy.

My right hon. friend said that after the Naval Service Act had been passed the Liberal party, in other words, the Government of the day, had done nothing save the marking of time, up to election day.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Two ships, the Rainbow and the Niobe.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Let us see about the marking of time and make a comparison based upon facts as to what was done. Here is the record of the Liberal Administration while in power. The Naval Service Act was passed on May 4, 1910. Immediately, a deputy minister of the department was appointed, and steps were taken to organize the department in its different details. On the 8th July advertisements were inserted in the leading newspapers of Canada for the construction of vessels for the Canadian navy. Canadian and British firms were invited to tender. On August 18 the second-class cruiser, the Rainbow, which had previously been purchased by the Canadian government from the British Admiralty for use as a training ship on the Pacific, sailed from England and arrived at Esquimalt on Nov. 7. On October 10 the first-class cruiser Niobe, previously purchased from the British Admiralty by the Canadian government for use as a training ship on the Atlantic sailed from England and arrived at Halifax on October 21.

Recruiting for both the Rainbow and the Niobe started on their arrival, also the organisation of the dockyard at Halifax. According to the report of the Deputy Minister of the Department of Naval Service for the year ending March 31st, 1911, recruiting was satisfactory and the complement of the Niobe was practically complete on that date. There were still a few vacancies on the Rainbow. By January 19th the Naval College at Halifax was formally opened. On May 1st, tenders, in accordance with the advertisement and information furnished, were received by the government of Canada from several firms. On May 12th, the Hon. L. P. Brodeur, Minister of the Department of Naval Service, sailed for England to attend a subsidiary conference of the Imperial Conference on Naval Defence. On June 29th, an agreement was concluded between the British Admiralty and representatives of the Dominions of Canada and Australia, respecting the control of the naval service and forces of the Dominions of Canada and Australia, setting forth the limits of the Canadian and Australian naval stations respectively. On July 16th, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, returned to Canada. Then on July 29th, the Canadian Parliament was dissolved and on September 21st the Dominion general elections were held.

Because of the impending elections, the Prime Minister of the day, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with the high sense of honour that characterized him, felt that it would not be proper to accept the tenders and award the contracts immediately on the eve of the contest.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When were the tenders asked for and when were they received?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The advertisements were inserted on July 8th, 1910, and tenders in accordance therewith, based upon information furnished in the interval, were received on May 1st of the following year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: And the House was not dissolved until well on in July?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: No. But, as I mentioned, the Minister of Naval Defence was absent in England in the interval attending a subsidiary conference of the Admiralty on the question of naval arrangements.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When did he leave?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: He left on May 12th and returned on July 16th. I think the Prime Minister was also away at the time. He returned on July 16th and on the 29th of that month Parliament was dissolved.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Why was the space of ten months necessary before tenders were received? And why were they not accepted when received?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend may know that, in regard to ships of this character, much of the information that had to be supplied to the firms tendering was necessarily of a confidential nature. It was furnished in part by the British Admiralty and, in part, from other sources. It therefore required considerable time in order to prepare the tenders for submission to the government. The position, as outlined indicates that if a government had tried its best to proceed quickly, and had eagerly sought to get the naval service under way, it could not have been expected to proceed much more rapidly than did the Liberal administration of that day. The Naval College had been established and the Naval Service Department brought into being. The tenders for the various ships were in, and the whole arrangements were virtually complete. But for the fact that the question of Reciprocity reached such an acute stage during the discussions of that year, the whole naval service would have been launched in the course of the year 1911. Was that marking time, as my right hon. friend suggests? That was doing everything it was possible for a government to do to bring into effect the original purpose of the act, that of creating a Canadian naval service.

But from the moment after the election of 1911, what happened? From that hour until the war was over, during all those years, the government that succeeded the Liberal administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has not a single act to its credit. Although they came into power in 1911, and had before them the tenders for these various ships, they refused to award a single contract. That is how much attention they paid to naval service and how much they believed in the existence of an emergency. The Niobe and the Rainbow, for which sailors had been recruited, were tied up to the docks. If those hon. gentlemen believed in an emergency and were prepared to meet it in that way, they were not fit to hold office as the governors of the country. That is the difference between the two administrations. It is all very well to talk a great deal and to utter an abundance of words. But actions speak louder than words, and if the two administrations are to be judged by their actions, the country will not have much difficulty in deciding which of them prepared in an effective way to meet our national obligations in regard to naval service.

I will not follow my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) in his endeavour to arouse prejudice and passion in the country. It seems to be one of his weaknesses that it is impossible for him to make a speech of any length without injecting into it, sooner or later, something calculated to stir up racial or religious animosity in the country. But when he begins on this occasion to talk about Bourassaism as being a factor in any naval question before Parliament he is going pretty far afield in his effort to arouse prejudice and hatred, which we had all trusted were buried ere the close of the great war. I tell my right hon. friend that his time would be better employed, when he is talking about moral obligations—

Mr. MEIGHEN: May I ask my right hon friend—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Have I hit the right hon. gentleman again?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has a perennial joke on that subject. I suppose he may say that I am hit when I rise to refute a misrepresentation. The only method he has of hitting me is to misrepresent my position. Will he explain how the mention of Bourassaism is calculated to arouse prejudice and religious ill-feeling in the country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Fortunately I may leave the matter in the hands of the House. Hon. members are quite able to judge the effect and intent of my right hon. friend's remarks. I do not seek to misquote him in any way. However, I shall not go into the nature of the conflict in 1911. But I can remember how he and his friends in the province of Ontario went up and down the back concessions declaring that Laurier's creation was a tin pot navy. They told the people that he was a French-Canadian and would do nothing for the Empire; and while they were making these representations in one province, other of the right hon. gentleman's friends were going up and down the province of Quebec

saying that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party were too imperialistic, and were trying to force Canadians, by conscription, upon warships in order that they might be brought into European and Japanese broils.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend may refer to others, but he should do them the justice of quoting them exactly. So far as I am personally concerned, I deny absolutely that I ever in my life—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Hon. gentlemen opposite have the habit of meeting argument with roars. Now, I never made any reflection in my life on Sir Wilfrid Laurier or any other man because he was a French-Canadian. But I do not refrain from referring by name to any man as a political force merely because of his race.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend as the leader of a great party should be more chivalrous to his followers. He should be prepared to take upon his own shoulders the obligations of his party instead of always trying to creep out from under himself. I will not follow him in the history of the campaign of 1911. We all recall only too vividly the Nationalist-Conservative alliance whereby the Government formed in 1911 was composed of a certain number of Nationalists and Conservatives, which two forces operating together, prevented any step whatever being taken towards putting into force a naval programme to meet the obligations of the day, notwithstanding that those same hon. gentlemen were professing that there was a great emergency of which account should at once be taken.

In 1913 the government of Sir Robert Borden did bring into the House a resolution in regard to the navy. I shall read that resolution and the amendment which was proposed to it, and I shall ask the House to decide which of the two parties was the sounder in its judgment on matters of naval policy. This is the resolution which was moved by the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden on the 5th December, 1912:

Resolved that it is expedient, in connection with the bill now before this House, entitled an Act to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire to provide:

(a) That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding $35,000,000 for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire;

(b) That the said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of the Governor-in-Council in the construction and equipment of battleships or armoured cruisers of the most powerful and modern type;

(c) That the said ships when constructed and equipped shall be placed by the Governor-in-Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire—

The phrase used by my right hon. friend a few minutes ago.

(d) That the said sum shall be paid, used and applied, and the said ships shall be constructed and placed at the disposal of His Majesty subject to such terms, conditions and arrangements as may be agreed upon between the Governor in Council and His Majesty's Government.

The Liberal party opposed that particular policy as outlined. Why? Because they believed at the time that it was not as good a policy, for dealing even with the situation then forecast by the right hon. leader of the government of the day, as was the Liberal policy of 1910.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Which claimed there was no emergency.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will answer my hon. friend in one minute.

I ask the members of this House to appeal to the events of history as they have transpired, since that resolution was proposed, and ask themselves how far the judgment of the then Prime Minister was to be compared with the judgment of the leader of the Liberal party of that day.

What was the proposal? To give to the British government a contribution in money for the construction of three of the largest battleships in the world. That is what was then proposed. Of what service would those three battleships have been in the late war? The large dreadnaughts were of little or no service and supposing that resolution had carried, what would be the situation as regards those ships to-day? They would have been in British waters throughout the whole period of the war without being of any real service at all, and to-day they would have been among the number of capital ships consigned to the scrap heap. Does my right hon. friend think that that judgment was sound and safe and calculated to ensure permanent support for the Mother Country and a fuller recognition by this country of its obligation in the matter of naval defence?

But what were the facts in regard to those ships; why was that proposal made? It was made because of the Nationalist-Conservative alliance, so that the Nationalists in the government might go to their friends in the province of Quebec and say, "We are proposing to give a contri-

bution of money to England to purchase three of the largest battleships in the world, and so end for all time to come anything in the nature of a Canadian naval service or a further recognition of our obligations." And in order that the Conservatives in the government might go to their Imperial friends in the province of Ontario and say, "This is only the first step in a series of contributions towards a permanent Imperial naval defence fund." That was the position.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. Prime Minister not afraid that by attacking the Nationalists of Quebec he may arouse race and creed divisions in this country?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not in the least afraid of arousing any prejudice in that connection. If my right hon. friend is still sensitive in regard to his Nationalist allies, I feel sorry for him, but I do not think there will be any danger such as he suggests from any remarks I have made.

Now may I quote what was proposed in the amendment to this resolution of the government of the day? The Liberal amendment was wholly consistent with the Liberal policy as laid down in 1910; and, let me repeat it again, in the light of the events of the war it has been vindicated and justified a thousand times over. The amendment proposed was as follows:

This House declines to concur in the said resolution and orders that the same be referred back to the committee, with instructions to amend the same in the following particulars, namely, to strike out all the words after clause (a) and substitute therefor the following:

The memorandum prepared by the Board of Admiralty on the general naval situation of the Empire and communicated to this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister on December 5th shows that several of the most important of the foreign powers have adopted a definite policy of rapidly increasing their naval strength.

That this condition has compelled the United Kingdom to concentrate its naval forces in home waters involving the withdrawal of ships from the outlying portions of the Empire.

That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada without further delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

That any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial naval defence which does not employ a permanent policy of participation by ships owned, manned and maintained by Canada and contemplating construction as soon as possible in Canada, is not an adequate or satisfactory expression of the aspirations of the Canadian people in regard to naval defence (and is not an assumption by Canada of her fair share in the maintenance of the naval strength of the Empire).

This House regrets to learn the intention of the Government to indefinitely postpone the carrying out by Canada of a permanent naval policy.

It is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken at the present session to give effect actively and speedily to the permanent naval policy embodied in the Naval Service Act of 1910 passed pursuant to the resolution unanimously approved by this House in March 1909.

This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition by Canada under the above act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada, respectively, rather than by a contribution of money or ships, is the policy best calculated to afford relief to the United Kingdom in respect to the burden of Imperial naval defence, and in the words of the Admiralty memorandum, to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea and directly promote the security of the Dominions; and that the Government of Canada should take such steps as shall lead to the accomplishment of this purpose as speedily as possible.

There was the Liberal position in December 1912. Though the government of the day had wasted two years, though they were talking emergency and had let two years go by without doing anything, that was the course the Liberal party in this Parliament urged they should immediately adopt, and in which course they would have had the support of the Liberal party, namely to construct as speedily as possible fleet units on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coasts.

I ask my right hon. friend, I ask any other member of this House, if that course had been followed as was suggested by the Liberal party in 1912, would not this country and would not the British Empire have been in a much better position when war came in 1914—would they not have been in a position to deal more effectively with the situation that then developed?

But my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) said something a moment ago about an emergency. To show how insincere the then government was, in regard to its proposed construction of dreadnaughts to meet any emergency, when the bill passed this House—as it did under closure in that momentous debate to which my right hon. friend referred,—and went over to the Senate, it was defeated there, as he has already stated. But what did Sir George Ross, leader of the Liberal party in the Senate, say at the time of that defeat? He pointed out very clearly, that the only reason the government was proposing this contribution of dreadnaughts by a separate act was, that the Nationalists of Quebec might tell their followers there, that it was a means of escaping any permanent naval service, of getting rid of it entirely and of any obligation under it; and Sir George

made this statement in the course of the debate from which I now quote:

> Under the Laurier Act of 1910 now in force any number of millions could be contributed by Parliament if so disposed. Why then harass Parliament with a bill which is not required for emergency purposes and which is not as effective as the Act of 1910? If the hon. gentlemen are sincere in their efforts to meet an emergency, let them withdraw the bill now before us, and submit to the House a supplementary estimate for ten or fifteen millions for the speedy construction of battleships, wherever they can be built and then, from year to year, ask parliament for such additional sums as may be necessary for their completion, according to the practice of parliament in regard to all larger appropriations.
>
> I do not know that a single senator would object if it was proposed, in the regular and parliamentary way, to do that. May I say more: the bill provides that this money shall be applied in the construction of a certain number of ships. That could be done under the act of 1910. I am informed that it is the intention to construct three battleships under this bill. If hon. genlemen or the government of the day wanted four or five they could build them wherever they pleased under the act of 1910.

Now, what has my hon. friend from Oxford to say about the belief in emergency under these circumstances, and the Government's endeavour to meet it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND: On January 19, 1914, a year before the war, the Liberal party took the ground that there was no emergency—even at so late a day as that.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am stating the position the Liberal party took in this Parliament, the position that they maintained consistently from 1910 until the moment of the war. It was that this country should construct fleet units on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and should do so just as speedily as possible; that there was legislation on the statutes to enable any government to do what it pleased in the way of constructing capital ships and to use them as they wished; there was no need for the adoption of a special measure behind which, an ulterior motive might lie concealed. That was the position of the Liberal party, and it is a position of which every Liberal in this country has reason to be proud. Had this policy been carried out, there would have been a very different story when the war came on, as to the part played by Canada's naval service, in addition to the magnificent part which was played by her army.

Mr. CLARK: Is that the Government's policy of to-day also?

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That was the policy of the Liberal party in 1910; it was the policy of the Liberal party in 1912; it was the policy of the Liberal party in 1914, and it is the policy of the Liberal party to-day. It is the policy the Liberal party will continue to advocate as the one effective and only reasonable policy for this country.

Mr. CLARK: Do I understand the Prime Minister aright? Is it the Government's proposal to construct these fleets immediately?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I drew my hon. friend's attention to the purposes of the Naval Service Act and to the Liberal policy, which aims, let me repeat, at the creation of a naval department, the establishment of a naval reserve, the creation of a volunteer naval force, and the construction of ships to act in co-operation with the British navy at such times, as the Government of Canada may place them at the disposal of the Admiralty. That is a broad policy; it is a policy not for one day or one month or one year; it is a policy for the years that lie ahead. When it was promulgated it had regard to a situation which existed or was believed to exist at the time; it was put forward in the light of the financial condition of the country, in the light of world conditions at the time. And that policy will be carried on in the light of our country's present financial condition and in the light of conditions generally throughout the world. That is the policy which we believe it is most advisable to follow, alike in the interests of this country and in the interests of the Empire.

Mr. CLARK: Does the naval expenditure as represented in the estimates presented this session represent Canada's proper proportion in the way of naval expenditure within the Empire?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I shall be glad to take that point up later. The question of proportion must be considered in relation to all the other aspects of the subject. It is perfectly proper to consider it in relation to the naval and military expenditures that we are called upon to make at the present time, in relation to our public debt, to what we have still to meet in the way of obligations arising out of the war. We are entitled to take all these matters into consideration in undertaking to say what is wise and in the public interest at the present time, in the way of

further naval expenditure; and that is what we propose to do. But the broad policy is exactly as I have indicated it to my hon. friend. The Liberal party has had one policy, from the start, and that has been a permanent policy. It has never wavered in that policy; it has fought for it; it will continue to stand for it, and some day that policy will become the pride of this country as well as of the party that inaugurated it.

Now, Sir, that was the position in 1912. And after 1912, after this resolution with regard to the three dreadnaughts defeated, what did the Government do? They professed to believe in an emergency, but from that moment until the hour that war broke out, and until the war was over, nothing was done in any way to further the development of a naval service or—until the war had started—to put into commission the two ships which had been purchased by the Liberal Administration. As a matter of fact, if I recall the circumstances aright, when these ships were put into commission they played a very good part in the war—in a small way, it is true, but nevertheless a part of which we were all proud at the time.

So much for the period preceding the war and the intentions and purposes of the respective parties in the matter of naval policy. When the war was over, when the troops were being demobilized, when this country was being called upon to vote millions upon millions of dollars for the return of the men from overseas and to meet expenditure of further millions for pensions and the like, we naturally expected that at least a breathing time would be permitted, before we were asked to make further expenditures on naval account. I must say that for the first year after the war there was a slight cessation; the total expenditure on naval account in the year 1919-20 was $209,456, this amount being provided to keep up the services which the department was controlling and which related to branches of national administration other than those I have mentioned. In the following year, 1920-21, the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, under whom the Naval Department had been placed, came before Parliament, and in the main estimates, first of all, asked for an appropriation of $300,000. The press of the country announced that he had decided to demobilize the naval forces which then existed, and the country got the impression, that for a time at least, there was to be a little leeway in the matter of further expenditure on naval account. Then, much to the surprise of this House, within a very few days of the conclusion of the session, when Parliament had reasonable ground for the belief that its work was done, and most of the members were preparing to leave for their homes—on the 14th of June, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought down a supplementary estimate of $2,200,000 for naval expenditure.

Here is what the minister said on March 25:

> In view of Canada's heavy financial commitments and of the fact that Great Britain has not as yet decided on her permanent naval policy, and of the approaching Imperial conference, at which the question of naval defence of the Empire will come up for discussion between the home Government and the overseas dominions, it has been decided to defer in the meantime action in regard to the adoption of a permanent naval policy for Canada.

That sounded very logical and very reasonable. If it was sound logic and good reason on May 25, 1920, it is equally sound and equally good to-day, and it is a position, which this Government has taken with respect to naval expenditures—except, that the present Government has a permanent naval policy. The point to which we are giving consideration at the moment is, in the light of present needs, in the light of existing world conditions, in the light of the fact that the Imperial Conference referred to has not been held, how far is the Government justified in going at the present time in making expenditures under the Naval Service Act?

We take the position that was taken by the Minister of Marine at that time, that there are heavy financial commitments of which this country and this Parliament have to take account, that Great Britain has not yet fully decided on her policy, and that an Imperial conference is to be held at which the question of naval defence will come up for discussion, between the home government and the overseas dominions. Hon. members opposite have always contended, that we should wait until there had been an Imperial conference before taking any steps that committed this Parliament very far in the matter of naval expenditure. I think they are right in that. I think they are sound in their view that naval policy, so far as this country is concerned, should have, as one factor meriting consideration, the matter of possible co-operation with the other British dominions and with the United Kingdom in the event of any great and serious danger arising.

Possible co-operation, I say, but thus far, in regard to the question of existing naval armaments, there has been no Imperial conference held since the war.

But what did the minister say further; and now I come to the point that has a particular bearing on these very ships we have been discussing to-day:

> The Government has decided to carry on a Canadian naval service along pre-war lines, and has accepted the offer of Great Britain of one light cruiser and two torpedo boat destroyers to take the place of the present obsolete and useless training ships, the Niobe and the Rainbow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think this House was entitled a year or two ago, and I think it is entitled at the present time, to have some definite information with respect to these ships which were a so-called gift on the part of Great Britain. We have never been told why that gift was made to Canada, whether it was made at the instance of the British government, offering us ships which were never requested by us, or whether it was made at the instance of the government of the day making some suggestion to the government of Great Britain. Will my right hon. friend, who was Prime Minister and should know, tell the House the circumstances under which these five ships were accepted from Great Britain?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think I was Prime Minister at the time the arrangement was made. I am not certain as to the date. I know of no special arrangements at all except that Great Britain offered us the five ships, which were accepted. I remember there were negotiations as to the character of the ships, and finally these were agreed upon as being modern and useful for our purpose. I know of no other arrangement at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Does it not strike my right hon. friend as a somewhat curious circumstance,—because even if he were not Prime Minister at the time, he was a member of the government which accepted these ships,—that he should not be informed about any agreements or arrangements with respect to the offer or its acceptance?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not know that there were any special arrangements. I do not know why there should be.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Is it not an amazing thing, that the acceptance of a gift, which involved an expenditure of something like $2,500,000, should have been made, without any understanding or any conditions or any agreement one way or the other, between the parties to the transaction?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government of the day intended to maintain them and to use them for their purposes, or they would not have accepted them.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Did the government of the day so inform the British government?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not that I know of. So far as I know, the British government did not exact anything. They had some confidence in Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Then we come to this position. The government of the day intended to put five ships into commission, involving an annual expenditure of $2,500,000, but the government of the day had no authority from Parliament for that purpose, nor did it ever present to Parliament, as a matter for discussion, the question as to whether they were justified in taking that particular step.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister knows we could not put a ship in commission or spend a dollar until Parliament had voted it for the purpose. We came to Parliament to get the vote, and Parliament voted it.

Mr. LAPOINTE: After having accepted the ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well, but Parliament did not have to vote it. Parliament is not voting it to-day.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: What was the position my right hon. friend and his colleagues took in Parliament? It was this: If you refuse to vote this money, you repudiate this gift on the part of the British government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. gentleman read that?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I could if I had the time to look it up. It would not take long to find it. That was the nature of the argument that was presented at the time.

Now, the position is this: In regard to naval policy, more perhaps than in regard to any other policy of which this Parliament has reason to take account, we contend that what is to be done and what shall not be done shall be a matter of discussion in this House and in this Parliament. That is the essential condition. But such an op-

portunity was never given to the Canadian people or to their representatives in Parliament with respect to these ships, nor was it given to the Parliament of Great Britain with respect to the ships that were given away. It was all a matter of secret arrangement between some right hon. gentleman associated with my right hon. friend, and one or two members of the British administration. The position we took at that time, and the position we take to-day is that the acceptance of these five ships committed this country to a certain course for years to come. We contended that before that obligation was consummated, Parliament should have been fully informed and should have had an opportunity to express its views. To the extent to which we of the Liberal party had an opportunity to express our views, we protested against the acceptance of these ships. We asked that they should not be put into commission at that time because we regarded them under the circumstances as a very expensive and unnecessary luxury. May I quote to the House, a brief extract or two from the remarks which I ventured to make as leader of the Opposition at that time with reference to the acceptance of these ships? I quote from the Hansard of the 14th of June:

I shall not attempt at the moment any criticism with respect to the acceptance of this gift beyond mentioning that on these matters Parliament should in the first instance be consulted. The people of Canada have a right—through their representatives in this Parliament—to say whether or not at this time the country should be committed to an expenditure such as this afternoon the minister has announced we are to be asked to meet. We have this right as a Parliament and the country should not have been committed to this course by secret negotiations made by the Prime Minister and his colleagues during the course of the last year, or the last few months. All that we have been told this afternoon is that negotiations have been carried on by the Prime Minister and his colleagues and some members of the British Admiralty. With this comes the announcement that certain commitments have been made by Order in Council, in regard to none of which this Parliament has had the slightest intimation.

And further:

A wave of indignation will sweep over this Dominion when the statement goes forth that, now that the war is over, at a time when we are considering in what way we can retrench on naval and military expenditures, and after the professions they have made, the Government have announced a programme involving an expenditure such as that which has been mentioned to-day, and more especially when the country learns that this has been done without Parliament having had any voice in the matter one way or the other. That, Mr. Speaker, is the exception I wish to take at the moment to the programme of the minister and of the Government. I shall, at the moment, say nothing as to whether it is right that Canada should or should not do this or that. I believe that Canada should assist in naval matters—in coast defence and co-operation in other ways—but I say that the country has a right to have its policy determined on the floor of Parliament and not in secret councils of the Cabinet. Certainly in this matter, the Government have shown a complete indifference to the rights of the people, through their representatives in this House, in giving no opportunity whatever for the country to say whether or not these ships shall be accepted, whether or not the expenditures, they will involve shall be incurred, whether or not we are to launch upon such a programme at the present time. All that the Government have said is that they have no policy, and will have no policy, until after the Imperial Conference in 1921.

What was said in that connection from one source was said also by a number of other speakers who addressed the House at that time. May I read just one paragraph from a speech made by my hon. friend the present Minister of Finance, in the course of the same debate? Here is what the Minister of Finance said at the time with reference to these particular ships:

I say that there are reasons why we should not proceed further in this matter. The first is that we have not the money; second, there is the fact that we are not in a position to-day to declare any extensive naval policy; and last, but not least, is the fact that if you accept these ships from Great Britain you accept a white elephant. We should say with great gratitude that we appreciate the offer which Great Britain has made us but that we cannot find it possible at the present time to avail ourselves of it. Later on we may have the ships when we can afford to undertake a definite policy in this direction. We are not going to ignore naval responsibility and refuse to take our share in naval affairs, but in view of all that has happened, let us have a breathing spell, let us have time to think matters over, and let us devote the money to things more urgent than this.

That was the position the party took when in opposition; that is the position which we take to-day. We say, that there are more urgent matters; we say, there are demands for our money to-day greater than any that come within the circumference of this particular contribution for naval purposes.

But that is not all. Not only was this Parliament not consulted, not only was Canada placed under an obligation by the late government through forcing these expenditures on the country against its will, but when the British Parliament met, subsequent to these gifts being made to Canada, we find that the members of the British House took exception to the gifts being made without the Parliament of Great Britain having been consulted. That is the strange position into which the two coun-

tries have been brought, by the way in which the recent administration was dealing with some of its friends in the Cabinet of Great Britain at the time. Is that the way to bring the British Empire closer together; is that the way to work out an effective naval scheme of co-operation—a surreptitious method which causes the parliaments of both countries to take exception to a course of action which owes its origin to their not having been consulted in the matter at all? I have here the first, second, third and special reports from the Select Committee on Public Accounts, together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence and the Appendices of the British House of Commons, July 1921, and on page 9 of the committee's third report, I find the following:

> In connection with the navy, the army and the air accounts our attention has been called to very large gifts of public property to Allied Powers, dominions and institutions.
>
> Not to mention smaller items, we note (Navy Accounts p. 36) H.M.S. Encounter with certain guns and stores to the Australian Commonwealth; three mine-sweeping sloops value about £73,000 each, together with their equipment, to the Australian Commonwealth; two submarine engines with certain spare parts to the Royal Australian navy; two H. Class submarines with torpedoes and stores to Canada; certain hulks to an allied government. It is clearly a serious matter that ships of the British navy should be given away without the consent of Parliament.

There is the report of the British House of Commons Committee on Public Accounts, saying, that it is clearly a serious matter that ships of the British navy should be given to Canada without the consent of the Parliament of Great Britain. Then, looking at the minutes, I find that the chairman asked the following question:

> Does Parliament consent to it, or is it done by the Admiralty on its own responsibility?

The answer was made:

> We have to make out a case to the treasury.

The witness speaking was Sir Charles Walker, K.C.B. Mr. Millar, another witness, made a statement to which I call my right hon. friend's attention. He said:

> I may say that in the case of the larger items the gifts of ships to the dominions were made under the instructions of the Cabinet. What happened was that the dominions made requests—

That is the statement given in evidence before the British Parliament "the dominions made requests." My right hon. friend said, he does not know how the offer was made.

Mr. LOGAN: Now the cat is out of the bag.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, we find here, how it happened:

> —the dominions made requests for certain vessels which were usually in their waters, were not required by the Admiralty for further use and probably to them had not much more than a scrap value—

They cost us two millions and a half a year to keep up and to Britain they did not have much more than a scrap value—

> —and the view of the Cabinet was that when a dominion made a request of that sort it should be acceded to.

Well, that was not enough for the chairman of the commission, and he asked the further question:

> What occurs to me is whether the committee is satisfied that important ships should be given even to our Dominions without the authority of Parliament. Has the Cabinet the power to give away any of the ships of the British navy?

To this Mr. Stewart, the witness, replied:

> I suppose there is no precedent.

Now that is the way in which these ships were obtained by Canada.

Mr. STEVENS: The Prime Minister will permit me this question: If I caught the reading carefully it referred to "gifts" what the Prime Minister is relating refers to "ships in their waters." That seems to be not applicable to the Canadian case.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Well, my hon. friend can get what satisfaction he can out of that.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not seeking to get any satisfaction, I am trying to obtain information.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I will quote from the record again:

> What happened was that the dominions made requests for certain vessels which were usually in their waters—

That does not say that in all cases the vessels were in their waters.

Mr. STEVENS: In our waters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think there is any distinction made as between vessels in Canadian waters and vessels in other waters.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It could not possibly refer to Canada. I do not know who made the proposals first, but I do know this, that the ships first under consideration were ships that were not of a modern character,

were not oil-burning ships at all. A discussion took place for some time over those, and finally ships of the most modern character were taken. Those words could not apply to them. The minister himself says the ships are of a value that cannot be scrapped even now, and he is going to put them to use. Why then does the Prime Minister stand there and say they are of no use at all, that they are only of use for scrap?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am not saying they are only of use for scrap. It is as far as the British government is concerned, that they are only of use for scrap. This is a statement that was made under oath before the Public Accounts Committee of the British House of Commons.

Mr MEIGHEN: It cannot refer to our ships.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is as clear as it possibly can be to what ships it relates. I may say, that in case of the larger item, gifts of ships to the dominions—

Mr. MEIGHEN: It may not be Canada, it may mean ships that were in their waters.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The statement does not say that it is ships that were in their waters. The statement speaks of "the dominions", and that embraces Canada. It does not speak of ships "in our waters" but "in their waters." It includes all the ships as definitely as any statement can.

Mr. MEIGHEN: When were these ships in our waters before?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Speaking of the gifts as a whole, the statement refers to ships that were usually in their waters. The witness evidently tried to find some excuse to save the face of the Cabinet; but what the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons did was to take exception to the gifts being made without parliament having been consulted. However, I think all hon. members will be able to judge of the value of the evidence for themselves. The evidence as taken before this committee is exactly what is implied in this statement. My hon. friend has no other statement to give us than that the ships were offered by the British government. Well, according to the statements I have quoted, even that was entirely without precedent. If the British government had kept the ships they would probably have been of use to them only as scrap; they had served their purpose and it suited the government's purpose to give them away. The point we are taking exception to is that the government of my hon. friend and his predecessors bring into this country ships which might have been consigned to the scrap heap by the British authorities, but upon the upkeep of which we must expend two and a half million dollars, if not more, and this without ever consulting Parliament as to whether or not the ships should be accepted.

I come next to the Imperial Conference of Premiers which my right hon. friend attended. Let me say that the position which the Government takes to-day is precisely in accord with that which is set out in the resolution of the Conference of Premiers that has been quoted by my right hon. friend. The resolution reads:

> That while recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire to provide such naval defence as may prove to be essential for security, and while holding that equality with the naval strength of any other power is a minimum standard for that purpose, this conference is of opinion that the method and expense of such co-operation are matters for the final determination of the several parliaments concerned, and that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming Conference on Disarmament.

Let me say a word in regard to the first part of this resolution, which reads, "recognizing the necessity of co-operation among the various portions of the Empire." If that has any meaning other than reference to co-operation as the word is used in the Canadian Naval Service Act, I will not accept the further meaning. If it implies an obligation beyond that which, this Parliament itself has been ready to assume, in the matter of national defence, then, I contend it goes beyond rights or powers which the leader of the government of the day had any right to assume in giving assent to the resolution. I asked the right hon. member whether it did go further than this Parliament had recognized its obligation to go, and he answered me in the negative that it did not, and I accept his word for it. He has referred to a resolution of April 27 which was adopted, but I will quote it because it further states the Liberal position on the matter of naval service. It reads as follows:

> That the House while recognizing the propriety of Canada being represented at any Imperial Conference or Conferences of the Prime Ministers of the Empire that may be called, desires to record its opinion, that at the coming conference no steps should be taken in any way involving any change in the relations of Canada to other parts of the Empire, and that in view of the present fin-

ancial position of Canada no action should be taken implying any obligation on the part of Canada to undertake new expenditures for naval or military purposes.

That was the Liberal position before my right hon. friend attended the Imperial Conference as a representative of Canada. I understand from his remarks that that resolution was unnecessary, that in no way did he exceed the intent or purport of it in representing this country at the Imperial Conference. The Government of to-day, propose to accept that interpretation of his action while at the conference, and not to recognize any obligation, which may directly or indirectly have been made as respects Canada, implying military or naval expenditure beyond what had already been agreed to, before my right hon. friend attended the conference. I should like my right hon. friend to tell the House frankly and openly if he feels that is other than a just and proper interpretation, or whether he thinks additional obligations have been put on the Dominion by reason of his having been at the Conference of Prime Ministers.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As I have stated, the resolution could not be worded more clearly. It means precisely what it says. It places no obligation upon us at all. It clearly says that what we do, in point of character and in point of amount, is for us to say. Any obligation we are under is bounded only by our sense of duty and right and honour in the Empire.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is quite clear. I wish to draw attention of hon. members to one or two matters in conclusion. First of all, in regard to the ships accepted in the manner I have described, we have consistently taken the position, that this Parliament should have been consulted, before those ships were accepted, and I think it is only right and proper at the present time, that Parliament should understand that we recognize no obligation in virtue of any action taken by our predecessors, without having consulted Parliament or without having for it the approval of Parliament.

Mr. CRERAR: That would include moral obligations?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is a matter which may be considered wholly apart from anything else, but I contend my hon. friend had no right—and I am assuming from his word that he is stating that he did not—to obligate this country in any particular, at the last Conference of Prime Ministers, beyond what had already been formerly agreed to in this House. This resolution states:

> The conference is of the opinion that the method and expense are matters for final determination of the several parliaments concerned.

That is the position we are taking at the present moment, that while we have our naval policy, it is our duty to come to Parliament and discuss the expense which will be involved in bringing any part of it into practice or full play. More than that, we take also the position that the views expressed in the next recommendation or the next statement is a sound and proper one to have regard for: namely, that any recommendations thereon should be deferred until after the coming conference on disarmament. That is one of the strongest reasons why the government of the day, should not have accepted any ships which involved additional naval expenditure by this country. The conference of prime ministers thought it well to state that, before any of the dominions undertook to do anything of a material character with respect to their respective naval policies, they should have regard to the conference of disarmament and what actions might grow out of that conference. We have had regard for the Disarmament Conference and part of our policy is the result of what took place at that conference. The Minister of Naval Defence has this afternoon given a quotation from a document that I laid on the Table of the House on the 11th April. It is the memorandum of the British Government on Anglo-French relations; I wish to repeat one sentence to which he referred, because it gives the reason why the Government of to-day thinks it unwise this country should incur further expenditure in the matter of submarines. These submarines it should be recalled, were accepted by the Prime Minister of the day, without I think, his even consulting his cabinet, certainly without any consulting of Parliament. They were put into commission and we have been paying the cost of them ever since. What is stated in the British memorandum? It is—

> The British opinion, however, based on four years' experience, is that submarines are effective only against merchant ships and are ineffectual otherwise as instruments either of attack or defence.

We do not feel justified, in view of the opinion expressed to the world in that mem-

orandum, in having as part of our policy the maintenance of submarines. But if that is not sufficient, I would refer my right hon. friend and hon. members opposite to the report of Sir Robert Borden at the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments held at Washington. Let me read Sir Robert's own words in reference to the use of submarines, on page 22 of the report which has already been presented to Parliament and of which hon. members have copies. The report says:

> An important proposal by the British Empire delegation, which enlisted universal attention, should be specially mentioned here. It looked to the complete abolition of the submarine. The proposal was formally placed on record in the following terms:
>
> "The British Delegation desires formally to place on record its opinion that the use of submarines whilst of small value for defensive purposes, leads inevitably to acts which are inconsistent with the laws of war and the dictates of humanity, and the Delegation desires that united action should be taken by all nations to forbid their maintenance, construction, or employment".
>
> It precipitated a remarkable discussion to which the widest publicity was given. To those who have acquired any intimate knowledge of the character of submarine warfare, the conclusion expressed in the proposal seems irresistible.
>
> It was effectively argued that for defence the submarine is of relatively small value, while, on the other hand, the very nature of the craft and the physical necessities under which it operates are such that its use in war inevitably produces acts inconsistent with the plainest dictates of humanity.

I ask my hon. friends, in view of a statement such as that, in view of the Conference of the prime ministers having expressed the view that regard should be had, in any future naval policy, for the work of the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments at Washington, whether this Government would be justified in continuing to keep in commission the submarines accepted by the late government.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the Government is quite as sensible as any of its predecessors of the obligation that rests upon this country as a nation and as part of the British Empire. It is fully cognizant of its obligation of service on land and sea, and its obligations, moral and otherwise, in every other respect. But we feel that every obligation can be rightly discharged only in the light of conditions as they exist, and the conditions to-day are entirely different throughout the world, and in our own country in particular, from those that prevailed prior to the war. To hear the argument advanced by my right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) one would imagine that the position was exactly the same in the world to-day as it ever was. He dwelt at considerable length and eloquently on the position of Great Britain, who had scrapped so many ships; but he never said a word about the ships of other nations having been correspondingly reduced in numbers. He did not say anything about one great menace having been completely abolished.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend evidently did not hear me. I referred to the reduction of the United States navy and to the destruction of the German fleet.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My right hon. friend is quite right in saying that he referred to those matters; but he did not mention them in the connection I mean. I am speaking of his remarks as regards the necessity of Canada recognising its moral obligation towards Britain. In that connection he spoke at great length of how Great Britain had reduced her different fleets and of the consequent necessity for Canada to give so much more to meet the situation than she would otherwise be obliged to do. Now, as hon. members are well aware, the condition of the world to-day is vastly different from what it was previous to the war, particularly in the matter of navies. The German navy has been completely destroyed. What menace is there at the present time that threatens any part of the British Empire on sea? Does my right hon. friend think that Canada, or Great Britain, or any other part of the British Empire is going to be attacked by the United States, by France, or by Japan? These countries have recently entered into a solemn agreement together with Great Britain for the very purpose of helping to obviate the possibility of war arising between them. Is there any danger from Italy or from any of the smaller countries? Have we not a right, in considering expenditures here, to take all these facts into account? Have we to assume that at all times a situation will exist such as existed prior to 1912? I think the Government is justified in taking,—indeed, I think it would be seriously lacking in its sense of duty if it did not take—very much into account the changed conditions in the world to-day, and, in addition to that, the changed condition of our own treasury and the way in which these matters are likely to be viewed by the taxpayers of the country. We can build up the British Empire in no better way than by helping to make a

united, a contented and a happy people. And when my right hon. friend talks about moral obligation, let me remind him that the best defence is no offence, where you can avoid it, to other countries. I thought of that the other evening when the right hon. gentleman talked about exclusion with respect to a great Asiatic power. If he wants to build up the Empire and at the same time to avoid the necessity for military expenditures let him treat courteously the other great powers and there will be less need for munitions and instruments of war. Let us establish that good-will by which the building up of vast armaments is eliminated altogether, instead of creating the ill-will which, throughout the whole of history, has been responsible for wars among the nations of the world. We are sensible of our moral obligations and we shall do our utmost to meet them; and what I have just indicated is one of the most effective ways of doing so. There is the further position taken all along, that it would be the part of wisdom and prudence on the part of the Government to wait until after another Imperial Conference before beginning to launch out on any scheme in connection with naval matters, in the direction my hon. friends have indicated, which may not be acceptable and which may result, as the submarine business has done, in a waste of public money to no purpose. These are the reasons which have actuated the Government in seeking at the present time a retrenchment in the matter of naval and military expenditures. We are seeking to consolidate the great departments of defence and to bring into one department, under one minister, the naval, the military and the air forces. What is the object? Avowedly, it is for the purpose of economy; avowedly, for the purpose of retrenchment. If we are ever to have retrenchment in military and naval expenditures this is the one moment in which it is possible to bring about something of that character. The Government regards that as its first duty, its first obligation. It is sensible of all its larger duties and obligations, but it feels that it will best serve the interests of the British Empire as a whole when it helps to enlist, in the matter of defence, whether on land or sea, the sympathies of all our citizens throughout the Dominion, rather than antagonize their just sentiments by experiments of different kinds which will only tend to increase taxation and render no effective service in the long run.

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not desire to make anything in the nature of a speech in reply to my hon. friend, but merely to refer to three or four matters which he has brought up, in order that what I said before may not, through any fault of mine, be misunderstood. The Prime Minister's address consisted in the main—at least half of it did—not so much in a review of the history of this question as in a continuous and bitter attack upon his political opponents and upon the stand they have taken from time to time upon the question. I sought to make a review, but I place myself in the judgment of the committee if, in the course of that review, I made any attack whatever or any attempt to enlist the sympathies of the House on behalf of one or other of the old parties. I made no comparison of the relative merits of one course as against the other. I refrained from doing so, not because I did not think I was capable of doing it. Were the occasion appropriate, were there any object to be served, I think I might employ as forceful an argument—I venture to suggest, in all respect, a more effective argument, one more faithful to the facts—than did the Prime Minister. That was not my purpose.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The usual tactics are becoming apparent. How different is the course pursued on one side of the House from that followed on the other.

Mr. DUFF: That is because you are up.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it is; I think that is the reason. Cannot hon. members meet me any other way than that?

Mr. DUFF: It is your fault, not ours.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I sought to review the history of the question only that the perspective might appear and that the committee might the better judge what we should do now. That is all. I made no attack upon the principle of the Naval Service Act; nor, in the whole history of the debates in this House since I became a member of it, have I ever made an attack upon that principle. My position has been that under the act you could not develop a navy, either in point of ships or in point of men, in time to meet any situation that might confront us. I have made no attack on the principle of the act as being a sound one applicable to this country. In fact, I affirm that in 1918 at the conference Sir Robert Borden himself proposed, on behalf of the dominions, that the proper line to pursue by way of a per-

manent policy was even in the direction of the Naval Service Act. In so far as a Canadian naval service is embodied in the minister's proposal, I make no attack now. But policy consists not only in a statute, but in the actual proposals of the government as to what they are going to do under the statute. And it is in that respect that I make any attack. I propose to confine myself in what I say to that. I will not be drawn into the old discussions that took place years ago. We gain nothing by referring to them to-night. I want to discuss for a minute or two a few of the remarks of the Prime Minister as related to the point in issue.

On the lines of the Naval Service Act are these proposals adequate and worthy of our country? The Prime Minister attacks me very bitterly because I was a member of the Government that acceptd the free gift from the British Government of five ships, and he says that we never should have accepted them without coming to Parliament, because by that acceptance we obligated this country to maintain those ships.

The government of the day in accepting those ships certainly intended to maintain them and use them for the purpose for which we accepted them. But we could not do so until we came to Parliament and got authority. We could not pay a dollar of the cost in discharge of the obligation of this country without coming to Parliament and securing that authority. We came to Parliament, and we got authority for that purpose—just the same authority as the Government is seeking to-day.

Is it the argument of the hon. gentleman: But Parliament could not help itself. You by merely letting these ships into your ports obligated the country morally to maintain and operate these vessels. Is that the argument? I do not think it is. But if it is, how is his Government discharging the moral obligation now by abandoning the ships? Their own conduct now shows that by the mere acceptance of the ships they do not consider that a moral obligation was incurred at all. That is their position, rightly or wrongly. If the obligation exists, how can they abandon those ships now?

Mr. VIEN: Will my right hon. friend allow me a question? Does he not believe that Canada, like other nations, should disarm after the Washington Conference?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman must have been asleep; I was on another subject altogether.

Mr. VIEN: I was quite awake.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Then why does he want me to leave the subject I am discussing? We came to Parliament for authority to spend every dollar. I am not concerned as to the position of the British government. The British government parted with property; we parted with nothing; that is the difference. What they should have done is for them and their Parliament to say. The hon. member tries to read into some evidence that was given there the inference that the vssels we took were worthless. Well, the vessels are there to be seen. Those vessels are modern.

Mr. DUFF: No, they are not; they are obsolete.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They are not as modern as when they were built,—nothing ever is. After the Government has had these two trawlers, three or four years they will not be modern either. On that principle you would never get anything. Those vessels were modern in construction, they were oil-burning vessels. They were as modern as any that the British government had; that is to say, of their size and for their purpose. They are not, of course, capital ships, but they are useful for training purposes. The fact is they were good vessels when we took them over, they are good to-day, and the Government admits it by saying they are going to put them to use.

Mr. VIEN: They were not going to be kept in commission in England.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. The British government may have had sufficient vessels without them; I know nothing about that; but I do know that they are well constructed, modern vessels.

The next thing my hon. friend says is—

Mr. CANNON: How can my right hon. friend argue that England expects us to keep these ships in commission when she has been scrapping other ships?

Mr. MEIGHEN: England is scrapping her ships to-day,—she has scrapped twenty-three or twenty-four. But does that imply that we are under no obligation in the matter of naval defence?

Mr. VIEN: She does not need more ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: She does not need more ships, but she needs to maintain a defensive naval force, and it is in the maintenance of that defence that I make my plea.

Mr. VIEN: These were surplus ships.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Suppose they were, the naval service must be maintained, and its maintenance costs money. Britain's expenditure this year is about $400,000,000—about $10 a head; ours is 17 cents.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not think my right hon. friend really understands the point I wish to make when I spoke of the right of Parliament to pass on these matters. Does he contend for one minute that the Union government, which was formed for the purpose of carrying on the war, had any right to deal with post war questions with respect to naval policy? And would he say for one minute that his government had any right to deal with this naval question which related to post war policy?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Undoubtedly I say so.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Where did you get that right?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The government of the day had to carry on all matters of policy. The government of the day in any event did not make any change in naval policy, none whatever.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Was it understood by the people of Canada when the Unionist government was formed that after the war was over part of its duty was to inaugurate a naval policy for post war times?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Unionist government did not inaugurate a naval policy at all.

Mr. DUFF: For once he is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But I am afraid my hon. friend will be censured very soon by his leader.

Mr. DUFF: Do not worry.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the complaint?

Mr. DUFF: The complaint is that the Tory party had no naval policy.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister's complaint is that it had. We simply carried on a system of training for the naval service, believing that was the best by way of permanent policy, and we carried it on on a scale that we thought fair. Certainly it was not on too great a scale; if there was any complaint it was that it was on too small a scale. We carried it on on a scale that we thought fair until the aggregate commitments of the Empire would be known. These aggregate commitments became known at the Disarmament Conference.

[Mr. Vien.]

Now I come to my last point. After the Disarmament Conference, when the utmost efforts of Britain were put forward and assisted by this country, by Australia, by New Zealand, and the other British commonwealths, and, let me add, by the United States—after those countries had exerted their efforts to the utmost, still the obligations of Great Britain remained at the point I have named, with the approval of those countries. Now, is Canada to stand up and through its Prime Minister say: Those countries do not know world conditions. Britain does not know world conditions, and she has assumed naval obligations that she does not need to assume at all. Do the Government take that position? I do not think they will now say so. We know what burden Great Britain has assumed, reduced by that conference after every effort of those peace-loving nations had been brought to bear—we know that the residuum is about $400,000,000 a year. The Prime Minister says that our fair share of that huge burden is $1,500,000, to be spent on training boys two or three weeks in drill halls and on trawlers watching seals in the Behring sea.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I do not know by what right my right hon. friend quotes me as to what I consider Canada's share of naval defence to be. This country through this Parliament has the right to determine what it thinks is necessary in the matter of naval policy, apart from any moral or other obligation that has been referred to.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Prime Minister does not need to emphasize that point. I have emphasized it all through my speech, and I emphasize it now. We have the right to say what we will do in regard to naval policy, but what I am asserting is that the Government in its proposals does not fairly assume to discharge the moral obligations of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is for the Government to determine.

Mr. DUFF: What are the moral obligations?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is what I am debating.

Mr. DUFF: What are the moral obligations of Canada from the standpoint of the leader of the Opposition; what should we do?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The moral obligation of this country is affirmed in the resolution

of 1910, agreed to by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and by the House; affirmed in the resolution of 1912 moved by Sir Wilfrid Laurier; affirmed in the policy and resolution of the Government; affirmed repeatedly ever since —the obligation to co-operate in the naval defence of the Empire of which we are a part.

Mr. DUFF: How much money, in round figures, would the hon. gentleman say we should spend on the navy—$5,000,000, $10,000,000, $20,000,000, $30,000,000, or how much?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not for me to fix the amount.

Mr. DUFF: Oh, yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is before us now is this: the appropriation of $1,500,000 particularly when it is wasted in this way, is certainly not discharging the obligations of this country.

Mr. DUFF: I agree with the right hon. gentleman that $1,500,000 cannot go very far. But if he is sincere, will he tell us how much he would spend in 1922 toward the naval defence of Canada by way of discharging our moral obligations? Now, be a man and answer it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. DUFF: How much money?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I might remind my hon. friend that I am not Prime Minister of this country.

Mr. DUFF: Thank God for that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the amount, I do say it should be very substantially more than this.

Mr. DUFF: How much more?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And I do say that it should be something which would be effective as to training and service.

Mr. MARTELL: Why?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman asks "Why"? The committee will appreciate the position I am in when I receive questions like that. Now, the hon. gentleman argues, and he argues rightly, that if we had, in an independent sense, to protect our own shores and to develop here a navy which in itself is sufficient for our defence, we would need to spend—I do not know whether he is right or not, but I think he fixed it at $200,000,000.

Mr. DUFF: At $100,000,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very well. But as part and parcel of the British Empire, as an autonomous nation within it, we occupy a more fortunate position; the real value of the great League of Nations of the British Empire is that by co-operation we can secure that defence at a much lower cost. But we cannot have co-operation unless there is among the various nations of the Empire a sense of the individual duty of each nation and some honest attempt to discharge that duty. This point the Toronto Globe of this morning very forcefully emphasizes.

Mr. DUFF: I would like to get this matter down to a basis of dollars and cents; that is the only way in which we can settle the matter. What I want to know is how much the leader of the Opposition thinks the people of Canada should spend in 1922 on naval defence?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I will tell the hon. member this: I would certainly maintain the operation of what we have.

Mr. DUFF: What would that cost?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Last year it cost $2,500,000.

Mr. DUFF: You did not do anything.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh yes, we did. There are boys in training to-day who under this policy will be thrown out, whose careers will be destroyed, whose years of work will be lost. That is the effect of this policy.

Mr. VIEN: The right hon. gentleman says he would maintain what we have; would he include the two submarines?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will come to that in a moment or two. There was something just on this point that I wanted to refer to.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my right hon. friend—

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask hon. members not to interrupt the leader of the Opposition until he has had an opportunity of answering the question that has been asked him. He has indicated his objection to interruption.

Mr. DUFF: I would like an answer to my question; how much should we spend this year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have answered it.

Mr. DUFF: No, you have not.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the hon. member will give the vote he ought to give, and other

hon. members opposite follow, it will not take me long, in a post of responsibility, to announce a policy that is a policy for this country.

Mr. DUFF: But we have no confidence in the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member has not; we will not quarrel over that.

Mr. CANNON: Will my right hon. friend answer one question? He said we should protect our coasts, as part of the British Empire. Would he state to the House against whom we should protect our coasts?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If there is no one to protect against, why waste a million and a half in preparing for protection? The Prime Minister used language that was very much the same, and when I come to that—if hon. members will allow me—I think the hon. member for Dorchester will admit that I have made reply.

The Prime Minister says that at the Disarmament Conference all were agreed to scrap and to reduce; and why not Canada as well?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I never said that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, I understood that to be the argument, and I am afraid I lost the argument if it was not. I do not think the Minister of Naval Affairs will dispute that he endeavoured to set that up as an argument on Friday last. And I can recall quite well the hon. member for Pictou saying: Other nations are taking a holiday for ten years; why cannot Canada do so? That is representative at least of the line of thought presented by those hon. members. My point is this: Canada for fifty-four years has been on a long holiday in the matter of naval defence. We have done very little. The question cannot be proportionate reduction until you get something like proportionate burden. It is proportionate burden—not portionate to population, but having regard to all considerations—a fair distribution of burden. That is what I am arguing for. Canada, indeed, has never pretended that she ever reached a fair or just discharge of her obligations in this matter. Now, I come to this question—

Mr. MARTELL: My right hon. friend is very good natured and I am sure he will permit me two questions. Is not some of this expenditure for the protection of our rights around the Pribyloff Islands as regards sealing? That is number one; this is number two: Who asked for the ships which we received from England? Was not the taking of them from England condemned by the people of Canada and was the giving of them not also condemned by the people of England through the Public Accounts Committee of the British House of Commons?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first question is: Is not some of this money for the purpose of protecting our fishing rights?

Mr. MARTELL: Sealing rights on the Pribyloff Islands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Well, the minister says it is, so the answer to that is, yes. But I wonder if it is the conception of the hon. member that we are meeting our just share of defence obligations by looking after fish around Behring Sea? As the hon. member for Lunenburg says, that is not a matter of defence at all; that is only working something into defence in order to provide an excuse for the money going under that head—that is all. Now the next question is, was not the accepting of the vessels condemned by the people of Canada?

Mr. MARTELL: If my right hon. friend will pardon me, I said: Was not the accepting of the vessels condemned by the people of Canada and the giving of them condemned by the people of England, as was evidenced in the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee? That is to say, both the giving and the taking were condemned.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I was not very far wrong. However, I give my honest opinion: I do not think one man in five hundred had the matter at all in mind in the late contest.

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: An hon. member says, "Yes". Well, I do not think so. But I really do believe we have a higher opinion of the sense of public honour and self-respect of the people of this country to feel that it was derogating from the rights of Canada to accept as a free gift from the motherland vessels that were of use to us, in our modest way, in preparing a naval service for this country. As to what the people of Great Britain have done, that is not my business. I am not in this Parliament to make any comment on the action of the British parliament or the British government. They are responsible to their people; we are responsible to ours. Now, the last

suggestion has to do with the hon. member for—

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my hon. friend another question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MARTELL: Is it not fact that the giving of these ships without consultation with or the approval of the British Parliament was condemned by the Public Accounts Committee of the British House of Parliament? I do not know whether it is so or not, and I would like to ask my right hon. friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I really do not know. The only information I have was right from the Prime Minister. I do not think we are particularly concerned with that. Whether hon. members differ with me or not, I see a very great difference between receiving something and giving something.

Now on the last phase, the Prime Minister asked: Which is the nation that may attack us? Why should we be alarmed? I cannot quote his exact words, but he demanded to know who it was we feared, and that is a very common question in this House. It is repeated now by the hon. member for Dorchester. The Prime Minister brought it up in connection with the question as to what we ought to do. I ask hon. members to reflect on this question which I mentioned when I rose the second time. After the Disarmament Conference, after all the facts that could be known were known and all that could be done was done, Britain's obligations rested upon a parity with those of the United States, only on a parity, at a certain amount per annum, the maintenance of a certain size of navy costing so much per annum. We cannot say it is too much. No Canadian will say that Britain can afford to become a second-rate power in a naval sense. We cannot say it is too much. Now hon. members admitting that this minimum has been arrived at in the effort to reduce armaments, the only question for us to decide is what share of that aggregate would fairly and rightly under all conditions be the proportion of this country? That is the question before us.

The hon. member asks: What are we arming against? As I stated in the debate on the militia estimates, that is a question that never can be answered, and it is a question that, if it could be answered, might not wisely be answered. I am not going to point my finger, I would not if I could, to any special nation and say: There is a potential enemy. That is not the habit of any civilized country; that is not our habit; we do not do that. We say now we are in the position where we should only do our share in the common defence proportionate to what we have to defend, proportionate to our strength to defend, our fair and reasonable share under all the circumstances of the case. That is all we have to decide. There are many things to be taken into account, and if I were to stand and argue all the considerations, it would take some time. But I say one manifest thing: Outside of Great Britain, for Great Britain is not the only country in the Empire, we cannot stand squarely in front of our fellow-citizens of other dominions and say that we are bearing our fair share of the burden under the conditions of to-day.

The Prime Minister says we should pursue a pacific policy. I agree with him to the full. He intimates that it has been my plan to carry discourtesy to other countries and to stir up strife. When was I guilty of that? When were any words of mine ever of that character in this House of Commons? None that I can recall, none certainly were ever intentionally so. This country cannot pursue too pacific a policy to suit me, nor can this Empire pursue too pacific a policy to suit me. This Empire and this Dominion must, in words, and in every other way, pursue a most courteous policy towards Japan and every other country, but courtesy is not inconsistent with reasonable guarantees as to our control of our immigration and reasonable guarantees as to the composition of our people. It need not be inconsistent at all. If it were so, then I would say we would do better to suffer something rather than to pursue any course that had even the appearance of hostility towards a great friendly power. But after all this is done, there remains a necessary defence for great countries. We know the magnitude and the aggregate of that defence to-day, and in all self-respect I say that we ought to do our share.

Mr. STEVENS: As the hour is very late—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am prepared to stay until morning till we get it through.

Mr. STEVENS: I would remind the Prime Minister that in the old days before this session, if a minister were to make an answer of that kind, it would bring a ready retort from him when he was on this side of the House. I am speaking in all

courtesy to the Government when I say that in view of the late hour and the hour to which we sat last night—

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am speaking in all courtesy, too, but may I remind my hon. friend that at ten minutes to six o'clock the House was ready to carry the resolution. Then his desk-mate rose and asked if the Government would be agreeable to calling it six o'clock to give the right hon. leader of the Opposition a chance to speak later on in the evening. I rose and said that if there was any other member of the House who wished to speak, we would go on until six o'clock, but that otherwise, to meet the convenience of the leader of the Opposition, and give him a chance to speak afterwards, we would call it six o'clock. Under these circumstances, I think it is perfectly reasonable that we should seek to end this debate to-night.

Mr. STEVENS: I think my hon. friend the Prime Minister will acquit me during the last thirteen sessions I have been in this House of ever taking advantage of a seeming agreement. I was not in the House at the time, but my colleague informed me that he knew the leader of the Opposition had intended to speak but had not expected the hon. member for Hants to resume his seat before six o'clock, and surely it is not an unusual thing to ask the Chairman to call it six o'clock when it is almost that hour. If, however, my hon. friend insists that we should sit until this item is passed, why, of course, he is in control of the situation. I have no desire to weary the House, but this is certainly one of the most important problems that has ever been brought before Parliament, and I think it would contribute very much to the success of the debate and the securing of the opinion of Parliament if we were to adjourn now, but if the Prime Minister insists, of course, we shall have to go ahead.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I have no desire to take an arbitrary stand on the matter at all, but I do think hon. members of the House are beginning to feel that we ought to get through the work of the session. We have had a couple of days now on this estimate, and I doubt very much if there are any other hon. members who wish to speak besides my hon. friend. If there are, and they will rise, and I see there is an appreciable number, I am quite agreeable to adjourning, but if it is only my hon. friend I think we should go on.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. STEVENS: I think the Prime Minister is wholly unfair in putting me in that light, as if I was simply rising for the purpose of delaying this vote. That is not my intention at all. I consider this is one of the most important questions before Parliament. It is a matter that might very properly come before the House in the form of a resolution on going into Supply and be the occasion of a full dress debate in the House for days with profit. The leader of the Government has repeatedly enunciated as one of his fundamental principles that he must consult Parliament and now he infers just because three or four members of the House have spoken, certainly not more than six, on this important matter, that it may be disposed of without further discussion.

I listened with a great deal of patience and attention to the discussion to-day and also to the very brief discussion,—not a whole day's discussion as my hon. friend the Prime Minister suggests—on a previous occasion. The minister introduced this item with a very brief speech and the leader of the Opposition stated that it was so important he would like time to consider it. Then we meet this afternoon and have a further discussion of it. I regret that the discussion this evening particularly in the address of the Prime Minister should have been taken up with a review, not so much of historic facts connected with the naval question, but a review rather of the controversial points. Now what I wish to suggest to the Government is this: That a rehash of old political discussions and debates in this House of the naval problem will get us to no very useful conclusion, but I do think that the time has arrived when we as a Parliament, and when Canada as a country, should face this problem, and should face it seriously, and endeavour, as far as possible, to arrive at some conclusion commensurate with the importance of this Dominion and with the measure of her obligations.

Now I wish to draw attention to the question from this angle: First, I ask the question, is it Canada's desire to remain an integral part of the British Empire? To that I think there is only one answer which will be immediately given by every hon. member in this House, and I think by almost everyone within the confines of the country, and that answer is in the affirmative—that we do so desire, and that there is no wish to weaken the ties of Empire. Very well, let us accept that. Then we take the next step, which seems to me to be a logical

one and ask: Are we then as a member of the Empire, as a member of this commonwealth of nations called the British Empire, to assume that portion of the obligations of defence of empire which properly rests upon us? That seems to me to be the next point. If we admit that we are, and I have not heard a word to the contrary, then, by a logical sequence, we come to the next point: Is the estimate before us to be considered as a reasonable discharge of that responsibility? Now let us examine that briefly for a minute.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister, not only to-day but repeatedly, has laboured the point of our moral obligation. He has also queried the right hon. leader of the Opposition on this point: Did he obligate Canada to any specific obligation or responsibility in the recent conference at London? That seems to me to be begging the question. The point that the Prime Minister and his Government should determine is this: Are we obligated at all, is there any moral obligation resting upon us? If there is a moral obligation resting upon us, does not that imply a corresponding practical or political obligation that we should discharge or else be derelict in our duty? It is not a question as to whether the leader of the Opposition when he was prime minister, made for us any specific commitment in London. That is not the question. The question before this House, and the question the people of the country are seeking leadership on, is: What is the measure of the obligation of Canada at this time?

Now, I wish to take another step to a point which has already, I think, been effectively brought forward by the leader of the Opposition but of which I will at least take the liberty of repeating. It is this: The British Empire, represented by the Imperial government, in the recent Washington Conference came to a point in naval disarmament beyond which it said it could not go—

Mr. CAHILL: What right has the Imperial Conference as regards the Canadian Parliament?

Mr. STEVENS: I do not desire to be discorteous but I can hardly see the force of my hon. friend's question.

Mr. CAHILL: My hon. friend said the Imperial Conference decided something. I want to know what power the Imperial Conference has?

Mr. STEVENS: If I used that expression I made a mistake—I meant the Washington Conference. It decided the point to which the naval armament could be reduced, which is admitted to be the minimum.

Mr. CAHILL: What does my hon. friend mean by the defence of Great Britain?

Mr. STEVENS: I recognize the wit of my good friend from Pontiac who is really seeking to interject a little merriment in this debate and is not serious.

Mr. CAHILL: Not at all; I want to know what my hon. friend means by Great Britain in this discussion?

Mr. STEVENS: I cannot conceive of any hon. member asking me or anyone else to define what is meant by Great Britain.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, my hon. friend speaks of the responsibility of Great Britain. I want to know what he means by Great Britain in this connection? Or what responsibility Canada has towards Great Britain?

Mr. STEVENS: I made a statement to this effect: That at the Washington Conference a point was reached where it was agreed, not only on the authority of the British Empire but also on the authority of other members of the conference, that disarmament could not safely go below a certain point. That point represents a burden on the taxpayers of Great Britain of some $400,000,000 annually. Now then, it seems to me we have reached a basis of argument on this point where we come to a practical question. The question, as I have stated, is this: Are we obligated; are there any obligations resting on Canada in this connection? The Prime Minister has admitted that there are obligations; he has admitted that we must take our place as a member of the Commonwealth of the British Empire in this question of naval armament. In the face of the fact that Britain is maintaining naval defence for the Empire at the expense of $400,000,000 a year the question arises—is a million and a half an adequate amount for Canada to contribute towards that expense? I contend that it is not only inadequate but that it is not commmensurate with the dignity of the country.

Now let me turn for a moment to some arguments advanced by gentlemen opposite. The minister in the first place scrapped the whole of the new Canadian navy—that is the five ships presented to Canada by the Mother Country, and put into operation and commission by the previous government. Then he pointed out that this unit was useless so far as naval work was concerned. He, however, modified that to-day by admitting that the unit might be

useful for training purposes, that it might be useful for representing Canada in some parts of the world where her interests needed attention and protection; and furthermore he admitted that Canada's interests and obligations demanded the existence of this unit, or portions of it. What sense then is there in Canada abandoning this somewhat limited and small unit in the face of the admission that we have work for it to do, in the face of the obligation undoubtedly resting upon us? In the face of the recognition by the minister's action to-day that there is a need for some naval unit in Canada, what is the sense of abandoning the unit we have? Some hon. gentlemen to-day asked to what extent should we go? It is not for the members of the Opposition to state to what extent we should go; but I think we can, as a parliament, take this position: Until a further Imperial Conference is held we should maintain the unit that we already have in commission. That, I think, is a safe and reasonable position to take.

My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) to-day made quite an argument on the general basis of disarmament. He pointed out that the world was disarming, and therefore Canada should disarm. That we should present to the world a peace loving people, that we should not for one moment pretend that we are in sympathy with or in harmony with the maintenance of national defence at all. I think the House might very properly—and this has not been referred to by any previous speaker—turn its attention to the conditions and political activities in Europe to-day. Turn for a moment to the situation at Genoa, which it had been hoped, would usher in a new era, which my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) referred to, out of which it was hoped some solution might be reached of the economic problems of Europe, but, as a matter of fact, it is admitted to-day, by all the nations participating in that conference, that very little more than a complete failure has resulted from that meeting, but that is not all. If we turn to Germany and Russia, we find a new international treaty entered into by two of the greatest nations of the world, one of which has to-day under arms a force that, I think, is greater than the armed force of Germany before the war. She has an army running into millions, in active service, strung along her western frontier. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) has properly stated that perhaps it is not a wise thing for members in the House of Commons to refer to an apparently belligerent action or attitude on the part of any nation, but I think we are very unwise if we refuse to take cognizance of the existence of that tremendous armed force in Russia to-day. Then couple with that the fact that Germany has refused apparently, and is constantly refusing, to meet her obligations under the Versailles Treaty, that she is seeking to avoid those obligations, and add to that this fact that France—who is more intimately associated with the possible effect of such an alliance as I have referred to than any other nation,—expresses general alarm at these conditions; when you couple these three facts together, I think we have every right to say that there is an exceedingly disturbed state of mind in certain quarters of the world, which may be reflected at any moment in the form of active warfare. In the face of these facts, of our obligations as a part of the British Empire, of the admission of the Prime Minister that these obligations exist, it seems to me we are doing a most unwise thing, in not only cutting down, as we have done from last year, by a million dollars, but in scrapping the naval unit we have had, and in refusing to maintain that unit, and taking a decidedly backward step in connection with the matter of defence in Canada.

Mr. CHURCH: I regret very much that in Canada the question of land and naval defence has been mixed up with party politics. The question before the House to-night is one of the most important that confronts the people of Canada and the Empire to-day. Canada has been sponging on the Mother Country for years. After all the carping criticism which we have heard to-night, I may say "Thank God we had the British fleet to protect our shores". I do not know what would have happened to Nova Scotia and Quebec, and especially Quebec, if the German fleet had sailed up the St. Lawrence and blown up the citadel? What would become of the carping criticism which we have heard. If the German fleet had sailed up the river channel to Montreal and blown up the Merchants Bank, probably we might have realized the seriousness of it.

We have heard from the Prime Minister, whom I will call the First Lord of the Admiralty, and from the Minister of Militia, the Junior Lord of the Admiralty. I do not blame the Minister of Militia, because I believe if he had had his way, probably, the recommendation brought down to-night

would never have been presented to us. The minister referred to the changes which had been adopted and referred to the million and a half in the estimates. I may say the estimates were cut down a million. He goes on to refer to the Peace Conference at Washington and to the fact that at the great conference in that city recently we were represented. He says the great nations of the world agreed, not only to take a holiday in naval construction, but to scrap many of their fighting ships. So far as Canada is concerned, we have always had a perpetual holiday in naval affairs. From time immemorial, Canada has had a holiday in a naval sense. She has been content all these years to sponge on the poor hard-working taxpayer of the Motherland, where they have had their bread, tea and necessities of life taxed to construct their magnificent fleet to protect our shores. When you talk about our holiday, I tell you we have been holidaying all the time in a naval sense.

The minister refers to the recommendations of the report of the Disarmament Conference. The first recommendation was that all capital shipbuilding programme, either actual or projected, should be abandoned. That does not apply to Canada, because she has had no capital ships, but has sponged on the Mother Country in that respect. The only capital ships we ever had were the mysterious vessels, known as the Niobe and the Rainbow. The next clause of the recommendation of the Disarmament Conference was that further reductions should be made, and that old ships should be scrapped. That does not apply to Canada. We have no ships, old or new, or even row-boats. The next recommendation was, in general, regard should be had to the existing naval strength of the powers concerned. That does not apply to Canada. The fourth and last recommendation is that the capital ship tonnage should be used as the measurement of strength for navies, and a proportionate allowance of auxiliary combatant craft prescribed.

None of the recommendations applies to Canada, because we have never done anything to protect Canada. The policy brought down to the House yesterday and to-day is humiliating for the people of Canada when you compare Canada with the little colony of New Zealand, and consider what she has done. You will find that Canada has been lurking in the rearguard. This debate to-night is somewhat similar to one which took place in the Australian legislature last December. They had the conference at Washington then. The naval estimates of Australia are about $16,500,000 for the year 1922, notwithstanding the Washington Conference. Do hon. members think they are going to scrap all their merchant marine? After all is said and done, the back-bone of the British navy is the merchant marine, and in the good old days of Queen Elizabeth the merchant marine was the backbone of the defence of the country. Australia, in the southern Pacific, passed a vote on the 2nd of December last of £3,240,000. I think it figures at the exchange nearly $17,000,000 for the fiscal year for naval defence. The question was debated in New Zealand, but the government there stood by their colours. They are waiting to see what will result from the conferences held at Washington and Genoa, and they also want to see what the British government is going to do. It is true that in England the government reduced a force of some 10,000 commodores and officers by 1,847, but the people of Australia have nailed their colours to the mast and have decided to retain two light cruisers, the Melbourne and the Brisbane, one training cruiser, the Sydney, two sloops, the Geranium and the Marguerite, and three destroyers, besides vessels of other classes. Altogether they are spending some £3,340,000. They are going to retain the naval college if for no other purpose than to provide training for those who are going into the merchant fleet. Now, Canada, by reason of its position among the nations of the world, should take its share of the responsibilities and obligations attaching to that position. Canada which was first in the Diamond Jubilee procession was the last of the dominions to send a contingent to South Africa at the time of the war there. Unlike New Zealand and Australia, she was content to sponge on the hard earnings of the poor British taxpayers for her freedom. Hon. gentlemen talk about economy. How is it that this question of defence is the only one in connection with which we have heard any mention of economy since the opening of the session? In the Militia Department a reduction of some $700,000 was made the other evening, and in the Naval Department now there is a 40 per cent reduction from the estimates of last year, which last year represented an expenditure of only two and a half million dollars, whereas Australia has been spend-

ing nearly $17,000,000 for naval defence. Why is it that these two departments have been singled out for economy? Is it because we cannot afford a proper service? We have spent some $900,000,000, directly and indirectly, on our railways, and yet we cannot afford a few paltry dollars to safeguard our maritime freedom. The Prime Minister had a chance to adjourn and give the members an opportunity to take part in the discussion, to-morrow, but he said the debate must go on. Well is it going on and it is likely to last until five or six o'clock to morrow morning, but I do not see how the position of this country is going to be enhanced in consequence.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: My hon. friend suggests that the debate is likely to continue until five o'clock in the morning. Do I understand that there is some agreement between him and his friends to prolong the debate simply for the purpose of taking up time?

Mr. CHURCH: Let me tell my hon. friend that I have been sent here to represent a constituency on this question and I shall state the views of the people of that constituency no matter how long it may take me to do so. Now, General MacBrien has told the responsible minister that once you reduce the estimates for militia purposes by any appreciable amount you cannot have an efficient force, and the men will not be properly trained; and the same applies to the naval service. The small sum of two and a half million dollars is now reduced to a million and a half, about as much as was voted the other day for one year for the harbour at Quebec. I do not say, of course, that the latter expenditure is not necessary. But this two and a half million dollars is an insignificant sum to devote to the naval defence of the country. Why, it is far less than the little island of New Zealand is spending this year for this purpose. What New Zealand and Australia have done, not only before but throughout the war, for the maintenance of their maritime freedom, should be an incentive to Canada, and we should take a leaf out of their book. I regret nothing so much as the fact that the question of naval defence and naval policy was allowed to enter the field of party politics in 1910-11. In the little colony of New Zealand in 1887 the government seriously took up the matter of naval defence and passed a Defence Act providing for the payment annually of £20,000 to the British government as a contribution toward the service rendered by the British navy in protecting her shores. That was 34 years ago. That policy was supported by the working classes of that country. I do not know of any country where the working classes do more to promote good government than in the two sister dominions of Australia and New Zealand. Now, that little island of New Zealand, with a population of 1,000,000 to-day—at that time about 500,000—saw their duty clearly and led the way for all the other sister dominions of the Empire in the matter of naval defence. In 1903 New Zealand increased this contribution from £20,000 to a sum not exceeding £40,000, because they realized that if their self-respect was to be vindicated it was incumbent upon them to contribute in some part to the protection afforded by the Mother Country to that colony as well as to the other dominions over the seas. After all, naval training is not for man-of-war's men only. The sailors in the days of Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher, and the other stalwarts were not only fighting men; they were men of the merchant marine; and we cannot develop a proper merchant marine in this country unless we train our young men who intend to follow that calling. Winston Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, pointed out in 1909 to the government of the day that there was an emergency, and he also pointed that out to the government of Australia and New Zealand. New Zealand and Australia took him at his word in 1909. New Zealand presented a battle cruiser to the Home Government.

Mr. CANNON: Will the hon. gentleman tell the committee what book he is quoting from?

Mr. CHURCH: I am quoting from the official New Zealand year book—a section—"Sketch of Naval Defence." It was prepared by the Department of Naval Affairs in New Zealand. I will send it over to my hon. friend as soon as I am through with it. I got it from the parliamentary library. New Zealand did their duty and in 1913 passed their Naval Reserve Act, providing for the establishment of a compulsory naval force. They took the British Admiralty at its word—they saw the German peril right at their door. They were loaned a third class cruiser by the British Admiralty to form a training ship in order to establish the nucleus of a naval force. Another vessel of the light cruiser type was also presented to them. On the 20th August 1913 the battle cruiser New Zealand, one of the ships of the line,

which later in the great war was with Beatty in the North Sea, and brought Admiral of the Fleet, Jellicoe, to New Zealand after the war, when he inspected their naval defence, considered their problems, and made his report. The result was that the New Zealand government adopted an enlarged naval policy.

I would advocate that we also approach the British Admiralty and ask their advice on naval matters in view of the conference at Washington. We have a precedent here in the case of New Zealand. Indeed, I believe Admiral Jellicoe made a report on the naval defence of this country, but I have never seen it.

Long before the war New Zealand recognized the principle of contribution, and the existence of an emergency, and they contributed a dreadnaught, believing that as a great maritime people their money was well spent. They have compulsory military training, and their young men are trained for the merchant marine. There the building up of a merchant marine has brought more trade and commerce to the country than any other policy ever adopted by that government. What has been done there could also be done in Canada.

So much for New Zealand. What has Australia done?

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend tell me what Australia and New Zealand are paying for naval defence this year?

Mr. CHURCH: I already gave that. I must apologize to my hon. friend; I could not catch all that he said. Think of what the merchant marine did during the war; it went out on the seven seas, brought the troops across the ocean from Australia and New Zealand, transferred sixty-five per cent of the American Expeditionary Force and the larger part of the munitions which went across the seas from Canada and the United States. Here is what was said by the Prime Minister of Australia about the duty of Canada and Australia so far as the fleet was concerned.

> Yet but for the British navy, where should we have been? Where would civilization have been? The least we can say of the navy is that it has saved Britain. But the truth is that it has saved the civilized world.
>
> Behind that impregnable wall of triple steel we have had opportunity to remedy, in some fashion, our lack of preparation. But is there a man amongst us who does not pale as he looks back and sees the awful gulf which he has missed by a hair's breadth, who does not rejoice that there were men amongst us who shut their ears to the cries for a smaller navy?
>
> Think of the hundreds of millions we are spending to-day on this awful war; think of the spectacle of the civilized world wallowing in blood, straining every energy in this awful work of mutual destruction; think of the holocaust of lives, the fearful sufferings; and then think that, had Britain taken heed of Lord Roberts' warning voice, had we been as well prepared on land as we were on the sea, the peace of the world would have been, in all probability, unbroken.

He refers to Australia's part in the war. I shall read only one paragraph further:

> We live in great days. The British race is being tried in the furnace. For us here in Australia, saved by the British navy from the awful horrors of war upon our own soil, this is our hour of trial. We must do our part, cost what it may. For we stand now at the parting of the ways.

Debates on this subject have taken place in the Australian House. I have here the blue books published in Australia for 1919-20.

Mr. McBRIDE: I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what the hon. gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CHURCH: The hon. member has just entered the House and knows not what has been going on. He has himself wasted many hours of the time of the House; I have not yet heard him talk to the point. Perhaps it is just as well, sometimes, that I find it impossible to grasp what the hon. gentleman says. I may just say that he ought to be glad that he had the British navy for the protection of the part of the country he lives in.

In this report, Mr. Chairman, which is volume 14 of the official year book of the Commonwealth of Australia, you will find a statement headed: "Annual defence expenditure, 1901-02 to 1920-21." The estimate for this year is £3,453,158, or about $16,000,000. I may say that I have also before me the figures with respect to New Zealand so far as expenditure for naval defence is concerned. I quote the following from the Australian year book as indicating what Australia has done in this respect:

> Skilled artisans were dispatched from Australia to gain practical experience in naval ship building, construction proceeding both in Britain and Australia. Sailors of all ratings were also trained for the Commonwealth service. The first instalment of the Australian fleet unit consisted of two torpedo boat destroyers, of British construction, commissioned in September, 1910, and named Paramatta and Yarrow. A third destroyer, the Warrego, was shipped to Sydney in parts, and was re-erected at the Commonwealth dockyard, Cockatoo Island, Sydney, and commissioned on first June, 1912.

The battle cruiser Australia was commissioned in June, 1913, and arrived in Australian waters in the following September. Two light cruisers, the Melbourne and Sydney, arrived in Australian waters in 1913, and two submarines in 1914. A third cruiser, the Brisbane, and three more destroyers, the Swan, Huon and Torrens, were built at the Commonwealth Naval dockyard, Sydney. Another cruiser, the Adelaide, is under construction at the Commonwealth Naval Dockyard.

Then it goes on to refer to the different lines of expenditure on naval defence, setting forth an estimated cost of fleet unit amounting to £6,508,218, a little over $30,000,000.

At the invitation of the Australian government Admiral Sir Reginald Henderson visited Australia to offer his advice upon naval matters generally. I would like to point out also that a naval college has been established at Captain's Point, Jervis bay, consisting of numerous buildings necessary to the training of naval officers. A motion was put forward in the Australian House to do away with this college, and I would like to point out that many members of the Australian House who do not believe in war or dreadnaughts or torpedo boats stood by the college because, as they said, it trained the young men with a view to building up Australia as a maritime nation, enabling her to operate her merchant vessels in time of peace and to defend her shores in time of war or emergency.

At the invitation of the Government Lord Jellicoe visited Australia, in May, 1919, to advise the Australian authorities on the question of naval operations, not only from the defence standpoint, but from the standpoint of the merchant marine.

Mr. CANNON: May I ask my hon. friend a question? What value does he attach to Lord Jellicoe's opinion in view of his strategy at the battle of Jutland?

Mr. CHURCH: If the Prime Minister will give the hon. member time to-morrow, he may be able to go on with the debate and discuss Jutland. It was good for Quebec and his constituents that he had the protection of the British fleet. When we come to Canada, what is this country doing in the matter of defence? Canada from time immemorial has been content to sponge on Great Britain, not only for naval defence, but for every other kind of defence. The policy of the people of Canada was set out in 1910 right in this House, and it was said there was no emergency in this country. I have shown that both Australia and New Zealand said there was an emergency, and so firmly were they convinced of it that in order to protect their trade they voted these large sums of money for their naval defence. Canada is in a most humiliating position in regard to this matter, and I say that advisedly. I appreciate the high costs of ships per ton, the high cost of money at the present time, and the high cost of material, but I do say that the merchant marine of this country has never had a chance. It has been regarded merely as an appendage of the railway system, with the result that Canada is to-day very many miles behind the times so far as her merchant marine is concerned. It has never had a chance, and if the Government would only have Lord Beatty, Admiral of the fleet, report on the question of the merchant marine and Canada's Naval Defence and see what could be done to nurse this important industry, I say that it would be a splendid thing for the country, not only in the matter of freight rates but in the development of business generally.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. My hon. friend is talking about the merchant marine and we are discussing the naval estimates. I submit that he is entirely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: I rule that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MARTELL: I submit that the hon. member was discussing the merchant marine to show that by its abolition, we should have a lot more money for naval expenditure, which means that the public—

The CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the hon. member that the ruling of the Chair has been given, and while it would have been competent for him before to discuss the point of order raised, he is out of order now.

Mr. CHURCH: I am urging the Government to bring down their naval policy. It is humiliating to have this two-penny half-penny policy for a people of nine or ten millions, especially in view of the record the Canadian people made in this war. It simply means that we are sponging on the British people for naval and land defence. I would advocate a broad-minded policy, and it would really be an economy, if we had a proper shipbuilding programme for the lakes. It would help to solve not only the merchant marine problem, but the transportation problem, and unemployment, and would give us naval defence, and our ships would be able to sail the seven seas and

get some of the trade which this country should get as a result of the war. Certainly we are not getting the proportion now that we should get. I wish to quote from a little book called "The Fleets behind the Fleet" by W. Macneile Dixon, Professor in the University of Glasgow, to show that the great industrial expansion of Great Britain has not been due to free trade and Cobdenism but has been contributed to largely by the union of coal and steel and by the merchant marine. I say that every dollar spent on the merchant marine is a dollar spent on naval defence and for the expansion of trade and commerce, and that is also the view of this writer. He says that Canada should take a leaf out of the book of the Mother Country in this respect and goes on to speak of the merchant marine and the Royal navy.

> The Royal navy is the heir of the merchant service, the inheritor of its fighting spirit and tradition. Not till Victoria's reign was any clear line of division drawn between the merchant sailor and the man-of-war's-man.
>
> Histories as they have too often been written, obscure the vision and provide a false perspective. Faithful chronicles no doubt of the red-letter days of battle, but how few and far between were the battles in our long naval wars! Too often the histories speak of the navy as if it were a thing apart, a mere fighting instrument, and forget to tell us of the fleets behind the fleet: of the merchant sailors and the fishermen, the pioneers and the builders of our sea-supported confederacy.
>
> These "traders", it was said of the Elizabethan seamen, "escaped the notice of kings and chroniclers.' Nevertheless, it was those men who saved England and America from becoming provinces of Spain.
>
> The "navy" as we call it, what has history to say of it? That until the reign of Henry VIII, the pious founder of the Royal navy, it was, in fact, neither more nor less than England's mercantile marine. As for Elizabeth's tall ships and proud captains, Drake and Hawkins and Frobisher and many another, they were stout merchant skippers, and of the fleet which met the Great Armada, near upon two hundred sail, but thirty-four belonged to the Queen's navy.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: If my hon. friend intends to speak very much longer, perhaps he would let me know, and then I can say what I have to say.

Mr. CHURCH: I would say to the Prime Minister I shall be glad to talk for one, two or three days, if necessary and advisable.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The reason I asked my hon. friend the question was because I think there has been some misunderstanding as to the nature of a remark I made at the time the hon. member for Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) got up to speak. I intimated then that that I was quite prepared to stay here all night to get through the debate in order to get on with the business of the House. I understand that hon. gentlemen opposite have construed that as a threat on the Government's part to keep this committee sitting all night if need be, and that some of them have arranged to have a series of speeches running well on to the morning. Now I have no desire whatever to have any remark of mine construed as a threat—nothing could be further from my mind than such an intention. I did say, and I repeated it later on, that I thought most of the members of the House were anxious to get through with business and we would do so by bringing to a close, if possible, to-night a debate which has been going on for a couple of days. I certainly feel that the House has got an entirely wrong impression of what I had in mind if it thought my words implied a threat in any way. The statement I made was that if there were a desire to continue, and if members on the other side would so indicate by rising I would be quite willing the debate should be adjourned. Only the hon. member for Centre Vancouver rose. I desire that there shall not be any misunderstanding as to the attitude of the Government. We have every desire to give every hon. member who wishes to speak the opportunity to place his views before the House. If, therefore, there are several hon. members who still wish to speak I am quite willing that my hon. friend who now has the floor should adjourn the debate, and that the committee should rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CHURCH: Then I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. ROSS (Kingston): I did intend to say a few words, but I wish to say that I am not in any combine to detain the House. Unless I had something that I thought would be of practical use in the debate I would take no part in it, I do not think that any hon. member can say that I unnecessarily detain the House.

Mr. STEVENS: I would also like to explain that there is no understanding of the kind alluded to.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved by Mr. Church that the committe rise and report progress.

Mr. GRAHAM: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Chairman, may I say that I am

generally very easy to get along with but I do not think the Opposition is treating me in a matter that is exactly fair. This is the third time Naval Estimates have been postponed. I postponed bringing them in at the request of the Opposition because certain members were away. I did so because I wanted to accommodate them. The other day when these naval estimates were up, at the request of the leader of the Opposition I kept back this large item and set a day for its discussion, with the inference of course that the discussion would be concluded to-night. Now I find my convenience is not considered by the Opposition. I do not wish to complain but I have to go away to-morrow in order to fulfil an engagement. That means that my estimates will have to be further postponed, and I do not know for how long. If the courtesy is only going to be on one side I shall not be so courteous the next time.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not really understand the minister in making this reference.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true that the Opposition asked for the postponement of the Defence Bill for a certain reason.

Mr. GRAHAM: My estimates have been postponed three times at the request of the Opposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Postponements are quite usual and are always granted. On Friday after the minister had stated his naval policy I suggested that we might go on with the other estimates, but I said I did not think this item should pass—that it was one of the most important matters; indeed by far the most important—that has been before this House. The minister should not have expected that the criticism should come immediately after his pronouncement of policy. The request for postponement was a most reasonable one.

Mr. GRAHAM: Certainly.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the Opposition doing to-night?

Mr. GRAHAM: Talking against time absolutely, as the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) certainly has been doing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think my hon. friend is fair in saying that. There has been no such purpose in view. The comment he makes is unfair and unworthy of him; there was no purpose whatever to obstruct the minister's estimates. There was a purpose to have an opportunity for discussion on the part of those who wished to fairly discuss the estimates. That is the only stand we take. Furthermore, if the minister had been in the last Parliament he would know something about what obstruction and unfairness to the government was.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: Allow me just a moment. I do not wish to be misunderstood, or to allow my right hon. friend to say that the postponment was in reference to some bill. On three distinct occasions I was asked to postpone the estimates and I did so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not dispute that.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, I think there ought to be some little reciprocity.

Mr. MEIGHEN: If the minister wants the postponement we are quite willing to meet his wishes. If he is not able to be present to-morrow we are quite ready to take this matter up again on Thursday. We do not desire to unnecessarily exhaust any time at all.

Mr. GRAHAM: I leave it to the judgment of the House whether my statement is correct or not.

Mr. MARTELL: In the Montreal Herald to-day there is a despatch—

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I call the attention of the member for Hants to the fact that there is nothing before the committee at the present time. The motion to report progress has been carried.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at one a.m., Wednesday.

Wednesday, May 17, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION

MOTION FOR ATTENDANCE OF SENATOR McCOIG

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi) moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate requesting that their Honours will give leave to the Hon. Archibald B. McCoig, one of their members, to attend and give evidence before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Is this motion based on

any report of the committee? And if so, has that report been presented? Of course, if it has not been presented, I presume that no motion based on it can be moved.

Mr. KAY: This motion, Mr. Speaker, is for the purpose of securing the attendance of the Hon. Mr. McCoig before the committee in order to examine him on the standardization of repair parts for agricultural implements, a matter not yet before the committee, but we wish to take it up at a later date.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think it is in order for a motion to be made on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture without a report from that committee being first presented.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS: (Centre Vancouver): This matter was discussed in the committee, and unquestionably it should be part of the report of the committee's proceedings. Why a report has not been presented to-day in the usual manner is, I think, a fit subject of inquiry. The rules of the House require that a report should be presented. None was presented when the appropriate order was called.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Marquette): I think in this case, Mr. Speaker, opposition to the motion should be withdrawn. I understand it is the intention of the committee to investigate the standardization of repair parts for farm implements. Senator McCoig has given the matter a lifelong study and probably is as well informed in regard to it as any man in this Parliament. I understand he is willing to attend and give evidence, and, if so, I see no reason why any technical objection should be raised by my hon. friend for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens). I think the motion might very well be adopted and so expedite investigation of this very important matter.

Mr. STEVENS: My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) wholly misunderstands me. I wish to submit this to you, Mr. Speaker, as a point of order. The subject matter of this resolution was discussed in the committee to-day. In the ordinary course it should form part of the committee's report. I have absolutely no objection to the motion, except that I cannot understand why the ordinary procedure was departed from and no report presented to the House; at least, I have not been able to learn of any up to this moment. I submit, Sir, that this resolution cannot possibly be moved until a report of the committee incorporating this resolution is submitted to the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. A notice is required. The motion stands until the report is presented to the House.

Motion stands.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CHARTERED BANKS—NOTES, DEPOSITS, ETC.

Mr. COOTE:

1. What was the largest amount of notes, of Canadian chartered banks, in circulation in each of the years 1901, 1911 and 1921?
2. What was the largest amounts of deposits of these banks with the Minister of Finance for security of note circulation during each of these years?
3. What was the largest amount of deposits of these banks in central gold reserves during each of the said years?
4. What was the largest amount of railway and other bonds, debentures and stocks held by these banks in each of said years?
5. What was the largest amount of call and short loans in Canada of said banks in each of these years?
6. What was the largest amount of call and short loans elsewhere than in Canada in each of said years?
7. What was the largest amount of real estate other than bank premises held by said banks in each of these years?
8. What was the largest amount of loans of said banks, to directors and firms of which they are partners, in each of these years, and does this amount include loans to incorporated companies, of which they are directors?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

	1901	1911	1921
1.	$60,397,097	$111,943,580	$229,608,213
2.	2,568,918	5,815,000	6,529,310
3.	——	——	95,302,533
4.	33,061,712	64,889,452	46,605,691
5.	39,324,335	72,640,526	113,818,308
6.	50,963,477	104,009,030	193,001,119
7.	1,078,810	1,575,328	4,582,328
8.	12,834,058	10,348,216	11,130,653

The return specified by the Bank Act is of the "aggregate amount of loans to directors, and firms of which they are partners."

IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT APPOINTMENTS

Hon. Mr. STEVENS:

1. Has the Government under contemplation the appointment of a representative of the Immigration Department in China?
2. Has the Government received an application from W. W. B. McInnes (former judge of

the County Court of British Columbia, and candidate in the last election for the Liberal party), to be appointed immigration commissioner with headquarters at Canton?

3. Is the Government aware of any application being made by said W. W. B. McInnes, or any other person, to the Civil Service Commission for such appointment?

4. If such an appointment is made, what will be the powers and duties of persons so appointed?

5. In the opinion of the Government would such an appointment facilitate the emigration of Chinese to Canada?

Hon. Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil):

1. No.

2. No formal application received.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4 and 5. Answered by No. 1.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What prosecutions have been held, and how many each year, against trusts and combines and combinations, in restraint of trade in Canada from 1909 to 1922?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to hold an inquiry into the high cost of tobacco, cigarettes and cigars?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to hold a fair price inquiry into the high cost of the necessities of life in Canada?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. As regards prosecutions under federal legislation, no prosecutions were held against trusts and combines and combinations in restraint of trade in Canada from 1909 to 1922, but under the Combines Investigation Act, which received the Royal assent on May 4, 1910, a Board of Investigation was established in February, 1911, by the Minister of Labour to inquire into an alleged combine on the part of the United Shoe Machinery Company of Canada in the manufacture and sale of machinery used in the making of boots and shoes, and the report of the Board received by the Minister of Labour on October 21, 1912, declared the United Shoe Machinery Company to be a combine. No other investigations were ordered under the terms of the Combines Investigation Act and the Statute itself was repealed by clause 15 of the Combines and Fair Prices Act, July 7, 1919. The existing law for dealing with trusts, combines and mergers in restraint of trade is confined to the provisions of the Criminal Code. The Government has no information as regards prosecutions under provincial laws.

2. It is not deemed necessary to hold such an inquiry at present.

3. Answered by No. 2.

[Mr. Stevens.]

CHARLES DAUPHINEE

Mon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. Was Charles Dauphinee, janitor of the Public Building at Lunenburg, dismissed?

2. If so (a) when and (b) for what reason?

3. Did any one make representations with regard to Mr. Dauphinee, to the department?

4. If so, who made such representations, of what nature were they, and when were they made?

5. Was any investigation held as to the conduct of Mr. Dauphinee?

6. If so, when, by whom, and was he given an opportunity of meeting any charges made against him?

Hon. Mr. KING (Kootenay):

1. Yes.

2. (a) April 30, 1922. (b) Public interest.

3. 4. 5 and 6. Representations were made to the minister which he considers satisfactory without an investigation, and assumes responsibility for the dismissal.

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. LADNER:

1. Have there been any regulations issued under the act which permits the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine controlling the manufacture and sale of this product in Canada?

2. If so, what are these regulations: (a) as to the manufacture of oleomargarine; (b) as to its wholesale distribution; and (c) as to its retail distribution?

3. What branch or branches of the Department of Agriculture, or other government department, are charged with the enforcement of these regulations (a) as to its manufacture; and (b) as to its distribution and sale?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Regulations as to manufacture:

Licenses to manufacture oleomargarine shall be issued only to such applicants as have satisfied the minister that any building or buildings in which the applicant proposed to manufacture the oleomargarine is well lighted and ventilated, constructed of suitable material and provided with sanitary conveniences; that there can be no contamination of the oleomargarine by objectionable odours from packing houses, fertilizer or other sources; that the machinery and equipment is modern and capable of easy and efficient cleaning, and that the probable output of the proposed establishment will be sufficiently large to justify the employment of an inspector.

No oleomargarine shall be manufactured in Canada except under the supervision of inspectors appointed by the minister.

No oleomargarine shall be manufactured in Canada in any premises used for or connected with the manufacture or reworking of butter.

All materials intended to be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine shall be inspected and approved before being used for such purpose. The inspector may at any time take samples of any such materials for analysis.

No oleo oil or neutral lard shall be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine unless it is

the production of an abattoir under the inspection of the minister, and bears the Government inspection mark, or has been manufactured in the country of origin under inspection satisfactory to the minister and is at the time of importation covered by the official markings and export inspection certificate of the country of origin.

No milk shall be used in the manufacture of oleomargarine unless it is from non-reacting tuberculin tested cows, or has been pasteurized under the supervision of an inspector appointed by the minister, and no butter shall be used in such manufacture unless it is free from rancidity or any objectionable odour.

No preservative other than salt shall be used for the preservation of oleomargarine.

No person other than a licensed manufacturer of oleomargarine shall mix oleomargarine and butter.

No person shall manufacture, import into Canada, or shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale any oleomargarine unless the word "oleo" is stamped on the surface of the oleomargarine in capital block letters at least one and one-half inches high and of proportional width.

Every person who either imports, manufactures, or sells oleomargarine wholesale shall keep a special book in which is entered the date of each importation, purchase, sale and shipment of oleomargarine, and the quantity so imported, sold or shipped, the person from which it has been purchased and to whom it has been sold or shipped, and the place from, in, or to which it was imported, sold or shipped, and the name of the railway or steamship company or other transportation agency by which such oleomargarine was transported, and such books shall at all times be open for inpection for any person authorized by the minister to examine same. This special book shall contain no entries or information other than required by this regulation.

(b) Regulations as to distribution:

No person shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale in Canada any oleomargarine manufactured wholly from vegetable oils unless it is so designated upon all labels, brands or other markings.

No person shall manufacture, import into Canada, or shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale any oleomargarine unless the word "oleo" is stamped on the surface of the oleomargarine in capital block letters at least one and one-half inches high and of proportional width.

No person shall sell, offer, expose, or have in possession for sale in Canada any oleomargarine unless it is contained in—

(1) the original package which shall bear the official inspection mark of the country of origin, together with the name and address of the manufacturer; or,

(2) a small package wrapped separately having on the label or wrapper the word "Oleomargarine" printed or marked so as to form the most conspicuous word on the label or wrapper, as well as bearing the official inspection mark of the country of origin, together with the name and address of the manufacturer.

(3) provided, however, that no person shall sell, offer, expose or have in possession for sale in Canada any oleomargarine bearing on the package or container thereof the trademark or the name of the manufacturer in which is included any of the words "butter," "creamery," "dairy," or the name of any breed of cattle.

No label, brand or other marking shall be used in connection with the sale of oleomargarine until it has been approved by the Minister. Such approval may be withdrawn at any time on account of the violation of any provisions of The Oleomargarine Act, 1919, and an Act to amend the Oleomargarine Act, 1919, or any regulation made thereunder, whether such violation is due to the action of the manufacturer either in Canada or elsewhere, or of any wholesale dealer or other person who may be interested in the sale of oleomargarine bearing such label or brand.

No person shall sell, offer, expose, or have in his possession for sale any oleomargarine moulded or cut into prints or blocks unless such prints or blocks are of full net weight or one-half pound or one pound.

Every person who either imports, manufactures, or sells oleomargarine wholesale shall keep a special book in which is entered the date of each importation, purchase, sale and shipment of oleomargarine, and the quantity so imported, sold or shipped, the person from whom it has been purchased and to whom it has been sold or shipped, and the place from, in, or to which it was imported, sold or shipped, and the name of the railway or steamship company or other transportation agency by which such oleomargarine was transported, and such books shall at all times be open for inspection for any person authorized by the minister to examine same. This special book shall contain no entries or information other than required by this regulation.

(c) Answered by (b) with the exception of last paragraph.

3. (a) The Health of Animals branch; (b) The Dairy and Cold Storage branch.

COTTON INDUSTRIES—WAGES AND HOURS

Mr. St. PERE:

1. Has the Minister of Labour received, from the cotton manufacturers of Quebec and Nova Scotia, statements in regard to the number of hours which are devoted to these industries by the employees, and the wages they receive in return?

2. If so, why were the statistics concerning said cotton industries, where the employees work fifty-two or fifty-five hours per week, not published in the Labour Gazette?

3. Why were these statistics not published for each province as in the past?

4. Are the returns made to the Department of Labour considered confidential?

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK:

1. Reports as to hours and wages have been received by the Department of Labour from cotton manufacturers in the province named. The reports are furnished on the understanding that the information in them is regarded as confidential.

2. Considerable information as to hours and wages is published in bulletins issued by the Department of Labour as supplements to the Labour Gazette. In view of

the understanding on which the information is received care is taken that any information published shall not reveal the identity of a particular firm.

3. Statistics as to hours and wages cannot be published by provinces where such publication would reveal the identity of a particular firm. The latest bulletin on this subject, issued February 1922, gave information as to hours and wages in the textile industry, but the circumstances under which the particulars were secured would not permit the information being arranged by provinces.

4. Yes.

C. H. BLAND

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. How many times has the classification of C. H. Bland, of the Civil Service Commission, been changed since he became connected with Commission?

2. On what dates were these changes made and what was the maximum and minimum salary in each case?

3. What salary did the said Mr. Bland receive on his appointment to the said Commission?

4. Was his title of classification changed on the 9th of May last with a minimum and maximum salary of $3,900 and $4,400?

5. What amount of back pay will he be entitled to on account of the last change of classification?

6. What amount in all has he received in back pay on account of previous changes in his classification?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Mr. C. H. Bland was classified Assistant Secretary of the Civil Service Commission as from April 1st, 1919, salary range $3,060 to $3,420. This was amended as from the 1st February, 1921 to "Assistant Secretary and Chief Examiner", with a salary range of $3,660 to $4,020. The salary range was amended on the 9th May, 1922 to minimum $3,900, maximum $4,440.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. $800.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. $280.

6. $1,315.

L'ASSOMPTION AND MONTCALM LIGHT-KEEPERS

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. What are the names and respective residences of the light keepers in the counties of l'Assomption and Montcalm, Quebec?

2. How many of said light keepers were dismissed from the service from September 21st, 1911 to January, 1921, and by whom were they replaced?

3. Who recommended said dismissals and appointments?

[Mr. Murdock.]

Hon. Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Leopold Rivest, Aime Payette, Repentigny, P.Q.; Jean Baptiste Giguere, Lucidas Beaudoin, Arthur Payette, Hormidas Dupuis, Zenon Plouffe, Ovila Peltier, St. Sulpice, P.Q.; J. Oscar Lachapelle, Eloi Thouin, Repentigny, P.Q.; Alphonse Chicoine, Jr., St. Sulpice, P.Q.

2 and 3. None. Prior to 1914, however, a light was maintained at Ile a la Bague and the keeper thereof, Louis Dubois, was dismissed for political partisanship as a result of an investigation held on representations made by Mr. Jos. Morin, K.C., of Montreal, supported by a petition from certain electors of Repentigny Parish. Mr. Eloi Thouin was appointed to replace him on the recommendation of Mr. Morin, K.C. On the discontinuance of this light in 1914, Mr. Thouin was transferred to the keepership of the back light of the range at Ile Lebel.

ALIEN ENEMY PROPERTY

Mr. BLACK (Yukon):

1. Who are the officials who have charge of the clearing house for alien enemy property?

2. Are they officials of the Government?

3. If so, do they receive extra salary for the above work?

4. What is the permanent salary of each, and what the extra amount for alien work?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Custodian, The Honourable the Secretary of State; Deputy Custodian, The Under-Secretary of State; Assistant Deputy Custodian and Controller of the Clearing Office, H. Spencer Relph; Official in charge Property, Rights and Interests, William Pemberton Morling; Acountant, A. H. Mathieu; Chief Claims Clerk, Joseph Leslie.

2. The Deputy Custodian is a permanent official of the Department of the Secretary of State. The other officials have been temporarily appointed under and by virtue of the Treaty of Versailles, and The Treaty of Peace (Germany) Order 1920, and are solely engaged in work of this nature.

3. No.

4. Permanent salaries: Under-Secretary of State, $6,000; Assistant Deputy Custodian, $4,500; Official in charge Property Rights and Interests, $2,500; Acountant, $2.500; Chief Claims Clerk, $2,500.

OTTAWA-KINGSTON PROVINCIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. GARLAND (Carleton):

1. Has any Federal grant been paid on the cost of the provincial highway from Ottawa to Kingston, Ontario?

2. Were tenders called for the laying of that portion of this highway between Ottawa and Carleton Place?

3. If so, who submitted tenders and for what amounts?

4. Who were the successful tenderers, and what was the amount in each case?

5. Were any quarries purchased on this section of the above highway?

6. If so, who purchased same, and for what amount in each case?

7. From whom were the quarries purchased and what are the locations?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

No project having been filed by the Ontario Government with the Federal Highways Branch, and no agreement having been entered into under the Canada Highways Act, the Department of Railways and Canals has no information concerning the road in question.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

Mr. GORDON:

1. What was the consumption of binder twine and rope, in the various provinces of Canada, during the year 1921?

2. How much of this was manufactured in Canada?

Mr. LANCTOT:

1. What was the cost, in each Military District, of transportation, in connection with the Army Service Corps?

2. How many horses, automobiles, motor trucks and other vehicles are there in the Army Service Corps?

3. How many officers and men make up this section of the Militia?

4. What was the total value of all equipment of the Army Service Corps, and what amount was spent on upkeep and repairs to equipment, including forage, sickness, etc., during the year ending March 31st, 1922?

5. Would this service cost less to the country if the forage, supplies, and transportation were given by contract each year to an individual, according to lowest tender, or done by day work?

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR PAPERS

Mr. BOYS:

For a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the Government of Italy and the Canadian Government, in reference to the International Conference now being held at Genoa, Italy, including the Order in Council appointing delegates for Canada, and all instructions given to the said delegates by the Government of Canada.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

EMPIRE DAY AND ASCENSION DAY—ADJOURNMENT

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I beg to move, in accordance with notice given, that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, May 23rd, it stand adjourned until Friday, May 26.

Mr. HOCKEN: I would suggest to the leader of the Government that we adjourn until the following Monday. That would make it possible for those hon. members, who do not want to hang around Ottawa for two days, to go home.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I suggest that we sit on Saturday.

Mr. CRERAR: I dissent from the suggestion of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Hocken). There are a good many members of the House from the maritime provinces and the far West who are desirous of having the business expedited as rapidly as possible. It is only a few hours journey to Toronto, where my hon. friend lives, and he can doubtless go home on Tuesday evening and return on Friday.

Mr. HOCKEN: If the idea is to conserve time, then I think that we might sit Wednesday nights and on Saturdays as well. I am perfectly satisfied to stay here all the time if hon. members are anxious to get the business of the House done. Let us adjourn over the 24th and come back on Thursday.

Motion agreed to.

WOODMEN OF THE WORLD

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. O. R. GOULD (Assiniboia): I would call the attention of the House to a statement made in the Ottawa Citizen of May 17 in regard to the proposed amendment of the Insurance Act. In that statement reference is made to the Woodmen of the World. I desire to state for the information of the House, and in justice to the Association, that the name of this body was never mentioned in committee at all. I believe that the Superintendent of Insurance advised the reporter that it might be as well not to mention the name of the company that was responsible for the suggestion regarding the proposed amendment.

SUPPLY

RAILWAYS AND CANALS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Railways and Canals—Amount not exceeding $42,800,000 to meet expenditures made, or indebtedness incurred (where amount available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Canadian National Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company or any company comprised of the Canadian Northern system, or any one or more of them, on any of the

following accounts: (a) Operating deficits. (b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies. (c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations. (d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured. (e) Construction and betterments. (f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities. The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council, by way of loans in cash or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other. If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, payable half-yearly, secured by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve. If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $42,800,000.

Hon. WILLIAM C. KENNEDY (Minister of Railways and Canals): This appropriation is required by the Canadian Northern Railway, as approved by the board of directors of the Canadian National Railways, for the year ending March 31, 1923. These estimates were prepared by the officials of the Canadian National Railways, submitted to and approved by the board of directors, and then laid before the Department of Railways and Canals. I am assured by the management that the moneys asked for are necessary in order to operate successfully the Canadian Northern railway during the coming year. In the course of the statement I submitted to the House some time ago in connection with the railways I said that in the matter of improvements and betterments we were laying new rails only for replacement purposes. That was thought advisable in view of the hope we entertained that in the near future we might have a unified system with one board of directors; and we felt that responsibility for any capital investment should properly be assumed by them. In arriving at that conclusion, I think it is only right to say that neither the management of the railway, the directors, nor the Government, have lost sight of the fact that there are extensions that should be made in the West, and when opportunity offers these extensions will be given every consideration. I have before me to-day an analysis of this vote of $42,800,000 as follows:

Construction	$1,286,164 00
Betterments—	
Western lines	4,099,525 00
Eastern lines	2,031,390 00
Halifax & Southwestern Railway	112,235 00
Co-ordination	1,452,757 00
Right of way surveys	77,000 00
Hotel department	34,595 00
Telegraph department, railway	186,378 00
Telegraph department, commercial	110,734 00
Canadian National Express equipment	.....
Stores department	74,222 00
Materials and supplies, fuel, ties, etc	.....
Special items	285,000 00
	$9,750,000 00
Financial—	
Operating account	5,000,000 00
Taxes	750,000 00
Fixed charges interest	18,667,120 02
Sinking fund	1,113,133 33
Equipment principal	4,767,000 00
Securities maturing	2,500,000 00
Purchase of securities of subsidiary companies	
Contracts payable	223,827 62
	$33,021,080 97
Grand total	$42,771,080 97
Vote No. 136	$42,800,000 00

I have not the contracts for land but they bring the total up to about $42,800,000. I shall be pleased to give the House all the information I can. I hope I have most of it here, and anything I do not have I shall be only too glad to obtain and present at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. EULER: I note the minister anticipates a deficit of $5,000,000 on operating account for the coming year. How does that compare with last year?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Last year $5,000,000 was the estimated operating deficit.

Mr. EULER: I understand that you are now making an appropriation for the coming year, and that the estimated operating deficit was $5,000,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The operating deficit last year was estimated at $5,000,000, but actually it amounted to $12,827, 411.

Mr. EULER: Do you expect to decrease that this year?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Yes, according to these figures. This year we have an estimate of $5,000,000, and I am informed that we hope to be able to hold the deficit down to the estimate.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Does that cover the whole system?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The Canadian Northern.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. gentleman quite certain he is right as to the estimated deficit on the Canadian Northern lines last year? Speaking from memory, I am pretty sure that the deficit estimated then was more than it actually turned out to be.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): This deficit of $12,000,000 takes care of fifteen months last year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Instead of the deficit turning out to be more than the minister's estimate, it is my recollection that it turned out to be less. The minister will see a reference to that in the last debate, when the figures were given.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That was on fixed charges.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, fixed charges could not be less. I do not know the period referred to by the minister a year ago, but the deficit was estimated at a certain figure and the actual deficit turned out to be less than the estimate, not more.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I am dealing with the fiscal year and am giving the deficit as announced to the House last year when the Estimates were up, namely, $5,000,000 for the Canadian Northern system. It is the same this year, but last year in the actual working out the deficit turned out to be $12,000,000 odd for the fifteen months. My hon. friend is dealing with the calendar year, and I am dealing with the fiscal year.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that really makes any difference. The point is not of very great consequence, but I think I shall be able to show the minister that the estimate was more than the actual deficit turned out to be, whatever the period was.

Mr. CRERAR: I understand that the figure that has been given for the estimated deficit on operating account this year covers only what is known as the Canadian Northern lines.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): That is all.

Mr. CRERAR: It does not include the Transcontinental.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): No.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What does the item "Co-ordination" refer to?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I understand that co-ordination was to save money. I did not think we would have to vote money to pay for that work.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I think we will, but spending money on co-ordination will mean a great saving in the actual working out. We must, however, pay for the arrangements that are necessary in order to effect co-ordination. As far as the item itself is concerned it includes for co-ordination facilities:

$250,900 at Quebec and Limoilou;
$142,000 for the purpose of making a connection between the Canadian Northern and G.T.P. at Rowan, a point just west of Fort William;
$475,000 for the construction of a yard at Ft. William, and
$171,000 for the consolidation of terminal facilities at Jasper, Lucerne and the Yellowhead pass.

The balance is made up of a number of smaller items at various points of contact between the various railroads embraced in the Canadian National system.

The amount included in this budget is the portion of the co-operation expense chargeable to the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. MITCHELL: In view of some of the criticims that have been directed to certain members on this side, including m self, as to the stand we took during the last electoral campaign, in view of the statement made by the Government in the Speech from the Throne to the effect that they intended to give public operation of railways a fair trial, and finally in view of the statement made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) on the eleventh of last month, I feel that it is my duty to discuss the position maintained by us at that time. I may say that my position upon that question has not changed. I am still of the opinion that I was before and during the campaign; but in view of the statement that has been made by the Minister of Railways I feel that I owe some explanation, not only to the House but to my constituency and to the people of my native province where I discussed this question very freely. I realize and understand that there are many hon. members of this House, and many men throughout the country, who do not agree with the position I took during that campaign, which was to the effect that I was against public ownership and operation of railways. I have no quarrel with those who disagree with me upon this matter; they are entitled to their opinion. I respect their view fully, but I ask them to give the same thought to my own—an opinion

which I can assure the House has been reached after having given a great deal of honest and sincere consideration to the question and after having studied the matter in all its aspects.

Let us endeavour, if we can, to discuss the question freely and frankly, entirely apart from all bitterness of any kind, because, to my mind, it is not a political issue and should not so be considered; it is too serious for that. It is a question which I think, should be looked upon as a national issue because, if I am right in my beliefs with respect to it, it is a danger to the very credit of our country. In saying that I only reiterate what I said during the last election campaign. In saying that I took into consideration then, and take into consideration now, the vast area of our country; I took into consideration our sparse population; I took into consideration the development that has taken place in Canada; I took into consideration the enormous debt that we have and I took into consideration the fact, as I believe, that we are taxed pretty nearly to the limit. Taking all these elements into consideration I stated then, and I state now, that I do not believe our country can stand a deficit of $72,000,000 a year—even if it is only that, and I expect to be able to show that there will be a far greater deficit on the operation of our railways during the past year. In order that there shall be no misunderstanding about the position I took upon this question during the last electoral campaign, allow me to read from the remarks I made when I accepted the nomination for St. Antoine division at the very beginning of the campaign. I said:

> My stand on the railway question is just as clear and pronounced as it is on the tariff. On general principles I am against public ownership of railways. I realize that we have the railways. I think it was a mistake to acquire them. I think it was more than a mistake to take over the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk. It was a national blunder leading to national disaster. When the Borden and Meighen régime undertook to purchase and operate the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Railways they started out on a road which leads to national bankruptcy, and the responsibility is theirs, and theirs alone. But these railways are costing $100,000,000 a year. Does any one imagine that this can continue for long? We are losing as much money in railway deficits as would build another transcontinental railway in a few years. Everybody agrees that something must be done.
>
> What is the Solution?
>
> The government should get together the best railroad brains that the world can produce. Let them not confine themselves to Canada, or the United States, but get men from Europe and elsewhere whose railway experience would help. Let them investigate this problem from beginning to end, and allow them to do it without interference. I would not allow them to be told beforehand what their report must be, nor that they would have to favour this or that town. They would be told to devise means, and when I had the report from these experts before me, I would assist in finding a solution of the railway problem—a solution satisfactory to the people of Canada—but a solution without deficits, it must be so if we are to save our country.

Again, just previous to election day I issued a manifesto to the electors of St. Antoine division which contained the following:

> The present government committed the stupendous folly of saddling the country with the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Railways, and with the Canadian Merchant Marine. I am in principle opposed to government ownership and operation of public utilities. Thanks to the present administration, however, the problem is now on our hands and must be faced. We should secure the advice of the most competent experts that can be found. We must get at the root of a system which results in yearly deficits that are staggering and that are leading Canada straight to bankruptcy. The next government must take up this question courageously and find a solution that will put an end to a financial burden that is unbearable.

These statements, I think, fairly represent the position I took on every occasion when I spoke in the province of Quebec. What is the position I took? I simply said that in principle I was against the government operation of railways. I believed that we would have a deficit of $100,000,000 a year, and I asked that we should investigate this matter. I asked that we go into the whole book-keeping systems of these great railway systems and get down to the very—root, I think, was the expression I used—down to the very bottom of this whole question of government operation of railways in this country. We must have an investigation full and complete of the book-keeping systems of the Canadian Northern, the Transcontinental Railway, and all the other railways concerned. Let us have a full and complete investigation of those book-keeping systems and place the result before Parliament and the Canadian people. In addition to that, I suggested that we should obtain the best railway experts in the world, and that we should get them from Canada or the United States. I even suggested we should go to Europe, and I made that suggestion simply because I understood and believed that they had had great experience in Europe in the operation of government railways, and I did not think that any harm could come from getting the very best rail-

way advice whether in favour of public ownership of against it, in order that the minister could place before Parliament and the people a true inventory, a true statement, and a true solution of this vast, intricate and perplexing problem, which I believe is the most serious problem facing the Canadian people to-day.

Some hon. members opposite ridiculed my suggestion as to getting the best expert advice and accountants to investigate bookkeeping methods. I can see nothing in that suggestion calling for ridicule. I think it is good common sense, and a business method that would be adopted by any competent business administration on any of our great railways, or in any of our great corporations, if they had a like problem to deal with. If that advice had been followed in the past we might have saved hundreds of millions of dollars for this country. If that advice is not followed now, it will be followed sooner or later, because no matter what kind of a trial is given to the operations of the railways in this country, no trial would be satisfactory, either to those in favour of public operation of railways or to those who are opposed to it. No trial will be satisfactory to the Canadian public unless we know that we are getting a fair start, and unless the people who are asking for the trial know that they are getting a show for their money, and that we are going to get, at the end of the trial, a statement of facts and figures and a result that will be worth something to them.

What will happen if we do not do that? In a few months or years, whenever the occasion arises, they will come back and say that the statements were incorrect and that the trial was not fair and cannot be depended upon. If we want to give our government railways a fair trial, we require a true statement of the bookkeeping and accounting methods from one end to the other, and the best engineering advice we can obtain on this problem. When I heard the hon. Minister of Railways present to this House the other day a statement of railway operation for the last fiscal year, I was struck by the very fair and generous treatment that was given by him to the figures and accounts as presented to him by the management of these different railways. I must congratulate him upon his fairness and generosity, but I am glad to say that he coupled with that fairness and generosity a certain amount of caution, because he reiterated, time and again during his speech, that it was not his statement that he was presenting to the House, but that it was the statement of those responsible for the management and direction of the Canadian National Railways. In order to make that point clear, I quote from the statement made by the Minister of Railways a few days ago. He said:

> I would like to say that seemingly the outstanding feature of 1921 operation was the improvement in the position of the Canadian National-Grand Trunk combination.

Secondly he says:

> The National system is said to be the only transcontinental system in America whose earnings in 1921, etc.

Further on he says:

> It is claimed on behalf of the management that this reduction was not made at the expense of the property, and that deferred maintenance and betterment made during 1919 and 1920 were reflected in 1921.

He says again further on:

> It has been submitted by the management—

And again:

> The management informed me that the labour situation has greatly improved.

And again:

> I am glad to give expression to the views of the management in that regard.

And again:

> The management estimates the reductions in tie expenditure last year to have been—

The figures are then given. And again he says:

> The management state that in 1921 they did not purchase for the Intercolonial railway or ship to the Intercolonial railway east of Montreal any American coal.

And then he concludes by the statement that there has been so much criticism of the management of the Canadian National Railways, and also concerning the Grand Trunk, as to impair parliamentary and public confidence in figures and statements which have been put out from time to time. Then he concludes with the statement that he is going to appoint a committee to investigate the book-keeping methods of the Canadian National Railway system. Could there be anything clearer or more convincing than that the minister intended to throw the responsibility for all that statement he submitted to the House where it properly belongs, namely, on the management of the different railway systems which comprise the Canadian National Railways.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Is the hon. member not aware that the Government has now, and

has had for years, under its charge an independent audit of the Canadian National system which reports to the Government direct, and that, consequently, if the minister does not know the real position it is his own fault.

Mr. MITCHELL: I have no knowledge whatever, except the statements that are contained in the remarks made by the Minister of Railways the other day, and if you have that independent audit to which the leader of the Opposition refers, or if we had half a dozen independent audits, it would not alter the point I have made that the Minister of Railways and the Government say that the responsibility for the management and the statement that was submitted belong to the management and to the Government which appointed that management, and which controlled it during the whole time this statement covers. The fact that an independent audit may have been made does not in the least alter the situation, because the Minister of Railways told us that the public, and even this Parliament, did not have faith in the statements that were submitted nor in the bookkeeping methods that were employed by these companies, and that, therefore, the Government were going to ask the new management to appoint an investigation committee to go into all the circumstances.

As regards the question of the deficit upon the government railways, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) a few days ago asked the Minister of Railways whether the deficit should not have been less than it was. I think this will answer his question. If I remember correctly, the estimated deficit on the whole system last year was some $70,000,000; but that was corrected to $67,000,000, and then the Minister of Railways announced that the deficit on the Canadian National, not including the Grand Trunk, amounted to $56,000,000 in round figures.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That was not an estimate at all. The figures to which the hon. member refers were the actual figures of operation for the previous year.

Mr. MITCHELL: I thought the leader of the Opposition, when he was talking the other day in regard to the $70,000,000 and the $67,000,000, was referring to the estimate, but I may be wrong in that. In any event, the deficit last year upon the operation of the Canadian National system, not including the Grand Trunk system was $56,673,934, and the deficit on the Grand Trunk system was $15,672,298, making a total deficit of $72,346,232. By a simple process of calculation, we find that that deficit of, in round figures, $72,000,000, has added a per capita debt to our population of about $7. When we consider that the public debt of Canada at the end of the last fiscal year amounted to $2,340,000,000, or about $266 per capita, and when we find that, in the operation of our railway system, we have a deficit of $72,000,000, is it not fair for me to suggest to this House, to the Canadian people and to all these gentlemen who are in favour of government operation of railways, that we "stop, look, listen," before we go too far upon this road which, in the campaign last fall, I described as the road that was leading to disaster.

For the purpose of finding out whether that deficit of $72,000,000, which was referred to the other day by the Minister of Railways, is the actual deficit, I should like, for a moment or two, to discuss the returns which were filed by the Minister of Railways. We find that the operating expenses last year amounted to $142,784,000—my point is this, that all the savings in connection with the operation of government owned railways were savings in operating expenses. In 1920, the expenditure on this account was $162,484,000. Thus, in 1921 there was a saving of about $19,000,000 in operating expenses. I will show the committee in a few minutes how that $19,000,000 was saved in the expense account. The other day there was delight in the voice of the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) when he told us that the operating deficit was only $16,000,000 last year as against $36,000,000 the year before; that last year there was an improvement to the extent of $20,000,000. If hon. members will look at the monthly returns that are filed, one thing that will strike them as rather peculiar is that from the first of January to the end of June the monthly deficit in the operation of the Canadian National railways amounted to over $2,500,000 and, in some months, to nearly $3,000,000; that in the month of July we had an operating deficit of $1,261,000 and that then the surpluses began: August, $47,231; September, $504,174.87; October, $1,036,030.34; November, $734,149.65. Then in December we go back into the deficit column, and we have a deficit of $1,114,794.38. That is to say, during the first six months we had a deficit of over $2,500,000 and sometimes nearly $3,000,000 per month; then for

4 p.m.

August, September, October and November, we had surpluses; then in December we go back into the deficit column, and I understand that we are still continuing in that column. I would point out that there was a great difference between July and August, and between November and December. Hon. members will find that in the one case the actual difference amounts to $1,308,000, and in the other it amounts to $1,848,000. What I would point out to hon. members is what seems to me to be a queer coincidence, namely, that the four months during which we had surpluses in operation upon the Canadian National railways were the very four months when hon. gentlemen opposite were appealing to the Canadian people for support during the last campaign. Some hon. member may ask, what about July? If you will remember, the improvement started in the early summer and not right at the beginning of the election campaign. It will be recalled that, early in the summer, a demand was made by the press from the Atlantic to the Pacific upon the then Prime Minister (Mr. Meighen) calling upon him to go before the people of this country. That was continued day in and day out, and if I am not mistaken, the then Prime Minister stated early in the summer that he would announce his policy on the first of September. I think it was at the city of London, in the province of Ontario, that he announced that there would be a general election before the end of the year, and on the 7th October he announced dissolution, and fixed the elections for the 6th December.

Now, Sir, of course I know that hon. gentlemen opposite have often pretended that there was no interference by them with the management of the Canadian National Railways, but it does seem to me that the coincidence to which I have just referred would strike hon. members as at least somewhat remarkable.

And, further, on Thursday night we had a discussion over an Order in Council passed on the 6th October last,—the day previous to the dissolution—during the course of which we found hon. gentlemen opposite defending the Government for interfering in the management of the Canadian National Railways, and on this side we had hon. members calling for further contracts to be awarded to their particular constituencies. Is that the kind of fair trial of our railway system under public ownership that hon. members want? I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) the other night when he said that there should be no interference with the management of our National Railways whether it be by ministers of the Crown, members of Parliament or the public. It is only by freedom from such interference that our National Railway system will ever get a fair trial. If that is not possible, then I say the trial is not by any means a fair trial and the system is doomed to failure.

My reason for being against government operation of railways or similar undertakings has always been the same. While I have every confidence in the Government which I have the honour to support, in the members of this House, and in our people, yet I am afraid that until human nature is freed from the weaknesses that it has displayed for generations past, or until we have supermen in control of our Canadian National Railways who will stand inflexible against all demands whether by ministers of the Crown, members of Parliament or the public, we will not be able to get that satisfactory management and operation under public ownership suggested by the hon. member for Marquette.

Mr. GOOD: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he was opposed to the principle of public ownership and operation of all public utilities?

Mr. MITCHELL: That is what I said, and I still am of that opinion. I have had some experience, not much, of the public operation of public utilities, under which description, of course, I do not include every little waterpower or electric plant in a small village or town. From my examination into the operation of such utilities I have come to the conclusion on general principles that the public pay more in taxation than they benefit from lower charges under public ownership.

But I do not want to get away from the railway question. I know that in the great province of Ontario there is public ownership and operation of one of their public utilities that the people are proud of and want continued. I do not wish to discuss that feature to-day. I am dealing solely with the question of railway operation. But in answer to my hon. friend, I say that as a result of the examination I had occasion to make, in my capacity as Minister of Municipal Affairs in the province of Quebec, into the operation and management of various publicly

owned enterprises I was forced to the conclusion that no public utility of any importance can be operated to the advantage of the community under public ownership, if all the charges of every description that would be allowed for by a business organization running the same public utility were taken into account in making up the balance sheet.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the hon. member include the Post Office Department in that statement?

Mr. MITCHELL: Oh, no. The hon. gentleman knows that I do not refer to the post office or similar departments which have been run by governments from time immemorial and which have always been recognized as a part of the government's activities in any country. The hon. gentleman is evidently asking me the question in order to divert my attention from the subject of government operation of railways.

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman has referred to his examination into the operation of various public utilities in the province of Quebec. Would he be kind enough to be a little more definite and state the nature of the public utilities that he investigated?

Mr. MITCHELL: I do not think that is a fair question.

Mr. EULER: You referred to it.

Mr. MITCHELL: Any investigations I made were made by me as Minister of Municipal Affairs. I ask my hon. friend to accept my statement for what it is worth, and I give it to him frankly. It was my conclusion—I may be wrong; he might hold an investigation and reach a different conclusion—that public operation was not a success. I did not find one case of successful operation under public management. I trust the hon. gentleman will not ask me to give the names of the public owned corporations that I investigated.

Mr. EULER: I do not desire to be misunderstood. I was not asking for the names of the corporations that my hon. friend investigated; I was asking for the nature of the service they performed. Were they railways, gas companies, electric companies, or water companies? What service did they perform?

Mr. MITCHELL: Principally electric plants, small railways, and waterworks that were operated by various municipalities throughout the province of Quebec. Now, Sir, I want to call the attention of the House to one other fact, that not only did the improvement to the extent of $20,000,000 in the operation of our National Railways result from a decrease in the operating expenses which were under the control of the management of the Canadian Northern and the other railways forming the government system, but the Minister of Railways on behalf of the management made the following statement recently:

> It is claimed on behalf of the management that this reduction was not made at the expense of the property, and that deferred maintenance and betterments made during 1920 were reflected in 1921.

And he also stated:

> After the very heavy purchases of rolling stock and motive power in 1918, 1919, and 1920, it was not necessary to go into the market for equipment of any kind during 1921.

We have from the management of the railways the statement that the operations of 1921 benefited from improvements, betterments and maintenance and the purchase of rolling stock made previous to that year, and properly chargeable to the year 1919-20. So I say that in all fairness, you have to deduct from 1921 an amount equal to the improvements charged to 1920. In the Order in Council which was discussed the other day in this House the last clause but one reads:

> That in neither case shall expenditure incurred this year in anticipation of next year's requirements be chargeable against current operation or financing.

In other words, the government of that day took it upon themselves to instruct the management of the railways, under their direction and control, that they should charge against the year 1922 expenditures that should have been chargeable to 1921. I not only say that if that were legal, it would be wrong, but I emphatically declare that it is illegal, and there is no authority that can be found to justify that government or any other in instructing the management of the Canadian National Railways to charge against 1922 what is properly chargeable against 1921.

Mr. STEVENS: Will my hon. friend explain just how he fits that argument into the section he read from the Order in Council? I certainly cannot follow him.

Mr. MITCHELL: It occurs in several places. The Minister of Railways of that day had suggested to the management that they should anticipate an order for rails

and cars, as stated by him the other night, the object being to relieve unemployment. That was done during the fall months of the year, and after he had made that suggestion to the management, he says in his report:—

Mr. CRERAR: What is the date of the Order in Council?

Mr. MITCHELL: October 6, 1921. That was the day before the dissolution of Parliament, if I mistake not. At any rate, it was about the time the Prime Minister announced the dissolution. The hon. gentleman in his report said:

> In doing so, however, it is only fair to the railways that expenditures so incurred shall not be considered a charge against the current year's operations or financing and while the management will make every effort to see that repair work undertaken outside the railway shops is done at fair and reasonable prices, any increased expenditure involved should not be charged against the railways but against such financial provision as may, from time to time, be made by the Government to deal with unemployment.

The clause before the one I read a few moments ago is as follows:

> That in placing orders for the rebuilding and repair of freight equipment the charges against the railways shall only be the fair and reasonable cost of same at the company's shops, and that any extra expenditures involved be a proper charge against unemployment generally and be regarded as such.

If the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Stewart) will go into the accounts he will find that operations in the year 1921 benefited from expenditures which were charged against the year 1922. And the statement that I made during the last election campaign was not at all exaggerated. The deficit on the operations of last year, if the accounts are carefully examined, will be found to have been not only $100,000,000 but considerably in excess of that amount. If on top of all that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways will add the interest on the Intercolonial, the interest on the Transcontinental, and the other interest charges which, I understand, were not compounded from time to time, he will discover that I am well within the mark when I fix the deficit at $100,000,000.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend suggest that in connection with the orders which were anticipated in October of last year, the companies got too much for the rails?

Mr. MITCHELL: Not at all. I do not suggest anything of the kind, nor do I imply that there was anything wrong in the transaction in a general business way. I am simply criticising the business method that has been pursued in connection with the government operation of railways, and I say that neither the late government nor this Government, nor any member of Parliament has the right, under a proper system of management, to tell the railways that when they anticipate and purchase something this year for next year, they shall charge the expenditure to next year's account.

Mr. CARROLL: Is the hon. member not aware that at this present time the Canadian Pacific Railway are anticipating rail requirements for next year?

Mr. MITCHELL: That statement was made the other day, I think, by the ex-Minister of Railways, and I took the trouble to inquire of the Canadian Pacific Railway as to the accuracy of it. I am informed that at no time, on no single occasion, have they ever ordered any equipment in anticipation and charged it up against the following year's accounts. They have not charged to next year something that is chargeable to this year.

Mr. CARROLL: Does my hon. friend not know that it is a fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway are this year anticipating requirements of next year for the reason that rails manufactured and kept in storage five or six hundred miles from salt water improve?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have not gone into the question of the effect of salt water on rails, nor do I dispute for a moment that the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway has the right to order this year any rails that they may require next year. I do not dispute that; I have not discussed that feature of the subject at all. The only point I am endeavouring to make is that you cannot order to-day something to be used in any way this year and charge it to next year's account.

I am not criticising the management of the Canadian National Railways for ordering for next year's requirements, but I am criticising the late government's suggestion that they should do that for the sake of relieving unemployment. If unemployment was the sole reason, there would be a great deal to be said for that action. But what I say is, they have no right to authorize charging to next year's account what should have been charged to 1921.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Does the hon. member suggest that the rails authorized under Order in Council of October 6, or the cars which under that Order in Council were authorized to be repaired, entered into the operation of the system for 1921?

Mr. MITCHELL: I am not ready to say they actually did. What I ask is, that we go into the account. Because, if you take the benefits that 1921 got for the work that was done previously, and take the work which should have been charged to 1921 but was charged to 1922, you will find that the $20,000,000 of improvements disappears. I may be wrong, but I say that we are entitled, in view of the Orders in Council that were passed and the statements made by the management itself, to have an investigation to find out actually what was charged and what was not, and I can assure the ex-Minister of Railways that I shall be delighted if I find I am wrong on this point.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): The hon. gentleman has stated more than once in his remarks to-day that it was unfair to charge up to 1922 purchases authorized in 1921 and which affected the statement for the calander year 1921. I think, in view of his repeated statements, it is only fair that he should tell the House upon what he bases his remarks; because I have no hesitation in saying that the purchases authorized under that Order in Council did not enter into the operation of the system during the last calendar year.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is where I disagree with my hon. friend, and I say further, he should not require much more proof than is contained in the Order in Council itself, which says that what should be charged to this year shall be charged to next year.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): It does not say that at all.

Mr. MITCHELL: On betterments, maintenance, interest and like accounts you will find, not thousands, but millions of dollars charged to 1922 that should have been charged to 1921. In the discussion the other day I asked the ex-Minister of Railways at whose suggestion this Order in Council was passed, and in order to make the matter clear, I shall read a clause of the Order in Council which covers the point we discussed here last Thursday. I asked the Minister of Railways several times whether the instructions went from the Labour Department to the management of the railway, or whether they went to the officials of the Railway Department, and if I understood him correctly he said that the negotiations or the correspondence, or whatever it was, went on between the Labour Department and the management of the railway itself, not the Department of Railways over which he presided. I quote from the Order in Council:

> And in order that there may be no question of considerations other than unemployment influencing the placing of these orders, the minister suggests that the allocation of this business be, on the concurrence of the Minister of Labour, whose departmental officials are closely in touch with the conditions affecting labour throughout Canada, and whose officials shall co-operate with the officials of the Department of Railways in dealing with this situation so far as it affects the railways under government control—

And so on. I take the Order in Council for what it says, and it seems that the whole situation was engineered, governed and directed from the Department of Railways and the Department of Labour. Of course, I know that the solicitude of the hon. gentleman for the unemployed took a spurt just at that moment, but I could not for one moment imagine that this solicitude led to the placing of the contracts for rails and cars. The fact remains that the Order in Council of the 6th of October was not the first Order in Council that was passed for the giving of contracts for cars. We find that on the 13th of August, 1921, an Order in Council was passed, and on that occasion there is no mention at all of labour troubles. The only statement we have is one from Mr. Hanna which says that "for the convenience of the company" it might be wise—I am not quoting when I say "it might be wise"—"to give a contract to the Algoma Steel Company for 40,000 tons of rails." An Order in Council had been passed previous to that, on the 21st of April, 1921, placing an order for 50,000 tons of rails at $55. The order under that contract was not completed up to the 50,000 tons, but only up to 39,000 tons, so another Order in Council was passed on the 13th of August confirming the balance of 11,000 tons and awarding a new contract for 40,000 tons, and there was no question raised about unemployment whatsoever, except that I think the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Simpson) in discussing this matter said that early in the spring the question had been raised—evidently in connection with the contract authorized on the 21st of April. This is what the hon. member for West Algoma said:

I may say that strong representations were made to the management of the railway companies last spring by representatives of the steel companies at Sydney and Sault Ste. Marie to place railway business in order to provide employment for the men during the coming season.

That is the only mention of unemployment, and I notice that the representations did not come from the men who were unemployed, but from the companies that wanted the contracts.

Mr. SIMPSON: A large deputation of the men from the steel plant at Sault Ste. Marie came down to Ottawa and applied for rail orders to be placed to provide employment.

Mr. MITCHELL: Why did you not give it to them then, and not wait until the day previous to dissolution? The contract was given subsequent to April 21, and then a new contract was awarded on August 13, and when the hon. member for Fort William—

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Does my hon. friend say an order was placed on August 13?

Mr. MITCHELL: I intended to say Order in Council; if I said order I made a mistake, I meant Order in Council. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Manion), I think it was, the other night defended the Order in Council of October 6, on the ground that it was looking after the unemployment in certain districts.

Mr. MANION: Will the hon. member permit me; I did not mention Order in Council at all. I defended the policy of looking after the unemployment in this country, but I did not discuss the Order in Council.

Mr. MITCHELL: The Order in Council was being discussed at that time and I took it that my hon. friends were defending the government for having given a contract by virtue of the Order in Council of October 6, as representations had been made by different boards of trade and other people, according to the ex-Minister of Railways, to give work to the unemployed.

Mr. MANION: Would my hon. friend condemn the policy of the government in endeavouring to relieve unemployment in any manner?

Mr. MITCHELL: Not at all, I have not suggested that. I am still arguing—at least I am attempting to argue, and trying to do it as fairly as I can,—the question of interference by a government in the management of a railway; and when hon. gentlemen opposite were defending the government the other night, as I understood them, for having passed that Order in Council of October 6, they evidently had not read the document because in it the then government cancelled the contract with the Algoma Steel Company which was awarded on August 13. By some streak of luck they got the same contract again and continued to do business and to afford employment to the unemployed for which I am very glad.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): My hon. friend has again referred to the order that was placed on August 13. No order was ever placed with the Algoma Steel Company or with any other company under the Order in Council of August. That Order in Council authorized the Board of Management to make contracts for a given sum, but no contract was ever entered into under it; the only contracts that were entered into were under the Order in Council of October 6.

Mr. MITCHELL: Not at all, the hon. gentleman is mistaken because they had furnished 39,000 tons of rails under the Order in Council of October 21—

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Under the April Order in Council.

Mr. MITCHELL: Under the April Order in Council I think the government renewed or confirmed a contract to the extent of 11,000 tons and authorized the giving of a contract for 40,000 tons. On October 6, the authorization that was given in the Order in Council of August 13, was cancelled, and, as I said a moment ago, the Algoma Steel Company, so I am informed, got an order for an equal amount by virtue of the Order in Council of October 6.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend but I would like to ask this question: Does he suggest that it would have been possible for the Board of Management of the National Railways to have anticipated their requirements for the purpose of relieving the unemployment situation without coming to the government, and without authority by Order in Council to do so? In the estimates of last year certain appropriations were made for the year. Now, if these appropriations were made—

Mr. MITCHELL: I have no objection to the hon. gentleman asking questions but I think he better refrain from argument.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I am suggesting this to my hon. friend: If the Board of Management were to place orders to relieve unemployment in excess of the appropriations that were made in the estimates of last year, does he suggest it would have been possible to do so without coming to the government and asking for an Order in Council?

Mr. MITCHELL: I have not examined the powers of the Canadian National Railways or the Grand Trunk Railway system to anticipate their orders but I presumed, and I understood ever since the government took these railways over, that the Boards of Management were running the lines completely and fully, and that there was no interference by the government in any way, shape or form. That is what I understood, but now I find I was wrong in that view. When the ex-Minister of Railways asks if it would be right for the Board of Management to come and suggest things to the government he forgets that he mentioned the other night that it was not the Board of Management that made the suggestion but that he himself suggested to the management to anticipate these orders.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I do not think my hon. friend is quoting me correctly. I think he will find, if he refers to Hansard, that I stated there were conferences between the department and the board, and I think it would be fair to say that the conferences started prior to the time that I became Minister of Railways.

Mr. MITCHELL: Very well, we will not take the conferences, but we will take the ex-minister's own statement. In the Order in Council passed on October 6, we find this statement:

> And in order that there may be no question of considerations other than unemployment influencing the placing of these orders, the minister suggests that the allocation of this business be on the concurrence of the Minister of Labour—

If the ex-Minister of Railways will refer to his remarks made on May 11, I think he will find the following in connection with this item:

> I should like to explain to the committee that, in the closing months of 1921, very strong representations were made, not only to the Department of Railways and Canals and the government, but to the boards in charge of the operation of Canadian-owned railways.

Further on the ex-Minister of Railways said:

> [Mr. Mitchell.]
>
> The government conferred with the Canadian Northern board and the Grand Trunk board and suggested to them—

And so on. I am taking the ex-minister's own words, and I presume that what he gave us the other night was a correct statement of the facts. I think that if I have not conclusively and logically proven to the hilt that there was interference, I have at least made out such a case in connection with the management of these railways that those gentlemen who are in favour of government operation will at any rate want to have an investigation into the accounting of last year in order to see that when they start out on a fair trial of government operation they will get an honest start and one that may be worth something to them when the period of trial is over.

Mr. SIMPSON: Does my hon. friend suggest that a price in advance of the market rate was paid for rails?

Mr. MITCHELL: No I simply gave the figure of $55 which was mentioned in the Order in Council. I do not suggest such a thing in any way in connection with any of these transactions. What I am asking for is an accounting to find out the facts. Evidently my hon. friend has not got the point I endeavoured to make That is that in view of the statement made on behalf of the Board of Management that many expenditures were charged to 1918, 1919, 1920 and should be charged to 1921, I want to find out what the facts are—nothing more or nothing less.

Mr. CARROLL: Did my hon. friend state that a contract for rails was awarded to the Dominion Steel Company last year at $55?

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not mention the Dominion Steel Company; I did not know there was a contract given to them.

I mentioned a moment ago that the debt of Canada was over $2,340,000,000, and I have endeavoured to show that in my judgment the deficits will be $100,000,000 if a proper accounting is made with respect to the operations of these railways. When we take into consideration the fact that during last year, up till the 31st March, we collected $101,500,000 from the business profits tax and from the income tax, all of which has gone into the sink hole of the Canadian National Railway deficit, is it not fair for us to inquire how we are going to meet this liability? I am sure that if the members of this House are not asking themselves that question, one member in

this Chamber is seriously considering that matter, and that is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). If every dollar which he collects from income and business profit taxes, instead of going to pay off the war debt, is to be sunk in railway deficits, is it not time that we should try, at least, to make an honest and earnest endeavour to find the solution of this difficulty? It may not be the solution that I want. The hon. member may be able to prove that government operation is possible, but I ask, in conclusion, that before the Government makes a start—and I make this appeal to those in favour of public ownership—see that it starts right in order that the system may get a fair trial.

Reference has been made, in connection with government operation, to my position on the railway question. Someone has suggested, I do not know whom, that I was in favour of monopoly in railways. I would like to know where the idea came from because ever since I have been in public life I have been fighting monopolies and have been endeavouring to control them at all times and on all occasions. I am against government operation of railways in principle, as I have stated, but I am just as firmly against monopolies of railways, whether by the government or anybody else. I do not care who it is, because to my mind, in order to get service which, after all, is what we want, we must have competition. Let us get competition and we will get service. I sympathize with those who are asking for reduced freight rates. I believe we must get reduced freight rates in this country. But do not ask for a reduction below the cost of the operation of your railway, because that means a greater deficit, and will, of course, mean more borrowing, which, in turn, means more taxes. Let us get to the rock bottom of this question and endeavour, each with the other, to arrive at a solution that will get rid of these deficits. Such a solution must be found, and, in order to find that solution, we will have to bring in more immigrants, which will give us more business and more traffic. That will be the surer way of reducing freight rates. I may, perhaps, exaggerate the seriousness of this question, but I believe it is an extremely serious matter and we should co-operate in an earnest endeavour to wipe out the enormous deficit that the taxpayers of this country have to pay.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member answer one question which will, perhaps, help the point of his address? If, after the investigation he demands, the accounts are found to be correctly kept, and the returns are found to be true returns, what does he say ought then to be done about the National Railways?

Mr. MITCHELL: When the hon. leader of the Opposition was questioned similarly the other day he stated that he would answer that question when his duties called upon him to do so, but I will not take that course. I say that, taking everything into consideration, unless some method is found to get rid of the deficit $70,000,000, or $100,000,000 as the case may be, the credit of this country cannot stand it, and if no solution is found, either by the experts or in some other way, we should devise some means of getting rid of the railway. We will have to get rid of the enormous deficit which this country has been burdened with during the last few years.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am sorry the answer of the hon. member had so many "ifs" in it that it did not add to the point of his address. I do not know yet what the hon. member would do. If there is no solution, he wants something else done.

Mr. MITCHELL: I see what the hon. gentleman is trying to do. He wants to get me to say that I will take one or the other course. I have stated to this House that, first of all, this country cannot, in my judgment, stand a deficit of $72,000,000. Secondly, if, after investigation, those accounts are found correct, and if the experts tell us that we cannot re-systematize the railways in such a way as to wipe out that $72,000,000, there will be nothing to do but to turn them back to private ownership.

Mr. CRERAR: I should like to know whether my hon. friend supports the policy of the Government, as laid down by the Minister of Railways in his statement of April 11?

Mr. MITCHELL: Absolutely. I thought I had made that point clear in my opening remarks. I said that the Government had announced in the Speech from the Throne, and the minister had announced that they intended to give the railways a fair trial. I intend to co-operate absolutely in every possible way, in order to give that fair trial. My hope is—and what I ask for is —that, in order to give that fair trial, we should have an investigation and obtain expert advice, so that it will be a real fair trial.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. member supports the policy of the Government, as announced by the Minister of Railways. Will he now tell us wherein he differs from the policy of the late government?

Mr. MITCHELL: I hope the present management will endeavour to operate without government interference and I say that if they do not operate in that way, they will not get any better results than the last government.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman's only complaint, in respect to which he waged his campaign through his province and in this country, as to the late government's railway policy was that we endeavoured, by conference with the railways, and by standing for any loss ourselves, to relieve unemployment last winter. That, after all, was all the objection he had to government operation of railways as conducted by the late administration. Well, the mountain certainly has laboured, and the House will observe the result. I do not wish to say anything by way of reply, because, really, in the last words of the hon. member from St. Antoine are contained the sum and substance of his whole case. He really has no case at all. I know that we have a deficit. Every one knows that we have a deficit and knows the cause of that deficit. If the National Railways had been constructed by men desiring to make money out of them on a commercial basis for purely commercial purposes, then that deficit would not exist. But the National Railways were constructed under impulses, of which the hon. member was a considerable factor himself, political impulses, sometimes colonization impulses, sometimes for reasons going to the very root of Confederation, as in the case of the Intercolonial. That is the character of the National Railways, and because they are of that character, they cannot, under present conditions, be made to pay. The hon. member knows that, under present conditions, they cannot be made to pay; he knows that no separate private company, no private individual would take them with the idea of making money out of them. The only way that they would take the National Railways would be on the basis of the country standing good for these deficits, for which the country is responsible because of the construction of the road.

The hon. member makes a speech of an hour and a half on the matter of accounting. What reasons have we for thinking that the accounting of the National Railways is wrong? The hon. gentleman does not seem to be aware that, not only have we the authority of the various accounting firms who superintend the auditing of the different elements of the National system, but an independent audit has been carried on by one of the most reputable firms, I think, in the world, the Marwick, Mitchell firm, an audit for the advantage of the Government and independent of the railway auditors altogether. These independent auditors go into all the matters that the hon. member has referred to, such as charging against one year something that should be be charged against another. It is the business of the auditors to report such matters with their audit. Has the hon. member in his speech of an hour and a half adduced any reason that would be authority for us to challenge the auditors' report? I did not find one. Consequently, the plea he makes that there be some investigation into the accounting system, into the question whether or not we are really getting the facts, is not supported in any way by the statements that he has made. The whole fact turns out to be that he took advantage of a feeling, engendered by the press in his district and in his province, to ride on the wave into office, challenging the whole principle of government operation, challenging the whole principle of government ownership of public utilities; that he finds out when he gets here that conditions are such that there is and has been no alternative except government ownership and operation, and he places himself right behind both.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Does the right hon. member think that Canada, for all time to come, will have to maintain deficits under government ownership and operation?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There will be no need for such deficits as long as the railways are managed properly. Naturally, as the country develops and as the settlements along those roads which were constructed as colonization roads increase, the system will develop; it will develop chiefly because of the policy which the late government adopted of bringing great railway factors east and west together, because of the economies which will result from the amalgamation of large railway elements into one, and because of that, there will be no need at all for the maintenance of deficits such as that of last year. Indeed, the result

of last year, much better as it was than that of the year before, should be improved on considerably this year, and so on from year to year. But the fact is that, owing to the very nature of the capital investment, there cannot be anything but deficits for some time. It all depends on the ability of the management and on the pursuance of the policy inaugurated which the minister now continues, how soon those deficits will cease.

Mr. HOCKEN: The hon gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) is alarmed about the credit of Canada in consequence of these deficits. I would draw his attention to the fact that municipalities and provincial governments are issuing bonds to-day under better terms than it has been possible to get for some years past. I would also point out to him that the Canadian exchange to-day is less than one per cent. These are not evidences of Canada losing its credit, notwithstanding the deficits that we have had on the railways. There can be no doubt that these deficits will decrease, and under these circumstances I think our credit will constantly improve.

Mr. STEVENS: I should like to ask just one question of the minister before we get far away from the remarks of the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell). The hon. member repeatedly used the figure $72,000,000 as the deficit last year, and he also added that if the figures were correct the deficit was more likely to be $100,000,000. Would the minister give to the committee exactly the deficit for last year on the National Railways system?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): It was $72,662,278.46.

Mr. STEVENS: Will the minister analyze that briefly, showing how it is made up and give us the exact period? Is that for fifteen months, or for twelve months?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): For the calendar year 1921.

Mr. STEVENS: What is that figure made up of?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The items are as follows:

Canadian National amalgamated system, including the Grand Trunk:	
Canadian National Railway, operating revenue for 1921	$235,789,013 30
Operating expenses..	247,509,397 41
Net deficit, railway operations	11,720,384 11
Other expenses..	602,350 17
Total net deficit..	12,322,734 28
Fixed charges other than to the Government..	40,453,509 49
Net cash deficit..	$ 52,776,243 77

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is the figure which corresponds with the $56,000,000 odd that the minister gave us in his statement on the 11th April?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That figure is now less than $56,000,000; it is $52,000,000 odd.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Yes. Then we have:

Fixed charges to the Government, $19,569,989.79.

These amounts make the total deficit of $72,346,233.56.

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the 11th of April the minister gave the corrected figure for the deficit of 1920 as $67,000,000. That is the figure that compares with the $52,000,000 odd he gives now, because, in the $67,000,000, interest to the Government was not included. On the 11th of April he gave us $67,000,000 odd as the corrected deficit for 1920, and $56,000,000 odd as the deficit for 1921—

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): Estimated.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now he corrects the $56,000,000 odd to $52,000,000 odd, so that there is an improvement of about $4,000,000 to-day over the 11th of April in the returns of last year as compared with the year before.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): That was only on the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think it covered them all.

Mr. MITCHELL: The deficit as announced by the minister was $56,000,000 on the Canadian National, and $15,000,000 odd on the Grand Trunk, or $72,000,000 on the two.

Mr. STEVENS: That is the point I should like to have definitely cleared up. The hon. member (Mr. Mitchell) persists in saying that the deficit is $72,000,000. The hon. minister in reply to my question gives the figure as $52,776,000, to which he says may be added other fixed charges on amounts owing to the Government. Well, that is correct enough. But my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) added

to the $72,000,000 other imaginary charges, and he also added interest on the amounts advanced by the Government; but that is included in the $72,000,000. The $72,000,000 covers the ultimate losses; but the actual losses on operation and charges to the public is $52,776,000.

Mr. CRERAR: Mr. Chairman, the estimates that we are now considering, following the annual statement submitted to the House by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) on April 11, relate to what is, I think, by common consent regarded as one of the most important matters that this Parliament has to deal with. Indeed, I would say that that annual statement comes only second in importance to the statement this House will have from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) on Tuesday next.

Mr. MITCHELL: May I interrupt my hon. friend to clear up the amount of the deficit? I did not understand the Minister of Railways said that the deficit was $72,000,000, or $56,000,000 or $52,000,000. According to his statement it was $56,000,000 odd on the Canadian Northern and $15,000,000 odd on the Grand Trunk, making a total deficit of $72,000,000. I would like to make sure that that is correct.

Mr. CRERAR: The matter of settling whether the deficit is a million more or less is not very momentous in my judgment as far as the whole problem is concerned.

Mr. MITCHELL: Not $1,000,000, but $20,000,000.

Mr. CRERAR: This is one of the most important matters that this committee has to consider. I listened with very much interest to the remarks made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell). He stated quite frankly that he did not believe in the public ownership of public utilities, and he expressed very clearly his view that government ownership of such utilities could not possibly be made a success. I have no quarrel with the view entertained by my hon. friend. I recognize that there are in this House and outside many people who do not believe in public ownership, and I respect their view. I think they hold that view as honestly as I do the opposite view, that certain public utilities from their very nature are natural monopolies that can be administered by public agencies with better advantage to the public weal.

This is a question of the very greatest importance, because it touches the whole subject of transportation, and when we consider the physical character of this country and the scattered nature of its population, we at once realize that there is no subject of such great moment to our people as cheap and reasonable transportation facilities. For that reason, if for no other, the subject is of the very greatest importance. But it is particularly important to us at the present time because of the financial considerations involved. Had it not been for the very great increase in our national debt resulting from the part we took in the war, our railway problem, serious as it is, would not have been by any means beyond our capacity to handle readily and easily without our scarcely feeling the burden. But I quite agree with my hon. friend from St. Antoine that the existing situation, by reason of the enormous debt that this country has to carry, is one that must command the most serious and earnest consideration of this House and the country.

I quite realize the effect that sustained heavy deficits on the operation of our national railways may have upon our national credit. I cannot agree with my hon. friend, however, in the doleful picture he has drawn that if we do not get rid of these deficits immediately our national credit will go to pieces and we will be in a very bad way indeed. We have had these deficits for several years past, they are a matter of common knowledge not only in Canada but in the countries in which Canada borrows her money; but as my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Hocken) has pointed out, it has not affected the interest rate on our loans. A few weeks ago my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) negotiated a large loan in the city of New York. That loan was oversubscribed in a few hours' time. I think it was one of the most striking evidences we could possibly have as to the innate soundness of Canada's financial position.

The question we have to consider is how we can best handle this whole proposition, and before I address myself to a consideration of that question I want to offer a word of criticism of those who condemn the public administration of these railways, including my hon. friend from St. Antoine. We have those in the House and those outside who attribute all the difficulties we are in financially from our being in the business of operating railways, and they say that government ownership and operation can never succeed and we should get rid of these railways at once.

Now, the fair, plain question I want to put to such critics, whether in the House or outside, is this: What is your alternative scheme? Why are we in this position in respect to our railways? For one reason, and one reason only, as I have stated in this House before. Canada did not take up the government ownership and operation of these railways through conviction or belief in the principle of public ownership at all. Practically all the mileage of our government-owned railways to-day has come to us through the absolute and complete breakdown of private ownership. That is why we are in our present position in regard to these railways, and I challenge my hon. friends to deny it.

What assistance has Canada given to the building of railways? I gave the figures in the debate on freight rates a few days ago. According to the Drayton-Acworth report this country has given almost $1,000,000,000 in aid to railwa s almost all privately owned and privately operated. What we have given to the Canadian Northern alone runs up to the enormous total of almost $300,000,000. Here was a transportation system, privately owned, operated and controlled, to which this country had given practicaly $300,000,000, and yet that system broke down. What were we to do?.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Has the hon. gentleman figures to show how much of that total is cash and how much loans or guarantees?

Mr. CRERAR: These figures are contained in the Drayton-Acworth report of 1917.

Cash subsidies..	$38,874,148

Cold cash handed out from the pockets of the people.

Proceeds of lands sold....	$34,379,809
Loans outstanding or invest ment..	$25,858,166
Guarantees outstanding.. ..	$199,141,140

Or a total aid from the public of $298,253,-263.

These are guarantees by the Dominion and provincial governments. Those are the details of the assistance given to the Canadian Northern Railway, and do not include the large amounts given since this report was compiled.

Now, this fact must always be kept in mind in considering this question, that the country because of the guarantees it had given upon these securities was not in the position of being merely an uninterested outsider. My hon. friends say, or rather those who have been opposed to the policy by which the Canadian Northern was acquired by the government—those critics say that the road should have been permitted to go into liquidation. I want to point out to them that even if the road had gone into liquidation the liability of the country under those guarantees could not have been evaded, unless the Dominion and the provinces repudiated their obligations. I submit therefore that the government of the day had no alternative but to pursue this policy and take over the road. There may be some criticism offered that in the arbitration of the value of the common stock of the Canadian Northern Railway, a sum of money was paid to the promoters, to which they were not entitled. But that does not affect the substance of my argument at all. There was no other course for this country to follow than the taking over of this railway system. And the same thing applies just as fully to the Grand Trunk Pacific. Why was the National Transcontinental and whole Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise undertaken? It was undertaken first at the suggestion of the Grand Trunk Railway. I think the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), who was in the government of the day, will bear me out in this respect, that it was the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway who first approached the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier away back in 1902 or 1903 and asked for assistance in building the transcontinental line that would go into the prairie regions of the West. That was where the suggestion first came from. The Canadian government, with the full approval and consent of the Canadian people, undertook that enterprise. The government built the Transcontinental from Moncton to Winnipeg. By bond guarantees of a very liberal amount, it assisted the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific in the prairie regions and through the mountains of northern British Columbia. All that assistance was given and guaranteed by the government. What different course should have been followed when the officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific, in March, 1918, notified the government of the day that unless they got further subsidies in cash they would close down the operations of the road because they could not pay the running expenses? There was no other course for the government of the day to follow than the course it did follow. Tens of thousands of settlers had gone in along the road and were dependent on the railway for their means of communication. Towns

had sprung up which were in the same position. What would have happened if the road had ceased operations? My hon. friends ask again: Why did you not let it go into the hands of the receiver? Would that have repaid the people for the $50,000 a mile bond guarantees they had given in northern British Columbia? There was only one business course to follow, and that was to secure the roads, link them into the whole national system of railways, and build upon that system for the future, recognizing their great potential value and hoping eventually to emerge successfully from the difficulty. I might add, in passing, that the assistance that was given to the Grand Trunk Pacific totalled $114,000,000.

Now, there has been a good deal of criticism of the late government in regard to this matter. I am referring to the subject not in order to provoke questions of controversy, but because I think that this aspect of the matter should be placed before the public. There has been a good deal of criticism of the late government in acquiring the old Grand Trunk. The situation in that respect is well known. The Grand Trunk desired to evade their responsibilities in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific, which was their subsidiary company. The government recognized that, in view of the fact that this whole enterprise, which had committed Canada to hundreds of millions of dollars, had been undertaken at the request of the Grand Trunk Railway, the obligation of the Grand Trunk in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific could not be thrown aside. What course, then, was open to the government? It is a matter of common knowledge that they adopted the only wise course possible in the circumstances. There was nothing facing the old Grand Trunk Railway but absolute and complete bankruptcy, and it would have gone into the hands of the receiver and have been knocked down under the hammer to the highest bidder. But what would have happened if, in that event, the Grand Trunk had passed into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway or of some other private concern, that would not have been willing to make the necessary traffic arrangements with the Transcontinental system? The whole National Transcontinental system, the Grand Trunk Pacific system, was built entirely upon the assumption that it would be linked up with and be part of the Grand Trunk system in eastern Canada. If it was necessary in 1903 to create a system of that kind, was it not just as necessary in 1917 or 1918 to maintain the principle that lay behind the whole enterprise in 1903? There was no other course to be followed. The Grand Trunk system had to be brought into the Canadian National system, and the government of that day, in my judgment, would have been derelict in their duty if they had failed to do so. There are many things upon which I have differed with my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), and I suppose that in our public careers in the future there will still be many points of difference between us. But I believe that the policy of the late government in respect of the whole railway question in its main essentials was the only sound policy this country could follow; and for that reason I consistently supported it.

I want to offer a word of commendation to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) on the clear and lucid statement he presented to the House when he made his railway statement on April 11 last. I was particularly gratified to note the main lines of policy he laid down. No one who has studied that statement will disagree with my view that the policy submitted by the Minister of Railways, which I take to be the policy of the Government, differs not, in any principle, from the policy followed by the previous administration. I am therefore glad to commend it. I am glad of the courage and, let me say, the honesty of the minister in presenting that statement to the House, because the whole railway question should be lifted above the level of party controversy. For that reason, I say, I am gratified at the statement of my hon. friend. I was pleased also that he made it clear that the Intercolonial railway is to be part of the national system of railways of the country. I know the position taken by my hon. friends from the Maritime provinces in respect to the Intercolonial Railway. I have a good deal of sympathy with their position in that regard. It is true that the Intercolonial Railway was built as part of the compact of Confederation. The provision in the British North America Act respecting it was that the Government of Canada would construct such a railway. But nothing of this is changed in the policy of including the Intercolonial Railway in the Canadian National system, and I maintain that the Intercolonial, linked up with the whole national system of railways, when that system gets

operating smoothly and effectively, as I am convinced it will, will give better and cheaper service to the maritime provinces in the long run than it possibly could if operated as before. It is now part of the great national system of railways, and I do not think there is any question whatever as to what the final results will be.

The Government have very frankly stated, both since they came into power and before—and they are now only reiterating the statements they made during the election campaign—that public ownership of this system must have a full and fair trial. There may have been some differences in the statements made by some of my hon. friends opposite. In the heat of an election, we are all perhaps somewhat prone to make statements a trifle extravagant. But the Government's policy in stating that the system must have a full and fair trial is one that will command the respect and support of the country. Now, it is imperative that it shall in fact have a full and fair trial. I have said that the late Government's policy is the only one that could have been followed in the matter. There is no alternative; and I should like the critics of government ownership and operation of this system outside the House and in the House as well, if there be such, to state what their alternative policy in the matter is.

What is the alternative policy? I read the Montreal Gazette, for instance—an excellent newspaper—and I find it persistently and consistently opposing the policy of the Government, and of the late government. It is saying that it means financial ruin to the country, and that we must get rid of the system if the country is to escape all the dreadful things that will follow in the wake of public ownership, but I have yet to see any suggestion from that newspaper, or from any other critic of the policy this Government has followed, and the late government, of an alternative policy. This country has invested in these roads over one and a half billion dollars—fifteen hundred million dollars. What are you going to do about that? Turn the roads over to private companies? I say that if you put up the National system for sale you would not relieve the country of the liability it has at the present time. Why, the thing is absurd. Instead of getting rid of the deficit, you would simply be placing it permanently and forever on the Canadian people —nothing else. My hon. friend from St. Antoine says that government ownership will not prove a success in operation. I do not know what experience my hon. friend, who was Provincial Treasurer in the Quebec government, has had with public utilities, but I have seen a good many public utilities in operation which have proved successful, and there is no reason why a government railway cannot be as efficiently managed, under public control and operation, as a private railway.

Mr. ROBB: Is my hon. friend referring now particularly to the government elevators in Manitoba?

Mr. McMASTER: That is an unkind question.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not on very good ground in asking that question, because elevators are not in the nature of a natural monopoly. But aside from that, there is no reason why, with proper management and control, the elevators in Manitoba should not have proven a success. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he look up the records of the elevators owned by the Dominion government at the terminal points and see whether they have not proved a success financially. If he will consult the officials in his own department, and study the financial results of the government elevator at Fort William, one of the finest elevators at the head of the lakes, he will find that it contributes a very tidy sum each year to the Dominion treasury. Therefore, in order that this system may have a full and fair trial, I say it is absolutely essential that all lines owned by the Government be included in the system and I am glad to commend the policy of the Government in that respect.

There is another thing that is also essential. There must be complete unification in the control and management of the system. I quite agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Railways in his presentation of the case the other day, that there should be districts, regional districts, if you like, for the operation of these lines. That practice has been followed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I think it can with profit be adopted on the Canadian National system. I understand that my hon. friends from the maritime provinces have had cause for complaint, and I think rightly so, over the fact that if they wanted to arrange for a special excursion to a fair or picnic or sports celebration they had to go to Toronto to arrange for it. That is not efficiency in operation or efficiency in

management, and that should be changed. But the general policy of management must be under central control, and it must be freed, so far as is possible, from any possibility of government interference.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Arguing as my hon. friend does in favour of government ownership, does he not think that the successful operation of any railway, private or public, depends on the way in which it is managed and the people who are managing it? If he does, does he not think it a very peculiar thing to put the railway system of this country under the control and operation of men who failed to operate it successfully as a private concern?

Mr. CRERAR: I think perhaps my hon. friend is on pretty good ground in offering that criticism, but I am not going to discuss that at the present moment. The present administration have all the opportunity they wish to change that, if they so desire. I am not putting anything in the way of their doing that whatsoever.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I was dealing with the general problem of public ownership.

Mr. CRERAR: I lay this down. I think you can attract to a great national enterprise of this kind the brains, the ability and the spirit of public service that will make it a success, but you can never do it under the system that obtained on the Intercolonial when it was a department of the government, because then it was frankly and openly under government control.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It was run with surpluses.

Mr. CRERAR: That may or may not be the case. I do not think my hon. friend's statement can be borne out by an examination of the facts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Mr. Cochrane, in 1913, when he was Minister of Railways, gave to the House a statement of the operation of that railway for five years, during which the railway showed a net surplus of $1,000,000 in operation.

Mr. CRERAR: It may be true that during a few years—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not a few years, a great number of years.

Mr. CRERAR: Well, for quite a number of years, but I would point out to my hon. friend that from the time it was built right up to the present there was never a cent of interest charged against that investment.

Mr. MACDONALD (Picton): Neither was there against the canals of this country; they were built under the same conditions.

Mr. CRERAR: Very true, but if you are going to operate the Intercolonial on that basis—

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Not at all.

Mr. CRERAR: My hon. friend is entitled to his opinion, and will have an opportunity to speak later on if he wishes to do so. I repeat, it is possible to attract to the management of a great public enterprise of this kind the brains and ability and the spirit of public service that will make it a success. I am convinced it can be done, and I trust that that is the intention and desire of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and the Government when they select their board. Let me say in passing that when they select their board, the men should be in sympathy with the whole proposition, so far as it is possible to get such men. We have had the suggestion from my hon. friend from St. Antoine that it is necessary to travel to Europe or the United States or Africa or somewhere else to find supermen, if such can be found, to handle this system. My experience in business, Mr. Chairman, running over a good many years, has led me to the conclusion that supermen are very difficult to find, and very often they are not of very great consequence after you have found them. This system will never be saved by supermen—never—but I am convinced you can find right in Canada, possibly in the system itself, men who have the potential ability and capacity to handle this thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Will the hon. member express it as his opinion that Mr. Hanna or Mr. Mitchell, who I understand are the only two directors from the old system, were in the least degree responsible for the inability of the Canadian Northern to finance itself?

Mr. CRERAR: I would venture the opinion so far as my knowledge goes that they were not, but that is not germane to the argument I am making. I am asserting that the ability and the capacity to handle the system can be found in Canada.

There is one other thing that is necessary if the system is to be made a success. You

must enlist public support behind it, and that can be done. I think it is possible to have this great national enterprise recognized by the people of Canada as a great national asset, an asset in which they can take pride, a thing that will help to link up this country and unify it. I believe that is possible, but it is not possible if political considerations enter into the management and control—if sectional considerations, whether west, east, middle, or anywhere else, enter into the direction and management of the system. Under those circumstances I do not believe it is possible to make it a success.

Reference was made the other night to a contract for steel rails that was let in the month of October last, and my hon. friend from St. Antoine paid some attention to it this afternoon. I think that the late administration can be fairly criticized in respect to that contract. The business of the National Railways in respect to contracts of all kinds should be put upon an absolutely definite business basis, and no considerations other than the soundest business principles should govern. If your national system of railways is to be used to advance the interests of any one section by giving employment to labour, or by letting contracts to companies who may want business, it is not upon a sound basis, the system cannot succeed in this manner, and so far as I am concerned I shall criticise and continue to criticise that method of administration of these roads.

Mr. LOGAN: If by giving these contracts to private companies you could save a large amount of money to the treasury, would the hon. member not be in favour of placing the contracts where the work could be done most cheaply? If it can be shown, for instance, that cars can be repaired in a private concern, where perhaps the McAdoo wage scale does not apply, for a hundred dollars less per car than in the government shops, would he still advocate that the work be done in the government shops?

Mr. CRERAR: I regret that I failed to make myself clear to my hon. friend. I say that one consideration that should govern in the control of these railways is, having regard to all the factors of the case, to have the business done where it can be done most cheaply. I do not care where it is done, but no consideration other than that should govern.

Mr. LOGAN: Hear, hear.

Mr. CRERAR: Now, I want to say a word or two as to some of the things which in my judgment are essential.

Mr. HUGHES: If the statement made by the hon. member for Cumberland is correct, that cars can be repaired, or any work done, very much cheaper in private shops than the same work can be done for in the government shops would not that be a very strong argument against public ownership and operation? If the statement is true it is a serious matter.

Mr. CRERAR: I am not assuming, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friend from Cumberland is correct in his facts but I do say this: If it could be done more cheaply there I would have it done there; there are many concerns that are in the business of doing this kind of work, that is their business. But that is a totally different thing, and upon a totally different basis from the operation of a great enterprise which is in the nature of a natural monopoly. That is the point of my argument, because there is no one in this House more strongly opposed to government interference in things which in their very nature are matters of private business than I am, because in such things people can best act for themselves; but in a great national enterprise like this, where you can only have one line of railway you must have either very rigid control of your system if the public are to be protected or it must be a vehicle owned and operated by the people as a whole through their government.

Now when my hon. friend interrupted me I was about to remark there are some other things that are essential to the success of this operation. I have suggested in the House before, and I again offer the suggestion to the minister, that when this unification takes place, and your board is selected, there should be a complete revaluation of the whole national system of railways. I think there can be little doubt that these roads to-day as an operating concern are not worth the amount of money that they stand in our books at, and they are not worth that amount because of the very manner in which they were built. I will give the House a case which illustrates the point I am making. West of Edmonton, running through the Yellowhead pass, the Canadian Northern Railway built its lines to the point where the railway turns down the North Thompson river to the Fraser river. Through that same pass was constructed the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. Those two lines of railway

travelled for scores, yes, hundreds, of miles almost always within sight of each other, and indeed for many miles the tracks were so close together that they appeared to be a double track. During the war, when these railways were consolidated, it was necessary to lift the rails of a portion of one of these lines to send to the front. I know there has been some criticism of that action but that does not affect the point of my illustration. You can travel, Sir, over that line to-day and see the scores, yes, hundreds, of miles of railways that have been abandoned. The Grand Trunk Pacific railway is on one side of the pass, and the old Canadian Northern right of way on the other side, and there have been hundreds of miles of track abandoned which were of the most difficult and costly construction. You can travel there and see the wreck of a railway: Iron bridges, tunnels, rock cuts, all this sort of thing, upon which no rails are laid at the present time, and upon which I venture to say none ever will be laid; and yet that expensive mileage, costing, I believe, something in the neighbourhood of $100,000 a mile, stands in the books of the Government as a part of the value of the assets of this concern. There should, therefore, be a complete re-valuation of the system so as to put it down to a sound business basis, following precisely the same practice that a merchant follows when he finds he has goods on the shelf that have deteriorated in quality, and he must write them down and take his loss. That should be done in the case of this railway system. You cannot get a management, I care not how efficient or how able they may be, who will tackle a problem of that kind with the vigour, the energy and the willingness that is necessary, if they feel that they have to make headway against a heavy handicap of that kind.

Mr. McMASTER: You think good headway would then be made?

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, because it is a sound business practice and for that reason I commend it to the Government. If we have a capital loss in the construction of these railways let us face it frankly and put it where it belongs—add it to the debt of Canada. Do not let it stand against the system, otherwise you wil prejudice the cause of public ownership from one end of the country to the other, and it will be said "How can you make your railways pay when you are operating under conditions which render it practically impossible for them to do so?"

There is one other suggestion I have to make and that is in reference to the question of immigration. I agree with the view—

Mr. LOGAN: My hon. friend has been discussing a very interesting matter, and I would like to question him further in regard to it. As to the revaluation of the government railway property, would he be favourable to revalueing at an operating profit value or on a replacement basis?

Mr. CRERAR: I think a proper basis to take would be the basis of replacement under fair conditions.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am afraid that would increase the valuation.

Mr. EULER: My hon. friend suggests that the railways should be re-valued and the amounts covering the properties which have been apportioned should be written off. Does he suggest that the interest on the bonds, or any other obligation which covers the cost of construction, which is no longer in existence, should be no longer chargeable and help to make up the deficits on the operation of the roads?

Mr. CRERAR: I am very grateful to my hon. friend from South Waterloo who has made the point clearer than I made it myself.

Mr. McMASTER: Is it not a mere question of book-keeping, and the railway situation is not changed at all?

Mr. CRERAR: It may be as far as the net result to the country as a whole is concerned; but I am advocating this because of its effect upon the management of your system. That is the reason, and the only reason, that could be advanced in favour of it. My right hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) suggests that it might lead to an increase in value of the system to act on the basis I suggested. I do not think he is correct in that. I was going to elaborate that point further. We have, for instance, three national transcontinental lines running through practically a thousand miles of wilderness between Ontario and Manitoba. I do not know how far I may be correct, but I certainly think it would be the duty of the management to give due consideration to the closing up of a portion of these lines. We have the same thing in the West where there is duplication of services. All these factors should be taken into account in arriving at a proper basis of operations.

I want now to pass on to the question of immigration and I agree with the remarks made by my hon. friend from St. Antoine in this respect, that the question of immigration has a very important bearing upon the ultimate success of these roads. The difficulty with our railway situation is that we are overbuilt with railways in Canada, and the only final solution of the matter—and I submit a solution can only be found in a long view of the situation—is in getting more people into the country, by a policy that will bring in immigrants by tens of thousands or scores of thousands, and it should be directed to placing those immigrants along the lines of the National system, because, when you place them along that line, particularly in western Canada, you put them in the best portions of the country, where there will be the greatest likelihood of their making a success. Not only are you ensuring success for them, but you are creating business potentially for your roads.

Mr. CANNON: Is it not a fact that a great portion of those lands are now in the hands of private companies?

Mr. CRERAR: I think the statement of the hon. member from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) is true. I do not know the exact acreage in the hands of private companies. We find in western Canada, on account of the supertaxes imposed by the provincial governments on speculative holdings of land, that there is a very general disposition on the part of private owners to sell their lands at reasonable prices. There are still some homestead lands left, but I submit that, as far as possible, the Government should direct the settlement of the immigration to this country to districts that will provide business for the National Railways.

I am not going at the moment to touch that much contested question, the Tariff, but I think that the fiscal policy of this country has a great bearing on this problem. I hope that my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when he comes to consider his budget will have regard to that. I have stated before in this House and outside that agriculture is the real foundation of the prosperity of the Dominion, and when I examine the traffic returns of the railways, I find the greatest contribution in tonnage to our railways comes from farms, forests and mines. Let me give some information to the committee in that regard, and my figures are taken from the annual railway report.

Taking the Canadian Northern Railway, for the year ending 1920 the farms contributed over 4,000,000 tons, or 28 per cent of the freight hauled over the Canadian National lines in that year. The forests—that is lumber, pulp, cordwood, fence posts, and so forth—contributed 4,155,000 tons, or 28.66 per cent of the freight. Our mines contributed 3,676,000 tons, and our miscellaneous freight and manufactures contributed altogether only 17 per cent. In other words, over 80 per cent of the total freight hauled on the Canadian Northern Railway system in that year came from the farm, the forest and the mine. If you examine the figures for the Grand Trunk Pacific and the old Grand Trunk you will find they are about in that proportion. If that is a fact—and it is beyond question—it is a sound policy to direct your fiscal system along the lines that will give the greatest encouragement to these industries. I know there are a good many of my hon. friends to my right, I think probably all of them—and, I was going to add, I am afraid more than I should like to see among hon. gentlemen on the Governrment side of the House—who do not agree with my argument in this respect. But, nevertheless, I submit that it is sound business, from the fiscal point of view to shape your fiscal policy to give the greatest possible encouragement to the development of these great natural sources of wealth, and if you do that you lay the foundation for success in your manufacturing industry. There is no gainsaying that fact. No greater boon could be given to the manufacturing industries of Ontario and eastern Canada than to place one hundred and fifty or two hundred thousand good rugged farmers in western Canada, and nothing will bring more business to our factories. I submit to the Finance Minister and to the Government that when they are considering their fiscal proposals—and they are considering them now, because they are to be laid before the House next week—they could, with profit to the country, give recognition to the principle I have just laid down.

I desire to submit one other thought to the committee in this respect, and that is that these roads must be operated in such a way as to command public confidence. I believe that a way can be found to bring that about. I may say that a very great deal depends on the manner in which the Government handles the enterprise. If they absolutely, and beyond question of doubt, make it clear to the public of this country that they are animated and governed by considerations only that will bring success in opera-

tion, that they are maintaining this system free from political influences and control, they will be taking the longest possible step in establishing and maintaining, public confidence in the system, and, from the national point of view, that is highly necessary. We have this system of railways. We cannot get rid of it. We must make the very best of it, and, consequently, that is, in my judgment, the only sound policy the Government can follow, in order to make a success of it.

I think, too, that public confidence will rest pretty largely on the fullest and most complete information that can be furnished by those in charge of the operation of the roads. I would like to see the annual report of the Canadian National system of railways made as full as possible in the information it gives to the public, as to the details of operation, the prices at which goods have been purchased, the sources where contracts have been placed, and everything else relating to the operation of the system, and to publish a sufficient number of these reports so that they can be distributed to all who wish to have them, particularly to newspapers and institutions and organizations of a public character. Let that information be diffused as widely as possible, and you will create a confidence in your system. Not only that, but you will create conditions in the public mind that will assist the Government in resisting the pressure that might involve the operation or control of these roads in political considerations. The results, I think, Mr. Chairman, in the operation of these roads for the past year are not discouraging. The hon. member from St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) suggested that the profits shown in the months of August, September, October and November last may have been fictitious profits. If he will reflect for a moment, I think he will find he is not correct in that statement.

Mr. MITCHELL: I did not say they were fictitious profits. I said that the operations were reduced very materially during those four months, and charged to other years under the Order in Council.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh no.

Mr. CRERAR: I certainly do not wish to do the hon. member any injustice whatever, but I distinctly gathered the impression from his remarks that he had a question mark in his own mind as to the validity of the profits shown in those months. I may be wrong in that. If I have done him an injustice I am sorry, but I would point out to him and to the House that those four months, particularly September, October, and November, are the months of the heavy crop movement in western Canada, and there is not any doubt that the movement of the grain in western Canada provide both the National system and the Canadian Pacific system with a very large share indeed of their total earnings. It just happened this year that the movement of grain was free and heavy; it was heavier on the National lines last autumn than it was on the Canadian Pacific, and that contributed, in a very great degree, to the profits shown during those months. The results on the whole are not discouraging. I believe that, with efficient operation, with as full a knowledge on the part of the public as can be secured in regard to the potential value in these assets, we can, within a very few years, bring these roads to the point where they will more than meet their operating expenses. I would point out to the committee and to those outside of this House who are opposed to this enterprise and who are criticizing it and, I submit, not giving it a fair show or trial, that we have in these roads a splendid potential asset. If we dissipate that now; if we follow the advice that has been given in some quarters, that the Government should get rid of this system, pass it over to private hands at any price at which they will take it, what will be the result? This country will lose absolutely and forever the potential value that rests in this system to-day, but it will not escape a very large share of the liability that is in the system; it will not escape its bond guarantees; we shall lose all the cash and land grants that we have put into this system in the past, and we shall lose them forever. Those are the business considerations that should govern in the whole survey of this question. These roads are a good potential asset; if we have courage, vigour and honesty in the administration of the enterprise and I venture to say that there are many in this House who will live to see the day when they and this country will be proud of the Canadian National system of railways, I am wholly convinced that it can be made a success.

I have already expressed my opinion as to the statement brought down by the Minister of Railways. I liked the clear, definite position that he took in respect particularly to the control and management of these roads. A heavy responsibility rests upon the Government in the selection of the board that will administer

this system, in the selection of the management that will control its operation. As the minister pointed out the other day, the total amount spent by the National Railways last year involved more than $343,000,000. That is a vast sum of money; but I am convinced also that the men can be secured who will give this enterprise their undivided attention, who will bring to their work, not only a spirit of public service, but the ability and capacity to manage efficiently an enterprise of this kind. Such men can be found, and I hope and trust this Government will do everything it can to find such men. This question, let me repeat, is too grave and too great to be lightly considered. The losses are great; the responsibility is great; but I am convinced, if this enterprise is tackled vigorously, earnestly and honestly, a great success can be made of it, and in the years to come this country and even the members of this House who are now considering the matter, will have good reason for pride in our National system of railways.

Progress reported.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE COLONEL G. H. BAKER, M.P.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a message from the Senate informing this House that the Honourable Messieurs Bradbury, Casgrain, Foster (Alma), Griesbach and Pope, have been appointed a special committee to further consider and determine the form of the memorial to be erected in the Parliament buildings to the late Lieutenant-Colonel George Harold Baker, member of Parliament for Brome, who lost his life on the field of battle, and inviting this House to appoint a like committee to act jointly with the committee of the Senate.

At six o'clock the House adjourned without the question being put, pursuant to rule.

Thursday, May 18, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Chief Electoral Officer certificate of the election and return of Georges (Joseph) Bouchard, Esquire, for the electoral district of Kamouraska.

NEW MEMBER INTRODUCED

Georges (Joseph) Bouchard, Esquire, member for the electoral district Kamouraska, introduced by Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King and Hon. Ernest Lapointe.

PETITION OF ALEXANDER BIRNIE AND OTHERS

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a report from the Clerk of Petitions, who directs the attention of the House to the fact that the petition of Alexander Birnie and others, presented yesterday, is irregular in that it is addressed to the Prime Minister of Canada and not to the House of Commons in Parliament assembled.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): Before we pass from motions, I have been informed that a resolution has been passed by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. I desire to ask the chairman of that committee if he is not prepared to make a report to the House embodying that resolution?

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): I am informed by officials of the House that it is not necessary to make a report from the committee in reference to the motion which I presented to the House yesterday.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I found it hard to understand the reply, but I believe the hon. member must have thought I referred to something else. The motion made yesterday is another matter. What I am asking is whether or not he proposes to make a report to this House of the conclusions of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization as arrived at.

Mr. KAY: The Committee on Agriculture and Colonization has arrived at no conclusions as yet. It has nothing to report to the House.

VANCOUVER HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS

Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 106, to amend The Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act.

He said: Under the present provisions of the Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act, the appointment and control of the port warden and the shipping master is in the hands of the Harbour Commission.

The duties of these two officers are to enforce the Canada Shipping Act. In all the other harbours of Canada these two officers are appointed by and under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is felt that these two officers at Vancouver should be under the same control.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

PRIVATE BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 94 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Daly.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wrae Elizabeth Snider.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Oliver Kelly.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of Vera Hamlin.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Drewery.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Kate Holmes.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate) for the relief of Ernest Hull.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of Leslie George Dewsbury.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Douglas Stewart.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 103 (from the Senate), for the relief of Charles William Murtagh.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 104 (from the Senate), for the relief of Helen Garrett.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 105 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Leslie Smith.—Mr. Ryckman.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MARINE ALLOWANCE SALES

Mr. WHITE:

1. Has any portion of the Marine Alowance of, (a) The shore of Lake Huron, immediately south of the Sauble River, in the township of Amabel, County of Bruce; and, (b) The south shore of the Sauble River, from Lake Huron towards the source of the river, Township of Amabel, County of Bruce, been sold, conveyed or allotted to any individual or company?

2. If so, when, to whom, and what were the prices and particulars of the transfers?

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE KING: There does not appear to be the information asked for in this question in either the Department of Public Works or the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It may be that this is a provincial matter. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he confer with the Minister of Public Works in regard to it, and possibly what he is seeking might be obtained in some other form. In the meantime I would ask him to drop the question.

Question dropped.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—GRAIN LEAKAGES

Hon. Mr. MANION:

1. What was the cost to the Canadian National Railways of leakages of grain, from cars, between points of shipment and the head of the lakes, during the past railway year?

2. What was the cost to the said railways of new grain doors, and repairs to grain doors upon grain cars, during the same season?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. $193,339.48.

2. Amount charged to operating expenses for grain doors during 1921 was $383,467; of this amount, $55,843.26 was for repairs to grain doors.

The foregoing figures include the Grand Trunk Pacific.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. How many editions of the Classification of the Civil Service were printed?

2. What quantity of each edition were printed?

3. How many were printed in French?

4. How many were printed in English?

5. How many of each edition were distributed prior to September, 1919?

6. How many French copies?

7. How many English copies?

8. What quantity of the edition of September, 1919, were distributed?

9. How many French copies?

10. How many English copies?

11. How many copies of the edition of the 10th of November, 1919, were distributed?

12. How many French?

13. How many English?

Hon. Mr. COPP:

1. Two.

2. First edition, 3,000; second edition, 3,300.

3. 2,100.

4. 5,000.

5. 294.

6. 15.

7. 279.

8. 1,037.

9. 81.

10. 956.

11. No edition of that date.

12 and 13. Answered by No. 11.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAY—MENUS

Hon. Mr. BAXTER:

1. By whom are the menus of the Canadian National Railways printed?

2. What quantities are ordered at a time, and what is the cost?

3. How do these menus compare as to cost with those in use on the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Hon. Mr. KENNEDY:

1. Winnipeg Saturday Post, Winnipeg; Litho Printing Company, Toronto; Royal Litho-Printing Company, Halifax.

2. (a) Dining car evening meal folder menus—

Cost of menu covers (per thousand)	$24.50
Cost of menu inserts (do.)	8.35
Average cost of printing (do.)	30.00
	$62.85

(b) Breakfast and luncheon cards—

Cost of menu cards (per thousand)	$10.00
Average cost of imprinting (do.)	30.00
	$40.00

(c) Café and Buffet car menu cards—

Cost of menu cards (per thousand)	$10.00
Average cost of imprinting (do.)	30.00
	$40.00

(d) Observation Library-Buffet car menu folders—

Cost of menu covers (per thousand)	$ 8.00
Average cost of printing (do.)	30.00
	$38.00

(a) and (b) ordered in hundred thousand lots; (c) in ten thousand lots; (d) in five thousand lots.

3. No information as to Canadian Pacific Railway costs.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE EXHIBITION

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the minimum grant of $2,500 to the Portage la Prairie Exhibition Association?

2. If not, does the Government claim that this grant has not been earned in accordance with regulations?

Hon. Mr. MOTHERWELL:

1. All fairs which receive a grant from the live stock vote of the Department of Agriculture during the present fiscal year must have fulfilled the following conditions:

(a) If a fair received no grant from the Dominion Government at its last preceding fair, it must have paid a minimum of $4,000, and up to a maximum of $16,000, in prizes for utility classes of live stock at its last preceding fair. Such a fair will receive a minimum grant of $1,875, and in addition 50 per cent of the amount greater than $4,000 expended on prizes for utility classes of live stock, the maximum total grant payable, however, being $3,750.

(b) Fairs which received a grant last year must have expended at their last fair at least $4,000, and up to $16,000, of their own money, in addition to the amount of the grant received last year, in prizes for utility classes of live stock. Such fairs will receive a minimum grant of $1,875, and in addition one-half the amount spent for prizes on utility classes of live stock in addition to the combined minimum of $4,000, plus the amount of the grant received last year, the total maximum grant, however, not to exceed $3,750.

If the Portage la Prairie Exhibition has complied with these conditions it will be entitled to a grant on the basis of the above regulations, under which the grant is reduced by 25 per cent as compared with grants made in previous years.

2. Answered by No. 1.

STRUCTURAL STEEL IMPORTATIONS

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. How many tons of structural steel were imported into Canada, consigned to (a) Ottawa, (b) Toronto, (c) Montreal, (d) St. Johns, (e) Halifax, for the four months, January, February, March and April, 1922?

2. How many tons, during the same period, were imported into Canada?

Hon. Mr. BUREAU: The information is as follows:

IMPORTS OF STRUCTURAL IRON OR STEEL ENTERED FOR CONSUMPTION IN TH DOMINION OF CANADA, AND IN THE UNDERMENTIONED PORTS, DURING THE FOUR MONTHS ENDED APRIL, 1922.

—	Flat eye bar blanks, not punched or drilled, for use exclusively in the mfr. of bridges, or of steel structural work, or in car construction.		Steel plate, universal mill or rolled edge plates of steel over 12 inches wide, for use exclusively in the mfr. of bridges or of steel structural work or in car construction.		Iron or steel beams, sheets, plates, angles, knees and masts or parts thereof, for wooden, iron, steel or composite ships or vessels.	
	Tons	Value	Cwt.	Value	Cwt.	Value
		$		$		$
Ottawa						
Toronto			2,094	3,066		
Montreal			18,965	28,400	5,210	7,397
St. John						
Halifax						
Dom. of Canada	138	5,724	53,955	94,078	58,794	92,576

—	Rolled iron or steel beams, channels, angles and other rolled shapes of iron or steel, not punched, drilled, or further mfrd. than rolled, weighing not less than 35 lb. per lineal yard, not being square, flat, oval or round shapes and not being railway bars or rails.		Rolled iron or steel angles, tees, beams, channels, girders, and other rolled shapes or sections, not punched, drilled or further mfrd. than rolled, n.o.p.		Iron or steel bridges or parts thereof, iron or steel structural work, columns, shapes or sections, drilled, punched or in any further state of mfr. than as rolled or cast, n.o.p.
	Cwt.	Value	Cwt.	Value	Value
		$		$	$
Ottawa	1,281	2,040	187	425	
Toronto	35,323	58,949	16,463	28,074	
Montreal	75,640	130,981	13,947	24,649	
St. John	656	1,248	142	364	280
Halifax	178	285	416	722	
Dom. of Canada	201,602	350,841	74,779	137,557	2,150

INTEREST ON SAVINGS

Mr. SPENCER:

1. In what year did the Government reduce the rate of interest on savings deposits?
2. What was the reason for so doing?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING:

1. 1897.

2. The action taken was based on the general decline in the rate of interest on money.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. How many civil servants were in the employ of the Government on the first of January, 1912, and what was the total amount of salary paid to them?
2. How many civil servants were in the employ of the Government on the first of January, 1922, and what is the total amount of salary paid to them?

[Mr. Bureau.]

GRAIN TRADE

JUDGMENT OF THE MANITOBA COURT OF APPEAL

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir LOMER GOUIN (Minister of Justice): I beg leave to make a statement in reference to the recent judgment of the Court of Appeal for Manitoba in the case of the King vs. the Manitoba Grain Company.

The Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada have concluded, upon the advice of their counsel, to appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from the recent judgment of the Court of Appeal for Manitoba in the case of The King vs. The Manitoba Grain Company, whereby it was held that section 215 of the Canada Grain Act is ultra vires of the Parliament of Canada, and pending the review of that decision

by the ultimate tribunal it is not the intention of the Government to introduce any measure to amend the Canada Grain Act based upon the view expressed by the Court of Appeal, and the existing provisions will continue to be administered as heretofore. Obviously if these provisions be upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada no amendment will be necessary. If, on the other hand, the judgment of the Court of Appeal be affirmed, the Government will consider the propriety of introducing such further advisable legislation as may be found to be within the scope of the Dominion powers as interpreted by the court.

Mr. CRERAR: May I ask the Minister of Justice if he can give the House any information as to when this appeal will likely be heard by the Supreme Court?

Sir LOMER GOUIN: I could not say exactly. It may not be until September or October, but in the meantime, I think, the commissioners can carry on with the statute as it is.

Mr. CRERAR: If that can be done I think the situation is all right, but if there is any doubt of that, the question is one which should receive the very careful consideration of the Government.—

Sir LOMER GOUIN: It is receiving the careful consideration of the Government.

GRAND TRUNK FINANCIAL STATEMENT

On the Orders of the Day:

Right Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Leader of the Opposition): There has recently been given to the public the annual statement of the Grand Trunk Railway system. That statement discloses the financial position of the system in such a clear and unmistakable way that I think a synopsis of it with the conclusions therefrom, should be transmitted by the Government in a manner calculated to receive the utmost publicity in the Old Country where, I think, it will have the effect of disabusing the minds of any reasonable people who may have entertained doubts as to the honesty and fairness of the recent arbitration.

Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): The Government will be very pleased to consider the suggestion made by my right hon. friend.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. S. WOODSWORTH (Centre Winnipeg): May I ask the Government whether there is any safeguard against more immigrants coming into this country than can be employed? I noticed in the press a statement that the Department of Immigration and Colonization is making a change in the requirements concerning immigrants entering the Dominion, the change going into effect immediately. Under this change there will be a test to determine the fitness of immigrants and their occupation. In the past, if I understand, the sum which the immigrants brought with him was supposed to keep him until he obtained employment. Is there anything to guarantee that the immigrant on arriving in Canada will go on to the farm and remain there and not drift into the city and become an added charge on the community.

Hon. CHARLES STEWART (Minister of the Interior): Every precaution is being taken with respect to agricultural labourers to ascertain that they are really what they represent themselves to be, and that they will be more than likely to remain in that occupation. I intend giving a very full explanation when the estimates for immigration are considered.

SUPPLY

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I did not happen to be in the House yesterday when the railway question was up for consideration, but I was present some weeks ago when the Minister of Railways made a statement in connection with our railways. In that statement, which was carefully prepared and very complete, the minister disclosed a lot of facts bearing on the railway situation, and also announced that it was the intention of the Government to recognize the principle of public ownership with respect to the railways which we have acquired and, in the administration of those railways, to give that principle a fair trial. Yesterday the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) addressed the House on the railway question and took quite a contrary view, although he too declared that he was favourable to giving public ownership a fair trial. Nevertheless the hon. member told the House frankly

that he was opposed to the principle of public ownership and administration of the railways of this country. That may be his view, and he is entitled to it. I, on the contrary, believe in public ownership of our railways; and I am going to ask hon. gentlemen to listen to me for a few moments while I give reasons in favour of public ownership, not only from the point of view of myself and my constituents, but also from the point of view of a large proportion of the Canadian people. The views which I entertain upon this question have not been arrived at recently. Ever since I entered public life I have been an upholder of public ownership, and I have preached the doctrine in and out of this House. I have taken part in a great many election campaigns; and whenever this question has been discussed the verdict has generally been in favour of the principle of public ownership and of giving it a fair trial. I come from a province where that principle is now being carried out in a rather significant way; but something still more significant is happening in this House. I have sat in a great many parliaments, but never did I see before what is being witnessed to-day; sixty to sixty-five men, virtually a solid bloc, committed to the principle of public ownership in connection with the railways of Canada. Furthermore I never before saw in this House a party so determined and so united in upholding that principle, and other principles also, to which they are committed. They come here daily, they sit here throughout the session, they take part in the debates, and they watch these public questions; and I say it is a revolution that a political party has come into this House committed to, and prepared to defend, the policy of public ownership in connection with our railways.

Now I am going to give some of the reasons why I believe in public ownership —and have believed in it all the time I have been a member, and during all the time I have taken part in the discussion of public matters in the press and on the public platform. We often hear the phrases, "the right of collective bargaining", and "collective ownership." Both these phrases have been driven into the minds of the people, and are being especially applied to the ownership and administration of railways. But there is a third phrase, a very old and well known one, one derived from the past, and connected with our history,—"The King's highway". If the King's highway and the high seas

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

are free to all people to travel, is it anything out of the way that we should apply the principle of public ownership to the King's highway, the railway? We have applied it already in regard to ships on the high seas and rivers. Everybody has a right to transport on the highways, and exercises that right. We all drive our waggons and vehicles on the King's highway. That highway is being extended in all provinces of the Dominion; the people are spending immense sums and making good roads; and it is still the King's highway. The greatest competitor of the railways is the King's highway, with the motor truck on it, and it is still free. No company takes toll from travellers. This is not a new doctrine, but is an expansion of the old doctrine of transportation on the King's highway as a railway being in the control of the people. That idea is prevalent in Quebec, the maritime provinces, and all over Canada. Whereever we go there is a growing idea that the King's highway, as a means of transportation, should be absolutely the property of the people, and if there is to be transportation on the railway why should it not be controlled by the people? Why should transportation on a set of rails on private property pass into the hands of a private company, unless some good reason for it is shown? I do not think a reason can be given, and I can give a good reason why the railways should be the property of the people and should not be controlled by a private company.

This doctrine is not confined to our own people. The great roads of the Empire of Rome were the people's highway for the commerce of that empire, and the work of the army was done on the "King's highway" as a practical proposition. The trails of our North American Indians are still, and always have been, highways. This doctrine is altogether out of harmony —although we have been used to hearing the contrary—with the tradition that when the King's highway is furnished with rails, it should pass into the hands of a private company.

Transportation is absolutely a public service. We have the same principle in connection with the mails in our post office. That is a matter of transportation and is in the hands of the nation. Why should the rail traffic of the country not also be in the hands of the nation? That principle is growing. It may be denied in places, but

public ownership of railways prevails in many countries for good and sufficient reasons.

Next to the question of transportation on the King's highway being controlled by the people, I come to the question of transportation on the Canadian National railways. The feature about transportation is that it is a service for all the people, and especially a service in connection with the railways. There should be some compensation for the people who find the money for this proposition, but on what principle? The underlying principle of public ownership is equality and efficiency of service, and it must be made cheap in order to be efficient. If it is controlled by a private company, organized as a financial proposition, the shareholders want large dividends on all kinds of stock, including watered stock, and they want returns on bonds. And, without making any reflection on the Canadian Pacific Railway, they also want something else—they want the segregation of the extraneous assets. In other words, after paying their 10 per cent dividend, they want these extraneous assets in the reserves of the company distributed among the shareholders. First of all, the shareholders have the 10 per cent dividends. In addition, there has been a frequent cutting of melons by that railway in several ways. Stock has been given, not at par, not as a bonus, but at a lower price than the stock would have brought in the open market. Besides all this, the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific hope to cut many melons in connection with the extraneous assets, if they are allowed to do it. This is a very expensive way of financing railways.

What is the plan of those who favour public ownership as a national proposition? It is that the capital required for the construction of the railway shall be a bond proposition, guaranteed and secured by a mortgage on the undertaking. That is the essential feature of public ownership of railways. There is no high financing and no cutting of melons, but there is a flotation of bonds, say, at 4 per cent. As soon as the market recovers and business returns, we can get all the money we want for our national railways in this country on the basis of 4 per cent. on a bond issue. What is the difference between 4 per cent bonds, for which the money was really paid in, and the stock of some of the railways for which very little was paid, and where the shareholders not only have dividends but expect melons to be cut frequently, and whose ambition—and it is a fair ambition—is to receive a much larger return on their investment than even 10 per cent? Of course, the railways have not achieved that position in many instances. From the point of view of giving the best service and financing a railroad of the right kind, public ownership is far ahead of the other system. It is sound financing from start to finish.

There is another argument in favour of it, about which we do not hear a great deal, but it comes home to us and to all the world in connection with transportation. That argument is that transportation is not merely a question of carriage on rails, it is a question of transportation on waterways, rivers and seas, lakes and canals. The men who have been engaged in the business of transportation on rails have always been the enemies of transportation by water. Public ownership co-ordinates the two. With public ownership of transportation, that system is used which best suits the requirements. Great economies are effected in that way. The greatest enemy of reduced railway transportation, if that can be secured by means of waterways—and this question is very much to the fore in the United States now—is the railways. This opposition is not quite fair. After we have created these companies and given them permission to establish railway lines throughout the country, they have practically taken the stand that there should be no further water transportation in Canada. They are putting the competing river lines out of business; they have done that in the United States, and they are in league with steamship companies on the high seas to maintain railway rates. That is not giving the people what they are entitled to, namely, efficient service at a low rate.

Another feature of public ownership as applied to railways is freedom. The remarkable thing about public ownership is that you are free to do what you like, whenever you like, with your own; the roads are ours, and we can change our policy whenever we like. But the moment we get into connection with a private company whose main ambition is to make profits, they make contracts and secure franchises; and though we create them to do a service, they, of all people, declare that the state shall not go into the business that we created them to go into. At the present time the freedom of the people of Canada to go even into transportation is denied by the railway companies, and by no company as much as by the Canadian Pacific, which

has been so successful in the business of transportation. The Canadian Pacific, through the newspapers of this country and in various other ways, has told this House that we must not go into transportation; and yet the people of Canada, through its Parliament, created the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. That is, the creature says that its creator must not do what it desires to do, but must keep out of the transportation business. When we created the Canadian Pacific and these other railways, we did not create them to say to us that we should not go into transportation if the people saw fit to do so and thought that they could get more efficient service in that way. Therefore, for all these reasons, there is no question about the advantages of public ownership. Under public ownership, you can finance railways better, you can manage them better; you can avail yourself of any system as a complementary system in connection with the railways, and moreover, you have freedom in connection with the railways for all time.

It was said yesterday by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) that public ownership had never been a success. Has private ownership, company ownership, in this country been a success? Has the Grand Trunk been a success? Has the Canadian Northern been a success? Have hundreds of railway companies in the United States been successful? They have practically all failed, and as I pointed out in this House some time ago, railways in the United States have made confession that they can not go on. Billions of the money of the people of the United States were put into these defaulting railways to carry them through the war, and they cannot go ahead to-day. What is the good of pointing out to us that public ownership is no good, when we know that private ownership, as experienced, in the United States, has been an absolute failure?

Mr. CANNON: What about the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): It was subsidized, it was given millions of money and millions of acres of land, by the people of Canada; and it is charging exorbitant rates to-day to the people of Canada. Yes, let the Canadian Pacific make money under these exorbitant rates; but can the service be done for less money and better done by the people, with the men on this railway treated just as well as they are to-day being treated by the Canadian Pacific? That is the question. Are we going to get a better service and to have the railway better financed? While the Canadian Pacific is an example of the success of private ownership, the more successful the Canadian Pacific becomes, the more likely is it ultimately to be the master of this country. Where is this great success of the Canadian Pacific going to end? Who knows how wealthy the Canadian Pacific is to-day, what millions it has in its strong box which really belong to the people of Canada, and which ought to have been returned to them long ago in the shape of reduced railway charges? That is the point, and not how successful the Canadian Pacific has been in making money. My hon. friend opposite, however, says: See how successful the Canadian Pacific has been in accumulating huge reserves in its treasury. As I said a moment ago, where is this growth of the Canadian Pacific going to end? Do my hon. friends, who speak so much in favour of the Canadian Pacific and who are constantly quoting it, know that there is a very peculiar thing in connection with that railway, and that is the creation of a voting trust which will become stronger if it is permitted to grow? How many members of this House at present know that the Canadian Pacific, which is exalted before our eyes as the most successful example of private ownership, has a voting trust; that only two members of the board retire each year, and that the concluding words of the annual report state that "Messrs. So-and-so"—two members—"retire from the board this year and are subject to re-election?" But to-day even the shareholders cannot exercise their freedom in connection with the Canadian Pacific and change if a new condition arises. Let me tell the House and the country that this voting trust in connection with the Canadian Pacific is the greatest menace that we have in Canada, because now the interests before the people—

Mr. MARTELL: Why cannot the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific elect their own directors? I do not think there is anything in their charter to prevent them from doing so.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Only two directors can be elected each year. The Canadian Pacific has created this permanent voting trust, which was not the rule

in the past, and this shows us that the Canadian Pacific is gradually getting stronger. It is an outstanding fact in connection with railway administration that, while it is the people who use the roads and the shareholders who own the roads, it is getting to be more and more these little inside trusts that control even the shareholders and their property, and the shareholders have not the freedom which they used to have. Gradually the railways have come into the hands of little cliques on the inside who control them and who keep themselves in power by these voting trusts. That is the situation to-day in connection with the Canadian Pacific. In the old days a fresh board of directors could be elected at the annual meeting.

Mr. CANNON: What control have the people of Canada over the election of directors of the Canadian National Railways at present?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I hope we have a responsible government in power to do that work. My hon. friend apparently does not believe in responsible government. The shareholders of the Canadian Pacific are entitled to have their directors come under review every year, instead of two being retired each year so that the trust can continue. This creation of voting trusts is getting to be more and more the menace of financial institutions. The richest corporation outside of railways is a certain mining company which has passed into the perpetual control of the people at present in control of it, because, by means of this voting trust, the control can be handed down in perpetuity to their descendants. This matter of voting trusts is the menace of business and of politics in this country.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my right hon. friend allow me a question?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am not your "right honourable" friend.

Mr. MARTELL: Well, my honourable friend," then. Do the shareholders in this company, which the hon. gentleman speaks about, control by a majority, just as in the case of other concerns?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I am not going to go into the details of the matter, but I know that the system in connection with this company has worked very satisfactorily. It was decided that the management of the company could be entailed, like property, and an entailed administration in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was created by the people, is being developed in Montreal. I will now proceed to give my experiences in connection with public ownership. The member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) yesterday referred to some things that had happened in my province. Let me tell the committee what has been done in Ontario in regard to public ownership.

Mr. CANNON: The Hydro Electric?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes, the Hydro Electric; and if my hon. friend's province had an Adam Beck they would have a great future ahead of them. I should like my hon. friends from Quebec to visit the city of Toronto, where they would see the finest street railway in America, and one that is owned by the people. It is just as good as the street railway in Montreal, and the people own it, whereas the people of Montreal do not own the street railway there. The people of Toronto can reduce the fare the moment conditions will permit, and they intend to do so. The net rate is at present six cents.

Mr. MARTELL: Is the service good?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Yes, and it is being improved as expeditiously as possible. I might observe that the new cars that are being secured will be made in the province of Quebec. Now, I state without fear of contradiction that the best street railway in America to-day is that which is owned by the people of Toronto. The fares are reasonably cheap considering the effects of the war, and they can, and will be reduced whenever it is at all practicable to reduce them. I would seriously ask the hon. gentlemen to go and observe at first hand the satisfactory operation of this public-owned utility. Electrical energy is distributed more cheaply in Toronto than in any other city of similar size, and the facts amply prove this assertion. The municipalities of Ontario are to-day organizing the greatest system of distribution of electrical energy that will be found anywhere in the world. This power is all to be derived from Niagara, and the entire system is to be owned by the people. The scheme contemplates the distribution of energy to every house in the southern portion of Ontario. The plant is greater than that which is to be found on the Tennessee river, and this

system of public ownership applied to the development of power in Ontario will within two years produce at least half a million—I believe a million—horse power annually. At $10 per horse power this will represent an income of at least $5,000,000 a year; and if, as I believe, the power reaches the higher figure, the return will, of course, be $10,000,000. Many of the cities of Ontario own their own street railways and they would not part with them under any consideration. At Windsor on the Ontario side of the Detroit river there is a splendid system of public ownership and the service is splendid. Let me tell hon. gentlemen who are denouncing public ownership that the city of Detroit has taken over the street railway there, following the example of Toronto and other Canadian cities, while in the western provinces the people have tried public ownership of street railways with success. We are building a great system of public ownership here notwithstanding a certain degree of opposition, and in the United States the President and his party are now committed to a considerable scheme of publicly controlled development of electrical energy wherever it is possible in connection with the railways, in order to provide cheap transportation.

Mr. CANNON: If public ownership is such a good thing how does my hon. friend explain the fact that the American government turned over the railways to their private owners?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The fact is that the American railways could not serve the nation in time of war. They had absolutely fallen down. They had been so exploited by private ownership, the directors and managers being connected with different companies on the side, that the treasuries of the railroads were nearly depleted. They were nearly ruined—and I use the word advisedly—that they could not render the service required of them by the nation during the war, and the government had to take them over and administer them. They have given them back—

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Well, things were in such a bad shape that there had to be a readjustment, and in the meantime they have been handed back to the private owners. But the government will eventually have to take them over again. They have spent millions of dollars on them, and they will take them over just as we have taken over the railways in this country.

Mr. MITCHELL: What about Great Britain?

Mr. MACLEAN York): Private ownership did not prove successful there, either, during the war. There were twenty systems in that country and the only thing that could be done was to nationalize them. Now, public ownership is sweeping all over the world, and that is what my hon. friends cannot see.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): What about France? Have they not handed back the railways to the private owners there?

Mr. CANNON: What about Bulgaria?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Evidently hon. gentlemen are not serious; they are not dealing with facts. Public ownership has vindicated itself in Europe, in this country, and in Australia, and they are realizing the wisdom of it in the United States. Those who do not see it do not want to see it. There are too many blind men in this House. It may be all right to have a blind—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Pig.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, I am not talking about that. It may be all right to have a blind man, but it is disastrous to have a blind party.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR: Will you allow me a question? Why do you not come to Quebec and see what effect public management has there?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Well, who is to blame for that but the people of Quebec? That is the thing I am in favour of. When there is mismanagement, if the road is publicly owned it can be rectified, but if the road is privately owned, it cannot be.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): If we are to make a success of these railways, the people must have a say in the matter. If the people of Quebec, for instance, have no voice in the matter, how can the railways be made a success?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Well, you have the Government here, with more ministers from Quebec than from any other province. The people must take care of themselves, but you must not deprive them of

the right to take care of themselves by handing these franchises over to private companies.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the hon. member suggest that the Government should interfere in the management of the National Railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): The Minister of Railways says it is the intention of the Government to appoint a board of directors to administer the National Railways. I may say that I am confident that the Government will appoint a good board.

Mr. McKENZIE: That is not my question. Does the hon. member suggest that the Government should interfere in the management of the National Railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): Only to the extent that the minister has mentioned—that the Government get the best possible board to administer the system. The minister is responsible for seeing that that is done.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): To whom will that board be responsible?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): As is the case in all our public administration, it goes back to the individual voter. But between the voter and the system is the government, and between the government and the system is the board of directors. My hon. friends opposite are fond of preaching the doctrine of, "Trust the people". Do they say that the people cannot be trusted to see that there is a good board of directors?

Mr. CANNON: Would my hon. friend still support public ownership of the railways if the headquarters were transferred to Montreal?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I do not know. Would my hon. friend himself trust Montreal? I attended a meeting of the Railway Committee this morning and I understood there was some doubt about trusting Montreal. Now, these are nice little questions, but they do not interfere with the argument.

Mr. CALDWELL: Would my hon. friend be in favour of appointing a board of directors the members of which are already directors of companies which manufacture railways cars, locomotives, or steel rails, or operate coal mines, and so on?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): No, I would not approve of that. We have heard some intimations from the other side along that line, from some of the friends of the government. I have not the responsibility of administration of this act, but if I had anything to do with it I would do my share towards seeing that a good board was appointed, and there are good men in Canada who could carry out efficiently the work of such a board. We are just as good as the people of any other country; we have a great many men who are trained in railway matters and who could serve well in this capacity.

What would happen if we gave these railways back, as the Canadian Pacific suggests? Well, it would not be long before Parliament would be asked to vote an enormous sum to put them on their feet. We are not going to do that. We have these roads; let us stand for the deficits until such time as they can be put in shape. We are not going to hand them back to anybody, least of all are we going to hand them to the Canadian Pacific. We will keep them and get good men to administer them.

A great amount of the relief which is afforded in the way of transportation throughout the world is that which the waterways offer. In Europe they have not very good railroads, but they have a great system of waterways. There is not a town in Europe that is not connected with a section of seaboard or with a river; they have constant competition and good service. They have made more of their water transportation than anything else; in this country almost an opposite view is taken. In addition to waterway transportation we have the transportation of the highway. The highway is becoming one of the most aggressive of the competitors of the railroad. Perhaps we shall have a system of transportation in the air before long, but the competitors of the railroad now are the waterways and the highways. Now, there is no doubt that transportation by motor truck and by vessels on our waterway systems will have to be harmonized and brought into co-operation with transportation by rail. The railways do not want to do it; they do not want to avail themselves of the waterways. But the great merit of these various systems is the competition in the way of rates and service which they afford. The advantage of the motor truck is that it transports commodities from door to door, from factory to retailer or consumer, from the mine to wherever the material is required. Therefore in attempting a solution of our transportation problem we must deal with the

question of our waterways and our highways; we must consider all the methods of transportation, and we must harmonize them and bring them into co-operation. We must remember that we not only have to administer these roads, but also we have to see that they give good service.

I come now to the question of motive power for the railways. We have an immense mileage of railroads in this country that have been taken over by the Government, and we have to have motive power for them. The railroads of the United States are up against this same problem of motive power, and the President of the United States has had to come to their relief. He has propounded a great system of water-power development for the haulage of the railway trains of the United States, and the people of the United States are committing themselves to the expenditure of billions of dollars to solve this question of motive power. The railroads over there either own or control a lot of mines to supply the coal required in their operations. So, this problem is up in the United States as well as here, and the only way to solve it is through the development of water-power owned and controlled by the people. There is enough water-power in Canada, in the western rivers, in the rivers of Ontario and Quebec, to provide every railway in this country with motive power. That power cannot be developed in any other way as efficiently and as cheaply as it can under public ownership. There is no way out of the transportation difficulties of America to-day except by electrical energy applied to the railways, and all the railway authorities in the United States insist upon the electrification of their roads, at an enormous cost. I do not know where they are going to get the money, but they can only get cheap water-power as a public-owned proposition, they will never get it cheaply from private-owned concerns. We know how the mine owners exact exorbitant charges from the railway companies of the United States, and they would do the same here if they had the chance. So, we have to go in for the electrification of our railways, just as the United States are doing. President Harding has accepted that responsibility, and has committed his administration to the principle of the great development of water-power, under public control, for the haulage of the trains of the United States. We in Canada have the railways on our hands, and we intend to keep them and to make them efficient, and we must undertake this duty of electrifying them. We must find water-power for them, and if we do that, we shall be able to give our people a much better system of transportation than they have had in the past.

Mr. CANNON: Is it not a fact that railway experts agree that electrification cannot be applied to railway yards, for shunting purposes, and so on?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): That is a small matter. How much power is required in the yards? That difficulty has already been overcome in some cases. There is no other solution of our transportation problem than electrification. There may be minor difficulties, but electrification can undoubtedly be applied for moving the grain crops of our western provinces. There is only one way to move the trains, and that is by electrical power. We have the power in this country, and as the people are going to deal with the transportation system from now on—

Mr. CANNON: If electrical power cannot be applied at the terminal points, what would be its usefulness to the railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have seen lots of terminals where electrification has been applied successfully. That is a problem, of course, but I think we have the mechanical genius in this country to overcome all these problems. My hon. friend wants to find hidden enemies at every point. He is looking for them, and for what reason? To stop the people of Canada, now that they have the roads after their failure under private ownership. We are going to try out electrification and the responsibility is now on the Government in office.

I come now to the last point I want to bring out. What does the Government propose to do in connection with this great problem? They have announced in the House that they assume the responsibility and are going to give the roads a fair trial. They are going to appoint a board of directors, and get competent men. I believe there are competent men available, and the sooner they are appointed the better it will be for the railways. There has been too much delay in the past, and the Government ought to get busy and appoint the board as soon as possible—the sooner the better so that they can get down and study the great necessities of this country, as outlined yesterday by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar). There must be consolidation to effect

economy in the railways and the men to do it, I would say, are the directors who are to take charge of the railways. Put the men at their work, and let them survey the situation, so that these economies may be effected. I know line after line where great economies could be effected. I know a good deal about the two roads in Ontario, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk, and I know where immense savings could be effected on those lines. We shall have to trust to competent railway experts, under the direction and charge of a responsible board, and I am sure that when they get to work they will find where great economies can be effected. There are a lot of trains run that should be cut out; and a better service could be given at a lower cost. It is this duplication that is wasteful. How long is it going to be tolerated? We have a great asset in our railways.

I know why so much opposition is made to public ownership. It is because the people of Canada have got two great railway systems in their hands, and the greatest railway asset in Canada to-day is the Grand Trunk which has passed into the hands of the people. It commands the strategic points all over Canada. The Grand Trunk is stronger to-day in Montreal than the Canadian Pacific. It is strong in the city of Ottawa, and in Toronto it has all the good points, and on the Detroit and Niagara rivers. The same is true of the Canadian Northern and of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We have got all the best points right across the continent through acquiring these railway systems, and they should be linked up into a unified system. When that is done, we shall get lower rates and better service, and we shall be in a position to treat the railway men better than they have ever been treated before. You can unify. The people now have in their hands the business of the transportation of freight and passengers, the express business, the money order business, the telegraph business, and the transfer of mails. It is all right when these are concentrated in the hands of the people. The Canadian Pacific say that we should not be in this business. The Canadian Pacific is in another great combination. The greatest combination in the United States to-day is the American Telegraph and Telephone Company. It controls all the telegraphs and most of the Bell lines all over the world, and most of the cables all over the world. The Canadian Pacific is in with that combination, and I say it is absolutely necessary in the public interest, not only in Canada, but in the United States and every other modern country, that services associated with transportation should be in the hands of the people such as the telegraph, money order, postal and express business. These should not be in the hands of private corporations. And so I trust that the Minister of Railways will persuade his Government to assume this responsibility. The legislation passed by the previous government, providing for the consolidation of the railways, can be put into effect almost immediately and a good board selected almost at once. If the Government do that, and provide for the consolidation of these roads, you will see the railroads not only paying their operating expenses but beginning to discharge some of the deficits which they have incurred in the past. The prediction I make in connection with the National Railways is that we are going to wipe out these deficits; and it is because the era of public ownership is likely to come, and be a great success that the main opposition to it is encountered to-day. From our experience in the province of Ontario we believe more in public ownership to-day than we ever did. That policy has not fallen down, and there has not been the failure we have seen in the case of the private owned companies. The people did not bring about these deficits met with in the past; they were the result of maladministration and over-building. These railways are to-day in the hands of the people; the government have taken them in charge, and at a very early date they must disclose who are to constitute the board and what measures will be taken to ensure that the consolidation so necessary shall take place at the earliest possible date.

I have criticized the Canadian Pacific Railway Company here to-day, but I am willing that the Government should find a way to co-operate and to co-ordinate with that company if such a course will reduce traffic charges. There is no reason why the two systems should not work in co-operation, and, enable passengers to go from one railroad to the other if necessary, and in every way give a better service to the people. The railways of this country will very soon have all they can do, even though that condition does not exist at present, and the

people will be glad to see competition. The way to make the Canadian National Railways to do well is to keep the Canadian Pacific Railway as an efficient competitor. I do not object to competition with the National Railways. There is room for the two systems, and one day we shall want more railways in the West. We shall be able to get more settlers there when we are able to show that the best system of transportation in the North American continent is in Canada. Let us keep our national railways and make them efficient, and especially render them useful in the building up of our country.

Mr. CANNON Before my hon. friend resumes his seat will he state that public ownership is not one of the principles laid down by the Russian soviet government and denounced by every European government?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I have heard soviet doctrines enunciated even in this country but that is not a part of the issue here. Furthermore I am not responsible for the Soviet government.

Mr. FERNAND RINFRET (St. James): Possibly I should initiate these remarks by saying, as most members say when they rise in this House, that this is the greatest and most important problem before the country. But hon. members will concede that such a remark would be truer in this instance than in other cases, because every one admits there is no greater problem before Canada to-day, and none more complex. For it is a great problem, when this country has to operate more than 20,000 miles of railway at a deficit rate of $70,000,000 in 1920, and $56,000,000 in 1921, plus the $15,000,000 of Grand Trunk railway deficit. It is also a complex problem because we are not at its initiation. The question is not now whether we shall purchase these railways or not; the question is solely what we are going to do with them. And there are few solutions of the problem, if any, available to us. This is a matter as to which every hon. member should make his attitude perfectly clear. It is one that played a great part in the elections in that part of Canada from which I come; and I must say that it was possibly the main topic that we discussed in the late election, notwithstanding the innuendoes of some hon. gentlemen opposite that we dealt with other matters on that occasion. Personally I took a very definite stand on this matter, not only in the constituency of St. James but in every other electoral district where I happened to speak, and I desire to take exactly the same stand on the issue before us to-day. Briefly condensed what was that stand? It was that the Liberal party should decline all responsibility for the present railway situation in Canada; that the purchase of railways by the state was a grave mistake; that I did not believe in government ownership; that the system had been a failure in other countries; that the Liberals if returned to power should immediately endeavour to reduce the cost of the government railways to the taxpayers of the country, and avail themselves of the first opportunity to return them, on reasonable terms, to private ownership. That was my stand, Mr. Chairman, in the last election, and it is my stand to-day.

As to the proportionate responsibility resting on the respective political parties for the existing railway situation, I regard that as a matter of less importance. I believe that those parties should accept their responsibilities before the country, as well as before Parliament; but I also think that, faced with a problem of this magnitude, even the question of political responsibility should be set aside when we are addressing ourselves to that solution of the problem for which we are all looking. However, as to the responsibility for this situation there cannot be two opinions on the matter. The Drayton-Acworth report made in 1919 has frequently been referred to as showing that whilst from 1901 to 1911 the construction of railways in Canada was ever proportionate to the increase of population, during the period from 1911 to 1919 that proportion grew out of all bounds and clearly outran the increase in population. The figures are these:

	Population	Mileage of Railway	Proportion
1901	5,371,315	18,140	1 mile per 300 inhabitants
1911	7,206,643	25,400	1 mile per 284 inhabitants
1919	7,500,000	40,584	1 mile per 185 inhabitants

In other words, from 1901 to 1911 the population had increased by 34 per cent, and the railway mileage by about 40 per cent, while from 1911 to 1919 the population had practically only increased some 7 per cent and the railway mileage had increased over 40 per cent. We might appreciate the proportionate responsibility of the parties by taking the grants, cash subsidies, guarantees and other methods of

helping the railways that have been adopted by the Government. I do not like to quote figures, as my short experience in this House convinces me that when you ask for figures in regard to the expenditures on different railways, it is very hard indeed to get them to agree. There have been so many grants, subsidies and guarantees for the benefit of railways that it is hard to reconcile the figures, and to arrive at a conclusion. But I will quote, as an example, the figures that I obtained this year. The cash subsidies given to the Canadian Northern from 1883 to 1907 amounted to $6,226,000, while from 1911 to 1917 the cash subsidies amounted to $21,056,000 odd. This is the information given by the Government on May 5 of this year. If you ask about the guarantees, subventions, or any other form of aid, you would find that the different governments had helped the railways in the same proportion—that is to say, before 1911, when we were building only according to the increase in population, aid was given in a very moderate way, but from 1911 up to the time of the purchase of the railway, when the population was not increasing in proportion to the building, we were giving subsidies, guarantees and benefits in far larger amounts. The responsibility of the Liberal party in this matter is very clearly indicated by the position which that party took in opposition from 1911 till 1921. When the Borden government began their bungling of the Transcontinental, the Liberal party protested. When the same government, by the direct and persistent work of the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen), purchased the Canadian Northern, the Liberal party protested with renewed energy. They contended, with the best of reasons, that it was a pernicious deal. Not only did the government place a fictitious value on the stock of the bankrupt company—and that was a very grave error—but by becoming the owner of the road, gave a par value to all obligations, debts and promissory notes of that company, and thereby imposed on the country a burden of colossal proportions. When the present leader of the Opposition submitted to the late parliament his deal for the Grand Trunk purchase at the end of the session which had been called to discuss the peace treaty, again the Liberal party protested. There could be no doubt at that time that we stood against public ownership, that we considered it a colossal bungle, that the Borden-Meighen government had imposed a burden on the country, and that we favoured the Laurier policy of private ownership under the judicial control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. But now we are in power and we find an established situation. That is to say, we have railways which have not been purchased by us, but which have been thrust upon us, and the question is, not who is responsible for that situation, but what are we going to do about it? That is a much more important matter.

Possibly, at this point I might just outline what government ownership means to us. It means a capital outlay of an immense amount—over a billion dollars—imposed on this country; pretty nearly half of the public debt of Canada. At page 386 of Hansard of this session hon. members will find that the total obligation of the Canadian Northern Railway amounted, at the time these obligations were calculated, to the enormous figure of $586,000,000. If you take the obligations of the government railways, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinental, the Intercolonial, the smaller railways, and finally the Grand Trunk, you will find that the capital outlay on Government railways is well above, or at least well around, the one billion figure, and I repeat that that is pretty nearly half of the public debt of the country. What do the annual deficits of the railway mean to us. The deficit of 1920 was $70,000,000. Add together past deficits and those in prospect, with interest at 7 per cent a year, and you find that in 1925 the total will amount to $492,000,000. Or, if hon. members think the rate of interest is too large, put it at 5 per cent, and you will see that the aggregate deficit on these railways, with the yearly interest added, will mean a total of $470,000,000 in 1925. We must add interest, for we are not meeting the deficit but are simply adding it to the public debt. Unless a miracle is performed in the administration of the railway, the deficit will be increased every day by the constant increase in the fixed charges. The report of the minister, page 934 of unrevised Hansard, shows that the increased fixed charges in 1921 for the Canadian National Railways was $7,583,000, and for the Grand Trunk, $5,220,000. That is to say, the increase in fixed charges in 1921 alone amounted to $12,803,000.

Possibly we can ascertain what government ownership has done in this country by looking at the figures. I quote from the public statistics. In 1918 the Canadian Northern had an operating surplus over

current expenditure of five and a half million. The deficit, after paying all the fixed charges, amounted to $11,674,187. The government took it over, and two years later, in 1920, the deficit had increased to $34,074,847. The trade depression did not start until 1921. In 1920 the Canadian Northern earned $21,036,000 more than it did in 1918, and $13,133,221 more than it had earned in 1919. In other words, the earnings of the railroad had increased, and yet the deficit, under government ownership, was much larger than it had proved to be even under the administration of the former company. The increase in the employees of the Canadian Northern has been absolutely out of proportion to the increase of the mileage of the railway. In 1916, the mileage in operation was 9,702 and the employees per 1,000 miles numbered 2,151. In 1920, the mileage had not been much increased; it was 9,743, and the number of employees per 1,000 miles was 3,433.

Mr. LAFLAMME: In that connection, is the hon. member able to give us his views regarding a feature which, to my knowledge, has not yet been discussed? What would be the effect of state ownership and state operation of railways on the liberty or freedom of the franchise, if it is true that, in 1919, there was one mile of railway owned and operated in Canada per 185 persons?

Mr. RINFRET: I did say that I would not like to take a partisan stand on this matter. My impression is that, even with the best of willingness, you can hardly dissociate political advantage from political administration of railways, and I suppose my hon. friend feels as I do on this matter, namely, that when we advocate the doing away with the immense patronage that government ownership would mean to this country, we are advocating a policy which should prove to be for the good of the country.

Mr. LAFLAMME: Does the hon. member know that statistics in France have shown that state ownership there means the hand of the state on about 12 per cent of the voters?

Mr. RINFRET: I am aware of that, and I am also aware of the fact that the French government—I am going to refer to this in a minute—has done away with government ownership altogether. Possibly the French government has not had the advantage of hearing some of the speeches that are delivered in this House. I may also point out, before leaving this part of my remarks, that unfortunately the receipts of the Government railways have decreased very much this year. The figures for the week ending April 30, are $2,467,145, a decrease of $352,133 over the same period last year. But what is more grave, is that from January 1 to April 30, that is, for the first four months of this year, the receipts amounted to $33,579,677, a decrease of $7,647,545 over last year. That is to say, if the receipts are to continue at that rate during the year, we may face, at the end of this year, a decrease of over $20,000,000 in receipts on our government railways. As I do not see any hope of a similar decrease in expenditure, I am very much afraid that the deficit next year will prove to be much greater than it was last year.

I am coming to another point which is often mentioned in debates of this kind, and that is the result of government ownership in other countries. It is a fact that only lately we have had examples of nations abandoning the system of public ownership altogether. I have in my hand a despatch dated March 7, which was published in the Montreal Star and later in all the other Canadian papers, stating that the French government has ended the state ownership test. It reads:

> After being a drain on the French treasury for fourteen years, the Etat railroad system is to be handed over to a private corporation, the French government having decided that its talents do not lie in the direction of railway management. A parliamentary commission is completing plans for the disposal of the road, which has the reputation of being the most disorganized in the country. On completion of the commission's work, the chamber will be asked to approve its decisions, which, it is understood, are heartily backed by the Government.

On March 14, we were informed that in Newfoundland they had a government railway which cost the treasury about $1,500,000 a year, and that they were also very anxious to get rid of it. On May 9 of this year, we were told that the South African deficit in government railways was so large that that government also intends to dispose of its railways.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the benevolent efforts of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) to show us that the government of the United States had taken over their rail-

ways during the war, because they had been a failure under private ownership and —I do not quite recollect what explanation he gave, but he stated—that after losing about $500,000,000 a year on them the United States government returned them to private ownership. Possibly we shall hear more about that, but this is the first time that I have ever heard the experience of the United States in connection with their railways given as a good illustration of what public ownership could do, that is, given as an argument in favour of public ownership.

Mr. MACLEAN (York): I gave it as an illustration of the failure of private ownership. The United States government had to take them over during the war.

Mr. RINFRET: That is exactly what I cannot understand. The hon. member says that private ownership failed, so that the United States government had to take the railways over. Why did that government return them to private ownership?

Mr. MACLEAN (York): They took the railways over as they were.

Mr. RINFRET: I might remind the committee that the system in connection with railways is different in the United States from that in Canada. As they do in the case of banking, they have small railway companies, and the United States government thought that it was proper, during the war, to bring those numerous companies under one system for war purposes; but it found out at the same time that, while that might prove useful for war purposes, it was very costly. I do not remember for how many years the United States government retained control of the railways; but it was for only a few years, and, as soon as the war was over, they took steps to return the railways to private ownership, because the taxpayers in the United States would not pay the cost of government ownership of railways in that country.

Let us view the situation in Europe. I have a table which I will not read, showing around 1914, before the war, the proportion of government owned and privately owned railways in the world. I am merely giving the figures; they are open to discussion. The proportion was 70.9 per cent privately owned railways and 29.1 per cent publicly owned railways. I might explain, without going into details, that the enormous proportion of privately owned railways is due to the fact that, in the United States and at that time in Canada, practically all the railways were privately owned. The proportion in America was 96.3 per cent privately owned and 3.7 per cent publicly owned. In Europe, Asia and even in Africa, the proportion was about even between the two systems.

Mr. CRERAR: From what authority is the hon. member quoting? I ask just for information.

Mr. RINFRET: I am quoting from a well known book on the matter, "The Case Against Nationalization," by Edwin A. Pratt, a book which was published around that year. I give the figures merely as information; I do not pretend to base any argument upon them. We find that at that time, whilst Germany and Hungary had mostly public owned railways, in France and England there were no publicly owned railways at all; and while the railways were practically all under public ownership in Italy, in Spain and Portugal they were privately owned. The fact is that previous to the war, outside of America, the practice was about evenly divided between the two systems of operation. This author explains the case of Germany, which is very often cited as an illustration of the profitable operation of government owned railways. I shall merely sum up his argument, which is open to discussion, although it appears rather convincing to me. He points out that as regards Germany, the government owned railways are remunerative principally in Prussia, and this is due to many reasons. In the first place, it costs comparatively little to build railways in an exceedingly flat country: there is no heavy outlay on tunnels, viaducts, embankments and cuttings.

Mr. MITCHELL: That would apply to the West.

Mr. RINFRET: Yes; I will come to that point later. I might remark in passing, however, that in my humble opinion the Canadian Northern should be confined to the West. It becomes costly when it crosses the Algoma district and the Rocky mountains. But to return to Germany—and I promise not to keep hon. gentlemen there much longer. The second reason which this author gives for the profitable operation of railways in Germany, and particularly in Prussia, is the fact that certain outlays that are made in other countries are avoided there. For example, in most cases the stations in Germany are very modest, and if the surroundings are embellished or beautified the municipalities

contribute to the cost. Then, those railways that have been acquired from private companies have been purchased at very low cost by the Prussian government. And another reason for the cheaper operation of the government owned railways in Prussia is the fact that they are under a military system which precludes patronage and the political influences that are brought to bear on government railways in other countries. Furthermore, they do not pay to the state the same amount of taxation exacted from private companies. The German government has full control over freight rates and the law prevents strikes, and the wages paid are not as high as those paid in this country, for instance. These are among the reasons why it has been possible for the German empire, and particularly in Prussia, for government railways to be operated more profitably than elsewhere. It is also pointed out that they calculate their surplus on current expenditure. That is to say, the state incurs the expenditures, and the reports made from year to year give merely the surplus earnings on current expenditures. In Belgium, also, the state owned railways have had fair results. But it must be remembered that Belgium is an exceptionally prosperous country with a large population per square mile. Indeed, the population is very dense, and the people are industrious; and Belgium being a flat country, operation is necessarily cheap. Without labouring the point, I think it will be found that in most cases government ownership has been disastrous in every country where the experiment has been tried, and in those few countries where this has not been the result, whatever success has been achieved has been due to conditions that do not obtain in Canada.

The partisans of public ownership in this country may be assigned to two categories. The first comprises those who believe in public ownership as a gospel. The fate of other countries has failed to impress them; nor does our own misfortune move them. The theory sounds good to them, and they hope that facts and figures will some day confirm their belief. This class of worshippers, the Messianic hopeful, is in my opinion getting scarcer every day. But there is another category, much more numerous, who believe in public ownership in their own peculiar way. They do not believe that public ownership can be as successful financially as a private enterprise, they know that it will produce deficits; but they consider the necessity of retaining the local advantage that it holds for their own portion of territory. In other words, they claim that the railways are a public utility and not a business venture, and that the whole community should control it in order to ensure low freight and passenger rates. These claims may have considerations of local interest to substantiate them, but they are certainly no argument in favour of public ownership as a sound economic and practical business principle.

But what makes the problem complex is that we have no choice to-day as between purchasing or not purchasing. We have the railways; and the only question is, what we are to do with them? This government has proposed that as there is no other solution in view we should give government ownership a fair trial in this country. In this respect I share very much the view expressed yesterday—in my opinion, a wise, moderate, and very frank view—by the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell). I do not wish to renounce my personal belief, which is absolutely opposed to the principle of government ownership. At the same time, however, I do think that even those who are not in favour of government ownership should co-operate with the government in their own humble way and do their very best to ensure that the trial shall be as fair, as complete, and as convincing as it possibly can be made.

Let me point out, though, that a trial made by a government is always subject to future objections. There are those nonbelievers who will tell you that the government is submitting optimistic figures. Indeed, the statement has already been made this year that apparently satisfactory results are, in fact, only a mere matter of book-keeping, and that if the government railways show a profit, or any improvement, it is only in the books and not in reality. Then there is the other class, those who will say that the trial has not been fair. The leader of the Opposition himself (Mr. Meighen), in the debate on the Address, asks, how can we have a fair trial by a government which comprises in its membership men that are opposed to government ownership and who will do their utmost to bring about its failure? I am not quoting the right hon. gentleman verbatim, but words to this effect will be found on page 34 of unrevised Hansard in the speech of the leader of the Opposition at the beginning of the session. The trial will prove little to the majority of people

who will disclaim its appropriateness; it will, I fear, end where it has started; it will leave us exactly in the same position, and in the meantime cost this country, according to the number of years, several hundred million dollars. But, as we say, we have not the choice. These railways have been thrust upon us, and we can only do the best we can in the meantime.

Some hon. members may say that I speak with a prejudiced mind; that I come from a part of the country which is prejudiced on this matter. Speaking for the province of Quebec, I would like to say this. We have fewer railways than any other province, and we have guaranteed less money—in fact, in certain cases no money at all—than any other province. In that respect, I think the course adopted by our provincial government was a wise one. Yet we are one of the most important and most densely populated provinces. We have to pay a large share of the deficits incurred in the operation of railways which we do not enjoy, and for which we have never guaranteed one cent. I could make this plainer by quoting figures to show, for instance, that the Canadian Northern had very little mileage in Quebec when it was purchased by the government. But this fact and the others that I have mentioned are so well known that I do not think I shall delay the committee by going into them. But, as I say, let it not be thought for a moment that we from the province of Quebec come into this House with a prejudiced mind on this subject. I acknowledge at once that if we enjoy fewer of the railways for which the country pays, we have the St. Lawrence channel which has been deepened at the expense of the country and which is of use to the whole Dominion, but more especially, of course, to the part of the country through which it runs. I do not claim that my stand in this matter represents the full sentiment of my province; but neither my sentiment nor that of any other part of the province of Quebec is actuated by prejudice or by a feeling that the province has been less favoured in the matter of railway facilities than any other part of the Dominion.

Now, some people are asking the question: What are we to do with the railways? On that point I agree with the remark made by the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) yesterday, that we have too many railway lines in Canada. One who travels to the Pacific coast is struck with the fact that on exceedingly long distances we have parallel lines traversing wild and unsettled parts of the country in order to link the East and the West, the West and the Coast. Such is the case of the Canadian Northern line from North Bay to Winnipeg, which merely duplicates the Canadian Pacific. Such is the case of the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific from Edmonton to Mount Robson junction—in fact, only one of the two is now being used. After a few hours of travel to the south, the Canadian Northern parallels the Canadian Pacific from Kamloops to the Coast. In the last instance, the Canadian Northern being junior to the Canadian Pacific, the line had to be built on the less advantageous slope of the Thompson and Fraser rivers, taking a second choice. It must have been built at tremendous cost, but on account of these circumstances it is decidedly handicapped. In my humble opinion, the transcontinental line from Quebec to Winnipeg and the Grand Trunk Pacific from Edmonton to Prince Rupert have great trade possibilities in the distant future, but I fail to see how the Canadian Northern in the parts that I have mentioned can ever hope but to be operated at a tremendous loss, because it meets no requirements, it merely duplicates a senior line which itself operates at a loss in that part of the country. The case of the transcontinental railways may well be likened to human beings who, we will say, are fed only every two days. The railways have to take a lot of nourishment in the East if they want to avoid starving in the Algoma district, and, again, must overfeed themselves in the West before they cross the Rockies. In my estimation the Canadian Northern should have remained a mere feeder; it should never have attempted either to come East or to reach the Coast.

I believe also that much can be done by the exercise of rigid economy and by increasing immigration. These subjects have already been dealt with, however, and I shall do no more than allude to them. But if we are going to give these railways a trial, the Government is to do its utmost to decrease the deficit, it should not fail to take advantage of any opportunity that offers itself to free the country from that burden.

In conclusion, I admit that the Government may have no other course open to it than that of operating these lines to the best of its ability. Advocates of government ownership may rejoice over the fact that this will constitute a trial of the prin-

ciple that they favour. But, disbelieving, as I do, in that style of administration, I am quite convinced that the result will inevitably be to add many millions to the public debt. Possibly we are not able to avoid that, but we should make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that, hard as we may try to make the burden lighter for the Canadian taxpayers, we on this side decline all responsibility; that these railways were thrust upon us; that we accept the burden only with the greatest reluctance; that the railways are on the market for the earliest buyer who can give sufficient guarantee of good faith and fair operation; and that the sooner we can dispose of them and return to private ownership the better it will be both for the Government and for the country.

Mr. W. D. EULER (North Waterloo): I have only two reasons to offer for rising to intervene in this debate. One is because of the tremendous importance of the subject under discussion, and the other is because of the rather remarkable trend of the debate on this side of the House. It would be very easy, Mr. Chairman, to criticise the policies of former governments which have brought us into our present position with regard to the national railways. That sort of debate, however, is, to my mind, largely a waste of time. We have arrived at a certain condition; the facts are as they are, and I do not care to indulge in partisan recriminations which sometimes engage the members.

There are only two alternatives before Parliament. One is to accept our responsibility faithfully to operate the railways as a publicly owned utility in the interests of the people; the other, as has been suggested by my hon. friend who preceded me, is to return the National Railways to private ownership as soon as possible. I may say frankly that I very much prefer the first alternative. I am a believer in the principle of public ownership, and I believe that the railways of Canada, now under our control, can succeed provided that we make an honest and whole-hearted effort to make them successful. If we returned these roads to private ownership, it is my opinion that the ultimate outcome would be their incorporation in the Canadian Pacific Railway system. I think the people of Canada would consider that a calamity. They would view with alarm any suggestion that any one railway company, however efficient it may be, should have a monopoly of the railway business of this country.

I know that there are rumours in the corridors and occasionally in the press that there is still another alternative to that of the Canadian Pacific taking over the National Railways, and it is that another private company might be formed which would take over our railways and operate them in competition with the Canadian Pacific. I have not a great deal of faith in that alternative. Even under the most favourable conditions we shall most probably have serious deficits in the operation of the National Railways for some years to come, and I for one question whether a company sufficiently strong financially could be found to bear the strain for the number of years it would be necessary to operate, until they would reach a period of prosperity. I fear that even if the roads did go to a company other than the Canadian Pacific, the final result would be the same, and the Canadian Pacific ultimately would be found in possession.

I believe this also, that if one private railway company came into control of all the railways in Canada, we would no longer receive the efficient service that we now receive from the Canadian Pacific; for, if you remove competition entirely, you remove that incentive to efficiency and service to the public which exists to-day.

Yesterday the hon. member for Marquette delivered what I thought was a most excellent speech on the railway situation. I agreed almost entirely with his views. He said what I would have said, and much better than I could have said it. For that reason it would be out of place for me to reiterate the views he has expressed so exhaustively. Yet, on the other hand, it would be regrettable if there were not at least one member on this side of the House to declare that he believed in the principle of public ownership and had some faith that the National Railways under public management can be made a success if we address ourselves honestly to that task.

The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) also delivered a speech yesterday which, in its general tenor, was directly opposed to that of the hon. member for Marquette. With much that the hon. member for St. Antoine said yesterday I was in hearty accord. That the National Railways must secure the very best men possible for the management of the roads I quite agree, and every member of the House

takes the same position. In fact, that goes without saying, unless we deliberately set out to wreck the National Railways, which purpose I do not for one moment attribute to any one. The most important official that we have to find is, of course, the chairman of the new railway board which is to be constituted, and which will be named by the Minister of Railways, I hope, at a very early date. It may be that such a man may be found in Canada. It is even conceivable that he may be a man who has not been entirely and exclusively associated with railways. But we do need a man of first-class and proven executive ability. We need a man of strict integrity, and one who has the confidence of the people of Canada as well as the confidence of the members of Parliament. We need a man who has himself faith in the public ownership principle, and who has, something of a passion for public service. His will be a great task, but if it is a great task for the chairman of the new board and a tremendous responsibility, I say that it is also a tremendous opportunity and a splendid challenge for some big man in this country to perform perhaps the greatest service that is possible for the people of Canada to-day.

The hon. member for St. Antoine also spoke of the necessity for a proper accounting with regard to our national railways. I do not know if he has information with which I am not familiar. It may be that the books of the National Railways are not kept in a proper manner. It may be that we have entered as assets upon these books some things which have no longer any existence in fact, such, for example, the abandoned road-beds as referred to by the hon. member for Marquette yesterday. If that is the case, they should certainly be written off, so that the books of the National Railways will show the facts and the assets as they are. It may also be that there has been a practice, as there very frequently is, not only in connection with publicly owned utilities but with private corporations as well, of charging up to capital what is properly chargeable to profit and loss account. If that has been done, I think the matter should be investigated, and corrected.

The hon. member for Marquette said yesterday, as he did also in last year's debate, that there should be a revaluation of the National Railways. I agree with that. It is good business practice to have your books show exactly what your assets are, and not to carry any that are fictitious or over-valued. I would, however, say this: If he implies by what he said yesterday that certain assets should be wiped off the books, and in connection with that, that the annual charges based upon those assets and covered by bonds should no longer be chargeable to the railways but to the Consolidated Fund, that may be good practice; I have no fault to find with that. But the public should thoroughly understand that that in itself will not lighten the burden of deficits on the people. It may have a good effect in this way. The board of management will be encouraged by the fact that they are relieved of some of the present heavy fixed charges, although as a matter of fact the charges are merely transferred to consolidated revenue account and in no wise relieve the Canadian tax-payers. I have said that in the statements of the hon. member for St. Antoine to which I have referred, I quite agree with him. But when he declares himself opposed in principle to public ownership and expresses lack of faith in the ultimate success of the National Railways, I must disassociate myself from those sentiments. I have a good deal of regard for the hon. member for St. Antoine. He comes to this House from a most important office in the province of Quebec, with a reputation for efficiency and as a successful executive in the government of that province.

And so I say I regard his opinion as worthy of consideration. I do not question his right to take the attitude that he does, although I will say frankly, and without any thought of giving offence to anyone, that I doubt very much—considering all the circumstances and the fact that we now have the railways and have declared that we are going to give them a fair chance to succeed—I doubt very much the judgment of those who to-day declare that they do not believe we can be successful in the management and operation of these roads. The expression of such sentiments does not make for success in our great undertaking.

Now that we have these railways I agree in part with the hon. member (Mr. Rinfret) who has just spoken, that it becomes our duty—at least the duty of those of us who believe in public ownership—under all the circumstances as so far disclosed in the debate, to declare our faith in the principle and in the prospect of success. I admit frankly, Sir, that I listened with consider-

able regret to the remarks derogatory to public ownership and the operation of national railways that have been made. When a man goes into a fight and declares beforehand that he knows he is going to be beaten, he has lost the fight before he starts. I know very well that many hon. members on both sides of the House disagree with me on the matter of public ownership. One of my friends who generally sits to my right, would give the railways away for the sum of one dollar, but I hope he was not serious in that observation. It is true that in the previous parliament there were probably not more than half a dozen members who honestly believed in public ownership and operation of railways. If there was more than that number they never declared their belief in this chamber. And I am sometimes humiliated as a Canadian to have my fellow members, and the press of this country, say that they do not believe there are men in Canada who can run our railways as well as private corporations can. Sir, I believe there are men in this country who have the ability and the public spirit to administer this great trust in the interests of the Canadian people. To believe less than that is, in my opinion, to display an attitude unworthy of the representatives of a people who have shown in the past that they can rise to any emergency in the interest of Canada.

In matters such as this we judge, or ought to judge, by experience, if experience is available. I am very sorry that the experience of the hon. member for St. Antoine has been so unfortunate as regards the matter of public ownership and operation of public utilities. He told us yesterday that in his experience of municipal affairs in Quebec he did not know of a single instance where public ownership had been successful. Now, I hope he did not have the opportunity, or necessity, of dealing with very many instances, because I would be sorry to know that in the province of Quebec they cannot make public ownership a success. I do not care to make comparisons but I will say that I can tell a brighter story for the province of Ontario, and especially for western Ontario of which I know something. Dozens of municipalities in that province have administered their public utilities with entire success. They have operated their gas plants, their electric light plants, their waterworks, and in many instances their electric railways, with entire success and to the satisfaction of the people. In my own city of Kitchener

—where the population is 23,000, but combined with that of Waterloo reaches a total of 29,000 or 30,000 people—we have operated all these utilities. We have operated our street railway and it has been successful. There has never been the slightest accusation that into the operation of that road, or in the employment of men, favouritism, or local politics, or anything of the kind, has ever entered. We have had business men with sense of public duty who have administered these utilities without any remuneration whatever; and so far as our railway is concerned, if I might particularize in that one case, it has been operated with a profit each year. It has taken care of its debentures both as to principal and interest, as they matured, out of the revenue. It has, almost each year, paid into the municipal treasury an amount, larger or smaller, towards the reduction of taxes; and it has done that with a five cent fare. From the operation of public utilities in the municipalities, the province itself has advanced into a larger field. We have there what is known as the Hydro Electric system. I want to say this—and I do so with a full knowledge of what I am saying—that the Hydro Electric in the province of Ontario, despite the reports and propaganda to the contrary, that has been carried on in certain parts of Canada, has been an undoubted success. I am not now referring to certain other suggestions with regard to the proposed construction of radial railways; I am now referring to the distribution of hydro-electric energy for the purpose of power, and electric lighting throughout the municipalities of western Ontario. To-day we pay only a fraction of the cost that was paid under private ownership for electric current. We know it is a success by having recourse to the same method that Sir Wilfrid Laurier invited the people of Canada to use in order to test the success of his policy when he said, "We do not have to tell you that there is prosperity in Canada, you feel it in your pockets." That is exactly how we measure the benefits of the Hydro-Electric in western Ontario. Now I admit that that in itself is not an absolute proof that we can do the same in the national field and make public ownership and operation of railways a success; but it is at least evidence tending in that direction and encouraging in the matter of going on with it. And why should it not be?

Contrast public ownership, and the success that has been obtained in western Ontario, with private ownership of railways

in Canada and in some other countries of the world. I have never yet heard the statement contradicted that practically every privately owned railway in the United States has, at some time or another, been in the hands of a receiver. The Canadian Northern railway has been cited here as an example of the failure of private ownership, and no better example could be given. Three hundred million dollars from the public treasury went into that railway under private ownership. And yet it failed. We sometimes hear of the Canadian Pacific and of the success which it has attained. That is quite true, and I have absolutely no criticism to make of that system. It is a well managed railway and a benefit to the people of Canada; but the success of that company is not entirely the result of their own efficiency. Even to-day a very substantial proportion of their dividends is based on the benefits and grants of land which they received from the Dominion of Canada.

It is the fashion to-day to decry public ownership. So much so that I am sometimes tempted to think—and any remarks I may make in this direction are not directed at any gentlemen who have spoken or may speak—I am tempted to believe that the fashion has been inaugurated as the result of definite propaganda on the part of private ownership interests as against public ownership.

Mr. LAFLAMME: By which organization?

Mr. EULER: I do not believe it would be very difficult for the imagination of hon. members in this House to tell just exactly what I am thinking about.

Mr. BUREAU: Do not impute motives.

Mr. EULER: I am not imputing any motive to anybody, and if those who are interested in private enterprises are now doing their best to discredit public ownership, I am not sure that I can find a great deal of fault with them, because, after all, self preservation is the first law of nature. But for the public in general consistently and persistently to close its eyes to the undoubted fact that private ownership has been a failure is rather more than I can understand. No one expects that the national railways are going to succeed unless certain changes are made. We must consolidate the roads. We must cut out unnecessary duplication and unnecessary overhead expenses. That is going to take time, and I, for one, would express the opinion, off-hand, that it will take a period of at last four or five years to enable us to decide whether the great experiment which we are making will be a success or a failure. I presume it would be rank heresy for anyone to say in this House that the failure of the Grand Trunk was a blessing in disguise, because it would not have been possible, to make the national railway a success without the inclusion of the Grand Trunk Railway. I do not think that it was possible for the Canadian Northern, combined with the Grand Trunk Pacific, to make a success of operation unless they had in Ontario some such freight gathering agency as is supplied by the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk supplies in the east what the Canadian Northern did not have. The Canadian Northern supplies in the west what the Grand Trunk did not have, and a proper co-ordination and consolidation of the two carefully made ought to give us a system that will be able to compete, on something like even terms, with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

There is another point which has not been brought out. It seems to be the impression throughout Canada, in the press and in the House, that the whole purpose of public railway operation is the making of profit—financial profit. That is not the purpose of public ownership at all. The primary purpose of public ownership is to give service to the people and to give it at cost. I frankly admit that it would be bad business to operate the national railways with a view only to give service, having no regard at all as to whether the railways would carry themselves or not. But, primarily, the object of public ownership is to give service to the people, and the primary object of private ownership is to make profit, and service on a privately operated railway line is merely a secondary matter and a means to an end.

It is extremely regrettable that the test of public ownership, or public operation of railroads, comes at a most inauspicious time and under the most unfavourable circumstances. The Government was forced to take over these roads. They were taken over by a government that was not in sympathy with the principle of public ownership, although the Acting Prime Minister, Sir Thomas White, tried to make a virtue of necessity, and declared that his party was the party of public ownership. However, that claim was dropped very soon afterwards, and has not been repeated by any government since. A

parliament which did not believe in the principle was forced to take it over, and we were forced to make the test of public ownership under conditions which made financial success almost impossible for a good many years to come. Thus public ownership is charged by its foes with losses for which it is not logically responsible. Thus also an ideal situation was created for the opponents of the principle, and if they had had the selecting of the battle ground on which to fight their foes, they could not have chosen any better ground than the one upon which they stand to-day. Here was public ownership making headway day by day, in many parts of Canada. Municipalities were making a success of managing their public utilities in various parts of the country. Hydro had been a success. Labour was asking that the principle be applied much further than had ever been done before. It asked that it be applied to all the great public services upon which the convenience and the prosperity of the great mass of the people depend, such as telephones, telegraphs, control of water powers and other great natural resources. That feeling was making progress throughout Canada. Then providentially for the purpose of those who are opposed to public ownership, a situation was created which lent itself to the discrediting of the hated principle. What, then, was more easy, or natural, or misleading, than to frame the syllogism, with its false conclusions, that certain railways were losing money, that these railways were publicly owned and publicly controlled, and, therefore, that public ownership was responsible for the loss and would always result in failure. I say that public ownership up to this time in the national railway field has never had a fair chance. I want to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) for his courage, during the election campaign when he made the statement that the national railways shall be given a fair trial, which statement has since translated into government policy. I also congratulate the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) because of his pronouncements in that regard. But a fair trial means good management free from politics and the consolidation of the railways at as early a moment as possible. It means also retaining the confidence of the people of Canada in the sincerity of the Government as to its declared railway policy. That is absolutely essential. I believe in the sincerity of the Government,

[Mr. Euler.]

but I say that it becomes the duty of the Government, and of its followers, if we are to give public ownership and operation of the railways a fair trial, to do nothing that may create distrust in the minds of the people. That is why I deprecate the criticism from this side of the House.

The national railways have one tremendous advantage over any private railway; it has been referred to very seldom, and I do not know that anyone has spoken of it in this debate. If the people themselves have confidence in the government and in the management of the road, they will take a pride in what is their own and patronize it. It will be the duty of the board which is to be appointed in due course to cultivate that feeling, and to educate the people to the desirability and the necessity of patronizing that which belongs to them. I would say that it makes a very strong combination when you impress upon the public that in supporting their own railways, they are also serving their own financial interests. I venture to suggest that even to-day privately owned railway systems are not quite so sure as they were that the National Railways are not going to be a success and are already feeling the competition which greater efficiency has brought. For example, we have an excellent passenger service between Toronto and Ottawa. It is only two or three years ago when, if a man desired to obtain a lower berth on the Canadian Pacific, he had to reserve it two or three days ahead, whereas he could always get a lower berth on the National Railways right up to the last moment. That condition of affairs is pretty well reversed, and it is because the National Railways are giving service. It is also because the people are beginning to think they ought to patronize that which belongs to them. In this, I reflect in no way upon the service given by the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is excellent.

I have not gone into figures nor into details, because I do not think it is necessary to do so. The question is largely one of principle. I, for one, believe that the people of Canada have, in themselves, the genius, patriotism and self-sacrifice, if necessary, to succeed in the great work to which they have put their hands. But it will be a very difficult fight, if this Parliament or its members are the cause of any doubt arising in the mind of the people as to our sincerity in our efforts to give public ownership a fair chance. Let those who believe in the principle say so in this House

and elsewhere and let those who cannot say so, await results, meanwhile doing nothing to prejudice the great experiment. I believe, if we do that honestly, the time will come —and it is not so very far distant—when Canadians will say that the nationalisation of these great roads was in the interest of the people of Canada.

Mr. WILLIAM IRVINE (East Calgary): I do not rise to oppose the estimate and, therefore, I shall not take up much of the time of this committee. It has been rather surprising that the discussion on this estimate has centred largely around the principle of government ownership. I am unable to see the relevancy of the discussion inasmuch as we have government ownership of railways now, and the estimate, I presume, is to continue their operation. I do not, of course, profess to be a man schooled in the strategy of politics; but I would hazard the opinion that hon. members on the government side who have spoken against public ownership, have been compromising their party, for, if government ownership is a failure, it will be said, no doubt, that it could not be anything else when run by a government that did not believe in public ownership. If it be a success, that will be proof that their judgment was bad. It might be well just to "wait a wee," as the Scotchman says, before you come to your conclusions. Hon. members opposite, however, do not need any advice from me along that line. It is, of course, reasonable to suppose that when a government is opposed to a principle, it will make a bad job of administration. That is not always true; as a matter of fact the Liberal party has traditionally been opposed to tariffs, and yet it has made an excellent job of administering tariffs. It has done it equally as well as the Conservative party has done. While a number of Government supporters may be opposed to the principle of public or government ownership, I have no doubt the Liberal party will make, perhaps, as good a job of administering government-owned railways as it will do in administering a tariff, and if it does that, we shall be perfectly satisfied with the result.

Government ownership of railways may not be the solution that we are looking for; but hon. gentlemen who have spoken against it ought to be fair and admit the fact that the taking over of the Canadian Northern was not merely because the government of the day believed in government ownership, but because of the necessity brought about by a government subsidized line on the verge of bankruptcy and when hon. members of the present Government criticise the action of the former government in this regard, they have failed to tell us what should have been done under the circumstances. Would they have subsidized the railway further, or would they have sold it out for a song to a private company and given one railway company a monopoly of the railway business of the country? Or, what would they have done? I think we can safely leave that question aside and deal with the fact that we have at the present moment a government-owned railway, and that the job is to run it. It has been demonstrated that private ownership of that road was a failure. If it be heresy, as my hon. friend (Mr. Euler) remarked, to say that the failure of the Grand Trunk was a blessing in disguise, it could not be any more than heresy to hope for the failure of the Canadian Pacific also that we might have another and a larger blessing in disguise. That would help us to consolidate further and to have a real government-owned system of railways in Canada. I doubt very much whether we can hope for complete success of government-owned railways in this country while they are being run in competition with a large company that has been subsidized also from the public treasury. Therefore, I hope that, some day, instead of speaking against government ownership of a part of our Canadian lines, hon. members of this House will be advocating government ownership of all the lines in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Never.

Mr. IRVINE: An hon. gentleman opposite says: "Never." It is very easy to say that, of course, but it does not get him anywhere. The same could have been said of a thousand things that are to-day in practice. I presume the same hon. gentleman would have said: We shall never be able to fly in the air; but we are doing so now, and what he is "nevering" about now will be in vogue soon.

I have a suggestion or two to make, and I think I can say before six o'clock what I want to say. If co-operation be necessary to the success of business, it is, perhaps, more necessary on government railways than anywhere else. I believe that it will contribute largely to the success of the enterprise if the highest possible degree of co-operation can be secured along the whole line of administering that business. I am glad to think that the Prime Minister

(Mr. Mackenzie King) has gone on record in his book on "Industry and Humanity" for the principle of co-operation in running large public utilities; that is, that there should be co-operation between the public, the owners and the workers engaged in the industry. I would like to suggest very briefly that the present Government, in the operation of the Canadian National Railways, should adhere to that principle and that the great masses of the people who are engaged in running the railways, should have their quota of representation on the railway board in order that the highest possible degree of co-operation may be secured in the enterprise.

Furthermore, I should like to point out to the Government—it is not, of course, necessary to do so, because they know it better than I do—that one of the largest items in the deficit on our government railways is for interest charges. I believe I am right in saying that. I think the interest for last year amounted to somewhere in the neighbourhood of $17,000,000. Allowing, on the capital expenditure of over $471,000,000, 3½ per cent interest, we shall have approximately $17,000,000. Now, with a running tap of that nature it is not likely that we are going to be able to keep the reservoir full, and I urge that the Government take into consideration the possibility of turning the tap off. I have asked on previous occasions, and I ask again, is it possible for the Government to finance its own railways, financed for and by the Government in such a way as to eliminate interest? I would advise them to make the experiment along this line, and if it prove successful in this particular instance it may be possible to apply it to all other government operations and ultimately make it the national policy to finance every industry in Canada.

Now, it is six o'clock, and although I should like to say some other things I do not wish to detain the committee. I shall therefore sum up my remarks by saying that we need, first of all, co-operation in this great enterprise, among all the people working on it, as well as on the part of the representatives of the public and the Government, and I ask that the Government appoint a representative of labour, not only on the railway board of directors, but on the Board of Railway Commissioners. I would also emphasize the necessity of investigating the possibility of securing our own loans for the National Railways from our own treasury and thereby save interest to the people of Canada.

[Mr. Irvine.]

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The member for South Renfrew (Mr. Low) asked a question yesterday with reference to the deficit of last year. I could not answer him at the time, as the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) had the floor. I have had a statement prepared which I desire to place on Hansard:

The total deficit for the year 1921 on the Canadian National amalgamated system, which includes the Grand Trunk System (including the Central Vermont), and the Canadian National Railways, (including the Canadian Northern Railway, Canadian Government Railways and the Grand Trunk Pacific), was $72,662,278.16. This includes the fixed charges due the public and also the fixed charges due the Government, but does not include any interest on the capital cost of the Canadian Government Railways, which includes the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to Sydney, Halifax and St. John, and all branches, including the Prince Edward Island Railway, nor on the Transcontinental Railway from Winnipeg to Moncton, nor the Hudson Bay Railway.

Mr. MEIGHEN: What is the corresponding figure for the year before?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The corresponding figure for 1920 was $74,378,318.80.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of the $72,000,000 odd referred to in the statement just read by the minister represents interest?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): The fixed charges, other than government, were $40,453,509.49; the fixed charges, government, were $19,569,989.79.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess

The committee resumed at eight o'clock

Mr. A. J. Lewis (Swift Current): I do not wish to enter into a lengthy discussion of the railway situation, but as the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Euler) said before recess that he thought every member of the House who was in favour of public ownership should get on his feet and say so, I wish to state that so far as I am able to interpret the wishes of the people whom I represent, they are in favour of public ownership. I shall not go into any argument in regard to public ownership, because I understand that the policy of the Liberal party is public ownership of our

railways for the time being; at least, they are willing to give it a fair trial. The party to the right of me have also expressed their desire for public ownership, and I believe the same is true of the Progressive party. It seems to me, therefore, that this item is a very important one, because public ownership to-day is being weighed in the balance of public opinion, and in order that that public opinion may be favourable to public ownership it is well for the Government to take into consideration the very best means under which it can be made a success.

I wish to congratulate the minister upon the very favourable and optimistic outlook which, in bringing down his report, he displayed in regard to public ownership. It is gratifying to know that public ownership is being favourably received by the minister and also by the people at large, and that, carrying out the suggestion contained in the Speech from the Throne, the Government intend to co-ordinate the great railway systems which are nationally owned in Canada. It seems to me, Sir, that there are certain ways in which public ownership can be made to pay. First, there is co-ordination, and I understand that this is to be put into effect as rapidly as possible by the Government. I believe, like former speakers, that men can be found in Canada who are willing to give of their best advice and service to make public ownership pay. The men who run our great provincial universities are able to make them successful, and they also make them pay; and I see no reason why the same thing cannot be done in respect to our great nationally-owned railways. Of course, there is this difference between publicly-owned and privately-owned railways: those which are privately-owned take into consideration not only the question of service, but also the question of revenue with a view to paying dividends. It may be a long time before the Canadian National Railways pay a dividend, if they ever do; but if the quality of service which they render to the Canadian people is satisfactory, then the question of dividends is not a matter for consideration. It is not the hope that the nationally-owned railways will pay dividends; if they can come out even in the years to come, rates will be satisfactorily reduced until the cost of upkeep and general maintenance is at a minimum.

Not only must we have co-ordination of the systems included in our National Railways, but we must place them on a sound business basis. The railways should be taken altogether out of politics. That is one reason why I favour public ownership: because corrupt influences are often exerted in governmental circles as the result of private ownership. When we acquire a railway on behalf of the people; when it belongs to the people and they take an interest in it, it should be removed from the influence of politics and placed on a sound business basis; that is the only way, I believe, in which a nationally owned railway can be made to pay.

But there is more than that. I think the speech of the minister was good all the way through; it was optimistic, and there was a policy involved. But there is one point in the policy which I think is faulty, and that is the lack of any intention to continue to build branch lines. It is a well known fact that if the transcontinental railways that belong to Canada are ever to be made to pay, it will only be in respect of the traffic and business originating and carried on in that part of the system west of the Great Lakes, or west of Winnipeg. The trunk lines are already in existence and we know that alongside of these trunk lines the settlers are, and have been for many years. All the products of the farm are going to those lines and the only way we can bring prosperity to the national lines, is, in a measure, to increase the service. But how are we going to increase the service if we cut off all feeders to the trunk lines? There are various ways in which this matter can be dealt with. One way in which we can increase the service of the transcontinental railways is by increasing the number of people on each side of them. Looking over the statistics of immigration during the last twenty years, I find that 3,428,834 people have come into Canada, but of these, 2,000,000 have remained on this side of the Great Lakes, and only 1,423,538 have settled in the three prairie provinces.

I understand that contiguous to these lines to-day there are over thirty million acres of land not settled, and for that reason we must direct the stream of immigration to the West, so that these people will settle on the farms and increase the productivity of the land, thereby providing more business for the railways. It is only by increased service that we can get an increased revenue for the railways and place them on a paying basis.

I want to say a word or two in regard to the situation in my own constituency. I do not know how far a moral obligation of the former government obligates this one, but only last night I heard the Prime Minister ask of the leader of the Opposition if he when Prime Minister had in any way obligated this Government in regard to the naval question. I am not interested in that question at the moment. What I am interested in is this. Last year the Minister of Railways promised the people in my district that a certain railway extension would be completed. He said to these people: If you will go into that village and build an elevator we will see to it that the line is completed. In order that there may be no doubt whatver I will read what the minister said:

> Hon. Mr. Reid: In speaking to Mr. Hanna about the matter he mentioned that they would lay this ten miles this year for the reason that an elevator would be built, and it was for that purpose the rails would be laid. I am quite satisfied that it is the intention of the Canadian National Railway management to lay the ten miles in quesion, and I feel satisfied from the way Mr. Hanna mentioned it to me that there is no doubt it will be done. Unless something unforeseen should happen it is the intention anyway to lay the rails before that time. The 50,000 tons of new rails which were purchased are now being rolled and sent on to the main line. The rails thus released will go on to the branch lines, and the branch in question is one of those that will be taken up first.

On this promise of the minister the people went into that village—the construction way had already been laid, but not the rails—and the village came into existence and an elevator was built, people put more crops into the ground, and then last year, when the crop was harvested, they had no railway to take it out. At the present time these people are anxiously awaiting the fulfilment of this promise, which was made not only on one occasion, but repeatedly since 1918. It seems to me that if the national railways are ever going to pay, you must build these branch lines in order to serve as feeders to the trunk lines. It is poor economy, in my view, to cut off the branch lines. You cannot do that and reasonably expect the trunk lines to pay.

In looking over this item of $42,000,000 which is to be expended on this road, I find that only a very small amount is to be devoted to construction, namely, $1,286,164. This to me seems a very small amount, and I do believe that it would be in the interests of this great system to send out small feeders into the country to encourage the farmers—the wheat growers and the dairymen—to put more seed into the land and intensify their farming, and thus provide a greater volume of business for the railways that are on our hands at the present time. That would be real economy, and it would result in a larger share of business for the national railways, and in the sum total be the means of making them pay.

I trust that in the near future when these roads are co-ordinated, the men in charge will look into this aspect of the question and see to it that small branch lines, not very extensive ones, but lines that will reach to the people and bring business to the main line are built. Such a policy will produce a revenue that will probably put the railways on a paying basis.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's P.E.I.): The speeches that have been delivered to-day have been very interesting, perhaps instructive, but very largely academic. The speakers appear to have overlooked some facts which, if recognized, might perhaps have made the speeches shorter.

The first fact is that the country finds itself to-day the owner and possessor of about 22,000 miles of railway. The second fact is that the Government finds itself obliged to take over these railways. The third fact is that the Government has announced its policy to own and operate these railways, and to give that policy a fair trial. The fourth fact, I think, is that a large majority of the members of this House are prepared to support the policy of the Government. I think that the members of this House have sufficient information at the present time to enable them to give an intelligent vote on this question. I further think that a majority of the people of this country are prepared to support the Government's policy, and that those of them who take an interest in the question are fairly well informed. Therefore, I think that further speeches would not give much information, and I would respectfully suggest that under these circumstances we cut out any more speeches, proceed to business, pass the estimate, and advance towards the end of the session

Hon. J. A. STEWART (Lanark): I shall try as far as possible to follow the advice, with which I do not quarrel very much, of the hon. member for King's, but there are just one or two matters to which I desire to make reference.

In the first place, I agree with the last speaker that a number at least of the addresses to which we have listened this afternoon have been academic discussions of the question of public versus private ownership. I do not propose to follow the hon. member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), or the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) through their discussion for and against public ownership and government operation of railways. I do desire to say this, however, that it is gratifying to the party who sit in this end of the House, and who represent what is here to-day of the late government, to find that all parties in the House to-day are endorsing the policy of railway management which was inaugurated by the government which was in power up to the 6th of December last. Both from those who favour government ownership and operation, and those who are opposed to that policy and favour private ownership, and who sit upon the government side of the House, we have the assurance that it is their wish that government ownership as at present carried on by the present Government, and by its predecessor, shall be given a fair trial.

It does seem to me, however, that it would be consistent, at least, for some of these gentlemen to explain to the House when they became convinced that the present system was the best system in the interests of Canada at the present time. It is a fact that up to the 6th of last December, when all the information that we now have was available to men in public life, there was no feature in connection with the policy of the late government which was more severely and intensely denounced and repudiated by its opponents than its railway policy. However, I am not going to attempt to follow hon. gentlemen opposite through their various stages to their present position on that question. Nevertheless, it does seem to me that it would be desirable for the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) to confer with the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) and the member for St. James (Mr. Rinfret), and possibly with the Minister of Justice (Sir Lomer Gouin), and that these gentlemen should try and reconcile their positions upon this great question.

I want to say this: That so far as the policy of the late government—which is the policy of the present Government in connection with the management of the National Railways—goes, that policy was arrived at without any question of public or private ownership; it was arrived at by reason of the fact that the late government was forced to provide for the management of these railways which were practically left on its door-step. I do not think that it matters very much who was to blame for that. The question as to whether the Liberal party or the old Liberal-Conservative party was responsible for Canada's railway problem has been a fruitful matter for political discussion for many years. It has been threshed out in past parliaments and in past elections, until it is possibly a threadbare matter for political discussion to-day. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the late government was forced to solve the question of handling the railways which became national property during the war; and I do not think there is any real opinion in Canada to-day that will question the wisdom of that policy at the time it was arrived at by the late government. In that connection let me refer for a moment to what the member for St. James said with reference to the subsidies which have been paid out to the old Canadian Northern system. He divided the periods during which subsidies were given into the period prior to 1911, and the period since and showed, of necessity, that a very large proportion of the amount which had been paid in subsidies and in cash advances to the Canadian Northern was paid over to them subsequently to 1911. No one will dispute that, but why were these subsidies paid? The reason is very clearly set out in the address of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier on May 13, 1914 when, in discussing the Canadian Northern loan, which was then before the House, he made this statement:

> In 1899, or thereabouts, after we came into office we asked Parliament to give them assistance to extend the railway system then in existence in Manitoba eastward to the end of Lake Superior. If I remember rightly we gave them a cash subsidy of $6,400 a mile for that length of railway. Later in 1903 we induced parliament to give them a guarantee of $13,000 a mile for a line of railway running through Manitoba to the city of Edmonton. Afterwards, in 1908, we asked Parliament to give them another guarantee of bonds to provide for several branch lines which would be feeders of the line in the prairie provinces. In 1911, as has been explained by my right hon. friend, it was considered that the system would not be complete unless it were extended eastward to tthe St. Lawrence and eventually to the maritime provinces, that is to say unless it was made a transcontinental railway, and in that year we asked Parliament to give to the enter-

prise from Port Arthur to Montreal a guarantee of bonds to the extent of $25,000 a mile. After the new government came into office they took up the policy which we inaugurated. In 1912 Parliament was asked to assist a line from St. Albert to the limits of the province of British Columbia, a distance of 115 miles, with a subsidy of $35,000 a mile.

My hon. friend from St. James is entirely correct when he states that large sums were paid in subsidies to the Canadian Northern system subsequent to 1911, but these subsidies were paid in pursuance of obligations and commitments made by the government prior to 1911. I am not quarrelling with the wisdom of that policy, but what I object to is that an attempt should be made to show that these payments were made as a result of the action of the government which came into power in 1911.

What was the policy of the late government with reference to the management of the Canadian National Railways, and after all that is the question that goes to the very root of the matter? When the late government was forced to provide a system for the control and management of the railways which became its property a system was adopted which has recommended itself to the present Government, and which meets with the approval of hon. gentlemen to the left, and it was this: To provide for the control of these railways, for the management of the system, by an independent board freed entirely from political control, and I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that it is only by carrying out that policy that there can be any future for the National system. The management must be free from political control.

In the report which the Minister of Railways presented to the House on April 11, for the calendar year 1921, there was a very full statement given of the operations of the National lines, and I would like to draw attention to this fact: That report covered the railway operations for a period during the whole of which, with the exception of two days, the late government was in power, and it is a matter of satisfaction to those who were associated with the late administration to know that in the report there was not one word of criticism of anything that the previous government had done in connection with railway operation. The very greatest compliment that could be paid to the late government in connection with the operation of these railways is to be found in the fact that no report ever presented to this House dealing with the work of any public department has met with more general approval than the report brought down on April 11. There has not been one word of criticism of that report in this House; nothing but the warmest words of commendation have been heard. Similar commendation has appeared in the press of the country irrespective of political alignment, and I say that speaks as strongly as anything possibly could for the policy of the late government. Furthermore the policy adopted by the late government for the management of the National Railways providing for a unified board was crystallized into law and is on the statute books of Canada to-day, and that policy we are assured by the present Minister of Railways will be carried out.

I am not going to further discuss the general railway policy but I do want to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for St. Antoine yesterday.

I have no desire to introduce again the discussion with reference to the advance purchases of supplies made under the provisions of the Order in Council of 6th October, 1921, but I want to say that my hon. friend from St. Antoine has confused the issue, I think, in the minds of the public, and I think he is possibly confused himself, if I read his statements in Hansard aright as to the part the government played with reference to the ordering of supplies. I refer to it again for this reason: that the point raised by the hon. member from St. Antoine strikes at the very root of the whole system of government operation or control of the National system. If political considerations are to influence the board of management of the National system, then I agree with my hon. friend from St. Antoine that it would be a most dangerous thing for the future of the system. I know of nothing more dangerous than that the board in control of our National Railways should in any way be influenced by political considerations in their administration. If we reach the time when they are influenced and affected by political considerations we will have struck a blow from which it would be impossible to recover.

Reference has been made so often to the Order in Council of the 6th October, and the Order in Council of the 13th August that, it seems to me, these documents should be read into the record, in order that it may be complete, and I propose to place in the record, first the Order in Council of the 13th August, 1921, which is known as Order No. 2861, and reads as follows:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 9th August,

1921, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, representing that, by an Order in Council of the 21st of April, 1921, (P.C. 1403) authority was given for the ordering by the management of the Canadian National Railways from the Algoma Steel Corporation, of 50,000 gross tons of 85-pound steel rails at $55 a ton, f.o.b. Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., and from the Dominion Iron and Steel Company, of 20,000 gross tons of 85-pound steel rails, f.o.b. Sydney, N.S., at the same price.

Of the 50,000 tons ordered from the Algoma Steel Corporation, approximately 39,000 tons have been delivered to date, leaving a balance of 11,000 tons which may not be required this year. The Algoma Steel Corporation suggest that this balance be rolled and put in stock, to be shipped out when required, any tonnage accepted before the end of the present year to be paid for at the above mentioned price, and the tonnage held over to be delivered at the price which may be agreed upon for rails for early spring delivery next year. In connection with this suggestion, and also with reference to the requirements for next year, Mr. D. B. Hanna, president of the Canadian National Railways, advises, as follows:

"The present probabilities are that we will not require more rails this year, but it would be quite in order, as a matter of convenience to the Steel Corporation, to roll the balance (approximately eleven thousand tons) at their convenience, subject to a price to be fixed for next year's requirements, such price not to exceed the price quoted to other Canadian railways.

"The outlook for employment next winter is not satisfactory at present, and I would suggest for your consideration the passing of an Order in Council, authorizing us to place a contract at an early date for forty thousand tons of rails (which is in addition to the eleven thousand tons referred to) for winter rolling, as we will require the tonnage, and if we can indicate to Mr. Franz that the rails will be required, it will enable him to take in sufficient raw materials in the shape of coal and iron ore before navigation closes, and thus permit him to give us a substantially lower price per ton than present year's prices."

The Minister, on the advice of the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, recommends that authority be given for carrying out the suggestions of Mr. Hanna with reference to the said balance of 11,000 tons of rails remaining undelivered this year, and to the quantity of 40,000 tons required next year; the price to be paid for the 40,000 tons to be agreed upon, but not to exceed lowest prices paid by other Canadian railways, and payments to be made as deliveries taken.

The committee advise that the requisite authority be granted accordingly.

That is the Order in Council passed on the 13th day of August, 1921, and it agrees as to date with the statement of the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) as to unemployment, made in the early stage of this debate. On the 13th August, before there was any question of an election, or any statement or thought as to the dissolution of the House, the question of unemployment was raised in the communication of the President of the Canadian National Board to the Minister of Railways as set out in the Order in Council itself.

In order that we may follow as to date, let me read to the House, next, a letter, dated 13th September, 1921, from the President of the Canadian National Board to the Minister of Railways of that date. The letter is dated Toronto, September 13th, 1921, and reads:

TORONTO, ONT., September, 1921.

My dear Doctor,—

Referring to conversation regarding repairs to Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian National freight cars.

In the early months of the year indications pointed to a substantial recession in freight traffic, and to meet this condition we made a substantial reduction in our forces over the entire System and at all important divisional points in the hours of labour of such men we carried on the pay rolls. The effect of this in our repair work was very noticeable. We side-tracked a very large number of freight cars, until at the present time we have approximately 8,000 cars waiting repairs. Of this number, either in partial service or side-tracked on repair tracks, there are not less than 2,000 Grand Trunk Pacific cars. Many of these cars have been out of service for a period of time before we had anything to do with the management of that Company, and having regard to the fact that most of the Grand Trunk Pacific equipment has been in service around fifteen years, it follows that a large number have yet to be repaired, or rather rebuilt. This leaves approximately 6,000 National System cars in bad order. It is estimated that 3,000 of these require more or less heavy repairs, and the work to be done on the balance of 3,000 is of a minor nature or what is called running repairs, and will be restored to service by our own shopmen.

It occurs to me, in view of wide spread unemployment, that the car plants of the different operating companies are, in respect of some of them at all events, closed down; that in all probability the Dominion Government will be called upon this fall and winter to help out the situation with cash contributions to an unemployment fund, it might be a good move to distribute to these plants sufficient cars requiring heavy repairs (having regard to their daily output) to keep the companies going during the winter and into the early spring months, with the hope that conditions will have improved by that time to take up much of the unemployed forces.

The following plants, I am advised, are and have been closed down for some months:—

Fort William plant,
Eastern Car Company's plant, New Glasgow,
Amherst plant,

and the following plants partly under operation:

National plant, Hamilton,
Canadian Car and Foundry plant, Montreal.

The need for repairing all of our equipment, including the Grand Trunk Pacific equipment, from a traffic standpoint, is not a vital one, as we are with our own organization able to keep up our ordinary running repairs. But it does seem to me, if the unemployment situation can be to some extent relieved as suggested in this letter, we should be authorized to

make arrangements to put as much of our equipment as possible into good repair, even though, because of trade conditions, many of these cars are, after being repaired, side-tracked waiting for loads. In other words, instead of handing out contributions to an unemployment fund, it would be much better to use the funds proposed to be expended in that connection and authorize us to negotiate with the car plants to do repair work for the National System.

Please let me hear from you.

Mr. CAHILL: Whom is that letter from?

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): As I stated when I read it, it is a letter addressed by the President of the Canadian National board, Mr. Hanna, to the Minister of Railways at that date.

Nothing further, so far as my knowledge goes, occurred until the 6th of October, 1921, when the following Order in Council was passed:

P.C. 3800—

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated 4th October, 1921, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, stating that, in his capacity as Minister of Railways, he has discussed with the Canadian National management, and with the chief executives of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the question of unemployment in its relation to the railways now under Government control and operation.

Serious consideration has been given to the possibility of the National railways (including the Grand Trunk) so anticipating their requirements as to permit the placing in the immediate future of next year's orders for rails and accessories, and for the rebuilding and repair of freight equipment, in order that present unemployment may be relieved, and work provided during the winter months.

Under normal conditions, it is the practice to place such orders during the early spring months, and to confine rebuilding and repair work, as far as possible, to system shops. The minister believes that, in view of the present abnormal industrial situation, the usual practice might well be varied to the extent of placing, at an early date, next year's orders for rails and accessories, and, in addition to repair work now being done in railway shops, by arranging with the various equipment companies throughout Canada to participate in the rebuilding and repair of freight equipment.

In doing so, however, it is only fair to the railways, that expenditures so incurred shall not be considered a charge against the current year's operation or financing, and while the management will make every effort to see that repair work undertaken outside the railway shops is done at fair and reasonable prices, any increased expenditure involved should not be a charge against the railways, but against such financial provision as may from time to time be made by the Government to deal with unemployment.

And in order that there may be no question of considerations other than unemployment influencing the placing of these orders, the minister suggests that the allocation of this business be on the concurrence of the Minister of Labour, whose departmental officials are closely in touch with conditions affecting labour throughout Canada, and whose officials shall co-operate with the officials of the Department of Railways in dealing with this situation so far a it affects the railways under Government control.

In order that the management may have a free hand and that the business may be distributed to best advantage, it is considered advisable that the Order in Council to authorize the purchase of 40,000 tons of rails from the Algoma Steel Corporation for next year's delivery be cancelled, and that such new business as may be given the Algoma Steel Corporation be contingent upon the general situation as it may develop.

The minister, therefore, recommends, on the advice of the deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, that Order in Council of the 13th August, 1921 (P. C. 2861) granting authority to the management to order 40,000 tons of 85 lb. steel rails from the Algoma Steel Corporation for next year's delivery be and hereby is cancelled in so far as it relates to the 40,000 tons in question.

That, having due regard to the unemployment situation, as well as the requirements of the railways, the management of Canadian National Railways and the management of the Grand Trunk railway be authorized to order on next year's account, and not exceeding next year's prices, a maximum of 75,000 tons of rails and necessary accessories, and to arrange for the rebuilding or repair of 2,000 cars at suitable points at fair and reasonable charges, and that the expenditure so incurred be provided for in the Supplementary Estimate to be brought down at the next ensuing session of Parliament.

That in placing orders for the rebuilding and repair of freight equipment, the charges against the railways shall only be the fair and reasonable cost of the same in the company's shops, and that any extra expense involved be a proper charge against unemployment generally and regarded as such.

That in neither case shall expenditures incurred this year in anticipation of next year's requirements be chargeable against current operation or finance.

The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendation and submit the same for approval.

(Sgd) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

In pursuance of this last Order in Council, the cars referred to by the President of the Canadian National Board in his letter of the 13th of September were placed as follows: 500 cars were contracted for with the National plant at Hamilton; 500 with the Canada Car and Foundry plant at Montreal; 500 went to Amherst and 500 to New Glasgow. For the Grand Trunk Pacific, there were 1,000 cars that went to Fort William, and that order was placed and authorized in pursuance of the order appointing the receiver; it was approved by the Exchequer Court of Canada.

The point I desire to make in connection with this, is that the Orders in Council were absolutely necessary in order to enable the board to contract for car repairs, and

to purchase the rails. The board had no authority under the law to proceed, without the authority of the government through an Order in Council. The reason for that is this: Last session Parliament in its estimates provided certain sums for these purposes. As regards the expenditure of the sum authorised in the estimate of last year, the amount could be expended by the board upon the authority of the estimates; but when the question became one of anticipating the requirements of the road and ordering, in the fiscal year 1921-22, rails and car repairs that would naturally fall into the fiscal year 1922-23, it became necessary, for the purpose of financing and preventing the amount being a charge against the fiscal year 1921-22, that an Order in Council should be passed. The point which I desire to make clear if I can is, that as regards any of the items authorised in the Order in Council of the 6th of October, not one dollar's worth went into the operations of the fiscal year 1921-22, as would appear to have been the idea of the hon. member for St. Antoine. Not one dollar of that would operate to improve the financial statement for the past year.

If we admit unemployment and if we admit the wisdom of the late government in anticipating, during the past winter months, the requirements which would be inevitable when we reached April, May and the summer months, then surely no question can be raised as to the wisdom of the late government's policy. If we admit that unemployment existed, if we admit that there was any duty or obligation upon the government to relieve that unemployment, so far as it lay in the power of the government to relieve it, the logic of the late government's position is irresistible.

I wish to refer to one other matter, the point raised as to the great improvement that took place during the four months of August, September, October and November, 1921, an operating account. I do not think any one ever claimed that the late government was entitled to credit for that. If the claim has been made I have never heard it. The point was answered by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar) last night. It is to be explained by the fact that during these months we reached the peak in grain transportation, and consequently it was a natural result that we should have had an improvement in operation account.

Mr. MITCHELL: Yesterday when I referred to this matter I pointed out that the whole saving of $20,000,000 was in operating expense account, so that the question of increased freight during those months would not affect the statement I submitted to the House.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): I was referring to the point as it arose in the address of my hon. friend from Marquette. He referred particularly to the increase in freight, and I thought that my hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) had done the same. But a review of the financial operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the same four months will reveal that in that period they also showed a substantial increase on operating account. While possibly the late government are not entitled to any credit for the results obtained during those four months, I am sure that my hon. friends opposite must rejoice that the greatly increased proportion of grain that was handled in 1921 played a large part in reducing the operating deficit for the year. I have nothing further to say in connection with this item, and I see no objection to its adoption.

Mr. GOOD: I can say all that I wish to say in less than five minutes, because my views have been very fully expressed by the member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) and the member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). But there are two points which I should like to mention. I was very much surprised yesterday to hear the member for St. Antoine (Mr. Mitchell) declare that he did not believe in the principle of public ownership of public utilities, and I took it that he based his belief upon his experience in the province of Quebec. If I am wrong in that interpretation of his remarks I stand to be corrected; but I would submit that the logic of the inference is decidedly questionable. Granting a break-down in public ownership, there are two causes: either the one assigned by the hon. member, or another one which he did not mention, and that is the lack of public spirit and the disposition on the part of those concerned to regard the public service as a happy hunting-ground for private graft. Of course, public ownership of public utilities will fail and must fail if that is the attitude of the individuals who have to do with them. And there is a very different interpretation which may be put upon the facts as submitted yesterday in that connection, an interpretation which, I think, the hon. member would hardly care to impute to his native province. But public ownership of public utilities need

not fail. It has not failed in thousands of cases, and it will not fail, given a reasonable amount of honesty and public spirit. We are not asking for the application of public ownership to our farms and thousands of other businesses. But in connection with natural monopolies, whether they be municipal, provincial or federal, the conditions, I submit, are such as to render public ownership the wise, the prudent and the right policy.

Now, there has no doubt been a great deal of bungling in the past in regard to our railways, and things have reached a pass which is very regrettable. We have to face the conditions, and I just want in conclusion to deal with one suggestion that has been pressed in this House during the past two days as a solution of these difficulties, and that is, the getting rid of our National Railways. Well, who is going to buy them? There is only one concern in Canada that can take the National Railways off our hands, and that is the Canadian Pacific Railway. And if they did, what would be the result? You would have a practical monopoly of all railway transportation in Canada. In that connection I might refer to an article I read in the Grain Growers' Guide a few years ago in which it was stated that 42 men whose names were given, all but three of them residing in the cities of Montreal and Toronto, through interlocking directorates, had what might be described as a strangle hold on nearly all the manufacturing, transportation and financial interests of this country. Now, if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to absorb our National Railway system, and the Bank of Montreal should continue the absorption of our banks, what a huge octopus we should then have controlling the whole transportation and financial machinery of this country. I say, without casting any aspersions on the gentlemen concerned, that such a condition as that is a menace to democracy in this country, even though the parties who constitute such an enormous corporation might be angels. I wish to declare, and lay down as a principle, altogether apart from the character of the people involved, that this is a state of things which we ought not to permit in this country. And it is a condition of affairs that is apparently in anticipation in certain quarters. That is all I have to say in this connection. I wish to endorse the points of view presented by the member for Marquette and the member for North Waterloo.

[Mr. Good.]

Mr. RYCKMAN: I merely wish to make a short comment and to ask a question or two. This Government has been in power for four and a half months. On the 8th March we were told in the Speech from the Throne that it was the policy of the Government to co-ordinate the railways, thereby effecting economies; and it was stated that that would be done at an early date. Later, on the 11th of April, this declaration was emphasized in
9 p.m. the very excellent remarks which were made by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy). I have been informed upon what I consider reliable authority that the consolidation of the government owned roads would save to this country at least $50,000 a day. My information is that the estimate is even larger. Now, while I am always anxious to be on the safe side, yet if I had the choice of $50,000 a day on one hand, and, on the other, the unknown figure, I would choose the latter, because I am certain that the consolidation of the railways would effect a greater saving than $50,000 a day. That amount in less than twenty days would equal all that was paid during the last fiscal year by way of duty on agricultural implements coming into Canada. In less than twenty days—to make the matter personal—it would pay the indemnities of all the members of this House. In fourteen days it would pay the amount that the Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) struck off his estimates and which we wish was still there. There is no doubt that every succeeding sun finds a loss settled upon this country, a loss that cannot be recovered. Nor can we make up at the other end what we are losing now; it is absolutely dead loss.

Now, I think if this were a business proposition it would be tackled by a board of directors—business men—and some solution would long ago have been arrived at. By the way, I was told—and if it were not for this evidence to the contrary, I would be inclined to believe it—that the Minister of Railways was a strong, silent, business man. If he is not, there ought to be other men in the Cabinet who would take this matter into consideration and decide upon it. I am not one who believes that no one can be got in Canada to take up this important problem and settle it in a business way. I am satisfied that if it were committed to Mr. D. B. Hanna or to Mr. Mitchell, they could help us very much. At all events, there are business men in this country who, if they had to deal with this proposition,

would take it in hand at once; they would not permit loss to succeed loss as the days go on. Why, some hon. members of the House have been able to tell the minister how they would effect pronounced economies if they were asked to take the matter in hand. Surely something will be done long before the House prorogues to bring about what is so much desired by everybody. I would ask the minister then, if he can say that my estimate of the saving which would be effected by the consolidation which he has promised is incorrect. If not correct, can he give me the estimate that he has? Finally, and most important, when is this thing going to be done in a business way?

Mr. KENNEDY Essex: I am not in a position to verify the statement that my hon friend (Mr. Ryckman) has given the committee as to what might be saved in the event of immediate consolidation, nor am I in a position to give, to a dollar, the saving that would thus be brought about. But I may say that having in view the annual expenditure involved—which, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Crerar) said yesterday, amounts to over $330,000,000—perhaps we are justified in going slowly and carefully, in taking our time to see that the men who are placed in charge of this undertaking are men who will carry it to a successful conclusion. I may say that an example was set in this regard by the government which my hon. friend supported in the last election. They appointed their directors in May, 1921, and in their wisdom they decided to go slowly in the matter of consolidation. I think, perhaps, they were right. So far as the Government is concerned, we are going to bring about coordination as quickly as we can.

Mr. EVANS: I have listened with some interest to the discussion of this important question. I look upon it as the greatest problem that faces the Government and the people to-day. Our attention is forcibly directed to the deficit we have to face. In order to enable the railways to pay their way, we have repeatedly raised the freight rates—to such an extent, in fact, that it is like the tariff for revenue; the higher the tariff, the less revenue we get. It is evident that the present rates do not permit the commerce of the country to move freely. I do not think there is any need of engaging experts, either from the United States or from Europe, as has been suggested, to tell us how we shall run our roads. But to the casual observer there seem to be several ways in which improvements could be made.

I believe there are many leaks at present, and these are apparent even to those who are not very well acquainted with railway matters. I will mention one or two. One is the expensive duplication of service over the lines in western Canada, and, I think, as well in eastern Canada. For instance, we have two lines west of Saskatoon running so close together for one hundred miles that you could hand a message from one train to the other. As if that incongruity were not complete in itself, express trains on both lines—on the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific,—run the same way at exactly the same time each day; service to the public is not considered at all. That has been going on for several months, and if attention is called to the matter we are told that a change cannot be made.

We have to evolve some method that will give the railway employees the proper viewpoint; that will bring them to realize that they are part owners, with the rest of the people of this country, of our national system. This may apply to the operators, engineers—yes, all the way down, even to the switchmen and sectionmen. Something should be done to give them the idea that the railways belong to them as well as to the rest of the people. It would be interesting to know what loss occurs annually in transit, due to breakages; for I believe that that loss could largely be prevented. I have no doubt the minister will give us that information before the discussion closes. In fact, I have even thought, Sir, that it may become necessary in some way to bonus the railway employees according to the length and quality of their service. Something will have to be done to offset this great waste.

It would be very interesting to know what the travelling expenses of certain officials over these lines are, their purpose in travelling, and whether such travel is really necessary. The hon. member for St. Antoine has said he did not believe in government ownership. Therefore, I take it he is not an unprejudiced observer of the government operation of railways. The fact remains that there is quite a suspicion in these days that those who have had the directing of these railways have not approached their task with a single eye to the successful operation

of a government owned and operated system. We must realize that we have these railways on our hands, and although perhaps we do not want them under our ownership all at once, there is nothing for it now but for the Government to make the best of it. At this time we need at the head of the railways men who believe in the system they are trying to run, who believe in government ownership, and have faith in their own ability.

We are always being reminded that the Canadian Pacific is a tremendous success, both as to service and profits. I myself am not so sure of that, in view of what it has cost the Canadian people to establish that great system. I think it is worth while to ask, when considering this question, what we have paid for the Canadian Pacific Railway. No great corporation was formed and built this system for the benefit of the people particularly, but this country has given to that company in money grants, cash subsidies, finished railways and lands, amounting, if we take a fair average valuation of the land, to a gift at the expense of the people of this country of nearly $40,000 for every mile the Canadian Pacific owns and operates today. These figures were staggering to me when I first worked them out. Furthermore, the Canadian Pacific have always been the first to set the cost of service, and they have set it high enough to cover the cost of paying a dividend of 10 per cent yearly, and do some melon-cutting among themselves. In fact, I think some people have come to think that this country was developed for the sake of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But at last even this great company, I think, has come to realize that we have in the National Railways a system that is able to compete with them, and I am glad the minister has given it out as his policy that everything is to be done to give government ownership and operation a chance to succeed.

As far as the West is concerned, I know that the people there are proud of their national system, and that they will cooperate with the minister and with the directors of the road with a view to making this great system a success. But one thing they do ask of the minister and of the management, and that is that to the responsible positions in the system only men who believe in government ownership be appointed.

I think another factor that would help towards making the National Railways pay is a system of feeders. There are many parts of the West to-day without railways, where settlers who went in many years ago expecting a railway are still without transportation facilities. In the prairie provinces some of these roads were projected and even surveyed while they were still under the control of the provincial governments, but these charters have been allowed to lapse. The Canadian Pacific have surveyed lines and obtained charters in certain parts of the country with the idea, I believe, of heading off the Canadian National system, and the settlers there are still without transportation facilities to market their produce. These charters were allowed to lapse and to-day the Canadian Pacific is seeking for the second time that I know of, to renew them. I hope the management of the Canadian National Railways will see to it that duplication, as far as possible, is eliminated, and that feeders will be built in those districts where they are so much needed at the present time.

Mr. GARDINER: Is any portion of the item of $1,286,000, for construction, to be used for the purpose of laying rails this summer on completed roadbeds?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): No.

Mr. GARDINER: Is any portion of the item of $4,990,000, for betterments, to be used for that purpose?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): No.

Mr. GARDINER: What does the Government propose to do with regard to the bridge over the Red Deer river from Hanna to Medicine Hat? Is that going to be gone on with this year?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I have not the information here, but I shall be glad to get it and give it to my hon. friend at the next meeting of the committee.

Mr. GARDINER: I should like to go a little further into this matter. In western Canada at the present time, the Canadian National Railway have built many miles of roadbed on which at present there are no rails. Some of these roadbeds have been built over two years, and they were built for the purpose of giving the settlers in these various districts the accommodation they required. I understand from the minister that it is not the intention of the Government, or, so far as I know, of the railway officials, to lay rails on these roadbeds during this summer. I would point out to the House that at the

present time the people who live in these remote districts require transportation facilities. The roadbeds have been built in many places, and all that remains is for the steel to be laid. I think that the policy of keeping these people without transportation facilities, merely for the sake of not spending the money for laying the rails, is a policy that cannot be upheld under any circumstances whatever, and I would submit that the officials who are to be appointed to look after the National Railways should take into consideration this very important question at an early date. These roadbeds are deteriorating all the time, and they might just as well be made use of in order to serve the people in those remote districts. Some two or three days ago I received a letter from a man in the constituency I represent who resides alongside a piece of this completed roadbed on which no steel is laid—it is the Hanna-Medicine Hat branch of the Canadian Northern—and he tells me that no matter what the crop conditions are, there are over two hundred Hollander families who intend to pull out of that district unless the steel is laid there this year. They live right alongside the roadbed, and any one who knows the Hollanders as settlers in western Canada knows that they are perhaps the very best settlers we have. They are industrious and mind their own business. They are good farmers and they make very successful settlers. As I stated in this House two or three evenings ago, we have been spending millions of money to get people into this country and yet here are completed roadbeds of railways without steel on them, although by simply putting the steel on these roads we could attract the needed settlers. I maintain that the matter should be looked into and if possible steel should be laid wherever needed without further delay.

Mr. MILLAR: I want to ask the Minister of Railways a question. I am not going to speak on this matter, although I would very much like to do so, because in my constituency there is a short railway very similar to the one just spoken of. In this case also the ties are down, the road bed is built, and the people there are very anxious to have the railway completed and operated at once. If the line cannot be completed in any other way the farmers there would like to undertake the work themselves. Now, as to the question I desire to ask. Men who have travelled round the country considerably, and have had an opportunity of knowing the conditions, tell me they have noticed very careless handling of freight at the freight sheds. During the Easter holidays, to mention a specific case, a man who is a cheese inspector said he was standing at a freight shed and noticed the railway employees turning over a box. He knew what was in the box and the value of its contents, and that it would break if not handled carefully. In a few minutes the box did break and the goods to the value of $12 were utterly destroyed. Folks have told me that they have noticed a great deal of this careless handling and I was just wondering whether the minister could give us any information on the subject. I shall not criticize the department, previous ministers, or anyone else because I realize how difficult it must be to keep tab on men when they are beyond the reach of a foreman, and it is difficult enough when the foreman is standing right over them; but I thought that possibly the minister might have some figures which would give an idea of the extent of the annual loss from this cause. I know the present minister has not been long in office and perhaps it might be difficult for him to give exact details, but even an approximate estimate would serve the purpose.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I feel indebted to the hon. member for bringing this matter to the attention of the committee, a matter which we are all interested in. I have had no report from the railway management in connection with it, or on the subject of breakages particularly, beyond the fact that they state that the breakages on the National Railways are not any more than they are on other lines. Just how much that represents I could not say, but I will bring the statement the hon. gentleman has made to the attention of the management, and I feel perfectly sure they will only be too glad to rectify such conditions if they exist.

Hon. JOHN B. M. BAXTER (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert): I doubt the wisdom of offering any observations owing to the length of time the debate has already lasted and yet, Sir, feeling that in a good many matters that have been discussed I personally differ, in some respects, from what I might call the prevailing opinion I think there is perhaps an obligation on members to express their views. There has not been since this House opened, I think, a better or a more useful debate than the one which

is drawing near a close. It has been marked—I think eminently marked—by the avoidance of all semblance of party struggle, or the desire for party advantage. It is right that it should be so. No greater problem has ever confronted the people of Canada, and it is doubtful whether any problem, at any rate in our generation, will summon the people of Canada to share a greater burden, or call upon them for greater co-operation in thought and in action, than this railway problem which faces us at this time. We can do no possible good by delving into the past and suggesting that it was not quite wise to have constructed large stretches of these railways when they were built and with the assistance which they received. All the talking that we can indulge in here will not turn back one page of history, or put back into the public exchequer one dollar that has already gone.

It is no use discussing the question that has been quite largely debated in this House as to whether government operation or private operation is the better. Nothing that we can do at present, so far as I can see, can take from the representatives of this country the obligation to make the best they can of these roads. We have public ownership. There are some in this Chamber who, like myself, despite the majority of voices we have heard in debate, do not believe that public ownership is accompanied by the same economy or the same efficiency as private ownership. I have seen too much of the waste that is incidental to public management to be easily converted, even by a round of speeches, to a belief in the absolute efficiency and economy of public management. There is, I grant, a wave on in Canada, and perhaps all over the continent, at the present time in favour of public administration. It may be the best thing for our country, but I do not subscribe to the belief that it is the cheapest, the most economical, or necessarily the most efficient system and there is an underlying reason. The private road, or the private utility, or the private company, hires whom it pleases and fires whom it pleases, and does not have to respond to the political dictation of the people whom it employs; and until you can write that out of public ownership you cannot have public ownership as independent and as efficient as private ownership. I do not suppose that I am in very much accord in that belief with many of the members of the group of this House of which I am a member; I do not suppose I am in accord with a single gentleman who sits to the left of this group; I know I am in accord with some of the gentlemen who sit across the Chamber but not all of them. But it is not necessary, it is not worth while, to pursue this subject because we have public ownership and we are bound to make the best of it; and whether I believe it is the best thing or not it is my duty, if I can help in any way to make that public ownership more popular or make it more efficient, to contribute what I can to that end. Perhaps nothing that I can contribute will be of value; but I have one thought in my mind which I wish to express before the debate terminates.

You will pardon me a moment longer, Mr. Chairman, but I want to touch as lightly as I may upon some phases of the discussion, and to ask hon. members to consider how they may appear to the country and how they may appear to other members. We have heard—oh, I will not say much—but we have heard some reference in this House to all private enterprises as if there could not be such a thing as a private company unless it was accompanied by stock gambling, stock watering, graft and mismanagement. Now, as a citizen of Canada, I must say that I do not think that is a fair description of the bulk of our industrial enterprises; I would be very sorry to think so. I do think that the attacks largely come from an unconsidered habit of dealing with questions of this character by which people, more for the sake of oratory and more for the sake of inflaming the public mind, launch into a generalized attack upon every form of capital in the country; and I tell you it is absolutely unwise. In the year when we have to carry a debt as great as we are carrying, when we have to face the making up of a deficit as great as the deficit is, and must be on these railways, what we want to create in this country is confidence in its institutions, confidence in the capacity of this Parliament to find a solution of the problem, and confidence in the great industrial enterprises of Canada to see and to fight their way through this difficult period.

It is not the man who indulges in idle and ill-considered criticism who helps to build up the country. I am not an advocate of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hold no brief for that organization. I do not think I ever received a dollar from them in my life. I do not expect and do not look for it, but in the part of Canada from which I come there is some appreciа-

tion of the great value to Canada of the development of that enterprise which has put Canada on the map of the world. I understand—and I think I am not wrong—that the Canadian Pacific has not been a company of watered stock. It got help, and not large help as we have measured later day subsidies, to put the line of steel across the continent; and in spite of much discouragement and many difficulties it did it. The Canadian Pacific Railway was the work of great master builders of empires, ruthless, possibly, at times, but valiant men, who saw their work and carried it through courageously. It is a work of which Canada may be proud. I know that in the East it does, at least, help one part of Canada, and help it magnificently, by simply doing the work for which it was created, and keeping the Canadian trade within Canadian channels. We can thank that railway for building up, at least, one of the ports within Canada, a doctrine which does not seem to have found very ready acceptance by some hon. members within the Chamber this session, but which I believe, after all, is the real aim of true Canadians who have vision enough to frame a policy for the whole of Canada and not for a section.

I trust that in whatever the minister does there will be no divorce, either by the Senate or by the House of Commons, of the Intercolonial Railway from the whole system of Government railways. Some people may take a partial view of it. The real future of the east is not in separation, but in greater and closer union. The same thing is true of the rest of Canada, and I hope that fact will be realized throughout Canada from end to end. Do not cut us off from the general system. We in the maritime provinces, in Halifax and St. John, give you your winter ports. You can find your summer ports on the Atlantic borders of this country as well. Keep us united with the railway system. Have the whole thing managed by the best brains that can be obtained, but let it be managed as a unit, and not as several distinct organizations, which will or may injure one another. At the same time give us a fair, reasonable and proper share of home rule. Let us have the administration within regions, by which the people in those regions can get more closely in contact with those who can feel the pulse of the business in the community, and shape the course of the railway, so as to bring about the best development in each locality. I am not asking more special privileges but simply what every man asks for, the opportunity of being easily heard, and of having just claims considered without delay, and without too much distance intervening. It was the policy of the late government to have—I will not say insisted—suggested or supported the idea that I believe took shape with the board of management of the railways to divide these railways into groups, or regional sections, where there would be an authority subject to the centre, and yet each authority would be supreme within the region. I believe, from remarks which have been made, that the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) does not intend to depart from that principle. I trust he will not, and in the constituency where my hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) finds a very powerful vote in his support, I think the Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) may advise that the centre of a very great region may be located.

I listened with great attention and much pleasure to the discussion of this matter by the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Crerar). To my mind, he advanced principally two matters for consideration. First he was in agreement with us in the maritime provinces as to the question of regional administration, but he advanced another proposition. He thought that writing off charges against the railway, the funded debt, would give some assistance. I entirely concur with the statement of the hon. member from Brome (Mr. McMaster) that that is simply a question of book-keeping and does not touch the crux of the matter at all. We could get no possible relief from that. I am heartily in accord with my hon. friend from Marquette, when he suggests the colonization of this country along the line of railway. That is a good idea and I trust the Government will make every effort to give us colonization with the right kind of people.

I need not dilate further upon that matter, but I would like to remark that down to the present hour, with the exception of something that was stated a few minutes ago, by, I think, the hon. member from Saskatoon (Mr. Evans) there has not been a hint, a whisper or a suggestion of anything that may be done to ease this problem, or to cut down the tens of millions of dollars of annual deficit. This is not a case where, by merely looking for some petty economy in the running of a private car or something of that kind, we are going to solve the problem. We have to go into bigger matters than that, and I think the member for Saskatoon came pretty near

the idea which I had in mind. Perhaps the idea is worth nothing, but I have confidence that, at least, there is the germ of a policy in it, and, therefore, I desire to present it to the House to-night.

In thinking over the problem I have been much impressed by a remark that was made, either by a gentleman in authority on the National Railways or someone on his behalf, perhaps a year ago, to the effect that the government railways were getting in a position to give the Canadian Pacific Railway a little healthy competition. I can understand a great many people in Canada applauding that remark, and thinking that a new and bright era was going to dawn for Canada, or their particular part of Canada, but, unfortunately, I do not construe that remark in that way. What does a little healthy competition mean when you get down to actual work and to dollars and cents? Commercial competition is commercial war, and commercial war is just as destructive of capital and resources as a war between nations. It may be less destructive in degree, but it is in the same character. What we want is not, I submit, the rivalry of two systems, each fighting the other, each trying to undercut and dislodge the other. What we want is harmonious co-operation between the two great systems for the purpose of giving the people, not the service that the people want—I am not going to use that phrase; I will be a little more careful of my language because I want to speak with a sense of responsibility—not the service the people want, but the service that this country can afford to give them, and that the people can pay for, not a service represented by a deficit, but a service which will produce a return sufficient to meet its cost. You cannot violate that principle without making the condition worse. What do we have? The hon. member for Saskatoon referred to parallelling conditions in the west and he spoke with knowledge and authority. I cannot follow him as to the geography of those roads; but I can invite the attention of this committee to something that, to my mind, is typical of general conditions and will illustrate the idea that I desire to submit for the consideration, not only of the minister, but of the committee as a whole. Travel, if you will, from Ottawa to Montreal; you can do it by three separate lines.

An hon. MEMBER: Four.

Mr. BAXTER: Four if you like. These lines, I will grant you, serve different territory. Two of them are Canadian Pacific lines, one is a Grand Trunk line, and the other a Canadian National. The Canadian Pacific line that terminates in Place Viger station does not provide a rapid train; the Canadian National provides a train that might be classed as fairly rapid, a good through train with all the appointments; the Canadian Pacific short line does the same, and the Grand Trunk does the same. I shall not advocate that anybody living on those routes shall be cut off from the world by the stopping of an entire line of railway; but I say that, if there were just plain, ordinary horse sense in the management of this business, the heads of the Canadian Pacific and the heads of the Canadian National would have talked together and would have arranged for one fast train to bring people who are in a hurry from Montreal to Ottawa or to take them back, instead of triplicating the fast trains. Accommodation trains would be run for the slower local service on each road, because you cannot get away from that without abandoning a road. That is only typical of conditions prevailing in many parts of the country. Hon. members will, perhaps, appreciate why I have asked this committee not to adopt the rather haughty language that impeaches the Canadian Pacific as if that company were a criminal standing at the bar of this House. That, in my judgment, is not the proper attitude to take.

In the army they have what is called a liaison officer, and what we want is something like a liaison committee. The Canadian Pacific will appoint from its directorate or its passenger or freight traffic experts a few men; the Canadian National will do the same, so that they will have equal numbers on such a committee or board or whatever you like to call it. They will bring expert knowledge to bear; they will confer about just such things as I am speaking of in relation to passenger business, and about things that I know nothing of in relation to freight business. The problem will be to advise each railway what can be cut out, what expense can be reduced and how much useful service can still be given to the public without duplication. I think that is the right spirit in which we should proceed. I admit I am not making a suggestion that is going to wipe out the deficit or anything of that kind; but having the idea that co-operation, ordinary conversation, ordinary meeting together to discuss these matters would be of value, I thought I would

take the opportunity of suggesting it to the minister and to the committee on this occasion as one slight contribution towards solving the railway problem.

Other hon. members may have better and more potent ideas than mine; but let us not rehash the question how this difficulty came about; let us make suggestions that will be helpful for the board, and that will cut down to some extent the tens of millions of dollars that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has to find, not for stock-watering, not for capitalists, but to provide for the people of Canada a service at just that much less than cost. If hon. members will visualise the matter in this way; if this country has to raise forty or fifty million dollars to pay the deficit, that money is not going to some bloated bondholder; it is going to give people freight rates lower than they ought to have, passenger rates lower than they ought to have. Until you face the problem in that way and also face the cost of providing the service—I say this in the widest sense—cut where cutting can be done, and get the people paying the cost of the service, a certain class of people are taking something out of the country every year instead of putting something into its exchequer. I cannot see the problem in any other way. The question is a simple one of arithmetic; it is also a question of principle. It is a question of policy, not great policy, not great strategy; it is simply the old homely idea of a man keeping within his income and, if he cannot do that, of finding means by which he will work harder and increase his income so as to catch up with the expenditures which he thinks are necessary.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): We have had two days of very useful and instructive debate, and as regards the Government and the Minister of Railways, I am sure the ideas that have been expressed will all be given due consideration. The fact, however, remains that we have not as yet passed a single item. We have three items, one after the other, that all practically pertain to the matter under discussion. The suggestion which I would make to the committee is that we pass these items and then go on to the next; and at any time while the debate is in progress, or the committee is sitting on the estimates of the Department of Railways and Canals, members of the committee will have an opportunity of discussing the matter again if they see fit.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): Those are the items under which the general discussion of the question most properly comes, and as many members are absent from the House to-night, I should like to have the assurance of the minister that, upon the other items in the estimates, a general discussion of the railway question will be permitted. If that is done, I see no objection upon our part to the three items going through. I understand that the two items that follow this and that provide for the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, have been passed upon by the board and have been approved. In view of that, I have no objection.

Item agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY

Amount not exceeding $25,750,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or any company comprised in the Grand Trunk Railway system or any one or more of them (excluding herefrom however expenditures or indebtedness incurred by or on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company except as specifically provided in item (g) hereof) on any of the following accounts: (a) Operating deficits. (b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies. (c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations. (d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured. (e) Construction and betterments. (f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities. (g) Guarantees by the said Grand Trunk Railway Company of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council, by way of loans in cash or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other. If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, payable half-yearly, secured by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve. If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $25,750,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Item agreed to.

Amount not exceeding $15,900,000 to meet expenditures made or indebtedness incurred (where amounts available from net operating earnings may be insufficient) by or on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or any Company comprised in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system or any one or more of them (excluding herefrom however guaran-

tees by the Grand Trunk Railway Company which are provided for in item (g) of the next preceding item) on any of the following accounts: (a) Operating deficits. (b) Acquisition of property, materials and supplies. (c) Interest and sinking funds on notes, securities or obligations. (d) Principal and interest of maturing or matured loans secured or unsecured. (e) Construction and betterments. (f) Co-ordination or consolidation of railway lines and facilities. The amount herein authorized may be applied from time to time, in the discretion of the Governor in Council, by way of loans in cash or by way of guarantee, or partly one way and partly the other. If by way of loans, the amount or amounts advanced shall be repayable on demand, with interest at the rate fixed by the Governor in Council, payable half-yearly, secured by mortgage or mortgages upon such properties, in such form and containing such terms and conditions, not inconsistent herewith, as the Governor in Council may approve. If by way of guarantee, any such guarantee may be of the principal and interest of the notes and obligations or securities of one or more of the said companies specified by the Governor in Council, and may be signed by the Minister of Finance, on behalf of His Majesty, in such form and on such terms and conditions as the Governor in Council may determine to be appropriate and applicable thereto, $15,900,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Item agreed to.

Hudson Bay Railway—Port Nelson Terminals —$40,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): While I am only too anxious to see the committee proceed, and to assist the minister in getting his estimates passed, I would ask that this item stand, because there are a great many members in this party who would like to speak on this resolution and who are not in the House to-night.

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): I had in mind the fact that many hon. members desire to discuss the Hudson Bay Railway question, and I have therefore, in accordance with the request of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Stewart), reserved item 350, "Canadian Government Railways," on page 65 of the Estimates, for the purpose of allowing the discussion of the Hudson Bay or any other government railway.

Mr. BAXTER: Perhaps it would be better to let the item stand. Speaking for myself and, I think, for the general locality from which I come, we do not
10 p.m. see any reason for spending even $40,000 on this particular railway at the present time, in view of the fact that we have a National Railway equipped to do the work. Why is it needed to spend this money this year?

[Mr. J. A. Stewart.]

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): If hon. members insist I shall be glad to let the item stand. I may explain, however, that this $40,000 is to take care of goods and chattels at Port Nelson belonging to the government.

Mr. BAXTER: Does it represent new construction in any way?

Mr. KENNEDY (Essex): No.

Mr. BAXTER: Then I will not object.

Item agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING: The Minister of Militia (Mr. Graham) was to have taken up his estimates. He is not here, and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Murdock) will proceed.

LABOUR

Labour—Unemployment relief, $100,000.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): When we came to this item some weeks ago the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) requested, because of the lateness of the hour, consideration of it be deferred for a while. I do not know whether he still desires to discuss the matter.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps the minister could take up another item. I know that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre is anxious to discuss this item but he is not present.

Item stands.

Miscellaneous—Printing Bureau—Plant, repairs and renewals, $30,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): How is the increase of $10,000 accounted for?

Mr. MURDOCK: It is to provide for one monotype and two monotype casting machines. This is additional equipment for the purpose of reducing the overtime period.

Item agreed to.

Printing Bureau—plant, new, $67,100.

Mr. STEWART (Lanark): What is the explanation of the large increase in this item?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think I unintentionally gave my hon. friend, on the last item, some information that was not entirely accurate; so I will just read the estimated plant requirements for the Printing Bureau for the fiscal year 1922-23.

Composition

Hand—

No. 1 item—Two No. 2 size proof presses at $565 .. $ 1,130
This is an addition to plant.

No. 2 item—One No. 1 size proof press .. 750
This replaces an old Washington proof press.

No. 5 item—Two new fonts of wood type and four refills .. 90
This is an addition and also replenishing defective wood type fonts used in poster printing.

No. 6 item—6,100 pieces of metal furniture .. 700
This is additional working material.

No. 7 item—12 Monotype sort cabinets .. 1,200
This is an addition for storing and constant use of type matrices fonts.

Monotype—

No. 3 item—Two Monotype caster machines, complete .. 10,000
This is additional equipment to reduce overtime period.

No. 8 item—One set each of sizes Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 of six point No. 347J, 8 set, matrices for Monotype Caster machines .. 115
This is additional equipment.

Linotype—

No. 4 item—New dress of matrices for present equipment of twenty Linotype machines .. 12,000
This will duplicate the most frequently used Monotype size and faces of type and enable work to be performed simultaneously or singly by either process of composition.

$25,985

Bindery

No. 1 item—One 12-in. by 16-in. ten-box standard mechanical gathering or collating machine .. $ 6,000

No. 2 item—One mechanical side wire-stitching machine for 1½-in. book thickness and 3-wire stitch maximum .. 3,850

No. 3 item—One mechanical, continuous covering machine for 12-in by 16-in. maximum book size .. 9,350
These three machines are to be linked up as one machine and handle all operations in one continuous control and output or may be used separately or in varying tandem combination.
With the addition of "Item No. 4," they will replace 13 individual machines now in use.

No. 4 item—One mechanical saddle-stitching machine, full equipment. 3,792

$22,992

Credit

Sale of—2 old, single-covering machines at $500 .. $1,000
Sale of—10 individual Latham Stitchers .. 1,311
One obsolete handgathering wheel—no value .. ..

$2,311 — 2,311

$20,681

Die-Stamping—Stamped Envelopes—

No. 1 item—One two-colour envelope printing press .. $ 3,200

No. 2 item—One self-gumming, all size interchangeable machine .. 6,000
These two items make a two operation manufacture, and replace two obsolete combination print-emboss and envelope machines.
Additional provision is here made for imprinting a business return address in another colour in same operation.

No. 3 item—One closed paper cutting die for envelope size 3⅝-in. by 6-in .. 100

No. 4 item—One closed paper cutting die for envelope size 3⅝-in. by 6½-in .. 100
Items 3 and 4 provide for present standard size envelope and the addition of a business size envelope.

No. 5 item—One paper cutter die grinding machine .. 2,500

No. 6 item—One paper cutter die sharpening machine .. 1,500
Items 5 and 6 provide for the necessary grinding and sharpening of these special shaped dies and ensure speedy and economical operation of this service.

$13,400

Then, there are various items of requirements in each press room and in the chief mechanic's division, together with general plant repairs and renewals.

Mr. JOHNSON (Last Mountain): The minister spoke of certain machines having been sold. Can he inform me whether they were sold by private sale or by public auction, or otherwise?

Mr. MURDOCK: I am glad my hon. friend asked me that, because I am not entirely clear on it myself. I will have to get the information for my hon. friend.

Item agreed to.

Miscellaneous—distribution of parliamentary documents and other government publications, $40,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): I am convinced that many tons of this mat-

ter are sent broadcast throughout the country with no resulting benefit. I know that I myself get much of it, and I have heard other members refer to the matter. I would suggest that questionnaires be sent out before this material is sent broadcast throughout the country, asking the people to whom it is proposed to send the material to state whether or not they wish to obtain it. There is no use sending it out at a great expense if it is not used.

Item agreed to.

Legislation—general—

Printing, printing paper, and binding..	$125,000
Printing, binding and distributing the annual statutes..	16,000
	$141,000

Mr. CHAPLIN: Does the minister intend to do more printing this year than last?

Mr. MURDOCK: From the 1st of April, 1921, as per Order in Council 1940, dated August 18, 1920, all requisitions for the printing of annual reports are charged directly against the department concerned, instead of against the general vote. There has been a change made in the manner of charging these items up as compared with former years.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My remark was based upon the fact that paper is a good deal less in price than it was a year ago, and it seems to me the item might reasonably be reduced.

Mr. GUTHRIE: With respect to the item for printing, binding and distributing annual statutes, heretofore that work has been done under the Department of Justice. I understood from remarks which fell from the Speaker a few nights ago that it would be continued to be charged against the Justice Department. Can the minister tell me why it now appears under the Department of Labour?

Mr. MURDOCK: My hon. friend will understand that this item does not concern the Department of Labour particularly. The estimate is in exactly the same position as formerly except that the Printing Bureau was under the authority of the Secretary of State until some time last summer, and is now under the Department of Labour.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Murdock.]

Naval service—to provide for the maintenance of the Royal Canadian Navy, $1,500,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would rather the minister would take up his militia estimates. The leader of the Opposition has something to say with regard to the naval estimates, and he cannot be here for some little time yet.

Mr. CHURCH: When will the naval estimates come up?

Mr. GRAHAM: The item has been called but my hon. friend from South Wellington asks that we take up the militia instead.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that the hon. member for North Toronto, (Mr. Church), the hon. member for East Hamilton, (Mr. Mewburn), and the hon. member for Kingston, (Mr. Ross) wish to speak on the naval service estimates, and they will be obliged if the minister would not take them up before Monday, as they cannot be here to-morrow.

Mr. GRAHAM: We will take the naval service estimates on Monday.

Item stands.

MILITIA AND DEFENCE

Militia and Defence—cadet services, $450,000.

Mr. GRAHAM: In fairness to the committee I must say that the last time the militia estimates were up I said I would make certain reductions. I have an amendment here, but according to the ruling of the Chair, I cannot move it myself.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that the item of $450,000 for cadet services be reduced by the amount of $100,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Perhaps the minister would explain what he proposes to do with the cadet services, with this $100,000 reduction.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am at a loss for details because my deputy is not here, but in short I understand that it will mean doing away with the boys' camps this summer. I think the boys will bear with me for this season and shoulder their share of the sacrifice we are making in these estimates. The other boys' training can go on in the institutions as formerly, but there will not be any camps this summer. I want to tell the committee that I am doing that for this year, and that is as far as any pledges will go, because if

the public understood this work, I am sure they would appreciate its great value. The number of cadets is increasing very greatly every year. This year we have a great many more than were ever enrolled before. To give the committee an idea of the work that is being done, I may say that the cadet training is carried out during the whole school year and includes instruction in signalling, first aid to the injured, physical exercise, organized games, elementary military drill, scouting and rifle shooting. Last year the cadet camps were of six days' duration, advance instruction being given in all the subjects I have enumerated. To show how the work is expanding I will read the following statement:

Province	Enrolled Strength April 30, 1922.
Nova Scotia	3,634
Prince Edward Island	735
New Brunswick	1,603
Quebec	42,081
Ontario	29,573
Manitoba	9,803
Saskatchewan	5,004
Alberta	5,330
British Columbia	5,303

Mr. CHURCH: I regret very much to hear of the action the minister has taken with respect to the cadets. I think it is the blackest eye the militia of Canada has ever received to cut out the cadet camps held at Niagara, Barriefield, London and other places. The cadets were brought to these camps from the public, separate and the high schools all over the province and received a good training there. I do not know of any money appropriated by Parliament which has been spent to better advantage by the government than the money spent on the cadet service. The training the boys receive at these camps, instils patriotism into them; it is an education in itself, and furthermore I look on it as a work of religion. These children, after spending ten months of the year in their schools, are brought to the camps and remain there for a week or ten days. During that time they are given physical drill, camp life and a little military drill. They are also taught to be men, and they learn patriotism.

I look upon this item, out of the whole of the militia estimates, as one which should never have been interfered with. If there was one item which should have been left untouched by the Government it is the vote for the cadet service because the cadets to-day are the backbone of our militia. A cadet of fifteen or sixteen to-day is the volunteer later; nobody knows that better than the officers of our militia battalions. I saw the twelfth York battalion enter camp, along with others last summer, and many were cadets of seventeen and eighteen years of age. You are going to disorganize the whole militia if you wipe out this item. You are going in opposition to the popular demand, because there is a demand for cadet camps in Canada.

An organization has been formed in the city of Toronto called the Sportsmen's Patriotic Association and the Ontario Athletic Commission and it has already spent a great deal of money, preparing pupils of the public, separate and high schools for these camps this summer. The president is Mr. P. J. Mulqueen who is giving his services for nothing. Camps were to be held at Niagara, Barriefield, London other places. They have been preparing all winter for these camps where training will be given which will make good citizens of the boys of Ontario. The Association provide instructors who visit the public, separate and high schools one day a week during the winter months and teach the boys physical drill and games and give them other training and when the summer comes they will be ready to go to the cadet camps.

This is not militarism at all; it is building up Canadian youth. We are spending immense sums to aid the live stock industry. The city of Toronto itself has erected a building with this object in view at the cost of a million dollars. Such expenditures as these are all right in their way; but my complaint is that not enough is being done by the Militia Department re cadet camps or by the Department of Health to develop the rising generation. The boy of to-day is the citizen of to-morrow. I am sorry that this Parliament is not spending even a five cent piece for the development of our youth. It can vote millions for railways but for building up character in Canada we have not a cent. The time is close at hand when the children from these schools should be aided to take the training I have mentioned, but how is it to be carried out if this vote is cut or disappears altogether? When I was at the Niagara camp last year I saw from seven to nine thousand children of all denominations, many of whom had come from the poorest slums of the cities and towns. Some of them were underfed. They went over on the Cayuga, the Corona, and other boats; and one boat came from Hamilton, General Mewburn's constituency.

The training the children receive at camps like that is of great advantage to them, and I am sorry to hear the minister get up at this late date and again change his estimates. If there is one minister whose estimates I would like to see go through more quickly than those of any other member of the Government it is the Minister of Militia. I have known him all my life; he is a good sportsman. The other day he came down and changed his estimates with respect to other services; and now he wants to make more changes and to cut out the vote for the cadet service. A night or two ago a sum of $25,000 was voted in aid of the Boy Scouts. It was money well spent; but I would like to see the minister do something for these cadet camps. If the work of these camps is stopped it will mean that the rising generation who come from places where the conditions are not good for physical development will suffer and have no recreation. Look at what has been done by the federal authorities in Washington, and by many of the state governments; they have multiplied by four or five their votes for the cadet services. In the parliament of the Australian Commonwealth an increased appropriation was introduced to provide for physical drill for the children, which the Minister of Defence declared he would never consent to cut off.

All this talk about militarism in this connection is futile. Not five per cent of the time in camp has been spent on military drill; games and physical recreation and sports of various kinds have been indulged in and the lads taught how to obey orders. I think that is something that is needed these days. The city from which I came is spending $11,000,000 in education this year, not omitting physical training. In the University of Toronto they are going to insist on physical drill. I hope the vote for this purpose will not be reduced or cut down. If it is it will mean that not only boys in Toronto, but boys in Aurora and other Ontario towns, will not be able to get to Niagara camp; the farm lads will suffer as well as the city children. Why, children attended the Niagara camp from such long distances as New Ontario. One company of fifty boys came from Copper Cliff; they had never been much out of their own town before. At Niagara they mixed with boys from old Ontario, with mutually advantageous results. The education they receive there is worth hundreds of thousands of dollars to the government. I hope the minister will re-consider his decision to reduce this vote. You cannot provide meals in camp for forty cents; at Niagara camp it costs sixty cents to properly feed the children. There are many other expenditures I would prefer to see reduced, or cut off altogether rather than the expenditure for this purpose which is going to build up character and stimulate patriotism in the children of Canada.

Many of the children who attend the Niagara camp are the sons of returned veterans. These men cannot afford to send their sons to play in the country and this camp has been a blessing to them. It has been a blessing to St. Catharines, Aurora, Newmarket, Copper Cliff and all the other cities and towns. I have letters from people in those districts asking me to do what I could. I urge the government to reconsider this item and give the public and separate school children a chance. Little enough money is being spent on the children. A dollar spent on the children will save later thousands of dollars in doctor bills, houses of correction, gaol farms and other institutions. By saving the rising generation and making good citizens of them, we are doing a great deal for the country. This is not a military work which the Militia Department has been doing; I look on it as a matter of religion. I hope the minister will reconsider the item. He has been a good friend of the children. The cadets in Hamilton have been training for months and their teachers are working for nothing after hours drilling them. The physical drill is far from military. Every university in Canada is going to insist on it. The largest universities in the States are insisting on physical exercises and participation in them by all the years in the university. The cadet movement is here to stay. This training is made compulsory in Australia and New Zealand. It is carried on in Great Britain, the United States and all over the world. I consider it one of the best works the government has undertaken.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: I would like to join with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) in urging anything that will extend physical training among the boys and girls of this country. I also sympathize with any movement in the direction of giving an impetus to athletics, but I want to decidedly protest against any expenditure which will tend to develop the military spirit among the boys of this country, and this cadet training, though

it may be camouflaged as physical training, has as its object essentially the development of what has been called patriotism, but which, in the mouth of its exponents, is another word for militarism. I have before me a letter which was sent me by the mother of one of these boys who had been receiving this cadet training. He took his course during his high school work. The mother was under the impression that he was getting good physical training, that his character was being developed, and so on, but she learned immediately the boy was through his course that every effort was made to get him to join the local battalion. The letter reads:

CAMBIE ST., VANCOUVER, B.C.

Dear Sir—I am writing you a personal appeal because I have watched with interest the cadet and physical training at the different schools in Vancouver.

You have now reached an age when you are to take your place as a citizen in this great new country of ours, of which there is none that can boast greater freedom or liberty for its citizens. As a unit in the British Empire it shares, not only the glories and liberties won in the past by our forefathers, but also shares in the glories of its history and its arms won in all countries of the globe, its literature and its commerce.

Have you ever stopped to think what you as a citizen will owe to this great country? You have been taught to sing "O, Canada," "The Maple Leaf," to swell with pride at tales of prowess, of the deeds of your forefathers, not only in the wars of Canada, but also in the wars in other parts of the world; of the part we played as Canadians in the Great War, and no doubt felt that, if need be, you would lay down your life for your country. But would not that be a silly sacrifice if in so doing you acomplished nothing. You know what happens to the boxer who goes into the ring without training; to the boy who, however plucky he may be, does not know how to defend himself. It is the same with nations; if one nation is indolent in preparing for its defence, and if it possesses something that other nations covet, sooner or later it will have to defend its possessions. The surest way to prevent war is to be prepared for war.

The circular winds up by urging that this boy and others should arrange to join the 29th battalion of the 1st B.C. regiment. The letter is signed by H. S. Tobin, Lt. Col. Commanding 29th (Vancouver) Battalion, 1st B. C. Regiment.

It becomes very apparent from such a letter as that, and from other activities which we know are going on, that there is a distinct inducement held out to these cadets to enter upon a military career. There is more than that on the part of the officers who are training them; there is a distinct effort to build up the military spirit. I can quite appreciate that these officers are honest in that effort. I think that they quite believe that that is what should be done, in order to carry out the patriotism which we all owe to our country, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that those of us who do not believe in that have a right to help decide what the policy of this country is going to be. If we decide on a military policy, undoubtedly it for the experts to determine how that can best be carried out, but we stand at the point where we must decide the fundamental questions as to what the policy of the country is really going to be. If it is true, as this military officer says, that the surest way to prevent war is to prepare for war, by all means let us go ahead and train our boys. Let us proceed to carry out this idea with all the military expenditure that we can possibly afford. But some of us challenge that statement and that policy. We were told some years ago that if we went into this last war it would be an end to all wars. I say that those who made that statement have absolutely deceived us; they have proved that they were false prophets and that they did not know what they were talking about. We listened to them and went into the war. Do we find that the war has ended wars? Now, we are told by some of the self-same gentlemen—at least by those who advocate the self-same policy—that we have to be prepared for an even greater European war than that through which we have just passed. We gave of our best, and I, for one, have every respect for the men who joined the colours, because they believed they were doing their duty. I think that when these men come back they should receive the very best this country has. We asked them to go and risk their lives, and many of them laid down their lives. Those that come back and the dependents of those who did not come back should receive the best. But that consideration does not make me believe that we should prepare to follow along lines of public policy which in the past have proved to be so disastrous. Never was there a better opportunity on such a world-wide scale for demonstrating the advantages of war; and never was there a greater failure in the history of the whole human race. If ever we had a demonstration of the futility of war we had it in this Great War. And now, notwithstanding that demonstration, we are trying to inculcate these self-same ideas of militarism in our children.

A little over a year ago the cadets of Vancouver city were reviewed in the King

Edward High School by a brigadier general. In encouraging the boys, he referred to the splendid showing which they had made as a result of their training, and he made this statement: "That nation whose boys can think clearly and can shoot straight is the nation that will be able to impose its will on other nations." That teaching is what we have ordinarily termed Prussianism—Prussianism pure and simple, and Prussianism does not look any more attractive to me in a British uniform than it does in a German uniform. We have complained again and again that, during the last few decades, the Germans have inculcated this military spirit in the minds of their young people; that they have introduced this teaching into their colleges, and that the whole of Germany was simply permeated by the military spirit. I have seen myself, in some of the universities in Germany, the result of that spirit, where those young college fellows dared not refuse to accept a challenge to a duel, and I have watched these student duels, as with a great deal of nerve, each man makes a thrust at the other fellow, all this being done to encourage the military spirit. I remember one of these students saying to me some years ago: "Oh, you Britishers; you have lost your old military spirit, your old military prowess; away back in the time of Shakespeare, you were a nation with noble ideals; to-day you are a nation of shopkeepers; you have lost the military spirit." That was the German idea of the situation, but we sit here to-night and listen to an hon. gentleman rejoice in the fact that we, in this day, in our universities are adopting the policy that Germany adopted thirty or forty years ago. I do not decry physical training in our universities; I am glad of it. I do not decry athletics in our universities. A few years ago I rejoiced to take my share in the athletics of my university. We do not want however to introduce military training into our universities, and we do not want to militarise the Canadian people.

It has been said that we want our boys to grow up to be manly boys. I have a boy of fourteen years of age taking his training in the high school, and my boy to-day is practically penalised because I refused to allow him to take cadet training. I did so, not because I did not want my boy to grow up to be strong, to participate in athletics and all the rest of it; but I refused absolutely to allow him to be placed under those conditions in which he would be likely to develop anything of a military spirit, because I believe that militarism to-day is bankrupt and has demonstrated its bankruptcy. Somebody might say that this was merely a personal opinion of mine; but I want to repeat what I said here the other evening, that, in speaking along these lines, I am speaking, not merely for myself, but, I think, for a considerable group of the labour men whom I know very intimately from Fort William to the Pacific coast. I think I have a right to speak for a large number of labour people, as I have received again and again communications from all parts of this country endorsing this position. I have an undoubted right to speak for my own constituency where this was one of the questions that we took up very definitely in the election campaign, where I received the fullest endorsation with regard to my position on military training in the schools and where we have discussed out this question in our municipal as well as in the federal and provincial campaigns. Under such circumstances, we have a right, in the consideration of these items, to consider frankly whether or not we wish, in the future, to continue to carry out a policy which must lead us into the same troubles into which militarism has led the race from the earliest times which history records.

Some hon. members will say: "What else is there ahead"? I submit that we might very well make some peace expenditures that would do a great deal more good than these war expenditures. This is not the time to suggest these things to the House; but I for one believe that if this Parliament voted a few of the millions that it is spending on military estimates, to feed the starving children of Russia, it would be an expenditure which would go a long way to cement international friendship. Other things that we could do could readily be mentioned. Why should we constantly think there is no other way in which we can spend our money for defence purposes than by maintaining a military force? We shall have a cessation of wars so soon as we remove the economic causes which are producing wars, and as soon as we remove those other causes which prejudice one nation against another. I should like to express in this House the hope—again if you like since other opinions have been expressed here again and again—that we, in this young Canada of ours where we have no enemy at our gates, would take the lead in working out some of these principles of good fellowship. I for one rejoice because of having come of parents and

grandparents who have been born in Canada, and this is my idea of patriotism. I think we are able to take the lead because of our connection with the great British Empire. I for one do not want to avoid any obligation that arises because of our connection with the British Empire; but we can fulfil our obligations in other than military fashion. There is, on the one hand, the tie that we have with Great Britain, and, on the other, the close connection that we have with the people of the United States to the south of us. We stand, it seems to me, in a unique position to foster those newer ideals, in which alone we believe the safety of the world consists. Within the last few days, it has been stated on the floor of this House that troubles are looming up in Europe to-day. Are we going to be drawn into this maelstrom of European troubles? Rather than that, I would say that we Canadians would have to stand here if needs be by ourselves to uphold the principles of peace. America has been separated more or less by the oceans from the old world. In the last few years we have seen the suicidal policies of Europe. Unless we are careful, those yellow races about which we talked a few days ago, are going to witness, as one of the great Counts of Japan said, the suicide of European peoples and the end of European civilization.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: Yes, carried, if you like. I have just about finished my remarks. I will vote for the amendment because it is a little better than the original estimate. We believe in taking small mercies. These things that I have been saying are things that, whether we like to hear them in this House or not, are things that are being talked and thought about by the ordinary people of this country from one coast to the other, and we in this House would be well advised if we endeavoured to keep a little more closely in touch with the current thought of the common people who suffered most in the last war.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not want to delay the passage of this item, but I desire to add my protest to that of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Church) against the suggestion that this vote for cadet purposes should be reduced by the substantial sum of $100,000. We are, of course, all aware that the minister has committed himself, since he brought his estimates to Parliament, to a substantial all-round reduction. All I propose to do is to protest against the reduction of this item. As I read down the estimates of the Militia Department I see several places where reductions might possibly be made which would cause less inconvenience and loss to the militia of Canada than would the reduction which is now proposed in regard to the cadet service in this country.

Mr. CANNON: What items do you refer to?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Wait until we come to them; I will explain then. The cadet service has not heretofore been looked upon as purely military service at all. It has been considered in this country, and I think in other countries as well, more in the nature of athletic development than as military training; and I am sure that in the future, as in the past, the Government will continue the service with that end in view.

Mr. POWER: Why not buy some hockey sticks?

Mr. GUTHRIE: This training has been regarded as the very best athletic development, being given under a system of military discipline. Military discipline and military training lend themselves with great advantage to physical development, and the best physical development that is given, whether in boys' or girls' schools, follows generally along the lines of military training. But that does not make it military training at all; it still retains the essence of physical development. And physical training is what is chiefly sought by the vote now under consideration. The expenditure is not a large one. Indeed, $450,000 for the development of the young men of this country is a very infinitesimal sum. Could we employ the money better in any other avenue of expenditure which we have in the Dominion at the present time? Last year's estimate of $450,000 provided for an annual camp for 8,000 cadets. That camp, it was estimated, would cost about $125,000. I assume that the estimate, when first brought down to Parliament at $450,000 all told, had in view the expenditure of about $125,000 on this annual training which is given to the boys in Canada. Now, it certainly is a splendid outing for them; it is a good holiday; it is a camp under strict supervision, where not only the physical condition of the boys, but their moral welfare as well is looked after. The moral conditions and the living conditions generally that obtain in these camps are of the highest standard. That $125,000 is money

as well spent as any we have expended in the Dominion, and I think that the minister should strain a point to rearrange these reductions, if he is bound to reduce, so that $125,000 may be spent on the boys in the annual summer camps. I think the camps are now held pretty generally throughout Canada. At all events, they were last year. It is not a movement confined to one province; it is now developed in all provinces, I believe, and it is growing with great rapidity. It is supported, I think, by the best elements in the community, by the best educationalists in Canada, by the various churches, without regard to denomination; and it is endorsed by leading medical and commercial men, as well as by agricultural people throughout Canada. Here is an opportunity for the minister to recast his estimates. He can do a greater service by allowing these boys to go through the annual camp than by cutting this item by $100,000 as proposed. I do not want to delay the item at all; I want the House to deal with it as speedily as possible. But I certainly want to make my protest and to suggest that the minister recast his estimates and save the situation.

11 p.m.

Mr. McBRIDE: There is one point I want to make clear. My hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Woodsworth) seems to convey the impression that he represents Labour. I might say that when I was nominated the Labour candidate did me the honour to withdraw, and I got 95 per cent of the Labour vote in the district I represent. I have always supported the cadet movement and the militia, and will continue to do so. In fact, I should consider myself a traitor to the people I represent if I did not, and I am sorry to see this amount cut down. These boys should get the training to which they are justly entitled. I regret also that the militia training item is reduced, and I am more than sorry that there is not more money in the estimate for the navy. I do not believe in training our young people for the purpose of offensive, but I do believe in training them so that they may be able to defend themselves if ever the time comes they are called upon to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is no better friend to the cadet movement in Canada than I, myself. I have always been their friend, as a private citizen as well as throughout my public career. But we are asking the militia and everybody else this year to make some sacrifice, and I do not believe that the boys will be any the worse off for feeling that they too are doing their share. One year is as far as I can make any pledge, because I fully agree that the training of the cadets, apart from any military idea at all, lays the foundation for the physical and mental manhood of the Dominion. The only thing that will be reduced is the expenditure in connection with the annual camps. The other training the boys receive in the collegiate institutes, in the public schools, in the high schools and in the universities will be carried on as usual.

Mr. STEWART (Leeds): I was greatly pleased to hear the minister speak so highly of this branch of the service. He is conversant with what is done in his own town, and I know something about the matter myself. I believe that cadet training is one of the most valuable services we can render the youth of the country. Has the minister considered the possible very serious effect, upon all the training throughout the rest of the year, of the knowledge of these boys that they cannot look forward to the outing which the camp usually affords them? I am afraid it will tend to demoralize their training throughout the rest of the year.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend knows the attitude I have always taken in regard to cadet training. I should not think that that knowledge would have any serious effect, because the training of the boys outside of the camps is about over for the year. At least, it is pretty well advanced. And as I have hinted, we are only asking that the boys shall make a sacrifice for this year.

Item as amended agreed to.

Clothing and necessaries, $361,400.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that this vote, No. 92, be reduced by $21,000.

Amendment agreed to, and item as amended agreed to.

Customs dues, $25,000.

Mr. GOULD: Why the difference of $15,000 between this vote and the vote of last year? Are we right in assuming that this indicates a difference between the respective fiscal policies of the two political aggregations?

Mr. GRAHAM: I would not like to say it is or it is not. I have not had time, really, to investigate.

Mr. WOODSWORTH: What does "Customs dues" mean?

Mr. GRAHAM: It is to pay the customs dues on imported clothing, stores, supplies for the manufacture of munitions, etc., at the Quebec arsenal.

Item agreed to.

Dominion arsenal, Lindsay, $25,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think this item and the next one—No. 97, Dominion Arsenal, Quebec—had better stand. There will be some discussion on these two arsenal votes.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How is it that the minister is able to make such a large reduction in the case of one arsenal while in the other there is practically no reduction at all?

Mr. PARENT: One was a war measure.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like the minister to answer.

Mr. GRAHAM: We have closed the Lindsay arsenal; we have only a number of caretakers there. As a matter of fact two arsenals will more than supply the requirements for the militia of Canada.

Mr. CHAPLIN: The minister knows very well that the Lindsay arsenal is manufacturing small arms ammunition. What is the present stock of small arms ammunition and how long would it last?

Mr. PARENT: We give no secrets to Germany.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I would like the minister to answer.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not know that it would be proper to say how much ammunition we have on hand, but I can assure the hon. member that we have a sufficient quantity. With the Quebec arsenal working, there will be plenty of ammunition for the needs of Canada for a few years to come—perhaps a great many years.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I do not think the minister has answered the question fairly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. CHAPLIN: He has not answered my question as to the small arms ammunition. I think he can give us more information as to how much small arms ammunition is on hand. The minister also knows that the Quebec arsenal is manufacturing the heavy ammunition.

Mr. GRAHAM: I may be wrong, but I think it would not be advisable to make public either the amount of ammunition or the amount of arms.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That is a strange position. That information has been given every year in this House for the last five years.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have not had time to look at Hansard.

Mr. CHAPLIN: A few days ago the Prime Minister made a very strong address in this House complaining of the amount of large ammunition that had been brought from the Old Country; yet the minister is proposing a vote to run the Quebec arsenal, which makes ammunition of the same size.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry? Carried.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Oh, no; it is not carried. I ask that these two items stand. I think the minister will make more progress if he takes up some other items and accedes to the reasonable request which has been made with regard to these votes for arsenals. Of course, if the minister does not take that view, we will have to discuss them.

Mr. BUREAU: Let one stand and discuss the two under one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No; let them both stand, and take up items which we can get through without very much discussion.

Mr. CHAPLIN: If the minister will let the matter stand and obtain the information, I shall be satisfied. The information has been produced here before, and I see no reason why it should not be given now. Otherwise, I will move an amendment to the item.

Mr. HALBERT: I live not far from Lindsay, and I know it is reported that there is a proposal to sell the arsenal there to the railway company. Can the minister give us any information on that point?

Mr. GRAHAM: There was a suggestion in that regard; I referred it to the Railway Department, and just a day or two ago I received a note that was not very encouraging. But I may say I have been approached within the last two weeks as to the probability of a private company being able to purchase or rent the property. That matter is now under negotiation.

Mr. HALBERT: Has any ammunition been shipped out of Lindsay from that arsenal? Has any ammunition ever been manufactured and shipped out?

Mr. GRAHAM: I cannot say, but I think there has been.

Mr. HALBERT: I have been given to understand there never was any ammunition shipped from there.

An hon. MEMBER: That is right.

An hon. MEMBER: Graft.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Political ammunition.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will get the information. We will let these two items stand.

The CHAIRMAN: Items 96 and 97 stand.

Engineer services and works, $610,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that this vote be reduced by $50,000.

Mr. POWER: May I ask where this $50,000 is to be taken from?

Mr. GRAHAM: The engineer services are for the maintenance of military buildings, rifle ranges and that kind of thing. It is possible that no service may be neglected, but it is impossible to say at what point the reduction will be made. Small amounts might be deducted from a great many of the different items.

Item as amended agreed to.

Maintenance, military properties, $235,000.

Mr. HANSON: There is a very large and valuable military property in the heart of the city of Fredericton which is now being used for no useful purpose except that a portion of the barracks is leased to the New Brunswick Liquor Commission. A portion of the property consists of what is known as the Officers' Square. It is right in the heart of the city, on the main street, and has been allowed to get into a very dilapidated condition. There is not even a caretaker to look after it. Would any portion of this vote be used to maintain that square in a tidy and decent condition, in harmony with its surroundings?

Mr. GRAHAM: That would probably come under the general vote. In reference to properties generally owned by the Militia Department I would say, and I think my predecessor made the same sort of statement, that the Government owns a great deal of property throughout the whole country that was devotetd to military purposes during the war. It is possibly not a good time to sell these properties now. I admit that a great many people would accept them at a price, but so far any offers that have been made have not met with the approval of the department. Every day we have requests for the properties in different parts of Canada, and at the conclusion of the session I hope to get a report on all these properties and then if the Governor in Council sees fit to offer any of them for sale, I shall be prepared to submit a list of properties that I think might be dispensed with if a proper price could be got. I think it was in reference to the Fredericton property that I was waited on a few days ago and asked if some other use might not be made of a portion of it. I have asked my officers to make a report on that.

Mr. HANSON: I do not think anybody has been asking the Government to sell the property to which I refer. I think there would be very great objection if the department were to sell it, as it has always been considered one of the beauty spots of the city. It is practically a little public park right in the heart of the city, and the property is now being neglected, no care being taken of it. When I was home at Easter the boys were playing ball on it, and it is becoming disfigured. There should be a caretaker to look after it and keep it tidy and clean, otherwise it will be a disfiguration to the city. It would entail the expenditure of only a very moderate sum, and I would like to know if this will be done.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will refer the remarks of my hon. friend to the Engineering branch of my department and get their views on the matter. If it can be done under this estimate, we will be glad to help out.

Mr. CHAPLIN: At the same time that the minister is getting the views of his officers regarding that matter, he might get their views regarding four or five hundred acres of land belonging to the Militia Department in the county of Lincoln. I have on different occasions called the attention of the department to the way in which some land in that county is being neglected by the department. It is

good land, and a good price could be got for it; and it is possible the Militia Department will never use it again. It is growing up in weeds, and is a menace to the whole countryside in one of the best districts in the country.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The minister's statement that it is not a good time to sell these properties would indicate that it is the Government's policy to dispose of practically everything in the nature of military property. It has just been intimated to the House that negotiations are on foot to dispose of the Lindsay arsenal. The training of the cadets is to be cut out, the annual training of the militia is to be dispensed with—

Mr. GRAHAM: I shall have to correct my hon. friend. The annual training of the militia is not to be dispensed with, but only slightly reduced.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: The estimate for the navy is also reduced, if the minister has his way. In fact, it would appear that everything in the nature of national defence is to be materially reduced, if not entirely dispensed with. It must have been encouraging for the minister to hear the hon. member for Centre Winnipeg approve of the policy which the Government are advocating at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM: Which he did not do.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I could not help but think, as I listened to the arguments which were advanced, of the example we shall be setting to the youth of this country. Instead of cultivating and developing a vigorous spirit among the youth of our country, what sort of a spirit are you likely to develop by cutting down these essential features of national defence? I notice an increase of $35,000 in this particular item. The Government are bound to reduce, so that they will be ineffective for any useful purpose, the items for important and essential features of national defence, while the non-essential items are being increased. The reductions that are being made in the essential features of national defence are such as to cripple the service and make it absolutely useless. I do not expect the Government will take any notice of any protest which may be lodged, but as a citizen of this country, as a representative of the people, and as the father of growing boys in this country, I refuse to countenance any such policy as this. I have altogether too much respect for the traditions of our country especially in this age, after such a splendid example having been set to the people of the world by those who participated in the late war to have any sympathy at all with those who would claim that now it is the duty of Canada to blaze the way, as it were, for the rest of the world in becoming a spineless people who will stand for anything rather than defend ourselves against any emergency which may develop in the future.

That is the policy which is to-day being advocated by the Government of this country. The minister to-night, after bringing down his estimates, calmly gets up and informs the House that he cannot move to reduce the items, so his colleague sitting next to him gets up and moves to reduce item after item that would serve a useful purpose, but when it comes to the non-essential items, such as the one now before us they are being increased. There is no move on the part of his colleague to reduce this item.

Why is it that the non-essentials are being maintained, and even increased, while the essentials are being so absolutely impaired as to be of no effective service whatever? Some hon. members may say "Oh, but see the time we are taking up in discussing these estimates." I suppose as time passes a feeling of apathy will come over the House and the remark will be made "What is the use of this anyway"? As one member of Parliament, I absolutely refuse to countenance any such policy as is recommended here; and I say—and I am most emphatic in my view—that the day is not far distant when the policy the Government is now advocating will be conclusively shown to be just as foolish and just as shortsighted as the policy which was advocated early in 1914, when we were on the verge of the Great War.

I was somewhat amazed to hear the terms in which the Prime Minister referred to the policy of the party of which he was a member at that time. I could not help but recall, as he was arguing that the policy his party advocated was the right one, a statement made by the late Colonel Roosevelt in 1917 when he said: "The only reason the war has not been brought to this country is because of Britain's navy and the British and French armies." The policy of this Government undoubtedly is "Somebody will take care of us; it won't be necessary for us to make any sacrifices in the event of any trouble arising. We have

the British navy back of us and after all nothing may happen."

But there is a duty imposed upon every citizen of Canada. His first duty is to see that he maintains, and perpetuates to the utmost of his power, and bequeaths to his children unsullied, the heritage which has been handed down to him—a heritage secured at great sacrifice by those who have gone before. We cannot afford to place that heritage in jeopardy because of the fact that it might cost something to maintain it. This is the first duty of our citizens, but it is a duty which this new Government has lost sight of. I am afraid the Government is attempting to carry out some promises made before the election by the policy it is now advocating. I protest as vigorously as I can against what has already been done and what is proposed to be done.

I am surprised that the member of the Government who is now sitting to the right of the Minister of Militia is not, if he intends to be consistent, attempting to reduce this item in some way, because he has clearly indicated to the House that the Government proposes to dispose of these properties. He has intimated that negotiations are on foot to dispose of the arsenal at Lindsay and this is not a good time to sell some of these properties. Why were these properties purchased? What use have they been put to in the past? Will the minister now tell us what properties the Government is negotiating to dispose of in addition to the arsenal at Lindsay? Will he tell us what the arsenal at Lindsay has cost. The minister is also going to dispose of, or disperse, the navy; the submarines are going to be sunk, they are not going to be put into use at all; and he is going to maintain an arsenal down on the St. Lawrence. Why, if he does that, in the event of trouble occurring, a submarine may come up the St. Lawrence some night and blow the whole thing up. If there is one place where there should not be an arsenal it is the city of Quebec. The policy of the Government is to place in jeopardy the very establishment needed for the manufacture of ammunition in this country. I ask the committee to consider well what it is doing. I must say that I am surprised that the Minister of Militia, whom I have known for many years, would be a party to such proceedings, that he would allow himself to be made the mouthpiece of a party that is endeavouring to put into effect in Canada any such policy as this.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

Ordnance Arms, Lands, etc., $75,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that this item be reduced by $9,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: Would it not be well to hear from the minister in charge of these estimates as to what the Government's policy is in regard to this item? Which minister is enunciating the Government's policy—the one who has introduced the estimates, or the one who has moved that they be reduced?

Item as amended agreed to.

Pay of Staff, $265,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move that this item be reduced by $10,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I move in amendment that the item be reduced by $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that the vote be reduced by the sum of $25,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Last Mountain): Let us understand this. The Minister of Labour has moved to reduce the item by $10,000. That is an amendment to the resolution. The member for South Oxford has moved in amendment to the amendment that the item be reduced by $25,000.

The CHAIRMAN: The order in which these amendments may be put to the committee is left to the discretion of the chairman. Usually the amendment calling for the largest reduction is put first. Mr. Sutherland's amendment is not put in the form of an amendment to the amendment, but as an amendment to the item under consideration.

Mr. CHAPLIN: It stands to reason that if these reductions are carried out there will be no necessity for the staff. If you are going to do away with all the clerks what reason is there for keeping the staff?

Mr. GOULD: That is a point I have endeavoured to stress.

Amendment (Mr. Sutherland) negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Murdock) agreed to.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Permanent force, $5,500,000.

Mr. GOULD: Is the Royal Canadian Artillery included in the permanent force?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes.

Mr. GOULD: Could the minister tell me the number of officers who are now in the permanent force, who never had any

experience before the war, and are now in the rank and file?

Mr. GRAHAM: There are not a great many. It must be remembered that there are certain distinct branches, and we have, in the several portions of the Dominion, men especially qualified to perform the duties, and the fact that they were not overseas in many cases is not their fault at all. Every man we have there has been recommended during the past year or two in the reorganization of the staff. There is a large reduction in this item, and it is hoped that during the year, perhaps in a few weeks or months, we will fully carry out the reorganization. It means a reduction in the staff of the permanent force of about 500 men all told of different ranks.

Mr. GOULD: The reason which prompted me to ask the question was, I confess, information I had gleaned around the city. Not alone in the House is there some opposition to these appropriations for militia and defence, but around the city there is opposition, and when you get in conversation with people you often find individuals who are well acquainted with military conditions, not alone in Ottawa but throughout the country. I have been prompted to ask the question on account of information I received in that way. When the minister expressed the idea that these men possessed technical knowledge, a case came to mind which I wish to cite. It is that of an individual on the permanent force living in Ottawa at the present time who confessed that he was unable to handle a rifle well enough to fire a salute at a military funeral, and I wondered why such men as that were kept in the permanent force. I do not see what position they could fill, and I do not think the country should be asked to pay for the services of men who make such confessions. That is one of the reasons why I protest, from a military point of view, at least, on behalf of those who object to money being taken from the people for the supposed services of men who have no greater qualifications than the gentleman I have mentioned. I ask the minister, in all sincerity, to look into his department, and to weed out of the permanent force of Canada those whom I have in the past called parasites and whom I think I have rightly named.

Mr. SHAW: Could the minister indicate the number of officers in the permanent force, as compared with the number in other ranks?

Mr. GRAHAM: I hope to be able to get the information in a few moments for my hon. friend, but I cannot lay my hands on it just now. I am labouring under the disability of not having my deputy beside me. We have that information somewhere, and if I cannot get it to-night I will furnish it at a later date.

Mr. CHAPLAIN: A few days ago, in discussing this item, the member from East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn), former Minister of Militia, pointed out in this House that a very large sum of money could be saved, and I think this is the item in regard to which he referred. Has the minister taken the suggestion of the ex-Minister of Militia into consideration in reference to this matter? I listened very attentively to what the hon. member from East Hamilton had to say. If we intend to make a real saving in this Militia Department, there is the place to make it, and I would like to know why some of our friends from the West, who are so anxious to save money, do not move a resolution in regard to some of these items. I have not seen any resolutions coming from them to reduce any of the items.

Mr. GRAHAM: This is following some of the lines suggested by the hon. member from East Hamilton to which reference was made, but it is not so easy to carry them all out. For instance, if I were to propose to abolish the military district where my hon. friend (Mr. Chaplin) lives I would be met by a strong protest. I have stowed away carefully the remarks of the member for East Hamilton, and the department has decided to give them full consideration. Some of the suggestions were very sweeping, and I am not sure that they would be altogether practicable. However, after investigation, possibly, they might be. I think the hon. member suggested that the Toronto and London districts might be amalgamated. The Toronto district is a very large one and in my opinion, from the information I have received, one man could not handle that district. The suggestions of the hon. member from East Hamilton will certainly be considered when the session is over.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I desire to call attention to the significant silence of certain members who sit on this committee now and who sat here a year ago when these matters were under discussion. The hon. member from Quebec South (Mr. Power) was in the House until a few minutes ago. He has now left the Chamber, and I call

the attention of the House to the fact that when this item was under discussion a year ago the amount which was asked in the estimates was six and a half millions, the hon. member from Quebec South moved that it be reduced by two million dollars, and every hon. member who then sat on this side of the House, in opposition, voted for that reduction. I think my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Gould) was one of them—I am sure he was. The silence of these hon. members on this occasion rather staggers me. I thought they were serious. From their remarks last year one would judge they were serious. But a year has passed and the vote to-day standing at five and a half million is practically going unchallenged by those hon. members who moved last year for a reduction of $2,000,000. I certainly am not going to move for a reduction of the item. I believe it is just and proper and should be retained. What think you, Mr. Chairman, of 30 or 40 hon. members of this House who sat in opposition last year, and solemnly voted to reduce the item by $2,000,000, who have not the courage on the present occasion to move to reduce the item by a single cent?

Mr. HALBERT: I do not wish to let the remarks of the hon. member from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) go unchallenged. So much has been said that I desire to say that I, as one from the province of Ontario, appreciate the action of the minister in starting off in the right direction in endeavouring to reduce the expenditure of the Dominion of Canada at the present time. That is one thing which we all want. I was in this House, and I may have supported a reduction of $2,000,000 in this estimate last year. I could not say whether I did or not, as I have not the estimate before me. The minister has already reduced this item by $755,000, thus showing that he is starting in the right direction, and as is said, "Well begun is half done." But since the militia estimates and other estimates too have been brought down in this House, we have witnessed something that, to my knowledge, has not happened in the House of Commons in the Dominion of Canada since confederation, and that is the Government desiring to reduce expenditure and the Opposition emphatically pounding and abusing the Government for doing so. At this time, I think the people of this Dominion are looking to the Government to reduce expenditures as much as possible under present conditions, and they will appreciate any reductions. I am of opinion also that the same feeling would have prevailed throughout the country had the Conservative party been in power.

We have heard a good deal about the cadets not getting their drill; but in Canada there are other boys than those whom we want to train as boy scouts and cadets, boys whom we want to train up to be good citizens of this country. Only to-day I received a letter from a man whose only son and support went overseas and made the supreme sacrifice. This man, who is over sixty years of age, is, through misfortune, unable to earn his living, and to-day he is without his only son whom he raised and upon whom he depended for support. My room-mate, the hon. member for Victoria and Carleton (Mr. Caldwell) is on the Pension Committee where such matters are being discussed, and I think we ought to be fair to the people who have made the supreme sacrifice and to their dependents before we start building up more militarism in this country.

Some people are not very consistent. We had the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) saying that, in his constituency, there was militia property that was growing up with weeds, and wanting to know what was going to be done with it, and then we had the hon. member for South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) finding fault with the Government for trying to do something with property that was not of use. Why not sell the property and turn the money into the treasury of the country, or give it to the dependents of those men who went overseas and made the supreme sacrifice instead of using this money to send our young men to the camps to be trained for militarism?

A day or so ago I had a letter in regard to the family of a man who enlisted, but who did not get overseas. This man was in a camp training, and owing to the effects of an electrical storm he died, leaving a widow with nine of a family dependent upon her. According to the law, the Pension Committee cannot give anything to the widow. If this property is of no use, why not sell it and give the money to those people to help them out? I am in favour of making any reduction possible, not only in this estimate, but in other estimates as well. I am not against the militia of this country, but if we can save a little on the estimates this year, it is our duty and the duty of the Government to be faithful to the people who sent us here and to reduce the estimates if we possibly can.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and wages, $225,000.

Mr. SHAW: In connection with the preceding item, Royal Military College, $345,000, I was under the impression that the Minister of Militia, in his opening address on these estimates, mentioned that he proposed to reduce this particular item.

The CHAIRMAN: That has been carried.

Mr. WARD: It is up to the Chairman to give the members an opportunity to speak on the items.

The CHAIRMAN: If any hon. member wishes an opportunity to speak, he will be given an opportunity if he rises in his place.

Mr. WARD: We were not given an opportunity to speak on that item.

Mr. SHAW: I think we have a right to rely on the statement of the minister that a reduction would be made. I move that we reconsider the item, Royal Military College.

Motion agreed to.

Royal Military College, $345,000.

Mr. SHAW: I understood that in the opening remarks made by the minister on these estimates, he stated that he proposed to reduce this particular item. I may be mistaken in that view, but I should like to be advised by the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is perfectly right. I did suggest that this item might be reduced by $10,000. That expenditure of $10,000 is a very small item, and I must say that I have had many vigorous protests by men from both sides of this House and from every group in this House saying that the Royal Military College was an institution that drew its students from all parts of the Dominion. If the House wishes me to move a reduction in the face of those protests, I am willing to do so; but unless the House wishes that, I would rather not. If hon. gentlemen from all groups could know the protests that I have received from all quarters, I think they would say that I have acted wisely in not making this reduction. I think I should make this explanation to the committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It would be well for us to get this item through as quickly as possible. Otherwise, we may have some more changes before the item carries.

Item agreed to.

Schools of instruction, $140,000.

Mr. MURDOCK: I move in amendment that this item be reduced by an amount of $50,000.

Mr. SUTHERLAND: I should like to have some information with regard to the instruction that is given.

Mr. HANSON: And where these schools are.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is a School of Military Engineering at Chatham; gunnery staff course; ordnance officers' course; Artillery College, Woolwich; officers' class in artillery college; inspection of ordnance machinery; master gunners' course at Woolwich; armament artificers' course, Woolwich; laboratory course, etc. I have a long list.

Item as amended agreed to.

Topographic Survey, $45,000.

Mr. HANSON: I am informed that this is one item in the militia estimates that might very well be cut out for one year at least. What explanation has the minister in regard to it?

Mr. GRAHAM: The following is the statement which has been prepared by the officers of the department:

Particulars of Topographic Survey referred to under "General Purpose", page 1.

Established in 1902 on the advice of the Imperial Authorities for the purpose of producing reliable topographic maps of Canada, primarily for military purposes, but also sold to the public, who appreciate them for various civil uses. With the exception of isolated areas mapped by the Geological Survey, these are the only topographic maps produced in Canada. Up to 1913 the completed drawings of the map sheets were sent to the War Office for reproduction and printing, but this plan was found unsuitable and a complete photo litho printing plant was established at Ottawa as part of the Survey division, and has been operating successfully from 1914 to date, printing all maps and diagrams required. The Survey division is thus enabled to do all the work involved in producing first class maps, from the initial survey to printing the map.

Besides the regular series of 1" and ½" maps a large number of other maps and diagrams have been produced,—larger scale maps of camp areas, various maps, diagrams, lantern plates, etc., for the use of troops in training, schools of instruction, Royal Military College, etc. Original plates of all maps, etc. are preserved and reprints made as required.

The 1" maps show all water features, boundaries and nature of timber. County, township and city boundaries, concessions and lots are indicated. All public roads, railways, bridges, settlements, factories, forges and houses (wood or stone) at time of survey. The relief of the

ground surface is shown by contours at 25 ft. vertical intervals and the elevation at many road corners.

The area surveyed and mapped to date is shown on the attached index maps.

	Sq. miles
Total area mapped	32,000
Surveyed, not mapped	5,500
Partly surveyed	5,000

In addition to making surveys and printing maps as above, the Survey division acts as a School of Instruction in Surveying for N.C.O's and men of the Permanent Force, with the object of selecting the best men to fill vacancies in the staff of the Survey division as they occur, and also to provide a nucleus of trained men in the Permanent Force for a Field Survey section. Ten men are at present under instruction (since January 1st) at Ottawa in theoretical work. They will be attached to survey parties as assistants for the summer, for practical work in the field.

The total at present consists of twenty-nine, all technical men,—surveyors, topographers, lithographic map draughtsmen, map engraver, litho-photographer, lithographer and transferrer, litho-printer, office clerks and two helpers. Twenty-one of the above are permanent civil servants, who are paid from civil government salaries.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I agree that this is one of the important votes in the militia estimates. It is not for the value of the map as a map. I believe that, at the rate they are going, the map will be completed in about two hundred years. There are portions of Canada already completed. These maps are very useful for automobilists, etc., as road maps, and a small amount is received by way of revenue by the Government through the sale of them. This is one of the most important parts of the military education. Map drafting and map reading are two very important elements in military instruction, and it is for that purpose that this vote is carried from year to year, far more than for the purpose of issuing a topographic map of Canada, important as that may be, if we can ever complete one. I was under the same impression as my hon. friend (Mr. Hanson) two or three years ago when I questioned the item, but General Sir Arthur Currie and Major General MacBrien explained fully to me the real object of the vote. It is to carry out the training of officers in order that they may instruct non-commissioned officers and men in the important subject of map drawing, and perhaps in the equally important subject of map reading. I do think, though, that the question of topographic surveys in this country is far too extended. I believe that in no fewer than four, and possibly five, departments we are making surveys and drafting maps, all of which should be done in the Department of Militia, where there are trained engineers and officers, who are quite competent to do that work and are now under pay. The expense would be very greatly reduced if survey work and the drafting of maps, now done by different departments, were carried out by the officers of the Militia Department. I made this suggestion to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) when his estimates were going through, and I trust that some one department of government will take the matter up and consolidate those various activities.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is right. That matter has been considered, and at present we have a committee of officers from the various departments to look into the question and see whether there is not some way by which the work can be concentrated in one department. Each department, I imagine, thinks it is best fitted to do the work, but I agree that the standard of map the Militia Department produces shows that that department has facilities equal to, if not better than, those of other departments.

Mr. ARTHURS: The remarks of the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) would apply to geodetic surveys, but I cannot see any possible reason why the vote should be carried this year for topographic survey work. Map reading, from a topographic viewpoint, is easy; any schoolboy can do that. From the military viewpoint it is the geodetic map that is required.

Item agreed to.

Training areas, $15,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What is this amount for?

Mr. GRAHAM: We have cut the item in two this year. It is for the purpose of purchasing any right of way that juts into training areas. We have no expenditure in view, but if it should occur that a piece of land juts into a training area the vote is provided so that we may be able to purchase it. The probabilities are that not a dollar will be spent.

Item agreed to.

Transport and Freight, $200,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: My remarks in regard to other items apply to this one. This is a case where the works are gone but the overhead remains. If you are going to do away with a large percentage of military camps

what is the necessity for $200,000 for transport and freight? Surely the item can be cut down.

Mr. GRAHAM: Last year the whole of the vote was expended but $2,000.

Mr. CHAPLIN: But you are cutting down your camps at least 30 per cent, and it stands to reason than an item of this kind should be reduced. I would suggest that the minister get busy now and make a substantial reduction.

Mr. HANSON: I move that this item be reduced by $60,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SPENCER: I move in amendment that the item be reduced by $10,000. That is the reduction the minister volunteered to make a few days ago.

Mr. GOULD: When the estimates were before the House at an earlier stage I cited several items from the Auditor General's report. I referred particularly to an item with respect to transportation and travelling expenses of staff. A good deal of travelling was done by officers around Saskatchewan, as I pointed out before; and I mentioned certain items of theatre tickets and various other things which these officers evidently seemed to think the people of the country should pay for. In the vote for transport and freight, which includes these travelling expenses, no reduction is made from the amount voted last year. I used Military District No. 12 as an illustration; if the same conditions obtain in all the other districts in proportion to size, then a huge sum of money is wasted in that manner. If these officers believe they have the right to spend the people's money in this way, then it is our duty at this moment to reduce this vote by the amount which in our opinion, is being wasted in that manner. Now, there is an amendment before the committee—

Mr. CHAPLIN: Move another one.

The CHAIRMAN: Order. It is moved by Mr. Spencer that vote No. 110, transport and freight, be reduced by the sum of $10,000. Is it the pleasure of the committee that the amendment carry?

Mr. GRAHAM: No.

Mr. RYCKMAN: The vote for annual drill has been reduced by thirty per cent. Is there any proportionate reduction of transport and freight?

Mr. GRAHAM: This vote is for transportation and travelling expenses of officers of headquarters and district staff, officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the permanent and active militia on change of station or travelling on duty, except duties connected with annual drill, cadet services, etc. It has nothing to do with the annual drill. Last year the whole amount of the vote was expended within $2,000. I ask the committee to put the item through as it is; any amount that can be saved out of the appropriation surely will be. What effect it would have to reduce the item by $10,000 when it has not anything to do with the other reductions, I am not in a position to say at this moment.

Mr. GOULD: I was rising to my feet when the hon. member got up who presented the resolution for a reduction of $50,000. I had in mind the soft impeachment of the hon. member for South Wellington and it was my intention to move in amendment that this vote be reduced by $25,000, an action which would be consistent with the statement I had previously made regarding these expenditures. I believe it would be well if it should be understood throughout the country that the people do not want these joy rides which go under the name of " staff rides "; at least, they do not want the excesses which these men indulge in when taking these staff rides. I believe the House would do well to give these gentlemen—gallant gentlemen, let us call them—a lesson by asking them to reduce their lavish expenditures by some $25,000, and I offer that as an amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM: There is already an amendment to reduce the item by $10,000. I think the item should not be reduced, for the reasons I have given. I thoroughly understand my hon. friend's impression with regard to certain things that took place; I have had some particulars in that regard brought to my mind during the last few days. But that is a very exceptional case, and I am sure it will not occur again. Money expended in that way is certainly not expended as, I presume, Parliament intended it should be. But I would ask the hon. member not to press his amendment, because I am not sure of what its effect would be on the work of the department. This was one of the amounts

that was fully expended last year; it has reference to services not connected with others which have been reduced. I assure my hon. friend that the performance to which he has referred is not likely to occur again.

Mr. GOULD: I am quite satisfied with the explanation of the hon. minister; I am sure he will look into these things and bring the matter to the notice of those who, we think, have erred.

Amendment (Mr. Spencer) negatived.

Item agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think we have done pretty good work. There is an item of war claims, but I would not like to press it to-night. It is a very large vote, and I would also like to have the member for East Hamilton (Mr. Mewburn) here when it is discussed. He is chairman of the War Graves Commission, which met recently and decided upon a course to be followed in the erection of memorial monuments. He is better posted on the details than anyone else, and I should like to have him here to explain what this commission is doing and what it proposes to do.

Progress reported.

ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following letter:

OTTAWA, 18th May, 1922.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Sir Louis Davies acting as deputy of the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber on Friday the 19th of May, at 4 p.m., for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain bills.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servants,
(Sgd) F. L. C. PEREIRA,
for Governor General's Secretary.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Friday.

Ottawa, May 19, 1922.

The House met at three o'clock.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres) presented the second report of the Special Committee to which were referred Bills Nos. 16 and 17 for consideration, recommending that the committee be granted leave to sit while the House is in session, and moved concurrence in the report.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not usual to ask for concurrence in a report the very day it is presented, especially a report on bills of this kind. None of us knows what the amendments are.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion only asks for leave for the committee to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the motion providing the report itself is only to the effect that the committee have leave to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: That is the only purpose of the motion.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. L. H. MARTELL (Hants): I should like to ask the Government when I may expect a return to an order of the House which I moved for some time ago relating to solicitors' bills in the province of Nova Scotia.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the matter, and will give my hon. friend the information at a later date.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

The House again in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Public Works—Chargeable to income—Harbours and Rivers—Prince Edward Island, $39,700.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister tell us what amount was spent upon these services last year?

Hon. J. H. KING (Kootenay, Minister of Public Works): It was $35,925.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was there any expenditure last year from the vote for "Harbours and rivers generally—repairs and improvements, $14,000"?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, the sum of $3,742.20 was expended.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How was the $14,000 made up, may I ask? Was it put in because that amount was in the estimates

last year, or does it consist of items that have been submitted by various officers of the department?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is a general contingency vote carried from year to year and is used during the year for repairs that become necessary from time to time. We really cannot tell in advance what these repairs may be.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The point that was drawn to my attention was this. While the amount of $14,000 is put in for Prince Edward Island that sum is very seldom, if ever, spent. Last year the total expenditure was only some $3,000 odd. It has been intimated to me that the other items cover very well, very liberally, all the expenditure that is likely, or is possible, in Prince Edward Island under this vote for the next twelve months. Someone, I understand, has gone over the requirements of the Island with a good deal of care, and has put in a separate item for each possible work that may be necessary during the next twelve months. Therefore, I am told, the item of $14,000 will not be required—it never, or seldom, is required and the committee could save that money by striking the item out of the estimates this year.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The item of $14,000 is for contingencies that may occur. It is true that last year the expenditure was only $3,742, but I do not think the present item should be disturbed; it is apparently the amount the staff think should be carried for a contingency of that kind.

Mr. GUTHRIE: But this amount of $14,000 is not recommended by any engineer of the department, or anyone who has examined the situation; I understand it is just put in as a sort of "cover all" charge; you may need it and you may not. My information is that some officer of the department has gone very thoroughly over the harbours and rivers of Prince Edward Island; that he has set out in detail what is required; and that he has been very generous in his estimate and has covered all the requirements in the various items totalling the sum of $39,700. Now the $14,000 is seldom, if ever, spent. In this case it is not likely to be spent at all; I would suggest to the minister under these circumstances it would have a better appearance if he agreed to the item of $14,000 coming off; or that $10,000 of the amount come off, leaving $4,000 for little incidentals that might possibly crop up.

Mr. FIELDING: There is a similar provision, I think, in the case of most of the other provinces. It is really an emergency item; it is not a thing that can be specified at the beginning of the year. And even if the money was not spent last year, circumstances might make it very desirable that it should be disbursed this year.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand the probable necessities of the other maritime provinces are much greater than those of the province of Prince Edward Island; in the case of New Brunswick there is a contingency vote of $40,000. I understand that quite often it is necessary to spend a good portion of the vote for a province, to repair damages caused by storms. But I am told that the officer who made up the estimate went over all these works and that he has taken possibilities as well as probabilities into his consideration. Now the expenditure under this item is about $2,000 to $4,000 annually. My point is that it is hardly worth while voting the $14,000 when there is no likelihood of spending the money. Something might arise eventually demanding an expenditure, —something did occur last year because $3,000 was spent. Under the circumstances I think it would be very reasonable to put in a sum of $4,000 for contingencies, and reduce the vote by $10,000.

Mr. HUGHES: It is quite evident from the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) that he is not very well acquainted with maritime province conditions; he comes from a part of the country where the conditions would not enable him to have very much knowledge in regard to matters of this kind. Owing to the fact that the province in question is an island it contains quite a number of harbours, and in those harbours are important public works. No man can foretell when a storm may come up and inflict very great damage on a number of these works. Therefore a prudent government, one having the interest of the country at heart, will most naturally and necessarily have an amount of this kind to provide for such contingencies. The necessity for the expenditure may not arise for years; but at any time storms may occur resulting in very great damage, and it would be very vital to have that damage repaired with the utmost promptitude. Really it is true economy to have the money available for that purpose; therefore this item has

appeared in the estimates for many years. It is not a new vote, and if the money is not wanted it will not be expended, and no harm will be done. I think that if my hon. friend understood the conditions as they actually exist in Prince Edward Island, he would not object to this vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The storm which my hon. friend fears might happen and do considerable damage, might occur anywhere; but we could always make provision for cases of that kind. Suppose you had an earthquake, or a heavy storm, and damage to the amount of $50,000 or $100,000 was done; that could immediately be taken care of.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In what way?

Mr. GUTHRIE: By Governor General's warrant. It has been done in the past, time and again. This system of warrants is designed to take care of unforeseen sudden expenditure, and there is no object in continuing the vote of $14,000. The minister might just as well put it in at $100,000 or $150,000. Experience has shown that $2,000 or $3,000 is necessary. Granting that you may be called upon to make a heavy unforeseen expenditure when the House is not in session, it is always open to the minister to go to the Governor General and get a warrant, and come down at the next session of parliament, as has been done time and again, and ask for the money.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there should be any misunderstanding regarding this vote. It is in the usual form and was carried last year and the year previous. It is a vote for contingencies which may arise, which cannot be foretold. A similar vote was passed the other day in regard to the province of Nova Scotia, $60,000 for contingencies. In regard to this particular vote, I am told that $2,200 has already been required as expenditures which should be made under that vote this year. Beyond that, we have no knowledge as to what will be required. It is a usual vote, not only in this department but almost in every department, for unforeseen expenditures.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queen's, P.E.I.): I desire to correct a statement made by the hon. member for South Wellington. When reviewing this vote he conveyed the impression that the whole requirements had been given in detail within the province of Prince Edward Island for those expenditures. His information is somewhat astray. I know that he would not willingly convey an incorrect impression to the committee, but if he were fully acquainted with the conditions in that province, as some of us are, he would know that this vote is merely to provide for expenditures that cannot be avoided, in the way of repairs. Many new works have been delayed in the past years, owing to heavy demands for expenditure, for reasons of which we are all well aware. Looking at the vote from the departmental standpoint, the policy has been to cover these votes by one general vote, and not by Governor General's warrant, as suggested by the hon. member. I think the committee will readily see that the proportion of this vote is not too great, when the expenditures in Prince Edward Island are considered, as compared with the other maritime provinces.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know whether the principle is a good or a bad one. I find the estimates show contingent votes for harbours and rivers, which run into a very large sum of money. For Nova Scotia we voted $60,000 for contingencies, not knowing how the money is going to be spent. For Prince Edward Island we are asked to vote $14,000; New Brunswick, $40,000; Quebec, $75,000; Ontario, $65,000; Manitoba, $15,000; Saskatchewan and Alberta, $20,000 between them; and British Columbia, $95,000—all these votes for contingencies. That is a very substantial amount of money, and there are no particulars given—none can be given, the circumstances have not arisen for the expenditure of even a fraction of it. Why can we not remove this large amount of money from the estimates, and, if money is necessary during the twelvemonth, get it as we did in other cases, by Governor General's warrant?

Mr. FIELDING: Is it not unfortunate that when my hon. friend (Mr. Guthrie) was in a better position to influence this item, he did not apply these principles? He has selected a regrettable moment to do it. He should have done it when he had the power.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not know that it is regrettable. I bring it up at the present time, and if I did not notice it or my attention was not called to it last year, it has certainly been called to it this year.

Mr. FIELDING: Evidently.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not by a man far from Nova Scotia, but by a gentleman from Nova Scotia, who pointed out the item. If the principle is wrong it is a good time

to correct it; if it is right, let us confirm it.

Mr. CARROLL: Who was my hon. friend's informant?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is none of my hon. friend's business.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The fact that I did not call attention to it last year, or the year before, is no reason for saying, if it is wrong, that we should not put it right now. Here is an item of $375,000 for repairs generally, and we do not know where the money is going, or whether it is going to be spent or not. I ask the House to consider the question of wiping out all the items for contingencies, and if the money is required, get it by Governor General's warrant.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member from South Wellington apparently has a stricken conscience and I challenge him to name a man from Nova Scotia of outstanding ability—

Mr. DUFF: Or in any other province.

Mr. CARROLL: Or in any other province—who objects to any item in the Public Works' estimates which have been presented to this parliament. When I ask him to suggest the name of any person in that province who objects to the estimates that have been brought before this House, he says it is none of my business. It is my business, and it is the business of this committee, and I challenge my hon. friend from South Wellington to name a man from the province of Nova Scotia who objects to the estimates that have been brought down by the Minister of Public Works.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—New Brunswick, $66,700.

Mr. LEGER: I see an item here "Portage river—repairs to breakwater $1,200". In what county is Portage river?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): In Kent county.

Mr. BAXTER: I understand there are two Portage rivers in adjacent parishes. Perhaps they are in adjacent counties. I would like to know the parish. I have had an inquiry about it.

Mr. LEGER: Parish of Carleton, Kent County.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the parish. Portage river is a small stream entering the Northumberland straits about five miles from Point Sapin and six miles north of Kouchibouguac, population 150.

Mr. HANSON: Has any policy been arrived at with respect to the question of provincial wharves on tidal waters in New Brunswick? If I understand the matter aright, the scheme adopted by my hon. friend's friends of the provincial government of New Brunswick is to unload upon the Dominion treasury the maintenance and upkeep of all the public wharves that have been built in that province since the beginning of time, and thus relieve themselves of a burden which they voluntarily took upon themselves in days gone by. If the minister will question the officials of his department, he will find that a very prodigal policy has been pursued in the past by both governments with respect to building public wharves in New Brunswick in tidal waters, which wharves, for the most part, have been built purely for political purposes. This was especially true on the river St. John during the regime of the Laurier government down to 1911 when a former member of this House represented that constituency as a supporter of that government. If you will travel up and down the river St. John in the counties of Queen's and Sunbury, you will find two or three wharves in the same locality, one built by the Dominion, one by the province and another by one or the other as a high water wharf or a low water wharf, as the case may be. At the present time, all are in a state of disrepair, and the provincial government have refused to carry out the policy which was instituted twenty-five or thirty years ago with respect to building these wharves, and to keep their wharves in repair. Similarly, during the war, owing to the exigencies of the finances of the country, the Dominion authorities allowed many of their wharves to fall into disrepair—one could very well understand that. But lately, an effort has been made on the part of the provincial authorities by the Foster government to unload on the Dominion all the upkeep and maintenance of these provincial wharves in tidal waters. Just the other day, Hon. Mr. Foster was a visitor to Ottawa. I do not know that his visit to the capital synchronized with the vacancy which has recently occurred in the Senate or not, but he paid a visit to Ottawa, and on his return to New Brunswick he announced that the Dominion authorities had agreed to take over from the province all the provincial wharves in tidal waters. I should like to have from the minister a

statement as to what policy has been decided upon in that regard. I would point out to him also the duplication of services by the two governments in the past, and, having regard to that, would ask what is proposed to be done in the future. While I am on my feet I should like to point out to the minister that, in this appropriation of $66,700, there is not one dollar for the repair of a single Dominion wharf in the water of the St. John river or its tributaries, although many important wharves are to be found in that locality.

Mr. COPP: Will the hon. member kindly state how many Dominion wharves are on that river?

Mr. HANSON: If I had time, I could recall them; but at the very least, there must be a dozen. In my constituency of Sunbury, there is one at Oromocto, one at Mangerville, one at Burton and one at Sheffield, a very important wharf.

Mr. MORRISSY: Is there on the St. John river one wharf owned by the Dominion government?

Mr. HANSON: Yes.

Mr. MORRISSY: There is not one. I was eight years in charge of the wharves there, and there is none.

Mr. HANSON: I will not take any back seat to the hon. gentleman. I have already pointed out four in the county of Sunbury, and if I had time to think of them, I could point out half a dozen more. There is a public wharf at Gagetown, a very important point on the river St. John, where during the season of navigation, a very large quantity of produce and lumber is shipped each year. That is a Dominion wharf. I know that because I was instrumental in having some minor repairs done to that wharf last year by the Dominion authorities.

In these estimates there is not a dollar for a single wharf on the St. John river, although there are at least a dozen in that locality. There is not a single dollar for a wharf in the bay of Fundy waters, except at three points in the county of Charlotte. The entire vote is being appropriated for the north shore counties, and that is not a fair distribution. With respect to the appropriation of $40,000 generally for harbours and rivers in New Brunswick, I do not object to the principle of that blanket appropriation, except to make this observation—that, in times gone by, a very much larger appropriation was inserted in the estimates, and it was used as occasion required, not altogether on business principles. I do not, however, object to the amount of $40,000 in the estimate this year, if the minister will say that attention will be given to those Dominion wharves where, I know, attention is required.

Mr. COPP: Does my hon. friend object to wharves in tidal waters of New Brunswick being taken over by the Dominion government the same as has been done in the case of wharves in other provinces?

Mr. HANSON: If that is a general policy that has been adopted by this Government—

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend misunderstands me. The wharves in the other provinces have not been taken over by this Government; they have been maintained by the Dominion government for many years, and the province of New Brunswick is the only province in the whole Dominion that has been compelled to keep up wharves in tidal waters. Does my hon. friend object to the province of New Brunswick being treated in the same manner as the other provinces?

Mr. HANSON: I do not understand that to be the case. If my hon. friend will, on his authority as a minister of the Crown, state that that is the case, then I would submit that New Brunswick should be placed in no different position from that of any other province. But if that be not the case, I will object to hon. gentlemen opposite loading on to the Dominion the burden which the province of New Brunswick voluntarily assumed, and which it should keep up because it voluntarily assumed the burden.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Representations have been made during the last two or three years to the Dominion government by the provincial government of New Brunswick, asking that this government take over and control the wharf service in New Brunswick. Heretofore there has been a dual service, which apparently came into vogue many years ago. The matter was under consideration by the late government and, I believe, it had reached a certain stage where an order would probably have been presented with that idea in view. The policy was not adopted; but for the information of the committee, I may say that recently I have had representations from the government

of New Brunswick following up the representations which they made in 1919 and 1920; the matter is receiving consideration, but the final decision has not been reached.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much of last year's estimate of $118,000 was spent, and how much of last year's estimate of $40,000 was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of the $40,000, $11,600 odd was spent.

Mr. CHAPLIN: How much was spent of the total?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Amount spent, $71,964.

Mr. HANSON: Who is the engineer in charge of the Public Works Department in New Brunswick?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Mr. Stead.

Mr. HANSON: Has the agency at Chatham been closed?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: And the whole coast line, including the river St. John, is now under his jurisdiction?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HANSON: I do not see anything in the estimates this year for any construction on the island of Grand Manan. This is the largest island in the bay of Fundy, with the largest population, and there are works there that undoubtedly require attention.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I understand that there was no report from the engineer, when the estimates were prepared, as to the necessity for any construction there.

Mr. HANSON: What are the instructions given to the engineer? Does he voluntarily make a report, or is he requested to go over the situation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): He voluntarily reports from time to time upon the requirements of his district.

Mr. GRIMMER: There is a vote of $1,500 for Leonardville and $1,700 for Welchpool, both for "repairs to wharf." Are these wharves in Charlotte county?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are both in Charlotte county.

Mr. GRIMMER: Have any representations been made to the department, on behalf of the people of Grand Manan and the neighbouring islands, urging the necessity for the construction of breakwaters in all or any of these islands?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be glad to look into the question and give my hon. friend the information. I have not the facts at the moment.

Mr. GRIMMER: I should be very much surprised to learn that no representations of this kind have been made to the department, for I believe that it was generally understood, prior to the last election, that in the event of the present administration being returned to power construction would be proceeded with at once on breakwaters at some or all of these islands.

Mr. HANSON: The promise was made.

Mr. GRIMMER: Well, at any rate, the people generally understood that. Now, the people have carried out their part of the programme, and it rests with the Government to fulfil any promises that may have been made on their behalf. These islands form a part of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, and they are isolated from the mainland. The island of Campobello and Deer island are situated five miles from the nearest point on the mainland out in Passamaquoddy bay and the island of Grand Manan is twenty miles away from the mainland out in Atlantic ocean. The people of these islands depend entirely on fishing for a living. Any hon. member who knows anything at all about this industry is aware of the hardships and the disadvantages generally which those who are engaged in it have to endure. The village of Castalia, on the island of Grand Manan, was at one time a prosperous fishing community, but owing to the disadvantages under which the people laboured the young men went over to the United States where they could engage in their occupation under more favourable conditions. The heavy seas and storms from the Atlantic, beating upon the island, have destroyed the waterfront. The people, in the event of a storm, have to moor their boats two miles from home, and this entails a serious hardship upon them. Nature has provided a splendid foundation for a breakwater and all that is required is for the Government to carry it to completion. The people believe that the young men will come back if they are given an opportunity to engage in the industry under proper conditions. The breakwater could

be completed at little expense and it would carry out any promises that may have been made to the people. At Woodwards Cove some years ago the government undertook the construction of a breakwater and completed one section, and the people are desirous of having the work carried to completion. On Deer island, at the cove above Wilson's Beach, which is the central part of the island, the fishermen work under more favourable circumstances. They do not require a great breakwater, as they have a magnificent cove in which to moor their boats. But the fishermen to-day have to carry their fish along the beach to the houses, the water being too shallow for them to moor their boats near shore. They are anxious to have the department of Public Works do at least a week's dredging so that they may have ample mooring accommodation. The work would cost comparatively little and would meet the requirements of those who engage in fishing in that part of the country. The upper portion of Deer island, as far back as the oldest inhabitants can recollect, has never received its due share of public works. The people desire to have a wharf or a breakwater there. Either would be satisfactory to them, and it is imperative that the construction be begun at as early a date as possible in order to enable the fishermen to carry on their industry. Only a small amount would be necessary to provide permanent facilities, and the people have been wanting the work done for a considerable time now. I see that for Nova Scotia the estimates provide $182,680 while for New Brunswick the amount is only $66,700, just about one-third. Surely the Government can afford to implement the promise they made the people in that portion of Charlotte county. I should be gratified if the minister would give me definite assurance that these new public works, which would not cost a great deal and which are absolutely necessary if these people are to carry on their business, will be provided.

Mr. HANSON: I would call the attention of the minister and of the committee to the character of the campaign carried on by the Liberal candidate in Charlotte county, New Brunswick, during the last election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. HANSON: The item is not carried. As hon. gentlemen are aware who know the geography of that locality, a very large portion of the population of the county depends on the fishing industry for a livelihood. I am intimately acquainted with the place, as it happens to be my native county, and I have lived there a good many years. During the last general election, Mr. W. F. Todd, the defeated Liberal candidate in Charlotte county, carried on a campaign throughout the island parishes, and promised a wharf or breakwater at practically every fishing hamlet in the county.

Mr. MICHAUD: Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hanson) make any promises of a similar kind in his county?

Mr. HANSON: No, I did not make any.

Mr. MICHAUD: What about the Transcontinental railway? The hon. member for York-Sunbury wanted the divisional point, which is in my town transferred to his own town, and he campaigned for that change.

Mr. HANSON: I would point out to the minister and the House that what I have referred to was a straight bid for votes on a bribery principle. We have heard of such cases in days gone by in connection with our election campaigns. I would point out further that no attempt whatever has been made to implement what the Liberal candidate so lavishly promised on that occasion. Some of those promises, I have no doubt, were made in good faith; others undoubtedly were made with the intent and purpose of influencing the electors. That practice has a degenerating influence on our public life, and—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. HANSON: Some of my hon. friends opposite laugh, I suppose because it has been such a common practice by them in the past, especially in New Brunswick. I would point out to the minister that some of these promises were made by Mr. W. F. Todd, the Liberal candidate in my constituency, and have not been fulfilled, I think the minister would be doing a duty to the people down there if he would endeavour to have those promises redeemed.

Mr. COPP: Were the wharves and breakwaters which my hon. friend says were promised, necessary to the county of Charlotte, which he speaks of as being his native county?

Mr. HANSON: Some few were; most of them were not.

Mr. COPP: Unfortunately Mr. Todd is not here to defend himself against this very serious charge. But my hon. friend was not content with making this charge against Mr. Todd alone; he says that all the members of this House from the province of New Brunswick took the same course during their respective campaigns.

Mr. HANSON: I did not say that. I said that that course had been pursued in the past by hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick.

Mr. COPP: Members of this House at present?

Mr. HANSON: No.

Mr. COPP: While making allowance for the fact that my hon. friend is a young member of this House, yet I feel it is neither fair nor courageous on his part—and I think the House will agree with me—to make these charges against his opponents without bringing evidence to substantiate them. My friend Mr. Todd was a member of this House for many years, and several hon. members will recall the splendid reputation which he enjoyed. Before my hon. friend charges his opponents with making, during the course of his campaign, promises verging on bribery, he should at least have the courtesy and courage to bring some evidence before this committee upon which he bases his charges. On the contrary he has not offered the slightest evidence in support of what he alleges.

Mr. HANSON: Mr. Chairman, I have great pleasure in bringing to your notice a specific instance. Just previous to the general election Mr. Todd arrived at Grand Manan, accompanied by a number of henchmen, including Mr. B. M. Hill, chief engineer of highways for New Brunswick. They not only told the people of Grand Manan that they would build them a motor speedway, but Mr. Hill, I am informed, actually went around among the electors—and, be it known, Mr. Hill was defeated in the provincial arena—and engaged men to work upon that road, ostensibly to make a survey, but practically to go to work on the road. That was all very well until election day; we have never heard about the matter since.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend, just as I expected, has shifted his ground entirely. He transfers his charge from Mr. Todd to Mr. Hill, the superintendent of local highways in New Brunswick. My hon. friend knows, as does everyone else in New Brunswick, that Mr. Hill is an employee of the local government there. No doubt he went down to the county of Charlotte for the same purpose that he has visited all the other counties in the province, to build highways; and he has helped to build many magnificent highways in New Brunswick. But the building of provincial highways has nothing whatever to do with the construction of breakwaters and wharves in the county of Charlotte.

Mr. HANSON: The money out of which Mr. Hill proposed to build the highways was to come from the federal grant, which certainly has a very important bearing on Dominion politics.

Mr. COPP: That is all expended by the local government under the superintendence of Mr. Hill.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

SITTING SUSPENDED FOR ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS

A message was delivered by Colonel Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, 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.

And having returned,

Mr. 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:

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 31st March, 1922, and the 31st March, 1923.

An Act for the relief of Wentworth Barnes.

An Act for the relief of Hazel McInally.

An Act for the relief of Edward Lovell.

An Act for the relief of Elizabeth Lillian Sharpe.

An Act for the relief of Percival Andrew Jamieson.

An Act for the relief of Frederick Henry Gill.

An Act for the relief of Blanche Elizabeth Macdonell.

An Act for the relief of Frank Charles Butt.

An Act for the relief of Edward Sidney John Turpin.

An Act for the relief of Albert Bethune Carley.

An Act for the relief of Ernest Zufelt.

An Act for the relief of Harry Johns Leach.

An Act for the relief of Nellie Berry.

An Act respecting The Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.

An Act respecting The Kettle Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting La Compagnie de Chemin de Fer de Colonisation du Nord.
An Act respecting The Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting The Canada Trust Company.
An Act to incorporate Canadian General Insurance Company.
An Act to amend the Penitentiary Act.
An Act for the relief of Ethel Turner.
An Act for the relief of Walter Michie Anderson.
An Act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Fredenburg.
An Act for the relief of Sheriff Elwin Robinson.
An Act for the relief of Rhoda Renfrew McFarlane Brown.
An Act for the relief of Abraham Leibovitz.
An Act to incorporate British National Assurance Company.
An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.
An Act respecting Prudential Trust Company, Limited.
An Act respecting The T. Eaton General Insurance Company.
An Act respecting Aberdeen Fire Insurance Company.
An Act respecting Armour Life Assurance Company.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

The House resumed in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Mr. HANSON: The Secretary of State (Mr. Copp) challenged me to give a list of the places where those supporting him had made definite promises to carry out public works in the county of Charlotte prior to the last election. I have in my hand a list of those places.

Mr. COPP: I did not say anything about those who were supporting me.

Mr. HANSON: I will let you have a list anyway. The first place as to which Mr. Todd, and those supporting him, made such a promise, and the most important public work to which he had relation, was the completion of the breakwater at Castalia, Parish of Grand Manan. Mr. Todd was there and personally looked over the ground and told the people he would have the breakwater carried to completion. The second place was at Welshpool—

Mr. COPP: Did my hon. friend say Castalia?

Mr. HANSON: Yes Castalia, Parish of Grand Manan. At Welshpool Mr. Todd personally promised that dredging would be done forthwith. The third place where a promise of a public work was made, was at the upper end of Deer island, near Lord's cove where he personally—

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. GOOD: Has my hon. friend any objection to the members in this part of the Chamber hearing his statement? We cannot hear him at all in this quarter.

Mr. HANSON: I shall be delighted to oblige my hon. friend. As I say the third promise related to a wharf or breakwater at the upper end of Deer island, just beyond Lord's cove. Mr. Todd promised a wharf or a breakwater; I am not sure that he did not promise them both. The fourth place was at Seeley basin, in the parish of Pennfield, where a wharf site was actually located before the 6th December. I dare say, if I had the time, I could give my hon. friend a dozen other places.

Mr. COPP: Is my hon. friend speaking from hearsay, or was he present and heard the statements referred to?

Mr. HANSON: The hon. member knows I was not there.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is repeating what somebody told him.

Mr. HANSON: I am speaking from information which I know to be correct.

Mr. COPP: I would like the hon. gentleman to give a little further information.

Mr. HANSON: I do not know, Sir, that you have any right to cross-examine me.

Mr. COPP: I am not cross-examining my hon. friend. Apparently he is a hostile witness and a cross-examination of that type of witness is sometimes dangerous. However, I would like my hon. friend to be kind enough—he having volunteered very valuable information to the committee in regard to the attitude of Mr. Todd during the last election campaign regarding the construction of wharves and breakwaters or both, in his county—to state whether the public works suggested by Mr. Todd as being desirable are necessary for the inhabitants of the particular localities mentioned.

Mr. HANSON: They are not in the estimates and therefore in the opinion of the Government they cannot be necessary. If my hon. friend wants an answer I would refer him to the officers of the Public Works Department who are the technical advisers of the Government. It is not my duty, it is not even my privilege, to advise my hon. friend.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend apparently misunderstood my question.

Mr. HANSON: I do not think so.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is a native of Charlotte county and he has a very close acquaintance with its requirements, as well as with the requirements of the county of York which he represents. I would like, therefore, if he would be good enough to tell the committee whether, in his opinion, the construction of the public works in question is necessary for the benefit of the inhabitants of the respective localities referred to? If he says it is, I am sure the Minister of Public Works will give the matter his very careful consideration?

Mr. HANSON: I will put this proposition to the minister: If I answer his question will he undertake to carry out the recommendation that I make? Then I will answer his question.

Mr. COPP: I am very deeply interested in the information my hon. friend has given to the committee. It is the first I have heard with respect to these localities requiring accommodation of the kind referred to. I would be very glad indeed if my hon. friend would inform us whether these works are absolutely necessary. If they are, I will be very glad, seeing that I represent the province of New Brunswick, to give the matter my very best consideration, and see if something can be done to meet the requirements in question.

Mr. GRIMMER: As the representative of the county of Charlotte I will answer the question and say that, I think these works are absolutely necessary. They should be built in the interest of the people of the county, and any promises that were made at the last election should be carried out. If Mr. Todd made the promises referred to I think he was perfectly right in doing so; the works are really needed by the people, the fishermen and others, who carry on their occupations in those localities. I will back the minister up if he will undertake these works and carry them to completion. However, as no amounts have been provided in the estimates I can see no chance of this being done.

Mr. DUFF: There is the sum of $40,000 in the estimates.

Mr. HANSON: That will not go far towards building a breakwater in Castalia.

Mr. FIELDING: I am a little interested whenever I hear of any one breaking a contract and not keeping faith. Now if anybody, either Liberal or Conservative, promised to build wharves or piers, or anything of the kind, as a means of getting votes, that is wrong, that is bribery—call it what you like—and therefore I cannot excuse it. But I am going to ask my hon. friend from York-Sunbury (Mr. Hanson) as to the nature of these promises. Did I understand correctly, that Mr. Todd promised that these things would be done if Mr. Grimmer was elected?

Mr. HANSON: The question of the hon. minister answers itself.

Mr. FIELDING: He does not allege that any such promise was made; therefore there was no breach of contract.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I call attention again to the very large item of $40,000 in these estimates. The total estimate is $66,000. There is an amount of $40,000 unspecified. I do not think it is good business to put such a large amount for unspecified work in the estimates. I noted what the minister had to say in regard to a similar item for Prince Edward Island. I wish to point out that the total estimates in respect to Prince Edward Island were $40,000 and the unspecified amount was $14,000. In the other case, the total amount was $66,000 and unspecified $40,000, a disproportionate amount.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not want to delay the estimate, but following up what the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) has stated, I think the minister should consider the objection. See the opportunity it gives the minister, if the vote goes through as it stands. Last year $11,000 was spent and $29,000 not spent. If similar conditions exist this year the minister will have under that general vote $29,000. For his own protection he should change this system. Every government heeler in New Brunswick will be after him to spend this money. At least, I venture the opinion that some will be after him. They will be chasing the minister, and all sorts of reports will come to him that $2,000 should be spent here, $3,000 another place, and $5,000 another place. Parliament has nothing to say in regard to the expenditure, we are leaving it in the hands of the minister to say when and where he will spend the money. He will undoubtedly be importuned and for his own protection it would be far better if the amount were reduced. There is no emergency that cannot be taken care of by Governor General's warrant, and the minister should welcome my

suggestion. I know that this system has obtained in the past, why not correct it for the future? I ask the minister if he will not announce a reduction of $10,000 in the total vote of $66,000. We have an item, "Contingencies, improvements and repairs generally, $40,000." We are asked to give the money without knowing whether it is going to be spent, or where. It is an improper principle.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will cite a few items of expenditure last year under this vote, and my hon. friend will see the fallacy of his argument when he says that a Governor General's warrant be passed on every occasion of this kind. We find that at Chance Harbour $100 was spent; at Cognac, $18; Leonardville Wharf, $25.20; Mill Point, $543.77. Many items, large and small, come up for consideration and conditions occur from time to time where the engineers or the officials are required to report on certain matters and make expenditures. I think the hon. member will see how cumbersome it would be if we had to obtain Governor General's warrants on every occasion of this kind. A contingent vote to take care of unforeseen conditions is not unusual in the Public Works Department or in any other department. The vote last year was the same amount as this year; I have not the information as to the preceding year, but I imagine the vote was somewhat similar. The expenditures vary from year to year, as one can well understand, and I see no reason why the vote should be reduced. It will not be expended if it is not required.

Mr. GOOD: What was the total expenditure in these items last year, and what need is there for having a much larger expenditure this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total expenditure last year was $11,666, out of a vote for contingencies of $40,000. I would not and could not advise the committee that the expenditure would be the same as last year. No one can foretell that. I see no reason to change the vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I see the point in what the minister says, that there is a lot of small payments which have to be made, but I think $10,000 or $15,000 would be sufficient for all purposes. I wish to test the matter and take the view of the committee, and for that purpose I am going to move to reduce the item. I do not desire to reduce it in respect of New Brunswick only, and I want to avoid making a motion as each item comes up, and my amendment will be simply to take the feeling of the committee upon this question. I move that the item of $40,000 for repairs and improvements generally be reduced to $20,000. That will allow the minister a very substantial amount and a large margin, to carry on incidental repairs.

Mr. FIELDING: The amendment of my hon. friend, I think, shows a failure to appreciate the very spirit and purpose of the resolution. It is an emergency vote for something that cannot be anticipated. The most we can say is that it may not be needed. The past experience has shown that when it was not needed it was not spent, but, surely, it is well to have a margin of safety in that case, and the figures the minister brings down are precisely the same as last year's. I think it would be a mistake to depart from the rule laid down in the past; I do not think the hon. member has shown any good reason for reducing the vote.

Amendment (Mr. Guthrie) negatived: Yeas 24; Nays 79.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Quebec, $396,980.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the committee that this appropriation be taken up in detail item by item?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely my hon. friends are not going to ask the committee to pass a batch of details consisting of probably forty different items, without a word from the minister. I am surprised that the minister himself did not offer to give to the committee an explanation of some of these items. How much of the total appropriation of $423,160 of last year was spent? How much of the appropriation of $75,000 of last year for harbours and rivers generally was spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The total expenditure from last year's appropriation was $254,557.56. Of the appropriation of $75,000 for harbours and rivers generally last year, the expenditure was $62,881. That in itself shows that these items vary from year to year. In Quebec last year we practically expended the sum set aside for contingencies.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister and the Government will note that, out of an appropriation of about $423,000, only

$254,000, or very little over one-half, was spent. The minister is asking this year, on the policy and plea of retrenchment and economy, an increase of about $142,000 over the expenditure of last year. We ought to have an explanation of this very large increase.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think my hon. friend would suggest that the estimates and expenditures made last year should govern and rule the committee this year. The estimates are prepared in the department on the knowledge and advice of the officials of the department. We have not found it necessary to ask for as large a sum as was asked for last year. This year we are asking for $396,980 against $423,100 last year. My hon. friend says that, as the expenditure last year was only $254,000, we should further reduce the amount this year. I do not think he is competent—and I know, as minister, with the time at my disposal, I am not competent—to advise the committee that that should follow. I am taking the advice of the officials of my department, and this would seem to be a reasonable amount for expenditures in the province of Quebec. It is well known to hon. members that, during the war period, undoubtedly, and wisely so, public works were not maintained as they should be in normal times, and the Department of Public Works at this time finds it necessary to make more extensive repairs than probably would have been necessary if the ordinary repairs had been carried on from year to year.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister is enunciating a policy of extensive and increased expenditure on public works. He states that during the war there was retrenchment, and that now is the time for expansion. We were led to believe, by the oft-repeated and widely advertised declarations of the Government that this was to be a period of retrenchment.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me. I merely stated that, owing to the fact that public works were allowed to fall into disrepair during the war period, it is found necessary now to make larger expenditures on these works in order that we may retain what we have. To do otherwise, would be false economy.

Mr. STEVENS: Surely we could run over these items quickly, and the minister could give us a brief explanation of the reasons for them. The first item, Anse aux Gascons wharf, is a revote of $29,000, only $20,000 of the appropriation of last year of $49,000 having been expended. We should have an explanation of that. And some of the other items are very large.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The $29,000 asked for Anse aux Gascons wharf covers a contract entered into last year. The contract price was $49,000, and the expenditure in 1921-22 was $20,000, so that a revote this year of $29,000 is required to carry out the contract entered into in 1921-22.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the appropriation for repairs and reconstruction of the wharf at Gaspé in the same situation? The appropriation last year was $34,000, and we are asked for a revote of $20,000 this year. Was that under contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think there was a contract for the wharf extension and repairs at Grosse Isle quarantine station, but I am not sure. How far has that work been proceeded with?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The vote asked is for repairs to the flooring, replacing of mooring posts in the eastern wharf and extension of eastern wharf. Of the appropriation of $50,000 last year, $15,000 was expended, and the amount lapsed is $9,000. This revote of $26,000 is to complete the work.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was $15,000 the total expenditure last year on this work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Last year's appropriation was $50,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Then the total cost of this work when completed is going to be only $41,000 instead of $50,000?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario, $398,800.

Mr. MANION: How much was spent of last year's estimate amounting to $644,700?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Altogether, $408,000.

Mr. MANION: What percentage was spent of the vote of $65,000 for harbours and rivers generally?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount spent was $44,263.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): Does the minister intend to put anything in the supplementary estimates for Goderich harbour? He will remember that a deputation waited upon him a few weeks ago. This is the only harbour between Port McNicoll and Sarnia, and last year 22,000,000 bushels of grain passed through it. The harbour should be dredged to enable big boats to turn round. Sometimes vessels have remained in the harbour for as long as ten days getting unloaded.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The representations made by my hon. friend and by the deputation are receiving consideration, but I am not in a position to advise as to what will be put in the estimates.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The question of the Goderich harbour has been before the House many times during the last ten years. The position became rather acute four or five years ago. It was felt that during the war the expenditure would hardly be justified. My recollection is that what is required in Goderich harbour will take a considerable amount of money. I believe that the expenditure is urgently needed. My hon. friend from South Huron (Mr. Black) knows the situation better than I do, but I have heard the matter discussed by various delegations, and I know something about the railroad that runs through the city of Guelph where I live and which is dependent for a large part of its trade on the grain that comes through the Goderich harbour. This harbour, I think, is the only one for large boats on the shores of Lake Huron, from Port McNicoll all the way down. It requires a considerable course of dredging. The chief expenditure is needed for something in the nature of a sea wall to make the harbour safe in stormy weather. At present it is the only port where a ship can put in in stress of weather on the whole of that side of lake Huron, and it is of considerable consequence to mariners in general to have the harbour properly built up and developed, apart altogether from the question of shipping. Goderich is reached now both by the Grand Trunk and by the Canadian Pacific railways. There are large elevator systems in the locality and a tremendous amount of grain passes through the port. I hope, therefore, that the Government will take the matter up, and when the supplementary estimates come down I shall certainly join with my hon. friend from South Huron in endeavouring to convince the Government that a substantial expenditure should be made there.

[Mr. Manion.]

Mr. LEGER: Why do you not make a motion to that effect?

Mr. DUFF: I see that we are discussing votes for Ontario, and it is rather strange that the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) does not move an amendment to reduce the item for the expenditure of $65,000 on harbours and rivers.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have explained why.

Mr. DUFF: Since he is appearing before the House as the great economist he might very well do that. He is not only backing up the member for South Huron in urging the necessity for expending this large amount of $398,000 odd in Ontario, but he wants the Government to spend more. Now, if that vote were asked for New Brunswick or British Columbia, or some other province, my hon. friend would be on his feet immediately, telling the Government that they were spending too much money. It strikes me that a great deal depends on whose ox is gored, and the hon. member for South Wellington seems to be the most inconsistent gentleman in this House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It will not take long to reply to my hon. friend. I am not making any motion in respect of this $65,000 for harbours and rivers generally, in Ontario, for the reason that I have given to the committee. I merely wished to test the opinion of the committee once for all, and apply it to all the items in the estimates. That would save time, and it is final and definite enough for me. I do not object to any expenditure on rivers and harbours in any part of Canada where the expenditure is warranted; I have not once objected to such expenditures in these items. I have however, objected to money being voted for the Government to spend without Parliament knowing how it is to be expended, and that objection was well founded, notwithstanding the vote of the committee.

Mr. DUFF: It is all very well for the hon. member to get up, now that he is in opposition, and be so pious politically: He was not quite so pious a few days before the election, however. He got contracts let in the city of Guelph for some $300,000 for militia supplies that were not needed.

Mr. GUTHRIE: For how much?

Mr. DUFF: Nor was he so pious in other things. He should be the last gentleman to rise in his place in this House and declare that there should not be one dollar expended without minute details as to how it will be disposed of. The whole trouble with the hon. gentleman is that he is not acquainted with the facts. With regard to the votes in the different provinces for harbours and rivers generally, I do not suppose it would be parliamentary for me to say that my hon. friend's attitude is due to ignorance on his part.

The CHAIRMAN: Order.

Mr. DUFF: I do say, however, that it is due to lack of knowledge. And that is the whole trouble with him. Now, I know very little about the province of Ontario, but I can conceive the possibility that instead of $65,000 being required for harbours and rivers in that province in the year 1922, the Government may have to spend $150,000. The money, I presume, is voted in order that the public works on the Great Lakes may be repaired when they are destroyed by storms such as we had last night. In the vote for Nova Scotia the committee will see, on page 38 of the Estimates, a sum of $60,000 provided for harbours and rivers generally. Those hon. members who went home late last night and experienced the disagreeable weather we had then, must certainly have realized, if their thoughts were either on the Pacific or on the Atlantic, that some damage was being wrought by the storm on those two great bodies of water. This morning I received telegrams from my own constituency informing me that several public works along the shore were washed away last night; and knowing the nature of those works, I should judge that it would take at least $50,000 to repair them. Of course, the member for South Wellington does not know anything about that; he is a sea lawyer more or less, and he is only arguing this afternoon from hearsay.

Mr. MARTELL: The hon. gentleman's remarks are not complimentary to sea lawyers.

Mr. DUFF: Perhaps not, but the hon. member's arguments are advanced only for the sake of opposition to the votes. The minister is quite right in putting these votes in the estimates, because it is impossible for himself or his officials to know just how much will be required in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, or any other province. It is good business to have these estimates provided, and it has always been done. The hon. member, I repeat, is objecting only for the sake of opposition and not because he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. BLACK (Huron): I do not always agree with my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), but I insist that a larger vote should be placed in the estimates for Goderich harbour than is provided. The Board of Trade at Goderich told me they estimated it would take $400,000 to fix the wharf, but they are only asking this year for about $100,000 to do necessary dredging so that boats can unload as they come in. I have a photograph showing eleven boats laden with grain all waiting to come into the harbour. Some are held back a week at a time.

Mr. FOURNIER: How much grain was handled at Goderich last year?

Mr. BLACK (South Huron): Twenty-one million bushels of grain was brought into Goderich harbour last year.

Mr. GOOD: As one of the members from Ontario who supported the amendment to reduce the previous vote, I wish to say to my hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) that I did not do so from a spirit of opposition, but for the reason that the vote last year was only one-third of the amount set apart and to be voted this year. Consequently it seems to me that without some justification for the increased expenditure we ought to cut it down.

Mr. DUFF: Is the hon. member satisfied with my explanation?

Mr. GOOD: With reference to the item for Ontario of $65,000, if it could be shown it was not needed I would be only too glad to support an amendment to reduce it.

Mr. DUFF: It is impossible to show that it is not needed.

Mr. GOOD: I understand, in respect to the $65,000 item, that last year nearly the whole amount was spent, so perhaps it is reasonable to infer that at least as much will be needed this year. That is the only basis upon which I refrain from objecting to this vote.

Mr. MALCOLM: The remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) in regard to Goderich harbour, are very well timed, and I thoroughly agree

with his request to the Minister of Public Works to consider the needs of that harbour. Goderich is the one point on lake Huron where the western grain is distributed to the millers of Ontario, and on that account alone deserves the support of this Government. But I would point out to my hon. friend from South Wellington that Goderich is not the natural harbour of refuge for lake Huron. Many old members will recall the awful storm of 1914 when much tonnage and many lives were lost on the Great Lakes. As a result the government of the day started to build a harbour of refuge farther north on the shore of lake Huron, Goderich being a little too far south to supply that needed shelter. Such a harbour of refuge is absolutely necessary for the safety of our mariners, and should be taken into favourable consideration by the minister. The losses on lake Superior and the other Great Lakes recently amply justify the need of more shelter.

I would point out to some members coming from inland ridings that those of us representing ridings with extensive lake frontage realize that these emergency expenditures to which the hon. Minister of Finance referred are at times entirely inadequate. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Duff) referred to harbours destroyed in the recent storm. His remarks apply to lake harbours as well. Wharves that have been allowed to run down during the war years are now in a perilous condition, and in my riding to-day I do not think the wharves can be put in shape for half the emergency vote for the whole province. Therefore I think members from inland ridings should be tolerant of this emergency vote, and also of the vote for Goderich harbour because of the fact, as I have stated, that it is the only grain distributing harbour on the Great Lakes for a large part of Ontario.

I shall be glad to support the minister if he brings forward any vote in his supplementary estimates for a harbour of refuge north of Goderich, because we know that the men on the Great Lakes at the present time have not the protection which they should have against the severe storms which occasionally overwhelm them. If we had another storm similar to that of 1914 there would be again a great loss of life, and this we should prevent if possible by the construction of a harbour of refuge.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): I think my hon. friend referred to the fact that 21,000,000 bushels of grain comes to Goderich harbour. Is any of that grain unloaded for transportation to other destinations, or is it all distributed to the millers in that section of the province?

Mr. DRUMMOND: As one of those well acquainted with the conditions surrounding Goderich harbour and the adjacent country, I must take exception to the statement of my hon. friend with regard to Goderich harbour as a distributing point. Goderich is the distributing centre for grain for six or seven counties in the western part of Ontario, and I would urge the hon. minister to increase the grant so that these counties may be benefited.

Mr. BOYS: Unfortunately I was called out when the hon. minister stated the total expenditure for last year. I notice the total appropriation for public works charged to income this year is $9,817,319.77; the amount asked last year for this service was $10,871,362.08. Can the minister tell me what the total expenditure was last year in connection with public works charged to income?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend is in error. The votes last year for public works totalled $13,188,000, and the amount expended was $10,283,000.

Mr. BOYS: I thank the hon. minister for the answer, but I do not quite see how I am wrong. I hold in my hand the estimates for 1922, and on page 38 I see the amount to be voted is $10,871,362.08. Of course, I am not including the supplementaries. I suppose that accounts for the difference?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. CARRUTHERS: I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to a really urgent case which has developed in my riding during the past two weeks, and I am afraid that if something is not done in the way of provision in the Supplementary Estimates the wheels of industry in that part of my constituency will be at least retarded if not entirely tied up. I have reference to the harbour at the town of Little Current, on the north channel of Georgian bay. As hon. members no doubt are aware, we have a large coal dock at that point handling from 100,000 to 200,000 tons of coal per annum, coal which is shipped in during the session of navigation and carried northward over the Algoma Eastern railway to the various industries on that line. Up to two years

ago boats of about 10,000 tons burden could carry the coal to the dock, but owing to the lowering of the water in lake Huron, probably due to the Chicago drainage canal and other causes, the channels of that lake are becoming so low that boats of large draft can no longer go through them. In this connection I should like to read a letter I have received from Mr. G. A. Montgomery, and of which no doubt the minister has a copy in his department:

Dear Sir,—The Steamer Collier owned by the Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company, Cleveland, O., loaded with approximately 5,500 tons of coal for the Spanish River Pulp & Paper Mills, struck while coming to our dock at Little Current on Sunday, April 23rd. The point where the steamer grounded was in mid-channel just off Gibbons Point. Captain Wilson who was in charge of the vessel, claims he was on the ranges when the boat grounded. Steamer was drawing eighteen feet six, but there was only abount eighteen feet two or three inches of water. Damage to the vessel consisted of thirteen frames bent and three plates sprung. This is the seventeenth trip that Capt. Wilson has made to Little Current and he states the Collier was on exactly the same course as followed by him on previous trips. The Collier is being repaired at Little Current by stopping up the leak with concrete. The Harbour Master at Little Current has been notified of the grounding and I understand he has, in turn, notified the Marine Department.

Following that, I received yesterday and the day before three or four telegrams. Here is one I received from the Soo:

Would appreciate anything you can do in removing danger of navigation at Little Current. Grounding of the steamer Collier already reported to you will have serious effect upon our business. Vessel owners making strenuous objections sending their boats to our dock on account of navigation difficulties that point.

I have also a telegram from the mayor of Little Current, as follows:

On last trip steamer Collier aground in centre of channel. Bottom badly damaged. Something must be done at once or coal dock will have to close to large steamers.

The minister, I think, received a wire yesterday from the owners of the boat at Cleveland, reading as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, May 16, 1922.

Steamer Collier entering Little Current channel April 23rd struck rock obstruction damaging eleven plates and frames to such extent boat obliged come down light. For drydocking cost of repairs approximately ten thousand dollars. Very necessary obstruction be removed. Considerable pressure is brought upon us from time to time move coal into Little Current as some Canadian owners have refused to carry coal to that place account of constant liability of damage.

A. E. R. SCHNEIDER,
Cleveland Cliffs Iron Company.

I might say in passing that the Espanola Pulp and Paper Company consumes some 150 tons of coal every twenty-four hours throughout the year. They get all their coal from that dock, so you can see what this means to them. If something is not done to remove this obstruction, that immense industry and other industries along the north shore will have to close down. I trust that the minister will have this matter attended to immediately. I might even suggest that the Government dredge, which I believe is now fitting out at Midland, on the Georgian Bay, be taken up to Little Current to do the work, so that these boats can get in. It will be a serious national loss if this work is not done.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Manitoba, $28,500.

Mr. LEADER: I think this item is very modest in comparison with appropriations that have been made for similar work in some of the other provinces. I think it is entirely inadequate to take care of the situation that has developed in Manitoba. The other day I brought to the attention of the House the fact that the Assiniboine river had overflowed, and that considerable damage had been done. The Prime Minister assured me that this matter was engaging the attention of the Government, that they were endeavouring to find out the actual extent of the damage, and would report later. We really do not know the extent of the damages yet, but the Canadian Pacific Railway has made an estimate, and their figures go to show that from fifteen to twenty thousand acres of arable land have been flooded. We also read in the press that hundreds of men have been engaged night and day trying to stem the waters of the Assiniboine. I believe it is the duty of the Government to compensate these men for the work they have been forced to do, and to reimburse them for any damage they have suffered. I would suggest that the minister ascertain the extent of the actutal damage as near as he can, and bring in a supplementary estimate to cover it. I might say for the benefit of the House that the overflowing of the Assiniboine river has been a political question in our constituency.

Mr. CALDWELL: Any promises made?

Mr. LEADER: There have been promises made in the past, and I would suggest to the Government that they do not wait until the eve of an election before compensating these people for the damages they have suffered. The damage has already been done, and now is the time

to take care of it. I was told that last fall engineers had gone over the ground and had made some observations, with what object I do not know; but that is all we have heard about it. I should like to read an extract from a letter signed by "Observer" to the editor of the Daily Graphic, a paper published in Portage la Prairie:

> The Assiniboine river is under the Dominion government, not the provincial government. This was duly evidenced during two different elections run by the late government at Ottawa, when they with great earnestness, foresight and sympathy put large gangs of men on the work of building a dyke along the Assiniboine river. The activities, however, appeared to cease on each occasion immediately after the election day was passed.

I have read that just to warn the Government that now is the time to take action, instead of waiting until the eve of an election. I want to plead for the settlers in my constituency, and I hope that the Government will see fit to help them in their extremity.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What was the actual expenditure under this item last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): For harbours and rivers generally, $6,341. The total expenditure last year was $27,000.

Mr. FORKE: I am very glad that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Leader) has brought up this question of the overflowing of the Assiniboine river, because I had intended to bring it up myself. I am interested in the matter because the Assiniboine river has been overflowing its banks right down through the constituency of Brandon, and has done quite a lot of damage at Virden. The banks have also overflowed at Brandon, and a great deal of inconvenience has been caused, not only to the farmers in the district, but to the people in the city of Brandon itself. I do not know just exactly what the law is and what the responsibility of the Dominion government would be in this matter, but I know that the Department of the Interior have had officers out there taking levels and looking into the matter, and I think something ought to be done. I have no doubt that this year the damages that have occurred to the farmers amount to something over half a million dollars. It is a serious thing. The loss is not so very serious to the province as a whole, but it is very serious to the people who live in that fertile valley. I do hope the minister will look into the matter and that something will be done. I have much pleasure in endorsing the remarks of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like to ask the minister about certain necessary work required in the region of Icelandic river. Has the minister decided to do any thing about that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not that information here, but I will look into it and advise my hon. friend as to any recommendations to be made.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like to ask one other question. I notice an item with respect to repairs to the wharf at Selkirk and it looks as though part of the work might have been done last year. Is the work under contract now, and if not will the contract for it be let by tender?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No there is no contract. There was an amount voted last year for re-construction but there has been no expenditure.

Mr. BANCROFT: Is it the custom of the department to carry out these works by contract?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): By contract wherever possible.

Mr. BANCROFT: I would like to see the minister do something about the work needed at Icelandic river. I think it is very necessary and would not involve a large expenditure. I notice that the estimate for Manitoba is about the only one that is cut down out of the estimates for all the provinces. I think the minister could reasonably carry out the work referred to this year without incurring any great expenditure.

Mr. LEADER: I would like to ask the minister whether any money was paid out last year in the Portage la Prairie district in connection with the dyking of the Assiniboine river, and if so can he give us the date of that expenditure?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there was any expenditure last year on works of that kind.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and rivers—Saskatchewan and Alberta, $20,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): How is this money to be spent?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is required to make provision for repairs and improvements to harbours and rivers under the control of the Public Works Department in Saskatchewan and Alberta. These are reported on by the district engineer, are under his control, and the expenditure is made as the necessity may arise.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): In that case it is simply a contingency vote.

Mr. KING Kootenay): Yes a contingency vote.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was anything spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The sum of $3,332 was expended last year.

Mr. CHAPLIN: I see the minister in this particular case has adopted the principle which I laid down in the case of several other provinces, and has reduced the item from $52,500, at which it stood last year, to $20,000. How can he justify his action in respect to the other provinces?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I imagine that this estimate, as in the case of the estimates for other provinces, has been made by the officials employed to do the work. It is they who have supplied this information.

Item agreed to.

Harbours and Rivers—British Columbia, $193,480.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not going to object to this vote. However, I wish to ask the minister if it would be permissible under this vote to bring up a matter which does not appear in the Estimates but to which I would like to direct the attention of the committee—I refer to the matter of dry dock facilities at the port of Vancouver. Some objection to the bringing of it up may be raised on almost any item, but as the amount does not appear in the estimates I must call attention to it in connection with some vote or other.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend had better bring it up when we come to consider capital expenditure.

Mr. STEVENS: With all due deference to the minister it is not a capital expenditure. I only wish to have a definite understanding that I can bring the matter up under some item. It is quite customary, in dealing with the estimates, to permit discussion of certain matters in connection with particular items.

[Mr. Leader.]

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have no objection to discussing it. Perhaps it would suit the hon. gentleman if the discussion took place on dry docks—that would be under capital expenditure.

Mr. STEVENS: I am satisfied so long as that is the understanding.

Item agreed to.

Dredging—Maritime provinces; Ontario and Quebec; Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta; British Columbia, $1,480,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I wonder whether the minister will be good enough to give us a brief statement of what this expenditure covers. I know that it deals with the general dredging vote of the various provinces, and it is one, I think, there should be no objection to; but it would be interesting to the committee to have a brief statement respecting this very large sum, including what amount was spent last year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount is chiefly for the operation of the various departmental dredging plants in the various provinces, covering their maintenance, the wages paid, and the supplies necessary to keep the plants in operation.

Mr. STEVENS: These supplies are all purchased by tender, are they not, and is that policy to be continued?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes I think so.

Mr. BOYS: Is this a vote for contingencies, or is it based on certain definite items?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a small contingent vote of some $30,000 I think.

Mr. BOYS: I do not wish the minister to go into detail. I desire to bring a matter to the attention of the department. I think it has been mentioned two or three times in the past, and I suppose, strictly speaking, it would come under the heading of dredging. A boat was sunk at the wharf at Big Bay point on lake Simcoe, nine miles from Barrie. I understand it still lies there. It is privately owned, but it is beside the government wharf, and very seriously interferes with navigation. I do not know whether the minister considers it his duty to provide money to remove a boat sunk under those conditions, but from the standpoint of the use of a government wharf, it must be got rid of, if the wharf is to be used. I do not know whether the Government have ever considered what is to be done in that connection.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That would be a matter for the Marine Department.

Mr. GARDINER: Are there any dredging operations carried on at Port Nelson, and, if so, does this vote include an amount for that dredging?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Not by the Public Works Department; it is Railways and Canals, and I am not conversant with that.

Mr. SALES: Will the minister tell us where dredging takes place in Saskatchewan?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I do not think there is any dredging in Saskatchewan.

Mr. SALES: Will the minister cut out the word "Saskatchewan?"

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I would hardly think that would be wise. I am not sure, but there might be some dredging required there. I understand that is the usual heading.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What is the reason for the increase in this amount?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): With regard to this increase, we have the report of Chief Engineer Cameron. The present amount includes the operation of the dredge Plamonder which was carried on last year under the appropriation for harbours and rivers Saskatchewan-Alberta. This represents an additional item this year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is the additional amount of $45,850, for rebuilding dredges Nos. 201 and 210. The former is a 12-foot hydraulic dredge employed in keeping open the channel at the mouth of the river at lake Winnipeg. The latter is to rebuild the dredge which the department has operated for some years at Winnipegosis on lake Winnipegosis.

Mr. SPEAKMAN: Is this vote purely for the purpose of assisting navigation, or does it include any appropriation for reclamation or drainage work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Navigation, I think.

Mr. BAXTER: What about dredging in the maritime provinces?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is dredging at the following places: Bathurst, in Gloucester county; Bayswater, in Royal county; Campbellton, in Restigouche, and Kennebecasis in Royal, lower St. Louis in Kent county, Millidgeville bay, St. John county, Miramichi bay, Northumberland county, Shediac in Westmoreland, St. Louis river in Kent county, Richibucto harbour in Kent county, and Richibucto cape in Kent county, Moulies river in Kent county, Shediac island in Westmoreland county, Summerville in Royal, Wilson's beach in Charlotte county, and St. Andrews in Charlotte county.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is any of this $400,000 going to be spent in Shuswap lake?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think not any of this amount.

Mr. McBRIDE: I have had an experience of over twenty years in connection with steamboat work in British Columbia and I do not know of any place more urgently in need of dredging than Shuswap lake. Nothing has been done there now for nearly ten years. The wharf is practically useless and, such as it is, steamboats cannot get near it except at high water. Shuswap lake has a shore mileage of nearly 800 miles and there is practically no road in that vicinity. The people are almost entirely dependent upon the water to get in and out from the farms, and I think something should be done to relieve the situation.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The matter has been under consideration. To carry on the work suggested would mean the construction of a new dredge at that point, and the matter has not been finally decided.

Mr. STEVENS: There is a dredge dismantled on the lake at the present time. All it requires is a scow to work with the dredge. I am almost certain I saw a dredge at Chase or Shuswap last year.

Mr. SIMPSON: Will the minister consider the matter of dredging the St. Mary's river, so as to deepen the channel to correspond with that on the American side, and of improving the entrance at the government wharf at Sault Ste. Marie? I understand one of the Canadian Pacific steamers grounded there a short time ago, and it was detained there some fifteen hours while trying to get into the government wharf.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The only amount that will be spent from this appropriation at that point will be small. No large expenditure will be made.

Mr. SIMPSON: I hope the minister will consider, when he is making up the supplementary estimates, the question of the government wharf at that point.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): If we might refer again to the item for dredging, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, I understood the minister to say that the increase was due to the repairing of a couple of scows and some other work, I did not catch what it was. Would the minister give us the actual amount covering these items?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I will just read the details again. The present amount includes the operation of one dredge, Plamonder, which last year was commenced under the appropriation, harbours and rivers for Saskatchewan and Alberta. This represents an additional item this year. There is also an additional amount asked for of $45,850, for rebuilding dredges Nos. 201 and 210. The former is a 12-foot hydraulic dredge employed in keeping open the channel at the mouth of the Red river. Those are the two items.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): This entire increase then will go to work in Manitoba?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. McBRIDE: Is it not possible to apply some of this $400,000 to dredging at Shuswap lake, to build a dredge and hopper scow? I know the work is very urgent.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I should be very glad to give the matter consideration. If I remember aright, the information which I had in the department was that this meant a very large expenditure for new equipment. The matter will be further considered, and I shall be glad to go into it with my hon. friend.

Mr. McBRIDE: The Dominion engineer, Mr. Doncaster, and I went over the ground, and we came to the conclusion that the plant required to do the work would cost about $37,000, not a very large sum.

Item agreed to.

Roads and bridges—Burlington channel—to complete new bridge, $20,000.

Mr. ANDERSON: What has the Burlington channel bridge cost to date?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount of the contract was $228,896. There is also inspection and contingencies amounting to $19,004.

Item agreed to.

Edmonton—repairs to bridge, $12,000.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): What is this bridge, and what are the specific repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This was a bridge built during the territorial days in the province of Alberta.

Mr. KENNEDY (Edmonton): Is that across the Saskatchewan?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The province is to carry a portion of the cost. On April 10, 1911, an arrangement was made with the city of Edmonton and the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company—Canadian Northern—that the cost of maintenance and repairs should be borne equally by the city of Edmonton, the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company, and the Department of Public Works.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and telephone lines—Saskatchewan and Alberta, $7,800.

Mr. EVANS: With regard to the item "telegraph lines generally," there is an old telegraph line that was built away back in the eighties which is still intact, running from Humboldt to Fort Pitt in Saskatchewan. This line is of no earthly use. It runs through the fields and is in the way of the farmers. Last year, at a cost of some hundreds of dollars, part of it was removed to the road allowance. It runs all the way alongside the Canadian Northern main line which is equipped with telegraph service. The old line is never used, and it is only a source of expense. There are two or three line repairers and two or three telegraph operators, all getting fair wages, I believe, and they could be used for some other useful purpose. What is the policy of the minister in regard to this line? It might as well be taken down and the material used or sold localy in the construction of telephone lines.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The policy of the department is to withdraw from any field where other service is being given. The Dominion telegraph and telephone service is not intended to serve the more closely settled places, but rather to reach out into fields where private enterprise would not go. I would be glad if my hon. friend would discuss the matter he speaks of with me, and if it is possible for us to withdraw from that field, we would be glad to do so, and to dispose of what plant and equipment we have.

Mr. SALES: It has been possible for the last fifteen years to withdraw the service which my hon. friend (Mr. Evans) speaks of. I used to live near this line, and it is of no earthly use.

Mr. MacKELVIE: The minister stated a moment ago that it was not the policy of the Government to continue telephone lines in sections where other lines were in operation. Does that policy apply to the Okanagan district in British Columbia?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): My hon. friend knows there are always local conditions to be considered when discussing the advantages of any public service. We have been giving some consideration to the situation, but I am not in a position to say that the Government are prepared to abandon their lines in that district.

Item agreed to.

British Columbia—telegraph and telephone lines, $23,000.

Mr. McBRIDE: I am sorry that this estimate is reduced from last year. If there is anything that induces people to stay in a rural district—and make their home there—it is an adequate telephone service. I think the minister should have increased rather than decreased the vote.

Item agreed to.

Public Works—Miscellaneous, $984,200.

Mr. STEVENS: This item contains many miscellaneous votes. It refers to a drydock, and immediately connected with that are subsidies to five dry docks. Was the contract entered into by the Government with the Burrard Dry Dock Company properly drawn, and in accordance with the provisions of the Dry Dock Subsidies Act?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. STEVENS: I desire to bring to the attention of the committee very briefly a matter of great importance. I may give a very brief history of the drydock situation at Vancouver. I notice, by the way, that the minister is apparently not listening. I should like to engage his attention if he will be kind enough to listen to me, because this is a very importnat matter. About the year 1912, or 1913, the first attempt was made to provide for a drydock in the port of Vancouver under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act; but the outbreak of the war prevented that scheme from being proceeded with. Recently, within the last two years, the Wallace Shipyards, one of the oldest shipbuilding concerns on the Pacific coast, which is a successful organization that has been operating for thirty years, and Mr. J. J. Coughlin, whose firm constructed a number of ships of about eight thousand tons each, during the war, combined and made application, under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, for a subsidy for the construction of a 15,000-ton dry dock in Vancouver. Under the act they had to comply with certain conditions, and these were all carefully observed. Ultimately, about a year and a half ago, I think an Order in Council was passed authorizing the Minister of Public Works to enter into what is known as the Subsidy Contract. The Subsidy Contract was finally signed, after a great deal of checking up by the officials of the department and the chief engineer. That contract was in every sense a compliance with the act. I have not been able to learn of a single objection to it so far as the law is concerned. Recently, most unexpectedly, the minister has announced that this dry dock is not to be proceeded with. I desire to lay before the committee some very pertinent reasons why the work should be undertaken. A short time ago I asked the minister for some information. He gave me certain facts and stated that he had no information on the other points, which I am now able to supply. I asked regarding the various ports of Canada. One of my questions was as to the tonnage in the major ports of the Dominion. The minister replied that he had no information on this point. I cannot understand why that statement should have been made, because I was able to get the information subsequently from the reports of the Customs Department. I will give the tonnage of the ports and point out to the committee that the port which has the largest tonnage in Canada is the only one that is absolutely without any dry dock facilities. The following are the figures:

Port	Total	Inwards	Outwards
Victoria, B.C...	8,325,722	4,168,992	4,156,730
Vancouver, B.C.	12,383,807	6,112,624	6,271,183
St. John, N.B..	2,719,394	1,359,711	1,359,683
Montreal, P.Q..	11,401,883	5,596,499	5,805,384
Quebec, P.Q...	3,656,198	1,829,879	1,826,319
Halifax, N.S...	4,424,777	2,227,216	2,197,557

Now, of all these, which are the major ports of Canada, the port of Vancouver has the largest tonnage. It exceeds Montreal by almost one million tons. But it

is only fair to state that Montreal is closed for five months of the year while Vancouver is open the year round. That, however, does not alter the fact that the tonnage, inwards and outwards, in the port of Vancouver exceeds any other port in Canada, some of them by two, three or four million tons. I have a return showing the dry dock facilities of all these ports and will briefly refer to that. The figures are:

	Length ft.	Breadth at entrance ft.	Depth over sill ft.
Victoria	450	65	28
Victoria (being built)	1,150	135	40
Prince Rupert	600	110	32
Halifax	567	89	28
St. John	1,150	133	42
Quebec, Lorne	600	57	25
Champlain	1,153	120	40
Montreal	601	110	31

It will be seen from this that every port except Vancouver has dry dock facilities, although they all have very much less tonnage than that port.

Now I come to the point. The contract for the dry dock that we have asked for in Vancouver was entered into by the then Minister of Public Works, on behalf of the government of Canada, under the Drydocks Subsidies Act, which was passed in 1910. Under that act any company may make application to the Dominion government for a subsidy—in this case amounting to 4 per cent on $2,500,000—providing certain regulations and provisions are complied with. This company complied with every detail of the requirements of the act. The government of the day went carefully into the matter, not just prior to the election but a year ago last January, if I am not mistaken, and an Order in Council was passed authorizing the construction of the dock. During the interim engineers of the department checked the plans, and corrections and changes were made; for instance, the dock was changed from a graving to a floating dock, until finally the subsidy contract itself was signed, as I have already stated.

We cannot understand why the minister should, without any reason so far as I can see, arbitrarily cancel this contract for a dry dock in the port of Vancouver, the tonnage of which exceeds that of any other port in Canada. It is useless to say that a dry dock at Victoria will serve the tonnage entering and leaving the port of Vancouver. I am not criticizing Victoria, Prince Rupert or any other port on the Pacific coast, but I want the House to understand that Vancouver is the point of discharge for ocean ships. But a great deal of our repair work is done on the oriental side of the Pacific at Hong Kong, Shanghai, and other ports, because those also are ports of discharge, and ships being then again empty, repairs are done there which should and might properly be done in Vancouver.

I have a telegram here from the Vancouver Board of Trade, dated May 18, 1922, addressed to myself, which I should like to read. It is as follows:

> At a mass meeting held last evening attended by over twelve hundred citizens of the Lower Mainland representing the centres of Vancouver, New Westminster, Port Moody, North Vancouver, Point Grey, West Vancouver, Chilliwack, Cloverdale, Surrey, Abbottsford, Mission, Langley, Soluth Vancouver, together with representatives of over eighty organizations in the city of Vancouver called together by the Mayor of Vancouver and President of the Board of Trade to discuss the telegram received from the Honourable Doctor King intimating that your Government had decided not to continue the work on the Vancouver drydock, unanimously passed the following resolution.
>
> This mass meeting does here and now register a most emphatic protest against the action of the Government in refusing to continue with the work of providing a drydock for Vancouver. The meeting further resolved to request the Dominion government to immediately reconsider their decision and that the Honourable Doctor King be urged to come to Vancouver at the earliest moment for investigation purposes with a view to providing this much needed utility. Letter follows.

The hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) who has been called away by the death of his sister, would like to make a few remarks in regard to this item, and if the minister will permit, under this or some other item, further discussion of this matter when he has given consideration to what I have already said, his courtesy will, I am sure, be appreciated.

At six o'clock the Speaker resumed the Chair, and the House toook recess.

After Recess

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READING

Bill No. 5, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Knox.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill No. 21, to incorporate Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.—Mr. German.

Bill No. 50, to incorporate The Sisters of Saint Mary of Namur.—Mr. Demers.

Bill No. 72 (from the Senate), for the relief of Joseph Robert Lloyd Beamish.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 73 (from the Senate), for the relief of Clarence Robinson Miners.—Mr. White.

Bill No. 74 (from the Senate), for the relief of Mary Eleanor Menton.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 75 (from the Senate), for the relief of Harvey Easton Jenner.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 77 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Lawrie.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill No. 81 (from the Senate), for the relief of Alexander Frederick Naylor.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 82 (from the Senate), for the relief of Margaret Yallowley Jones Conalty.—Mr. Jacobs.

Bill No. 84 (from the Senate), for the relief of Daisy Mary Nicholson.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 86 (from the Senate), for the relief of Edwin Dixon Weir.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 87 (from the Senate), for the relief of Henry James Bristol.—Mr. Boys.

Bill No. 88 (from the Senate), for the relief of Florant Brys.—Mr. Macdonald (Pictou).

Bill No. 89 (from the Senate), for the relief of Catherine Rudd.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 90 (from the Senate), for the relief of Norman Edward Harris.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 91 (from the Senate), for the relief of Maria Amy Drury.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

SECOND READINGS

Bill No. 94 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Daly.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 95 (from the Senate), for the relief of Wrae Elizabeth Snider.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 96 (from the Senate), for the relief of Oliver Kelly.—Mr. Rankin.

Bill No. 97 (from the Senate), for the relief of Vera Hamlin.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 98 (from the Senate), for the relief of George Drewery.—Mr. Stewart (Hamilton).

Bill No. 99 (from the Senate), for the relief of Kate Holmes.—Mr. Hocken.

Bill No. 100 (from the Senate), for the relief of Ernest Hull.—Mr. Duff.

Bill No. 101 (from the Senate), for the relief of Leslie George Dewsbury.—Mr. Church.

Bill No. 102 (from the Senate), for the relief of John Douglas Stewart.—Mr. Sheard.

Bill No. 104 (from the Senate), for the relief of Helen Garrett.—Mr. Ryckman.

Bill No. 105 (from the Senate), for the relief of Arthur Leslie Smith.—Mr. Ryckman.

SUPPLY

PUBLIC WORKS

The House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Gordon in the Chair.

Public Works—miscellaneous, $984,200.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Before six o'clock the member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) had spoken on the matter of dry dock accommodation at Vancouver. He requested that an opportunity be also given the member for Burrard (Mr. Clark) at a later date to discuss the same subject. I am rather anxious that we should proceed with Supply, but I may tell my hon. friend that an opportunity will be given the member for Burrard, possibly under the Supplementary Estimates, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. STEVENS: The committee will realize that the request I have made on behalf of the hon. member for Burrard is not without good reason. As I intimated, he has been called away by the death of a member of his family, and I have asked that he be allowed on another occasion to discuss the matter because he is very anxious to present his views upon it. I have no desire to interfere with the progress of the estimates, but it is somewhat difficult to know under just what item the matter can be again taken up. If the minister can give me an assurance, that is all I require.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There will be no difficulty about the matter.

Mr. LADNER: I have received a very strong telegram conveying the views of the people of the lower mainland, and, I think I may safely say, of the province of British Columbia, in regard to this question. One of the features of the election campaign was the unanimity of both parties on the point that above all things the dry dock in Vancouver would be proceeded with, no matter what party was returned to power. We heard that on many occasions, although there were vague rumours from the East that perhaps some

thing might happen in the event of the present Government being returned to office. Now, a dry dock is a business necessity. The member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) went into the details of this particular matter. I shall not do so, but in a word, I would urge upon the minister the importance of proceeding with this work. Ships leave this port for China, Japan, New Zealand, Australia, California, Mexico, South America and various places on the Pacific, and yet it is the only port of any considerable size in Canada without dry dock facilities. It is contended that sooner or later Victoria will have a dry dock that will provide for all our needs; but if I understand the situation rightly it will be four or five years before that dock is completed. The dock which it was contemplated to build at Vancouver would be completed, we understood, within a comparatively short time. I hope the Government will realize what it means to the people of Vancouver to have this dock built. We have guarding that great port, on the top of Crown mountain, two peaks having the appearance of crouching lions. They watch over the harbour, and I want to warn my hon. friends in the Government that these silent figures may make themselves heard before long. My hon. friends may hear their roar in a short while when the provincial elections come on. However, that is another side of the question; I am simply emphasizing the importance, from a purely business point of view, of proceeding with the construction of this dry dock. All the important organizations and public bodies throughout the lower mainland are at a loss to understand why the government of a great country like this can cancel a contract for such an undertaking in a city like Vancouver, the possible maximum liability being only about $112,000 a year. When we consider the large amount of money spent in other portions of the country, and realize the necessity of completing this project, the committee will readily appreciate the difficulty of explaining the Government's action to the people in that part of Canada.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This matter will undoubtedly come before the committee again, and I shall not take up time to-night discussing it. I will reserve my remarks until a later date. I am glad that the information in regard to the port of Vancouver has been submitted to the House; hon. members will have an opportunity of learning just the amount of business that passes through that port. I shall not discuss the question at this juncture.

Mr. HOEY: I was not in the House when the items for Manitoba were being considered, and there is a matter I should like to refer to. I received this morning, from a reeve in the municipality of Lac du Bonnet, a letter on behalf of the mail carriers in that district. He informs me that they are unable to reach their destination owing to the dilapidated state of a certain bridge on the Winnipeg river. It would seem from this letter that this is a matter that ought to receive the immediate attention of the department. I shall be glad to hand the communication to the minister at any time.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I shall be pleased to have the information, although I do not know of any Dominion bridge in that vicinity.

Mr. HOEY: The matter comes within the purview of the Dominion department inasmuch as the mail carriers cannot reach Bird river and Littonia in their gasoline launches.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): How much money was spent on the National Gallery of Canada last year, and what accounts for the increase this year?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Of the vote of $40,000 last year, some $39,000 was spent. An expenditure of $50,000 is estimated for this year. The work is carried on under a board authorized by statute, who undertake the care of works of art and see to their exhibition in various parts of the country.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): According to the Auditor General's report, the amount spent last year was $19,982.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That was the year before; the expenditure last year was $39,000.

Mr. THURSTON: A little further down I notice there is an item for river gauging and metering. Last year the appropriation was $23,450; this year it is $63,200. Why this increase?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Eleven thousand dollars was spent last year. We are asking for $23,000 this year.

Item agreed to.

Graving docks, locks and dams, etc.—Working expenses, etc.	
Graving docks (a)	$103,400
Harbour and river works, etc. (b)	60,500
Collection of Public Works revenues	5,000
	$168,900

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is this money spent for repairs?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Maintenance, repairs and operation.

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is about the usual vote?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Telegraph and Telephone Lines—	
Prince Edward Island and mainland	$ 7,000
Land and cable telegraph lines, Lower St. Lawrence and Maritime Provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service	225,000
Saskatchewan	78,400
Alberta	121,500
British Columbia—mainland	102,000
British Columbia—Vancouver Island District	126,000
Yukon System (Ashcroft-Dawson)	279,000
Telegraph and telephone service—generally	10,000
	$948,900

Mr. GOOD: Is this money spent for maintenance, construction or operation?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Maintenance and operation.

Mr. GOOD: What is the general proportion between the operating expenses and the line maintenance cost?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Under the second item, land and cable telegraph lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, I find: Expenditure on staff, $130,000; repairs and supplies, $95,000; making a total of $225,000 for last year.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): There is an item for Alberta telegraph and telephone lines of $121,000 odd. Do those lines pay?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No, they do not.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Are those telegraph lines along the railway?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): They are not along the railway lines except in northern British Columbia, where they follow the Grand Trunk Pacific. With regard to the Alberta expenses, I find: expenditure on staff, $71,000; repairs and supplies, $95,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): What I want to know is where the lines are.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): We will probably get on better if I answer one question at a time.

Mr. GOOD: The answer is quite satisfactory. I do not wish the minister to divide the expenses in each item; I merely want a rough approximation as to the relation between the operating and maintenance costs.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): No. I should like the minister to answer my question.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The lines are located as followers: Onion lake-Edmonton line, 222 miles; Peace river line, 754 miles; Fort McMurray, 245 miles; Lac La Biche line, 78 miles; telephone lines (scattered), 126½ miles; or a total of about 1,425 miles in Alberta.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Are these lines used for commercial purposes, as, if so, they would be a source of revenue?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes, they are used for commercial purposes, and they are a source of revenue.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Does this vote represent the deficit? Is there a counter entry representing the revenue from these lines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): A revenue account is kept in the department, but this vote is for operation and maintenance only.

Mr. JOHNSON (Moosejaw): Then the revenue account does not come under this estimate at all?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): No.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: The provincial government of Saskatchewan owns and controls all telephone lines within the province. Has the Dominion Department of Public Works control of any telephone lines there? If so, where are those lines located?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Qu'Appelle-Onion lake, 490 miles; Battleford-Isle la Crosse, 298 miles; Moosejaw-Wood Mountain, 212 miles; making a total of 1,000 miles.

Mr. CARMICHAEL: That is mileage that was built by the department and is still being operated by it?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): Yes.

Mr. HODGINS: Is any money necessary for the maintenance of the Ontario lines?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I have not the Ontario mileage. It is comparatively small.

Item agreed to.

St. John harbour—improvements, $850,000.

Mr. BAXTER: I would like to ask whether the vote for St. John harbour is to be devoted entirely to the construction of Courtenay bay or whether the minister can hold out any hope that the very much needed work of extending the Negro Point breakwater to Partridge Island will be carried on this year.

I do not wish to take up much time, because I think the minister has some knowledge at all events of the gravity of that situation, and I am sure the officers of his department understand it thoroughly. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Kennedy) was recently in St. John, and I am sure that from a personal inspection he too, has been impressed with the necessity of this work. The work of course, is necessarily a local one, because you cannot build a breakwater without a locality, but it is a most important work, not alone from the standpoint of the city which is in its vicinity, but from the viewpoint that the federal government has expended millions of dollars in digging out to a depth sufficient to float very large ocean steamships, a large space of territory between the breakwater and the present wharves. The government has also spent a large amount of money in providing very modern and first-class piers, but the outer berth at these piers is utterly impossible of utilization and the other two berths that lie between the piers can only be used under advantageous weather conditions. It means, that in the port of St. John, while we have very excellent though limited accommodation, we cannot count on being able to take advantage of that accommodation at all times during the winter. If there is a storm from the south of even moderate severity, it renders these berths simply impracticable for shipping and since the large dredging operations in Courtenay bay, I think the undertow on the west side has been increased. I am not asking to stop any work in St. John harbour, but I would like very much to have the minister show an ability to hold out some hope that this very pressing necessity might be grappled with before next fall.

I believe the department once had under consideration, not an expensive means of doing the work, but a comparatively inexpensive means. At first the engineers insisted on having large granite blocks which would have to be quarried at some distance and brought, at a great cost to the site, but I know that more recently representations have been made that the stone of which Partridge island is composed would be perfectly good, if taken off in sufficiently large quantities, and by a very simple device it would be possible to transport that stone by means of an overhead cable and drop it into this gap, reducing the cost of construction to a minimum. I do not want to elaborate on how this thing can be done but I would like to know that the necessity of doing the work in what I might call the immediate future is engaging the attention of the Government, and I would also like to know whether the Government thinks it can see its way clear to carry on this work.

Mr. MacLAREN: Might I add a word on the same subject? I would not urge the minister to undertake at the present time a work that is not imperative, but when a work is in my view absolutely imperative I would take the opportunity, as I do now, of impressing upon him the importance, not exactly of undertaking a new work, but the completion of an old work, and that is the extension of the Negro Point breakwater to which my colleague has just referred, to the adjacent island known as Partridge island. I am quite aware that the minister is familiar with the geography of the area I have mentioned, and it is at the request of the Board of Trade of St. John that I am bringing this matter for ward. I understand that the Board of Trade have also communicated with the minister direct in regard to this matter? Why do I urge this? I urge it for the protection of the wharves, of the shipping, and of the work in Courtenay bay—for the protection of all three. During stormy weather, as happened on more than one occasion last winter, the wharves on both sides of the harbour suffered considerable damage. Not only that, but several steamers suffered damage from being pounded against these wharves during the gale. Furthermore, gales have the result

of washing sand into the area of Courtenay bay which is now being dredged for the provision of extensions for the Atlantic service, the sand coming in as the dredging is being done. I would therefore urge the minister to undertake this work as it is imperative to save property, as well as loss in connection with the work that is actually going on. The object, I think, will be clear to the House. The extension of the breakwater will prevent the seas washing into the harbour under the influence of winds coming from certain directions. I also should be pleased if the minister could give us some encouraging statement regarding this matter.

Mr. KING (Kootenay): This amount of $850,000 is for the continuation of the work in Courtenay bay, and an amount of $65,000 will be required for maintenance and general repairs within the harbour. No provision has been made by the Government for the extension of the breakwater to which my hon. friends from St. John have been referring. Undoubtedly that is a work of great importance to the harbour and it will also involve a very considerable expenditure, but it is not the purpose of the Government to proceed with it this year.

Item agreed to.

Otttawa Parliament buildings, $700,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will this vote complete the work?

Mr. GOOD: Would the minister tell us what this money is for?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): First, let me say in reply to my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) this vote will not complete the buildings. In answer to my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Good), I will give the details of this expenditure.

General conditions—salaries of staff maintenance of plant, upkeep of staff		$ 8,000
Roadways		52,650
Carpentry and doors		9,000
Post Office fittings		10,000
Stone carving and modelling for interior		35,000
Pointing stonework, etc.		4,000
Painting and decorating		10,000
Electrical work, including maintenance		18,000
Special lighting fixtures		25,000
Bronze work, vestibules, handrail and standards		11,500
Wrought iron works, outside light standards, etc.		10,000
Main Tower—		
Amount required for cutting stone	$111,025	
Required for erection if plans received so work can be started in April	136,956	
Amount for setting stone stair	5,000	
Amount for steel work	2,000	
		254,981
Balance due Subs. on contracts and extras		66,000
Furniture		150,000
Miscellaneous to cover contingencies		35,869
Total		$700,000

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister tell us the amount spent to date on these buildings?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The amount expended up to 31st March was $10,275,269.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Has the minister any estimate of what it will cost to complete the work?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It will cost probably in the vicinity of another million.

Mr. RYCKMAN: Has any provision been made for the payment of the fees of the architect, Mr. John Pearson?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): If Mr. Pearson undertakes new work, such as the completion of the tower, that would have to be provided for. Probably my hon. friend is referring to some accounts now outstanding with Mr. Pearson. That matter is under consideration by the department, and we are hoping for an adjustment, but we have not made provision at present for the fees that are claimed by Mr. Pearson.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I would like to make an appeal to the minister. I am not instructed in this matter by the architect, nor do I hold any brief for him, but it does seem to me that he is entitled to remuneration. This building is a magnificent structure, as we all know, and the original contract called for an expenditure of $5,000,000. We know that an agreement was entered into; it has been referred to by many who are familiar with its terms—they are common property. Such a magnificent building could never have been put up for the sum of $5,000,000, especially in the times that have elapsed since the contract was first contemplated. The Dominion government entered into a contract to remunerate Mr. John Pearson at a certain rate, a rate I am familiar with. On a maximum expenditure of $5,000,000 he was to be paid 4½ per cent, in my opinion a very moderate amount. The original estimate of $5,000,000 was expended, and by reason of the enhanced

cost of everything entering into the construction, a larger outlay was necessary. Mr. Pearson was asked by the committee having the work of construction in charge, to do the necessary additional work; and I am sure the minister must be aware that even if no bargain whatever was entered into as to this extra work Mr. Pearson would be entitled, as a matter of law to remuneration for whatever he did upon the instructions of that committee. I have no doubt the Department of Public Works has already had legal advice in the matter, and I am satisfied that the legal advisers of the Grown have told the minister that the Crown is under obligation to the architect. Now that we have such a magnificent building I submit it is derogatory to the grace and the dignity of the Crown that this matter should become a subject of common talk, and that hardship should have been caused to the architect. He is entitled to a very large sum of money, but by reason of not having his claim satisfied or, seeing that there is a dispute, receiving a substantial sum on account, he has had to undergo hardship. I repeat it is not in accordance with the grace and dignity of the Crown that there should have been anything of the kind. I submit, therefore, to the minister that a payment should be made to the architect at once, and that this matter should be taken up in a business way and a settlement arrived at. If it is impossible for the Crown to reach a settlement with Mr. Pearson, then he should be given a fiat in order to enable him to take proceedings for the recovery of his claim.

Mr. MARTELL: Will my hon. friend tell me who is responsible for the condition which obtains?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I will answer my hon. friend by saying this: If I had undertaken to do this work, and if the appropriation, under the contract as at first contemplated, was exhausted, and my employer told me to proceed and spend twice as much I would ask him for the payment of something on account. I would remind that employer of the provisions of the arrangement under which I was first employed and to which he was quite willing to agree when the contract was first undertaken. I have found Mr. Pearson to be a reasonable man. Furthermore, I am sure he does not have the least idea that I am saying one word on his behalf to-night; but I must say to the minister that I have heard this matter greatly talked about.

Mr. MARTELL: May I ask my hon. friend another question?

Mr. RYCKMAN: My hon. friend may ask any question he likes and I will answer it to the best of my ability, but I would like now to conclude what I have to say. I have heard of it since I came to Ottawa, and I heard of it in the East and in the West. Surely, if this is a business government, they should get to work and reach some modus vivendi with the architect, and carry on until the building is completed. If an arrangement cannot be made with the architect, discharge him, get some other architect and go ahead. The statement that the late government was to blame is no answer. I am not trying to excuse them for any blame that may rest upon them in connection with this matter. I believe if this thing goes on, it will result in a scandal if this magnificent building which we admire so much, in which there is a spirit which cannot be found elsewhere, be left in an uncompleted condition.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RYCKMAN: My hon friends have taken a meaning out of my remarks which pleases them more than it occupies my mind. I was thinking of the nobility of this building and how it must impress every one who comes within its precincts. I say that it is a pity to have it go abroad that, by reason of this letter, which in law I submit is no defence, they are going to have a wrangle with the architect, that the building is not going to be completed, things are to remain at a standstill and the country is to suffer.

Mr. MARTELL: Was there not a contract let by the late government? If so, why was it that a dispute occurred between them and the architect? Why is my hon. friend so impatient and in such a hurry for the present administration, before they have had an opportunity to fully consider the case, to rectify a mistake made by the late government? The nobility of the building is not sufficient justification for the payment of enormous fees.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I think it would be well if the hon. member directed this question to the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend is giving the matter a twist as I said nothing to warrant his remark. I have not suggested that one cent more than a fair and just remuneration should be paid. My point is that there is money owing, and if there is money owing, it should be paid.

Mr. MARTELL: I presume my hon. friend is a lawyer, and if so, he must know that a person is bound by a written contract. If the architect guaranteed with the government of Canada to erect this building at a certain maximum cost, then why should he be paid for more than that cost?

Mr. RYCKMAN: I have seen the letter and the letter shows that my hon. friend's premises are incorrect.

Mr. BAXTER: I would ask the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Martell) if he thinks there is a written contract which would justify the previous government in refusing to make a payment to the government architect, why he prefaces his remarks by an attempt to make it appear before the country that the late government did something wrong? Is it so absolutely necessary to sneer at the late government and belabour it on every occasion?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): I think the committee should understand the position which exists today in regard to the Parliament Buildings, and the payment of the amount claimed by Mr. Pearson. When the buildings were first started an arrangement was made whereby a committee of this House, appointed by the leaders of the two parties, undertook to carry on the construction of this building. Up to date that work has been performed by this committee. Arrangements with the architect were made with the knowledge of the committee, and when the cost began to exceed $5,000,000, a claim was made by Mr. Pearson for further commission. An investigation was made by that committee and they recommended that he should be paid a commission on some $2,000,000, in addition to the five million that had been expended. That is the recommendation that is before the Public Works Department to-day. As hon. members may understand, many members of the committee that acted up to December of last year are not now in Parliament, and there is to-day no committee. As far as the Public Works Department is concerned, we have certain recommendations and minutes coming from this committee which suggests a fair settlement with Mr. Pearson. Mr. Pearson has not seen fit to accept the suggestion of that committee. He is contending for a larger commission, rightly or wrongly. Up to date commissions have been paid, to Mr. Pearson, to the amount of some $289,000 and to Mr. Marchand some $52,000, making a total of $342,000 paid in architects' commissions. The hon. member from East Toronto (Mr. Ryckman) suggested that the Government should issue a fiat. As far as we are concerned we have no great objection, if that is the wish, to issue a fiat, and let Mr. Pearson go to court. It is true suggestions have been made that we should get together and arrive at something that would be equitable and fair. Personally, I take the position, as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, that in taking over this work that was formerly under the control of a committee of Parliament, we must, at least, accept their suggestion in matters with which they had been dealing up to the time the committee ceased to exist. That is the position of the claim to-day. It is receiving further consideration. I may, in the course of a few days, make some recommendation to the Government in regard to it.

Mr. MANION: What is the intention of the Department of Public Works regarding the tower? An item appeared in the press stating that it was the intention not to proceed any further with the building of the tower. Is the minister ready to make a statement with regard to that?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): It is not proposed to continue the construction of the tower this year. We may ask to have plans prepared with a view to going on next session.

Mr. RYCKMAN: I was not in any sense levelling an attack at the present minister who has been in his office such a short time. I was hoping that I would have from the minister an assurance—which I think the minister has given me, and which I hope I can take as an assurance—that this matter will be taken up and remedied at as early a date as possible.

Mr. GARDINER: Can the minister give us any information as to why the building has cost so much more than was intended in the first place?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): The building is more elaborate and much larger than intended in the first place, and we are all familiar with the increase in cost of material and supplies generally. I think that would account for the great increase in cost.

Mr. GOOD: Is that item of $700,000 for work that has been done or that is to be done?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): That is to be done.

Mr. GARDINER: Were there any specific contracts entered into between the government and contractors with regard to this building?

Mr. KING (Kootenay): There is a contract with the firm of Peter Lyall and Sons on a percentage, or force account basis.

Item agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Department of Health—the administration of the acts respecting Food and Drugs, Honey and Maple Products, and Opium and Narcotic Drugs, $115,565.

Mr. MANION: Will the minister explain the large increase in this estimate from $80,000 to $111,565?

Hon. H. S. BELAND (Minister of the Department of Health): There is an increase in this estimate of $31,565, which is accounted for, first by the payment of seven officials who live outside of Ottawa and who formerly were paid out of civil government. They consist of one analyst in the Montreal laboratory, one analyst at Halifax, two analysts at Winnipeg, two analysts at Vancouver, and one senior inspector of food at Vancouver. That will account for $19,565 of the increase. The remaining $12,000 of the increase is due to the naturally increasing work in connection with the enforcement of the Opium and Narcotic Drug Act.

Mr. MANION: We are all interested in regard to the habit-forming character of the different drugs, and I should be pleased if the minister would give to the committee a brief sketch of the work that is going on in his department in its endeavour to eliminate the drug habit in this country.

Mr. BELAND: This work is being followed very closely. Though the quantity of narcotics entering into Canada through ordinary, permitted channels has immensely decreased during the last three years, I am sorry to convey to the committee the information that the illicit introduction of opium and its derivatives, such as morphine, heroin and cocaine has considerably increased. The smuggling in of opium is carried on particularly on the western coast, whilst the illicit introduction of other drugs, such as cocaine for example, is carried on especially through eastern ports. I may, if I am permitted for a moment, give to the committee the number of prosecutions and convictions by provinces and also by professions and nationalities entered during the year just ended:

Province	Doctor	Druggists	Veterinary Surgeons	Other illicit dealers	Chinamen.
British Columbia	4	0	0	11	300
Alberta	3	0	1	28	59
Saskatchewan	0	0	0	15	73
Manitoba	0	6	0	9	0
Ontario	2	0	0	12	52
Quebec, not including Montreal	7	0	0	4	10
Montreal	3	5	3	82	123
New Brunswick	4	0	0	1	9
Nova Scotia	0	0	0	1	8
Prince Edward Island	0	0	0	0	0
Total of prosecutions and convictions	23	11	4	163	634

That makes a total during the last year of 835 convictions. This will convey to the committee the extent of the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs in Canada. For this reason, it is the intention of the department to follow up as closely as possible and to prosecute illicit dealers in the year just commencing.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did I understand the minister to say that he got a conviction in each prosecution?

Mr. BELAND: Those are all convictions.

Mr. McKENZIE: I was thinking the minister must have had his own magistrate.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): Are the convictions followed by fines or imprisonment?

Mr. BELAND: In those cases the sentence is fine or imprisonment.

Mr. HOEY: Have any Japanese been convicted of dealing in narcotics during the past year?

Mr. BELAND: There is no record of any Japanese being prosecuted.

Mr. MANION: I should like to ask the minister a rather pertinent question; in fact, perhaps, somebody might call it impertinent. The statement is often made, in the press of a certain type at least, that the drug habit in this country is increasing —and I think I am right in stating that it is increasing, according to the number of prosecutions which the minister has men-

tioned—by virtue of the fact that temperance or prohibition measures have been taken in different provinces of this Dominion. I presume that such men as Doctor Amyot, the deputy minister, and other able officers in this department, have opinions on the matter which they have expressed to the minister. I am sure that the committee will be pleased to have a statement from the minister on the subject.

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend is imposing a considerable task upon me. I am indeed not in a position to furnish any information in this regard. Whether the use of alcohol would tend to abate to any extent the illicit desire for drugs, it is not for me to say. My impression, however, is that it makes no difference.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister could ascertain from the provincial returns whether there was a smaller percentage of prosecutions for the illicit use of drugs in British Columbia and in Montreal or Quebec than elsewhere. These two provinces are what are known commonly as "wet" territories, and if the prosecutions there were markedly less than elsewhere the suggestion would have some foundation, that the use of alcohol has a restrictive effect on the use of drugs.

Mr. BELAND: I am afraid that if that were true, British Columbia would be amply justified in having indulged in the liquor trade, because the number of convictions in the matter of drugs is a good deal larger there than elsewhere. But I do not believe that the liquor habit and the drug habit have very much relation to each other. It is true that in British Columbia the liquor traffic is permitted under certain legislative regulations, and it is equally true that it is in that province that the largest number of convictions for the illicit use of drugs have taken place. But the large number of convictions against illicit traders in narcotics in British Columbia would, I should think, naturally result from the geographic situation of that province. I presume that there is a larger number of Chinamen in Vancouver and Victoria than in any other city in the Dominion, and the proximity of these places to the Orient would perhaps account for the greater extent of the trade.

Mr. MANION: I do not wish to be understood as making the statement that the increase in the use of drugs is due to any corresponding decrease in the use of alcohol. I simply state that a portion of the press frequently makes that statement, and I thought in all seriousness that perhaps some of the officials of the department might have given a positive opinion on the matter. The minister, I think, did state that there was an increasing use of these drugs, which I take it include not only opium but morphine, cocaine and the various other habit-forming drugs, and possibly the number of prosecutions may be due to a stricter enforcement of the law. I may have misunderstood the minister, but I thought he said that it was the opinion of the department that the use of these drugs is on the increase. If that is the case—and the minister nods his head—would he be willing to give the opinion of some of his officers as to the cause of the increase? Or has any such opinion been expressed to him by the officers of the department?

Mr. BELAND: I am unable to give any reasons for the apparent increase. As my hon. friend, who is conversant with medical matters, knows, it is very difficult to say whether the use of narcotics has really increased. Apparently it has, and this may be due to the fact that the department has been very closely prosecuting the illicit traders. But we have no report in the department that assigns any reasons for the increase. Possibly, as in some other lines, the traders have found it very profitable to deal in these drugs, and the habit has spread among some of our compatriots, and is practised by more foreigners than in previous years. I can only say that it is most regrettable that the trade should have reached such proportions, and that is one reason why we shall require a little more money to bring to the enforcement of this act as much activity as possible.

Mr. STEVENS: I wish to bring to the attention of the minister a matter which I think is very important. The committee will have noted that in the number of prosecutions a very large percentage were aliens. I believe that a very considerable proportion of them were orientals. In British Columbia, where we realize, more than any other part of the country does, the connection between Canada and the Orient in the supplying of these drugs, and where we have been right up against the problem, so to speak, we have been asking that those found guilty and convicted in our courts shall wherever possible be de

ported. Nothing is so feared by a criminal practising in Canada as deportation back to the land whence he came. That is true generally speaking. There is nothing that the Chinaman in particular dreads so much as deportation. If the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Stewart) were in his place I would address a few remarks to him, but I trust that my hon. friend (Mr. Beland) will renew his conferences with him on this point. One of the heaviest blows that could be struck at the traffic would be a vigorous campaign of deportation. As the law now stands it requires that those prosecuting shall notify the municipal clerk who in turn notifies the immigration authorities. I am not criticising the law, but it does strike me that the Department of Health could, as it were, short circuit this red tape by having the representations made direct to the Immigration Department, who could actively take the matter up. As matters stand now, the Immigration Department does not act until the charge is laid by the municipal authority, whereas, if the Health Department, co-operating with the Immigration Department, were to notify immediately a prosecution was made, then the immigration authorities could follow the matter up. And if the Government would instruct the immigration authorities to take vigorous action it would go a long way towards remedying the evil.

Another matter I wish to refer to is the spread of the drug habit. From our experiences and careful investigations made, I think that the chief cause lies in the profit which is made by unscrupulous—I was going to say fiendish—traffickers. They are the root of this business, and it is encouraging to see the efforts made by the department of my hon. friend to prosecute these traffickers. But I think another step could be taken with pronounced effect. I have some papers on this point, but they are not under my hand at the moment. As, however, the minister will no doubt have full information in his department, what I say will be quite intelligible to him. Nearly all the civilized nations of the world, realizing that this traffic is getting a firmer grip upon their peoples, have entered into an international convention to restrict the traffic. As I understand it, the main source of supply for opium is the Orient, and for the derivatives of opium—

Mr. BELAND: Cocaine and morphine.

Mr. STEVENS: Those come chiefly from Germany, although to a certain extent from France also.

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. STEVENS: Here we have the two major sources of supply. I think Canada might very well initiate steps to prevent the exports of drugs generally from those countries to Canada except under strict regulations. Germany has been a serious offender in this respect. I do not know that the government of Germany wilfully permits the export of these drugs, but at the same time she has been neglectful in the matter, and I think we might very properly make strong representations not only to Germany but to all the other countries which participated in this international convention, to control the export of these drugs as effectively as possible. As a matter of fact, I think the minister will agree with me when I say that if we could control the manufacture and export of these drugs we would go a long way towards solving the problem. India and China are undoubtedly sources of supply. In the old Chinese government at Pekin we had a very sympathetic ally in the control of opium exports, but I am afraid that what we might call the de facto government at Canton is not attempting to control these exports at all so far as we can learn. Very strong efforts ought to be made not only by Canada but by the other signatories to the convention to curtail, and, if possible, prevent the production and export of drugs.

Mr. MANION: Before the minister replies to the remarks of my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens), may I add a word or two? Perhaps not having the papers under his hand my hon. friend has expressed his opinions a little differently from what he really wished to do, because after all, as the minister well knows, morphine particularly, as well as cocaine to a lesser extent, are very useful drugs if properly handled.

Mr. STEVENS: Yes.

Mr. MANION: Perhaps there is no drug more useful, generally speaking, than opium and its derivatives, and I presume that my hon. friend really suggests the prohibition of illegitimate exportation—

Mr. STEVENS: Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANION: —because the prohibition of legitimate exportation of drugs from those countries might interfere very ma-

terially with the practice of medicine. As I understood him, the danger really comes from the smuggling of these drugs into Canada, and if some method were adopted which, instead of prohibiting, would secure strict registration of such exportations to our country, these records could be given to our customs officers, who could pass them on to the officers of my hon. friend's department, and the same result would be achieved. In regard to the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman as to the deportation of peddlers of these drugs, I think it is very good.

Mr. BELAND: The committee will have an idea of how the legitimate trade in drugs has decreased in this country when I quote the figures for cocaine importations for 1919, 1920 and 1921. In 1919 we imported 12,000 ounces; in 1920, 6,900 ounces; in 1921, only 3,300 ounces. So in the last three years the legitimate importations have dropped from 12,000 ounces to 3,000 ounces. The same applies to morphine and to gum opium. One reason why these drugs are being absorbed in larger quantities is no doubt because through illicit trading they are sold a good deal cheaper. During the last three or four years the rigid enforcement of the law has prevented drug addicts from buying these narcotics so easily as they used to, and as illicit traders were in a position to offer the drugs at a cheaper price, the committee will readily understand that a much larger consumption has taken place.

I agree largely with what my hon. friend from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) has said about deportation. It can be readily understood that if Chinamen who indulge in the illicit trade in narcotics, especially opium, were deported, others would be deterred from taking a similar risk, and the trading would be very much restricted. That is a matter for the special consideration of the Minister of the Interior and also of the Government generally.

The control of export from the country of origin is perhaps a more serious matter. It would be possible for the signatories to the convention entered into in 1912, and ratified by Canada in 1919, to enter into negotiations with the view of ascertaining the exact quantity of drugs exported from every country. That would be perhaps a very useful step to take.

Mr. STEVENS: I believe the convention contains a provision for exactly that course to be pursued, and what I am urging is that the Government should take advantage of it.

Mr. BELAND: Every country which is a party to that international convention undoubtedly would be ready to supply this Government with figures of the exact export trade in all these narcotics. But my hon. friend will realize also that there exists in those countries an export trade which is outside the law.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister gave the total number of convictions as 835. Does that cover all convictions in Canada, not only those that have taken place through the efforts of the Department of Health, but through the ordinary channels of the enforcement of criminal law?

Mr. BELAND: No. The total number of convictions is 1,765, which includes provincial and municipal prosecutions followed by conviction. The total number of convictions secured through federal prosecution is 835.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The total number of convictions, including those which have resulted through the ordinary channels of criminal prosecution, is 1,765. It is most significant that of the 835 convictions, no less than 634 are convictions of Chinese residing in Canada. So the total number of convictions of citizens of all other nationalities, Canadians and others, is only 201. This would lead one to conclude that this illicit traffic in drugs is, to the extent of at least sixty or sixty-six per cent, due to the presence in this country of a substantial Chinese population. I was inclined to think that during the past five years there had been a very large increase in the number of convictions that had taken place in Canada on account of the traffic in illicit drugs. When I was in the Department of Justice the matter was brought to my attention on more than one occasion, and though I cannot give the figures from memory now, I am inclined to think the increase in the number of convictions in the last five years has been very, very rapid. From an examination of the figures given us to-night, I think we may fairly assume that a very large part of that illicit traffic is conducted by people whose presence in this country is no great asset, in my humble opinion. I sincerely trust that the department will continue its good work. It is doing an excellent work in this respect, as are also the mounted police and the provincial police, but I am just a little bit afraid from what I read in the papers

published in the United States, particularly in New York, that the traffic is on the increase and not on the decrease, both in Canada and the United States at the present time.

Item agreed to.

Quarantine—salaries and contingencies of organized districts; Public Health and other districts; Tracadie and D'Arcy Island lazarettoes; Public Health Act, $273,500.

Mr. MANION: Would the minister give a brief explanation of how this money is expended?

Mr. BELAND: We have in Canada eight quarantine stations: Halifax, Louisburg, North Sydney, Charlottetown, St. John, Chatham, Grosse Isle and Victoria. The two lazarettoes are, one at Tracadie, N.B., and the other at D'Arcy island, B.C. By far the most important quarantine station is that of Grosse Isle. Before dealing with that, I might give the committee the number of lepers in Canada. At Tracadie there are 14, and at D'Arcy island 5.

Mr. MacLAREN: Did the fourteen cases of leprosy at Tracadie originate in New Brunswick.

Mr. BELAND: No, not all of them. They come, I presume, from all over eastern Canada. Last year we had one case from Toronto, and two years ago two cases from Regina and Swift Current.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What were their nationalities?

Mr. MacLAREN: As the minister knows, in the area about Tracadie there have been cases of leprosy developing for the last one hundred years. Is there any diminution in the number of cases from New Brunswick? I take it from the figures that there has been some diminution in the number of cases during the last twenty-five years.

Mr. BELAND: While that information is being looked up, answering my hon. friend from Lincoln, most of the leprosy cases, if not all, are Scandinavians.

Mr. GOULD: There is a decrease of $2,440 in this item. That seems to be drawing the line pretty fine. We expect there will be an immigration policy this year, and some of the moneys at least in connection with immigration will have to be expended under this item. I wonder if the minister could explain just how the conclusion was arrived at that $2,440 should be the amount deducted from last year's estimate?

Mr. BELAND: The decrease is very small indeed, and at the present moment I am not in a position to say how it was arrived at. It is a trifling matter. I suppose that a few attendants that are not considered absolutely necessary are going to be dispensed with.

Item agreed to.

Immigration Medical Inspection, $50,000.

Mr. MacLAREN: Is the minister now in a position to answer my question of a few minutes ago?

Mr. BELAND: Yes. In 1897 we had 32 patients; in 1910, 22 patients; and in 1922, only 14 patients. My hon. friend will see that the number is decreasing.

Mr. MacLAREN: I might fairly refer to the peculiarly fortunate conditions under which these cases of leprosy have been cared for and attended to during many years. Nearly all the cases arising in New Brunswick have been among the French Canadians, and they are cared for by a community of nuns. It is particularly satisfactory that during this long period these men have been maintained in such comfortable circumstances, and under such careful and faithful attendants.

Mr. ANDERSON: At what ports is medical inspection carried out?

Mr. BELAND: Medical inspection is being carried out in different ports, the most important by far being that of Quebec. Then come the ports of Montreal, St. John, North Sydney, Halifax, Vancouver, Victoria, Prince Rupert and Portland. As to the inspection that has taken place during the year which ended March 31, 1922, the number of examinations is as follows: Quebec, 41,256; St. John, 8,964; Halifax, 7,400; Montreal, 797; North Sydney, including Sydney, 452; Vancouver, 1,628; Victoria, 1,538.

Mr. GOULD: I would ask the minister if this vote is to cover expenses connected with immigrants who may have contracted diseases on board ship?

Mr. BELAND: That is right.

Mr. GOULD: I ask the question because there was a person from my own electoral district who was detained on Partridge island and who, in consequence of being so

detained, was unable to reach home in time to get in a fair amount of crop, or at any rate such as he deemed necessary. It developed that he was not suffering from any contagious disease and I wondered what the attitude of the authorities was in a case of that nature?

Mr. BELAND: Do I understand my hon. friend to say the man was detained at the quarantine station on Partridge island?

Mr. GOULD: Yes.

Mr. BELAND: Well, that is the course followed, and it is proper. Sufferers from contagious disease are detained there for a certain period, and the contacts also, until they are entirely cured and for a certain number of days thereafter. That is in accordance with a regulation of the department in order that the infected persons may not carry contagion elsewhere.

Mr. GOULD: The man to whom I refer developed no contagious disease but was detained on Partridge island for weeks. In consequence he did not get as large an area of land under crop as he had intended or desired.

Mr. BELAND: He must have been in contact with some contagious disease on board ship and was therefore held under observation for what we call the period of incubation.

Mr. IRVINE: I would like to ask the minister if an immigrant coming across and refusing to be vaccinated is kept in quarantine?

Mr. BELAND: Yes, he will be kept in quarantine if he refuses to be vaccinated.

Mr. IRVINE: Is there any difference in that regard between a person travelling first class and a person travelling third class?

Mr. BELAND: No there is no difference.

Mr. ANDERSON: Is there any arrangement between Canada and the United States as to immigrants coming via the latter country?

Mr. BELAND: My hon. friend doubtless refers to transatlantic travel. We have an arrangement with the medical inspectors of the Medical Inspection Department of the United States for the examination of immigrants who are destined for Canada, and most of the time, I think, we have a representative at New York. We have no regular medical inspection between the United States and Canada, I mean for those travellers or immigrants, who come from the former country and are recognized as American citizens; because we take it for granted that having been admitted by the United States inspectors after inspection, the conditions would be such as to entitle them to admission into Canada. The only inspection, as my hon. friend is doubtless aware is the civil inspection, and in case of doubt the persons would be stopped at the border, or else turned over to our medical inspectors either in Montreal or Toronto.

Item agreed to.

Venereal Diseases, $200,000.

Mr. GARDINER: Will the minister give us some information as to what action the Department of Health is taking in regard to this item?

Mr. BELAND: For a number of years an appropriation of $200,000 has been voted for the combatting of venereal diseases throughout Canada, which campaign has been carried on in co-operation with the provinces. The idea has been to leave the matter almost entirely with each provincial government to organize its own campaign, this amount to be divided amongst the different provinces pro rata to their population. The campaign is now well under way. It has been organized and carried on in all the provinces, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, which has not availed itself of the provisions of the grant. The whole amount has been expended, with the exception of $4,686. I think the work has been carried on very effectively.

Item agreed to.

LABOUR

Labour—unemployment relief, $100,000.

Mr. STEVENS: I want to thank the hon. minister for his courtesy in holding this over when I was absent the other day. I understand this item was originally voted by Parliament as supplementary to the grant for the enforcement of the statute, chapter 21 of the Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, because of there being a number of offices, in addition to the joint offices, that were solely under the control of the Dominion Federal Labour Department, but that, as time progressed and the co-ordination was brought about, this vote would become unnecessary. I understand there has been a reduction of some 26 offices, and it appears to me that, with this reduction, and with the more efficient

co-ordination of the provincial and dominion work under this act, for which another vote has been passed, this $100,000 would scarcely be necessary this year.

Hon. JAMES MURDOCK (Minister of Labour): If my hon. friend will look at another item authorized by statute, he will find on the same page, "Organization and co-ordination employment offices, $150,000." That amount is fixed by statute. The hon. member from Centre Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) will probably recall the fact that the other day we passed in the supplementary estimates $400,000 for the last fiscal year on account of unemployment relief, or a total of $500,000, made up of the $100,000 voted last year, and two Governor General's warrants of $200,000 each. In addition to the $100,000 the committee is being asked to vote for this fiscal year, we estimate that at the present moment we are in debt about $1,260,000, or considerably over a million. I am not in a position to give the exact figures, although within the next few days we will try and estimate those figures as accurately as possible, for the purpose of presenting them in the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. STEVENS: I am not objecting to the item for unemployment relief, but the item in the estimates is to supplement the amount provided by statute. I am informed that this was for the purpose of maintaining certain offices, in addition to labour offices, jointly maintained by the provinces and the Dominion. If it is for unemployment, let us put it under unemployment, and eliminate this reference to the Co-ordination Act altogether. I do not want to labour the point or to embarrass the minister.

Mr. MURDOCK: The hon. member has the wrong item. He is speaking of No. 269, and we are dealing with 273. We passed No. 269 on the 21st April.

Mr. STEVENS: I was under the impression we were at 269—employment offices—and it was that point I wished to bring up. I recall the item now. It was agreed that under this general item we could bring up various questions. I would bring my hon. friend back to No. 269, and suggest that this provision for maintaining special offices, outside of those under the Co-ordination Act, should, at least, be eliminated as soon as possible. I will not say that it should be eliminated from these estimates, but steps should be taken to eliminate it, and bring it under the Co-ordination Act.

Mr. MURDOCK: I agree with the hon. member entirely. Steps have been taken in that direction to the extent, I think, that in all of the joint offices that we have now in any province we are not paying any more than 50 per cent of the cost of such employment offices.

Mr. STEVENS: How many extra offices are there outside of those under the Co-ordination Act?

Mr. MURDOCK: I think there are only two, one in Moncton, New Brunswick, and one in Chatham, New Brunswick, but even at that we are on a fifty-fifty basis.

Mr. IRVINE: Can the minister tell me if the $1,200,000 that we are in debt was due to the unemployment relief given last year?

Mr. MURDOCK: It was on account of the provisions contained in P.C. order 191, but a great deal of it, especially in Ontario, Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia, will be on account of the excess cost of winter construction of public works, the bills for which have not yet come through from the municipalities and the provinces to the federal government, and the figures that I gave on that account are simply estimated as accurately as we can do it at the present moment.

Mr. IRVINE: If unemployment cost $1,200,000 last year, plus the $500,000, which has been given, how does the minister expect to be able to get through this spring with $100,000?

Mr. MURDOCK: If conditions next winter prove anything like the conditions of unemployment during the past winter, we could not possibly get through with that amount at all, but it is reasonable to be optimistic, and to hope that, before another year rolls around, conditions will have improved materially, and that all men in Canada who desire work and are willing to work can find it.

Item agreed to.

SEVERAL DEPARTMENTS

Soldiers' land settlement—advances to soldiers settling upon the land and cost of administering the Soldier Settlement Act, including salaries, $12,000,000.

Mr. MANION: I would like to suggest to the minister (Mr. Stewart) that, with

all the goodwill in the world, we shall have to hold this item up for a while. This question would involve some discussion, and I should be glad if the minister would hold it over to some other day and take up some other items, on which, perhaps, less information would be required.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): I can give the hon. member all the information.

Mr. STEVENS: As a matter of fact, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Meighen) had no idea that this item was coming on to-night, and I think he would like to be present when it is being discussed. It is a very important item. We might take up any of the ordinary items the minister has and slide them through.

Item stands.

Pensions—pension to Madam Fabre, $1,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Why is this so much larger than the others?

Mr. FIELDING: This lady is the widow of a former commissioner at Paris. I could not tell my hon. friend exactly why, but the item is the same as has been voted for a number of years.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under the Canada Temperance Act, $35,000.

Mr. HANSON: May we have some explanation of this item?

Mr. COPP: This is for the purpose of providing for elections that may be carried on in certain localities during the coming year. We have no definite knowledge that there will be any elections.

Mr. CALDWELL: Elections or plebiscites.

Mr. COPP: Plebiscites in different places.

Mr. MANION: This has nothing to do with federal elections?

Mr. COPP: No.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the purchase of 650 copies of the Parliamentary Guide, $1,950.

Mr. CALDWELL: In past sessions we had alphabetical lists of members, giving constituencies and post offices addresses. Will these be issued this year?

Mr. FIELDING: They have been issued already. I have a copy here.

Item agreed to.

Expenses under the Naturalization Act, $50,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The reason is that there are probably more investigations under the Naturalization Act now than there were during the past couple of years. During the war the applications accumulated, and I believe that certificates are being granted more freely now.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: That is practically the explanation.

Mr. HANSON: There are quite a number of applications in my part of the country that should be investigated. I know that in certain parts of New Brunswick people are applying for naturalization on grounds that really do not commend themselves to reason.

Mr. COPP: I cannot give the details as to the different localities. Investigations are being held throughout Canada. In 1915 the Royal Northwest Mounted Police investigated 16 applications; in 1917, 18; in 1918, 199; in 1919, 5,437; in 1920, 6,258; in 1921, 7,424; and in 1922, from January 1 to March 31, 1,121.

Mr. HANSON: These investigations are carried on chiefly by the Mounted Police?

Mr. COPP: Entirely so.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the administration of the Business Profits War Tax Act, 1916, and the Income War Tax Act, 1917, and amendments. Appointments for the purpose and an additional salary of $4,000 for the Commissioner of Taxation may be made without reference to, and notwithstanding, the provisions of the Civil Service Act, $2,200,000.

Mr. IRVINE: Does the Business Profits Tax bring in as much as it costs to administer it?

Mr. FIELDING: I regret I cannot give that information offhand. It is not available to-night.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are you sure we shall need the money this year? The Budget has not been brought down yet.

Mr. FIELDING: I think we shall need it on the general principle that what we have we hold.

Mr. CALDWELL: I see that there is $4,000 for a commissioner who may be appointed without reference to the Civil Service Act. What is the idea?

Mr. FIELDING: This is a repetition of a vote adopted last year by the late government. Mr. Breadner was in the department at $6,000. His salary has been increased to $10,000. He is in charge of the Income Tax branch of the department.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am not so much concerned about this particular item, but I was wondering whether it was establishing a precedent.

Mr. FIELDING: If it be a precedent it was established last year.

Mr. CALDWELL: I do not feel a bit easy about continuing precedents set last year.

Mr. FIELDING: Well, sometimes it is inconvenient to make changes.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The Minister of Finance has himself set one this year.

Mr. WARD: How much does it cost to collect the income tax?

Mr. FIELDING: I cannot give the information now, but I have no objection to allowing the item to stand. If my hon. friend is very anxious to be informed on the point I can get the information and submit to him later.

Mr. WARD: It is an important question. We have been told on many occasions that it costs more to administer the act than we receive in returns. If that statement is not true, then it ought to be corrected in the House.

Mr. FIELDING: Having regard to the vast sum collected, I think it will be found that the expense incurred in the collection is a reasonable one. However, if the hon. gentleman desires more definite information I will give it to him later.

Item agreed to.

Purchasing Commission—salaries and contingencies, $72,000.

Mr. HANSON: Who compose the Purchasing Commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Mr. Lafleche is the chairman; I am not sure who the other officers are.

Mr. CALDWELL: It seems that every department has a purchasing agent, and there is besides a general purchasing commission. What is the need for an agent in each department?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: This commission was appointed by the late government.

Mr. CALDWELL: That does not make it unassailable.

An hon. MEMBER: "What we have we hold."

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes, I presume we are acting on that theory. I do not think all the departments have purchasing agents.

Mr. CALDWELL: I believe that all have.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Only two or three.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it the policy to continue the purchasing agents in those departments that have them, in addition to the general purchasing commission?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Those departments that have agents will retain them, yes.

Item agreed to.

Public Archives, $70,570.

Mr. SPENCER: What accounts for the increase?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is a statutory increase.

Item agreed to.

Salaries and expenses of the Paris agency, $42,500.

Mr. CALDWELL: What is the Paris agency?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The agency is looked after by a Commissioner General, corresponding to the High Commissioner in London.

Item agreed to.

Amount required to meet expenses of the Lake of the Woods Control Board, $15,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the Lake of the Woods Control Board?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It is a board established by statute to regulate matters pertaining to the lake of the Woods, and has been in existence for a number of years.

Mr. SPENCER: What are its duties?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: It has to do with the regulation and control of the flow of water as between the provinces, and also as between Canada and the United States, and it settles all questions of controversy that may arise between the various interested parties.

Item agreed to.

Canadian Representation in the United States, $60,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Could not that stand? It requires some discussion.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes.

Item stands.

Salaries and Expenses, Passport Office. $30,000.

Mr. HANSON: Is it the intention of the Government to continue the passport regulations? I notice the vote is the same as last year.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: The intention is to continue the regulations. I think it is necessary to do so for a time, at least.

Item agreed to.

To provide for Canada's contribution towards the maintenance of the Permanent Secretariat of the League of Nations, $150,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I ask that this item stand, too?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: All right.

Item stands.

Patent Record, $45,000.

Mr. SPENCER: Has that to do with the patent office?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. SPENCER: Do not the patent fees meet the cost of the office?

Mr. ROBB: Yes, I think the office is self-sustaining.

Mr. CALDWELL: If that is so, why is it necessary to ask for this vote of $45,000?

Mr. ROBB: We must vote the money so that the fees received may be credited back.

Item agreed to.

Legislation—Senate—salaries and contingent expenses, $166,205.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why this increase of $6,170.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I am told that it represents statutory increases.

Mr. CALDWELL: Does the Senate come under the Civil Service Commission?

Item agreed to.

House of Commons—

Salaries	$243,155
Expenses of committees, extra sessional clerks, etc.	77,000
Contingencies	46,885
Publishing Debates	60,000
Estimates of the Sergeant-at-Arms	179,350
	$606,390

Mr. GUTHRIE: Are the two increases in these items statutory increases?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Item agreed to.

Chinese immigration—salaries and contingencies, $35,000.

Mr. SPENCER: What is the reason for the increase?

Mr. STEVENS: Is this increase for the appointee to China that I asked about?

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River: What is the work done under this item?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This covers the inspection and work necessary at the coast to take care of the Chinese immigration.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The levying of poll taxes, and so on?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): That is a part of it.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Have the regulations governing Chinese immigration been modified, and if so, in what respect?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Not so far, but I have a number of suggestions to make regarding Chinese immigration that will require legalizing by Order in Council.

Mr. STEVENS: I understand the minister has promised to make an announcement later in regard to that.

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes.

Item agreed to.

Exhibitions, $115,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the explanation of this increase of $25,000?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): We put on exhibits of Canadian products at a number of the large exhibitions in the United States, at Tampa, for instance.

Mr. CALDWELL: To induce immigration?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Yes. I am told good results are obtained.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is it only in the United States that this is done?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Practically, so far, although we intend to have an exhibit in London.

Item agreed to.

Relief of distressed Canadians, $20,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Why the increase?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): This is the usual vote applicable wherever we find distressed Canadians outside of Canada. I think last year's vote was overexpended.

Mr. HANSON: The increase has nothing to do with the change of government?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): Does my hon. friend suggest that there would be more distress abroad in consequence of the change?

Item agreed to.

St. John immigration buildings, $25,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Why the decrease?

Mr. HANSON: Is this for the construction of the buildings?

Mr. STEWART (Argenteuil): There are more ships landing at Quebec this year than ever before, and probably a great majority of the immigrants from the Old Country will land at Quebec.

Item agreed to.

STEAMSHIP SERVICES

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—Canada and Newfoundland, steam service or services between, $35,000.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): These mail subsidies are of interest to many members in this part of the House, and I would ask the Government to hold these items over.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We might hold one or two for the purpose of discussion, if that is agreeable to my hon. friend, or any particular ones that he is interested in he could ask to have held.

Mr. HANSON: This item, I presume, is for the Reid-Newfoundland Company?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. HANSON: I presume the Government has noticed in the press that service on the Reid-Newfoundland line has been suspended, and it may be some considerable time before it is renewed. There ar other lines running between the maritime provinces and Newfoundland. Has the Government given any consideration as to whether some assistance should be given to some of these other lines in lieu of the subsidy that will not be earned by the Reid-Newfoundland Company now that it is held up? There is quite a serious situation down there. There is a block at North Sydney, I understand.

Mr. GARDINER: Are any of the Canadian Government Merchant Marine plying between Canada and Newfoundland?

Mr. ROBB: No, not just now.

Item agreed to.

Canada and the West Indies or South America, or both, service or services between, $340,666.66.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Mr. Chairman, I would ask that this vote, also the vote for steamship service between Canada and South Africa on the Atlantic, and the vote for the service between Canada and Australia or New Zealand on the Pacific, be allowed to stand.

Items allowed to stand.

Victoria, Vancouver, way ports and Skagway, steamship service between, $25,000.

Mr. McBRIDE: What companies are getting these subsidies?

Mr. ROBB: I regret that I am not able to give the information to my hon. friend, because I find that the details respecting all these services have been sent back to the office of the deputy.

Mr. STEVENS: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer the question. It is largely a Canadian Pacific service, and a very excellent one, plying regularly between these points and carrying mail.

Mr. SPENCER: Are subsidies paid to the Canadian Pacific company?

Mr. ROBB: We have to pay a subsidy for a service between certain ports along this coast, otherwise there would be no communication of the kind whatever, and it is an advantage to the country to have such a service.

Item agreed to.

Vancouver and ports on Howe Sound, steam service between, $5,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: Before this item passes I would like to ask a question: I

realize that possibly I am not in order in bringing forward such a matter on this item, but the fact is that the Pension Committee, of which I am a member, sits afternoons and evenings when the House is in session, and I may not be here when the items referred to by my hon. friend from Bow River (Mr. Garland) are taken up. I would like to ask the minister if the Government has any intention of subsidizing a line of steamers between St. John, N.B., and Cuba, at any future time, and I want to state my reasons for asking the question. Last year I took up with the government the matter of seeing if some arrangement could not be made to facilitate the shipping of potatoes to Cuba, due to the fact that the United States tariff on potatoes, and other farm produce going to that country, is such that the market there is practically closed to us. The farmers of New Brunswick to-day are realizing only 40 cents a barrel for their potatoes, whereas the cost to them of raising those potatoes is $2 a barrel. On the average that is what it cost them to produce potatoes last year. Now, when the farmer is only getting 40 cents a barrel it means that he realizes but $120 for a car after the payment of freight, whereas the expense of landing these potatoes in Cuba is $550 a car, which is rather a hard situation for the farmers, as every hon. member must admit. These potatoes are shipped from St. John by boat, and I would like to know whether the Government would not consider the desirability of providing better facilities for handling them at the port of St. John, and of granting a subsidy to a line of steamers whereby we might get our potatoes to market at a reduced rate and in that way, so to speak, lessen the cost of production. I would like the Government to consider what might be done to meet the existing situation. It was proposed last year that the Government Merchant Marine should put on a line of steamers between St. John and Cuba, but it would be necessary that the vessels should be fitted up in such a way that potatoes could be carried without injury. The necessity of this arises from the fact that the holds of the ships are so arranged that when loaded with potatoes the sacks in the lower tier get crushed by the sacks in the tier above. The facilities between decks should be such that no injury would result from this cause. I got the Dominion Merchant Marine to handle shipments on their boats in 1920, but when landed in Cuba some were in very bad condition due to the fact that the potatoes in the top tiers had crushed those in the lower tiers so badly that they were not marketable. I took the matter up last year with the Department of Marine and they told me the reason they would not be able to meet our wishes was because there were not enough potatoes offering at the port of St. John to enable such cargoes to be carried at a profit. Well, the reason for that is that our potatoes were going via Boston where there are better facilities for handling them than at the port of St. John. The Minister of Public Works agreed this session, as the result of a resolution I introduced into the House to endeavour to provide export facilities at the port of St. John. When that has been attended to we shall need some adequate means of transporting our potatoes to Cuba so that they may be landed there at a reduced rate of freight and without injury, thus enabling our farmers to realize a larger amount than they at present receive.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend will give me a memorandum on the subject I shall be pleased to take the matter up with the department.

Mr. IRVINE: I was under the impression that these subsidies were for mail carrying steamers alone; is that correct?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. IRVINE: I cannot see the connection between potatoes and mail?

Mr. ROBB: I may say to my hon. friend that we have an arrangement with these different lines that are subsidized that they shall carry the mails free.

An Hon. MEMBER: Not all.

Mr. ROBB: There may be some exceptions but as a general rule where these vessels go to points to which the mails are not otherwise carried, we have an arrangement whereby they will carry the mails free.

Mr. MARTELL: Has the minister any control over the freight rates charged by boats that receive government subsidies. I have had several complaints from farmers in the county of Hants stating that they are charged exorbitant freight rates, particularly on potatoes and turnips, by the Royal Mail Packet Company, which plies between Halifax and the West Indies.

Mr. ROBB: The rates charged are subject to the approval of the minister. If

my hon. friend will send me any complaints he has received we will take the matter up with the company and ascertain whether they are charging any rates other than those agreed upon.

Mr. MARTELL: I sent some complaints to the minister yesterday, and they are still coming in.

Item agreed to.

Miscou and Shippegan Islands and Mainland, Steam service between, $3,300.

Mr. HANSON: That seems to be a new item. I am not objecting at all, because I think the people who live on these islands are entitled to a great deal of consideration. These islands are on the Baie des Chaleurs and rather isolated. Could the minister tell us who is operating the steamships?

Mr. ROBB: As I stated a few moments ago, I sent the details back to the deputy for some further information. I am not able to give an answer now, but will give it later on.

Mr. STEVENS: The hon. minister could give the information on items 170 and 171.

Mr. ROBB: I could give it any time.

Mr. HANSON: I am not objecting.

Item agreed to.

Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, calling at intermediate points on the Miramichi river and bay, steam service between, $5,000.

Mr. HANSON: There is an increase in this item. This service is on the north shore of the Miramichi, below Newcastle, away from the line of railway, and I think the subsidy is a very fair one. We might have some explanation later on as to the increase. I have not understood that the service was poor, or that any improvement was required. Therefore, we should have some explanation.

Mr. ROBB: The president of the company, Mr. Snowball, I think, came to me and showed me the balance sheets of last year and the year previous, which showed a loss, and he stated that unless they got an increase they would have to discontinue. He wanted more than we allowed, but he consented to go on.

Item agreed to.

Mulgrave, Arichat and Petit de Grat, steam service between, $10,000.

Mr. CALDWELL: There are three services out of Mulgrave. Does this money go to the one steamship company for putting on one service?

Mr. FIELDING: Mulgrave is a terminal point, and the steamers from that point go to different districts.

Mr. CALDWELL: Is it the one steamship company?

Mr. ROBB: No, a different service.

Item agreed to.

Quebec, Natashquan and Harrington, and Bras d'Or and other ports on the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, steam service between, $85,000.

Mr. GUTHRIE: We would like some information on this?

Mr. ROBB: This is a considerable increase. The service will extend 300 miles further east, giving a service to Canadian ports, and bringing back to Canadian ports business that now goes to Newfoundland.

Mr. IRVINE: Are any of the Canadian Merchant Marine vessels employed on this service?

Mr. ROBB: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What service are we going to get? What ships are employed? This is an enormous increase, from $50,000 to $85,000.

Mr. ROBB: We are putting on new ships and a new service, giving an increased service over that of last year, between Harrington and the other points.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the hon. minister allow it to stand?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Item stands.

St. Catherine's Bay and Tadoussac, winter steam service between, $2,000.

Mr. HANSON: What about the winter service at that point?

Mr. ROBB: This is a new service. These people are completely isolated during the winter, so that they have no way of getting the mail sent in.

Mr. HANSON: How are they going to do it?

Mr. ROBB: The mails are carried by dog trains down to a certain point, and there will be a ferry service across from St. Catherine to Tadoussac.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the meaning of "winter steam service"?

Mr. ROBB: It means that the service will apply only in the winter time, when the mails cannot get in otherwise. In the season of navigation, there is another service.

Item agreed to.

St. John and St. Andrews, N.B., calling at intermediate points, steam service between, $4,000.

Mr. HANSON: This is a service that cannot be justified on the ground that it carries mail. The boat is a local freight boat owned by a firm at Black harbour, and travelling between St. John and St. Andrews. I do not want to be taken as opposing this appropriation; but I should like to know the justification for the subsidy, because this boat does not carry a single mail bag.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend desires that the item stand, we shall allow it to stand for further information.

Mr. HANSON: Let us have the information later on. I would not ask that the item stand.

Item agreed to.

St. John and Digby, steam service between, $15,000.

Mr. HANSON: This is a Canadian Pacific service, which is very well patronized. The boat is a good one, which carries a large tourist traffic in the summer. What is the justification for the apparently large increase? I do not see any necessity for an increase on this service which has been established for many years. This boat carries also a considerable quantity of freight.

Mr. ROBB: I will allow this item to stand if my hon. friend so desires. My recollection is that this is an increased service.

Mr. HANSON: There is a daily service now. Is the company putting on two trips a day?

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps the item had better stand until I have the information.

Item stands.

St. Stephen, Deer Island, and Campobello, steam service between, $2,000.

Mr. HANSON: This is a very inadequate service; in fact, it is not a steam service at all. The boat is a gasoline one. Possibly there have been applications for an improved service. In the winter time the boat is not fit for passenger service.

[Mr. Guthrie.]

Mr. ROBB: There may have been applications for an increased service. Many applications have been made for increased services and increased subsidies. We propose to make a thorough review during the coming season and perhaps, we shall correct the services, increasing some and reducing others.

Mr. CALDWELL: This service could be very well increased.

Item agreed to.

Sydney and Whycocomagh, steam service between, $7,000.

Mr. HANSON: This appropriation is nearly doubled. We ought to have some explanation.

Mr. ROBB: My recollection is that this boat showed very bad earnings during the last two years, and that the company were about to discontinue the service altogether, a service which was necessary for the people of this district. Otherwise, they would have no way of getting their produce to market.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the minister let this stand?

Mr. ROBB: I will.

Mr. CALDWELL: The minister tells us that they threathened to discontinue the service. Is this let by contract? Has the minister any guarantee of continuity of service where a subsidy is granted?

Mr. ROBB: These services are voted each year, and sometimes we give these companies contracts covering a term of years. But when they come forward with a statement showing that they are making great losses, it is often cheaper to cancel a contract than to attempt to make them carry out a contract when they are unable to do it.

Mr. CALDWELL: I am finding no fault with the increase of the subsidy, if that is found necessary on account of their producing a statement of their earnings. Has the department any guarantee of continuity of service for a definite time? When liberal subsidies are granted, there should be more than a yearly contract.

Mr. ROBB: There are in many cases. There are but few defaults.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I should like this to stand for further information.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am able to give the committee any quantity of information about this service, which must be about a hundred years old. The boat is a good many years old; but the company are getting a new steel boat this year, and that is the cause of the increase. The new boat is costing them something like $40,000, whereas the old boat was not so expensive. The old boat was getting a subsidy of only $4,000. The distance between Whycocomagh and Sydney is eighty miles. The boat is on the road all the time, going one day and coming back the next, going back and forth continuously, making calls all the way along the Bras d'Or lake. There is no railroad on that side of the island, and this boat answers the purpose. There are many wharves on the lake, and the boat carries freight and passengers back and forth. We could not get along without the service.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The minister stated that he had statements from the company showing that they were losing money. I think the committee ought to have those statements in order to see how the matter stands. The minister might let this item stand over until he can furnish the committee with the statements.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not see why this item should stand any more than any other item. If the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) thinks that, because this service is in my constituency, he is doing a great thing by holding over this estimate, we might stay here for a while and get the information. This item has been passed yearly for the last twenty years since I came to this House, and I never before heard a request that it should stand over. There should be no trouble in getting these statements showing that they were losing money, because I was present in the office when the captain of the boat and the president of the company made them to the minister. If the hon. gentleman thinks he is doing a great service to his country by stopping this item simply because the service is in my riding, I suppose he can do that; but it is a long lane that has no turning.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My hon. friend is assuming a great deal. He says that we are stopping an item because it refers to a service in his riding. I do not think that anyone knew, when the request was made, that the matter referred to my hon. friend's riding. Certainly I did not know. But here is an increase from $4,000 to $7,000. The minister says he has explanations which he will bring forward. We simply ask that the item stand, entirely apart from the fact that it refers to the riding of the Solicitor General. The hon. gentleman need not get angry.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not angry; there is no reason why I should be. Only protests or arguments from a gentleman would make me angry.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): The committee is entitled to the information; I think the item should stand.

Mr. STEVENS: We have been doing very nicely and we have asked that just four items out of some forty be allowed to stand. I do not think the request is unreasonable.

Mr. LAPOINTE: The temper of the committee is getting bad.

Mr. STEVENS: We have not made the request for the purpose of humiliating my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), who is beyond that, anyway.

Item stands.

Sydney and Bras d'Or Lake ports and ports on the east and west coasts of Cape Breton, steam service between, $14,000.

Mr. HANSON: How many services are there in connection with this item?

Mr. ROBB: There are quite a number of them; different services around points where there is no railway communication.

Item agreed to.

To provide for a Canadian Exhibition in France, $50,000.

Mr. STEVENS: What are the particulars?

Mr. ROBB: Last year Senator Beaubien arranged with France that in consideration of Canada giving free transportation to their products over our railways France would give in return free transportation and certain other concessions to an exhibit of Canadian products throughout that country. To take advantage of that arrangement it is well that we should take steps now, while the same government are in office in France, and before they forget the matter. We propose to send an exhibit of Canadian agricultural and industrial products to France.

Mr. STEVENS: Personally, I have no desire to delay the vote at all. In fact I am wholly in favour of it, and I state

frankly that I think it will be of great benefit to those Canadians who are interested in the French market. I think that an exhibition of a Canadian train in France would be of great advantage to us. We should do all we can to promote trade between the two countries, and I heartily endorse the vote. I know a good deal about it and I am entirely in favour of the scheme.

Mr. GUTHRIE: How is the $50,000 arrived at?

Mr. ROBB: It is purely an estimate. The negotiations with France were carried out by Senator Beaubien. It may require more than $50,000 but we are putting in this item in the hope that we shall receive some assistance from the Canadian Manufacturers Association.

Mr. IRVINE: I understand that France imports very little farm produce from any country. What are her agricultural imports from Canada?

Mr. ROBB: We can obtain that information, but my hon. friend is wrong. France has bought considerable amounts of Canadian products, and we hope to be able to increase the sales. If France were buying all the products we have to sell, it would be unnecessary, of course, to send an exhibit there and advertise our products. It is because we wish to increase Canadian business in that market, particularly our agricultural products, that we are taking this matter up.

Mr. STEVENS: Agricultural products, or implements?

Mr. ROBB: Both; I hope my hon. friend does not object to our selling agricultural implements in France.

Mr. IRVINE: It is because I doubt the existence of that market that I ask the question.

Mr. ROBB: There are other business men in Canada who hold a different opinion from my hon. friend.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Will the Government get some assistance from the Canadian Manufacturers Association?

Mr. ROBB: We hope they will contribute in part to the expenses. We will arrange for the train and for a suitable building in which to display our products. We may possibly also arrange for a permanent exhibition there, and those who are interested may contribute by supplying products.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. IRVINE: It seems rather strange that we should put a tariff on French goods and France impose one against us in order to keep out trade, and then we should turn round and spend $50,000 in order to get trade in.

Mr. ROBB: It is not the policy of this Government to keep trade out or to discourage it.

Mr. SHAW: Is the minister considering a mutual arrangement with France for a reduction in the tariff? The money would be better spent in that way than, perhaps, under this item.

Mr. ROBB: If my hon. friend will have patience possibly some day we will give the information he desires.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understood that France imported very few agricultural products; in fact, my information was that the French law prohibited their importation. At the present time I am informed that France produces all the agricultural commodities she requires. I understood, though, that there is a chance of doing business there in manufactured goods. It is probably more particularly for that purpose that this exhibition is to be held. I am not opposing the grant, but I was curious to know how this $50,000 was made up—whether the exhibitors were charged a certain amount and the Government was contributing the balance; and also whether agricultural products are to be put on exhibition as well as manufactured goods.

Mr. ROBB: The item was arrived at, as already explained, purely by estimate. We propose to have an exhibition of agricultural products, minerals, manufactured goods—in fact, everything Canada produces that we think can be sold in France. My hon. friends must keep in mind that France is one of the great tourist countries of the world, and therefore the exhibits Canada shows will be seen by the people of other nations.

Item agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MACKENZIE KING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I inquire whether my hon. friend has considered the question of sitting on Saturdays? A number of

members on both sides of the House have been discussing it during the last day or two, and I think myself that the time has come when we should deal with it. I should also like to know the business for Monday.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: I assume from my hon. friend's remarks that he hopes the Government will do everything in its power to expedite the work, so as to bring the session to a close as soon as possible. Certainly the Government has under consideration what may be possible towards that end. The coming week the House does not sit on Wednesday and Thursday. Some suggestion was made by an hon. member two or three days ago that we might sit on Saturdays, but there seemed to be considerable difference of opinion at the time, and for the Saturday of next week the suggestion did not seem to meet with general approval. The Government would be only too glad to sit on Saturdays if that course were generally approved by the House.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The House will sit on Friday?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Yes; and if between now and Tuesday it should appear that there is a general sentiment in favour of sitting on Saturday I am sure the Government will be glad to meet the wishes of hon. members in that regard. After the following Wednesday we will resume sittings in the evening. If there is any sentiment in favour of sitting on Saturdays we shall be glad to consider the advisability of doing so.

Mr. HANSON: I hope the Government will not sit next Saturday. After that date I should have no objection.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: We will be all ready to sit next Saturday if there is any agreement to do so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May we take it that the custom established by the Government at the commencement of the session of rising at eleven o'clock is not to be abandoned?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: Oh, no, I do not think it will be abandoned. If there is a disposition on the part of members to get through the balance of the work of the session by not speaking at too great length, I do not see why we should not adjourn at eleven o'clock as usual; but if for any reason there is a tendency to delay matters unduly, the Government will probably feel justified in continuing the sittings a little later than eleven o'clock to get through a good day's work. When we can get through reasonably by eleven o'clock, we shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): I am asking the question because several members leave towards eleven o'clock under the impression that the House will rise at that hour, but lately we have been sitting until twelve o'clock or later.

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: As to the business for Monday, we will take what remains of naval and militia estimates, mounted police, soldiers' land settlement, adjustment of war claims, fisheries, and any other estimates on the list.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—FOURTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1922

Abbreviations:—1r., 2r., 3r.,=first, second, third reading. Admn.=Administration. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Dept.=Department. Div.=Division. Govt.=Government. M.=Motion. Neg.=Negative. Qu.=Question. Ref.=Reference. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Abattoirs. *See also* Cold Storage; Health of Animals; Meat and Canned Foods
Maritime provinces in, M. 992, 1023

Accountants. *See* House of Commons; Senate

Accounts. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act; Finance; Public Accounts

Accredited Herds. *See* Health of Animals

Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834

Acoustics. *See* House of Commons

Actions. *See* Escheats Act Amdt.

Active Militia. *See* Militia; National Defence

Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 10, 15, 50, 98, 122, 173, 211, 260, 303, 326
Mover (Mr. McMurray) 10; Seconder (Mr. Mercier) 15
Speakers, Messrs: Baldwin, 60; Baxter, 98; Beaubien, 280; Brown, 332; Campbell, 356; Carmichael, 155; Church, 116; Crerar, 50; d'Anjou, 306; Denis (St. Denis), 348; Dickie, 341; Drayton, 195; Evans, 300; Forke, 76; Gouin, 140; Harris, 307; Hughes, 224; Irvine, 211; Johnson (Moosejaw), 112; Kennedy (Edmonton), 142; King (Mackenzie), 38; Ladner, 321, 326; Lewis, 149; Logan, 105; Macdonald (Pictou), 186; MacKelvie, 159; MacLaren, 353; MacLean (Prince), 335; Maclean (York), 63; McBride, 316; Manion, 263; Marler, 243; Meighen, 19; Neill, 169; Pritchard, 250; Putnam, 309; Raymond, 253; Robitaille, 320; Ross, 95; Ryckman, 284; St. Père, 281; Sexsmith, 293; Sheard, 294; Speakman, 80; Stansell, 359; Stevens, 230; Stork, 330; Turgeon; 273; Warner, 349; Woods, 92; Woodsworth, 84
Motion agreed to, 362; acknowledgment of address by Governor General, 746-7

Adjournments. *See* House of Commons

Adjustment of War Claims. *See* War Claims

Administration of Justice. *See* Justice

Administration of Oaths of Office bill, 1r., 6

Admiralty Act Amdt. bill (Deputy Registrar and Deputy Judge) 1r., 245-6; 2r., com., 2822; 3r., 2823

Admiralty Court vacancy at Quebec, 1275

Adulteration of Food. *See* Food; Health

Advertising. *See* American Magazines

Aerial Patrol. *See* Air Service

Aeronautics, control of. *See* Air Board Act

Aeroplanes. *See* Air Service

Age of consent. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Agents Provacateur. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Ages, Population by. *See* Population

Agricultural bloc in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Budget; Customs; United States

Agricultural Commodities. *See* Farm Products

Agricultural Fairs. *See* Exhibitions

Agricultural Fertilizers. *See also* Fertilizers
Inquiry as to legislation, 3041
Speaker's ruling, 1282

Agricultural Fertilizers, Regulation and Sale of, bill. Res. 3043; 1r., 3044; 2r., 3044; ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 3044; com., 3194; 3r., 3195. Senate amdts., 3607

Agricultural Implements, 2185, 2217, 2360, 2464, 2564, 2620
Brantford factories, closing of, 2375
Duties on, reduction, 2115, 2175, 2206, 2217, 2230, 2360, 2375, 2381, 2484, 2534, 2592, 2731, 3118-3120, 3141. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Drawbacks and refunds, 2175, 3122
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston — Last Mountain) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Imported from United States, 2413-14, 2486
By United Grain Growers, 3118-19
International Harvester Company, 2382
Massey-Harris Company, 2175
Price of, 1476, 2188. *See also* Address; Budget
At home and abroad, 2452, 2620
Protection, 2697
Manufacturers, and, 2575
Raw Materials for, 302, 309, 766. *See also* Customs Tariff
Raymond, Mr., and, 254, 255, 2705. *See also* speeches on Budget
Repair parts, 1901
Standardization of parts, 2406
Tariff, and, *See* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff

Agricultural Institute, 657, 969

Agricultural Instruction Act, 651-2, 994, 1012
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032

Agricultural Labourers. *See* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment

Agriculture. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Accredited herds, 995, 2556, 2734-43
Diseases, 968. *See also under this title,* Health of Animals
Valuation, 1000
Animal diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health of Animals
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Bounty to, 1698
Bovine Tuberculosis. *See under this title.* Health of Animals
Butter. *See also* Oleomargarine
Accumulation in England, 997
Colouring of, 1778
Imported, qu. 613, 803
New Zealand, from, qu. 614
Protection against oleomargarine, 177. *See also* Oleomargarine
Vitamines in, 1781

Agriculture — *Con.*
Cattle. *See also* Live Stock
Embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 992, 998, 2557
Abattoirs, maritime provinces, 992-3, 1023
Quebec, 1471
Warehouses, 3521
Commissioner of, qu. 609, 645, 3501. *See also* Marshall, Mr. Duncan
Committee on. *See* Agriculture and Colonization
Competition, 2698
Conditions and prospects, 16, 53, 78, 81, 85, 113, 150, 231, 252, 300, 2147, 2149, 2153, 2156, 2163, 2216, 2403, 2885. *See also* speeches on Address; Agriculture Estimates; Budget
Statement by Manitoba Agricultural College, 2332
Contributions to railway tonnage, 1927. *See also* Freight Rates; Wheat Board
Dairying. *See that title*
Depression in, 1475, 2147. *See also* Address; Budget
Department
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Comparison of average salaries, 750
Dominion Apiarist, 592
Estimates, 1018, 1718, 3520
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment of, 3501. *See also that title*
Salaries and contingencies, 588, 644, 3504
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 590, 3520. *See also under this title,* Entomology
Diseases of Animals. *See under this title,* Accredited Herds; Health of Animals
Entomology, 813
Exhibitions, 993, 1026, 3521. *See also that title*
Experimental and illustration Farms, 795, 2557, 3521
Buildings, expenditure on, 1264
M. (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item, 812
Mont Laurier, 994
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Export figures, 2446, 2638
Farm labourers, 79, 87, 251, 1153
Harvest excursions to West, 337
Immigration of. *See* Immigration
Unemployment. *See* Unemployment
Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers; Fertilizers
Fruit Industry. *See that title*
Importance of, 2386. *See* Address; Budget
International Institute of, 657, 969

Agriculture — *Con.*
Health of Animals, 967. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Bovine tuberculosis, 2556
Hog cholera, 1007, 1028
Alderson claim, 1004
Tuberculosis, 3521. *See also* Animal contagious Diseases
Japanese engaged in, 345-6. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Lecturers, 1023
Live Stock. *See that title*
Manitoba Agricultural College, statements on, 2332
Markets, 251, 2149. *See also* Address; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Wheat Board
Military and agricultural expenditures, comparison, 1137
Mixed farming, 2592
Potatoes. *See that title*
Root Vegetables. *See that title*
Saunders, Dr. C. E., Dominion Cerealist, gratuity to, 590, 3522
Seed, Feed, and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Seed Grain, 3522
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718. *See also* Live Stock.
Unemployment, and, 2158, 2331. *See also* Labour; Unemployment
Wheat Board. *See that title*

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Canadian Council of Agriculture Memorandum ref. to, 377
Constitutionality of Wheat Board, Law Officers' opinion, 940
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900, 2406
Reports
Inquiry as to, 1929
Second and third, 657
M. to concur in, 703, 726, 776
Amdt. (Mr. Meighen) to refer back, 779
M. as amended, agreed to, 786
Third, concurred in, 786
Fourth, concurred in, 865
Fifth, M. to concur in, 2915
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland), 2951; neg. 2969
See Wheat Board, for further proceedings
Standardization of parts of agricultural machinery, 2406

Air Board, qu. 366. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Air Board — *Con.*
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Civil aviation, 1722. *See also* Air Force
Estimates, salaries, etc., 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1728

Air Board Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Compensation for death or injury)
Res. 2357, 2820; 1r., 2821, 2r., com., 3r., 2826

Aircraft Limitation. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Air Force. *See also* Air Board; Militia, National Defence
Aeroplanes, danger of attack from, 2085-98
Civil Aviation, and, 1047, 1722
Aerial patrol, High River, Alta., 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Camp Borden, 1728
Co-operation with provinces, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, B.C., 1730
Forest patrol, 1047
High River station, 1048; qu. 1066, 1723
Railway Belt, B.C., 1730
Gasoline for aeroplanes. *See* Gasoline
Pensions, Widowed mothers, 1305

Air Service. *See* Air Force

Aird, Sir John, 1128

Alberta
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian schools. *See* Indians
Meeting of defeated candidates, 2858
Public buildings, 1254
Second homesteads, 1042
Soldier's Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Alcohol. *See also* Customs Tariff; Opium and Narcotic Drugs; Prohibition; Special War Revenue Act
Country doctors and, 2177
Retail druggists, for, ques. 1213, 1400; 2114, 2176-7, 2191

Alderson Claim. *See* Agriculture, Health of Animals

Aldred, Mr. J. E., 1128

Ale. *See* Liquor; Special War Revenue Act; Taxation

Algoma Steel Corporation, rails, 1689

Aliens. *See also* Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Deportation of. *See* Immigration Act Amdt.; Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Enemy property, custodians of 1672, qu. 1904
C.P.R. shares held by, 1672
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu. 3363
Prince Rupert, 3606, 3601
Fisher & Oughton, qu. 1773, 3601, 3606
Thorsch, Mr., qu. 1772
Williams & Manson, qu. 1772, 3601, 3606
Lord Kitchener, news of his death, and, 2155
Oriental Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens
Taxation of, 2155
Women of Alien Birth. *See* Dominion Franchise Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Allan, Sir Montagu, 872. *See also* Banks, Merchants Bank

Alliances, Political, 2095, 2097. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party
"Morganatic alliance", 2095, 2344

Alpine Club, grant to, 1053, 1387

Alternative Vote. *See* Proportional Representation

Aluminum Company of America, 71, qu. 728
Cedar Rapids power, qu. 1375

Amalgamation of Departments. *See* National Defence Bill

Ambassador, Canadian, at Washington. *See* Canadian Representation

American Bankers' Association, 2189

American Magazines, importation and competition, 3109

Amherst, N.S.
Car repair contracts, 1702
Drill hall, 1238

Ammunition. *See* Militia and Defence

Anaesthetics, use of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Budget, 2364. Tribute to Finance Minister; taxation and the cost of living, 2364; tariff; import and excise duties; free trade; origin of protective policy in United States; population, increase of; tariff reductions; a two and a half per cent budget; sales tax increase, 2365; party without definite fiscal policy; 2366; revenue and protective tariffs in England and United States; Fordney tariff, 2367; reciprocity with United States; British and American investment in Canadian industries, 2368; home manufacture; trade with Great Britain and United States, 2369; home market; difficulties due to war; debt and deficits, 2370; economy and expenditure; civil service; militia and naval service, 2371; taxation; railways; emigration; dumping clause, 2372; beet sugar; the amendment, 2373
Burlington channel bridge, 2007
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 954
Halifax and St. John quarantine stations, 1241
Halton county
Highways — Dundas Street, qu. 1065
Post offices, 1247
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021-2
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act, 3014
Orders in Council, qu. 935
Overseas service — categories, 3317
Penitentiary Act Amdt, 790
Pensions, commutation of, 1281
Public buildings
Rentals, 1259
Water, 1266
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, care and medical examination of patients, 1281
Steel rods, refund of duties, 1774

Andrews, Mr. A. J., K.C.
Winnipeg Strike correspondence, 2042

Anglo-French Relations. *See* Genoa Conference; Limitation of Armaments

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168. *See also* Japan; Limitation of Armaments

Animal Contagious Diseases Act
Administration, 967, qu. 3362

Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill (Compensation for slaughtered animals), 1r., 1283; 2r., com., 2102; com., 2734; 3r., 2806

Animals, Cruelty to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Annexation, 2550
"Annexationists of the prairie provinces", 1020

Annual Drill. *See* Militia

Annuities Branch, Salaries, etc., 776

Anti-Conscription, 22. *See also* Military Service Act Amdt.

Anti-Dumping. *See* Budget; Customs; Fruit; Trade

Appeal Cases. *See* Judges' Act Amdt.

Appeal Judges, Saskatchewan. *See* Judges Act Amdt.

Appeals from Provincial Courts. *See* Supreme Court Act Amdt.

Apples. *See* Fruit

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 26 (Interim Supply — for $53,-901,669.17 for 1922-23). Res., 362, 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599
2. Bill No. 85 (for 1921-22, for $9,623,-792.61 and 1922-23 for $88,517,204.53). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 1842-3
3. Bill No. 202 (for 1922-23 for $175,766,-646.71). Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3607

Appropriations not required. *See* Estimates

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Bankruptcy Act, trustees for Montreal district, 1183
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth). *See under this title,* Immigration-Criminal Code
Health Dept. correspondence relating to drugs, 1289, 1377
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Special Com. Reports, 1988, 2519, 3156, 3280
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Military Service Act Amdt., 642
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289
Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bill (Residence), 1062
Newspaper censors, 1069
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Point of order — relevancy, 1890
Pratt vs. Delphine, 302
Railway Commission, Chief Traffic Officer, ques., 1377, 2215, 2457

Archambault, Mr. Joseph — *Con.*
St. John harbour, qu., 1401
Trent canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376
Victoria bridge tolls, qu. 1377
War claims, details of estimates, qu. 1288
Welland canal, total expenditure, qu. 1376

Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Archives. *See* Public Archives

Arctic Ocean, patrol. *See* Naval Service

Arctic Regions, Mounted Police in, 3497

Arichat, port physician, qu. 1773

Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Armorial Bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601

Armouries. *See also* Militia and Defence
Fittings and alterations, 1261, 1288
Quebec, in, qu. 1287

Army and Navy Veterans, Oriental immigration, 1514

Arsenals. *See* Militia

Arthur Young & Company, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Canadian Transit Company Bill, 1771
Cash Bonus to Soldiers, 403; M., 429
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Fishing schooner race, 3514
Geodetic survey, 1986
Labour Dept.
Nova Scotia strike, 584
Salaries, 575
Temporary clerks, 567
Naval Service, cruisers, qu. 2039
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3440-53
Postal receipts, qu. 938
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3959
Reading of documents, 560
Returned soldier hikers, qu. 3153
Rural mail routes, qu. 3152
Soldiers' settlement, building loans, 3475
Transcontinental railway, 919

Articles. *See* League of Nations

Artillery. *See* Militia; Royal Canadian Artillery

Artisans, Immigration of. *See* Immigration; Labour

Ascension Day Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Asiatic Exclusion League of Canada, Oriental Immigration, 1514

Asiatics. *See also* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
British Columbia in, 171, 183

Assiniboine River Floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Relief measures, inquiry, 3491

Assistant Chief Electoral Officer. *See* Chief Electoral Officer

Athletics. *See* Cadet Camps

Atlanta, Ga., Penitentiary, 1278

Atlantic-Pacific, Canadian ports. *See* British Preference; Steamship Services

Atlantic Sugar Refineries, drawback, 2850

Audibility of Debates. *See* House of Commons

Audit, Supreme Court pre-audit, 1275

Audit Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt.

Auditor General
Contingencies, 3504
Salaries, 793

Auditor General's Report, 380, 424
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Ref. to Public Accounts Committee, 1462

Aurora, warship. *See* Naval Service

Australia
Immigration policy, 1536
Preservation of Industries Act, 2411, 2648
Reciprocal trade with, 33, 174, 2110, 2802
Correspondence tabled, 9
Steamship services. *See* Steamship Services
Trade relations with, 2592

Automobiles. *See also* Taxation
Duty on, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2232, 2574
Drawbacks, refunds, 2850
Excise sales tax, 2116, 2177, 2186, 2206, 2230, 2260, 2346-7, 2388, 3272-3, 3276
Amended, 2857
Ford car, cost in Detroit and Canada, 2186
Ford Motor Company, 3273
Duty paid by, qu. 3599
Output, 3273
Protection and profits, 2232, 2696
Imports, qu. 1633

Automobiles — *Con.*
Industry, protection of, 2696, 2730, 3132
Number of, by provinces, 2566
Refund of taxes, 3600
Results of protection of industry, 2696
Theft, penalty, 2831
Value, $1,000, to be admitted free for settlers, 2116

Aviation. *See* Air Board; Air Force

Bachelor Tax. *See* Taxation

Backus, Mr. E. W. *See also* Lake of the Woods Repeal Bill
Lease of timber areas, 2805; qu. 2992

Bacon, production. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock
Conference on, 1025

Baddeck, N.S.
Public Buildings, 1238
Wharf, 1269, 1765

Baie des Chaleurs railway service. *See* Gaspé Railways

Baker, the late Colonel G. H., M.P.
Memorial to, 1929
Appointment of Special Com., 2101
Second report, 3490

Baldwin, Mr. W. K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply, 60; congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail, income tax collections, 60; attitude of leader of Opposition, 60-61; conscription, 61; leader of Opposition, 62
Armouries, 1288
Budget, 2250. Public debt; sugar control; railways; economy, 2250; naval service; development of natural resources, 2251; geographical difference; party promises; water power development; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2252; tariff; Progressive party; Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; Sir John Macdonald and protection, 2253; wartime wages and prices; immigration, national spirit; inequalities of taxation, 2255
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1832

Balkan States, credit to. *See* Loans; Roumania

Ballantyne, Hon. C. C. *See* Banks; Ministers and Directorships

Bancroft, Mr. L. P. (Selkirk)
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Pensions for lightkeepers, 1496
Selkirk wharf, 2004

Banff, Windermere road, 1051, 1682

Banking and Commerce, Committee on
Bouchard, Mr., substituted for Mr. Stein, 2035
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref to, 1210
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, ref. to, 1210

Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703

Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bills
1. Bill No. 45 (Mr. Jacobs — additional grounds for petition in bankruptcy) 1r., 821; ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1395
2. Bill No. 56 (Mr. Ethier — court to which petition shall be presented) 1r., 1132; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1662
3. Bill No. 107 (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 2035; 2r., com., 3025; 3r., 3026
Sections and Subjects discussed:
Avoidance of general assignment of book debts, 3025
Court of bankruptcy, 3026
Judges to be assigned by chief Justice, 3026
Senate amendments, concurrence in, 3611
Suspension of payment, notice of, 3025
Winding up Act, 3026

Banks and Banking. *See also* Finance; Loans; Taxation
American Bankers' Association, 2189
Bank Act, revision. *See* Address; Budget
Bank balances and real wealth, 2497
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2177, 2329, 2852, 2856, 3258
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Circulation, tax on, 2117, 2626
Commerce, 1085-7
Credit system, 1290. *See also* Financial Credits
Credits, 1071, 2729. *See also* Loans
Currency, issue of, 2501
Deposits, ratio to capital, 2728
Gold in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
Grain trade, financing of, 2246

Banks and Banking — *Con.*
Income tax payments by, qu. 1400
Interest, 1291, 3601
Alleged violation of Bank Act, 2627
Interlocking directorates, 2503
Loans to directors, 1093
Merchants', 1085, 1092, 1121, 3604
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Amalgamation, 2727
Ballantyne, Hon. C. C., 1085
Independent inquiry by Parliament, 2396
Macarow, Mr. D. C., case against, qu. 2305
Merger, 158, 237, qu. 367, 872, 1085, 2727
Montreal Bank and, 1085
Royal Trust Company, and, 1085
Montreal Bank, 1071-85, 1129
Canadian Pacific, and, 64-66
Unemployed and, 87
Montreal City & District Savings Bank, 1087
Municipalities, withholding credit from, 2627
Nationalization of, 2325-8
New banks, starting, 2501
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, property, qu. 1182
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill. *See that title*
Penny Banks, depositories for money received, 1132
Profits, circulation, interest, etc., qu. 3598
Refusal to advance money to school board, 2627
Royal Bank, 1087
Special War Revenue taxation. *See that title*
Note circulation, payments on, qu., 1400
System, revision of, 138, 158, 223, 237, 352, 2501, 2506. *See also* Budget; Irvine

Barclay, Mr. A. J., qu., 963-4

Barkhouse, Captain, 1748

Barnet, Major. *See* Soldier Settlement Board

Barnjum, Mr. Frank J., Forest Protection, 1049

Battlefields Commission, 119, 771. *See also* War Graves

Battlefields Memorials. *See also* War Memorials
Estimates, 2098, 2975

Baxter, Mr. Charles W., Appointment of successor, qu., 2457

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 98. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 98; Conservative party, campaign literature, 99; natural resources of western provinces, 100; maritime provinces, 101; tariff and reciprocity, 102; railway situation; Canadian ports, 104; economy in expenditure; industrial depression, 105
Audibility of debates, 708
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 712
Budget, 2340. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; per capita taxation; expenditure, 2341; Progressives and Government; duties on coal, boots and shoes; platform of 1919; failure of Government to implement pledges, 2343; reciprocity with United States; morganatic alliance, 2344; platform of Canadian Council of Agriculture; the amendment, 2345; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; redistribution; taxation of luxuries; automobile tax, 2346; tariff proposals as they affect farmer and labourer; trade with Germany, 2347
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 3007
Date of coming into force, 3008
Canadian National railways
Government ownership and operation, 1965
Immigration, and, 2165
Intercolonial, 1967
Menus, cost of printing, qu., 1931
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606
Civil Service — Mr. Martell, 3101
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Fines, payment to municipalities, 2832
Half-breed scrip, 3217, 3221
Pool-selling and book-making, point of order, 2973
Customs tariff operation, 769
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, Lunenburg, qu., 1902, 2458, 2584
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, 3468-74
Dredging, maritimes provinces, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born wives, M. (Mr. Euler) 492
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2826

Baxter, Hon. J. B. M. — *Con.*
Fisheries
Deputy Minister of, 2166
Markets, 2166
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2817
Freight Rates
Special Com. on third report, 3577
Sub-amdt., 3586
Harbours and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
Immigration, maritime provinces and, 2165
Interior Dept., salaries, 454
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426, 546
Labour Dept., 494, 495
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu., 3598
Military expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Militia and Defence
Arsenal, Quebec, 2094
Expenditure and policy, 1149, 2094
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) 1117
Monopolies and excess profits, 3276
Monuments, historic sites, qu., 469
National Defence bill, 2809
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt.
Appeal, restriction of right, 3021
Deportation, 3024
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2016
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3441
Railway policy, 1965
Rideau Hall, coal supply, 1757
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. John, in, 736
St. John terminal facilities, 848-9
St. John Valley railway, 3039
Savoy, J. Clovis, qu., 3363
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — Insurance, 3253
Spruce bud worm, 815
Wharves in New Brunswick, transfer of, qu., 2305

Beatty, Mr. E. W., President of C.P.R., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. (Provencher)
Address in reply, 280; congratulations to mover and seconder, aims of Progressive party, 280
Boy Scouts, 773

Beaubien, Mr. A. L. — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — wrecks caused by defective cars from United States, 1708
Immigration — Ukrainians, 3061

Beck, Sir Adam, 63, 71, 92, 123, 124, 134, 633, 1327, 1937. *See also* Hydro Electric; Maclean, Mr., (York); St. Lawrence Waterway

Beef, Imports of, qu., 610

Beer. *See* Liquor; Taxation

Beet Sugar. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue

Behring Sea Patrol, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Béland, Hon. H. S. (Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Minister in charge of the Department of Health)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3479-84
Canadian Red Cross Society bill, 3151, 3386
Canteen funds, disposal, 3329, 3308
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 441
Chaudière Valley floods, 3492
Conservation Commission, 456-7
Election promises, 402
Health, department of
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289, 1377
Estimates, 2017
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
Salaries, 775
Venereal diseases, 2022
Insurance claim of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also under this title* Returned Soldiers Iusurance
Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, M. (Mr. Archambault) 1289, 1377
Enforcement of Act, 2017
Prohibition and, 2018
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill, 775, 1841, 2823, 3013
Appeal, 3020
Deportation, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3439-64
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1339, 1349-50, 3336
Appeals, 3341
Charges against, 3041

Béland, Hon. H. S. — *Con.*
Pension Commissioners. — *Con.*
Discretion, 392
Memorandum of Chairman, 2994
Representation of Quebec, 1350
Pensions
Commutation, 392
European War and active militia, 1353, 1361
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3523
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1307
Pensions, Insurance, etc., Special Com.
Appointed, 496
Final report, 3355
Shaw, Mr., 3326
Returned Soldiers, alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2639
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3358, 3388, 3398, 3437
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1341
Employers' Liability compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Hospitals, 1348
Nurses' salaries, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pensions, 1349, 1353, 1361. *See also under this title,* Pensions
Royal Commission on Pensions, 388. *See also under this title,* Pension Commissioners
Staff, 405, 1343
Reduction of, 3602
Salary increases, 385, 388, 401, 405, 551
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281
War service gratuity, interest on, 1347
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept. bill, 3597, 3609
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Unemployment relief, 1352, 3528

Belgium, free trade and, 2525

Bell Telephone Company, rates increase, 132

Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504

Belley, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Benefit Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt. bill

Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937

Betting. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Beverages, Tax on, 2594, 2857. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Bienfait, Briquetting plant at, qu. 6$4, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Expenditure and results, 2712-15

Big Bay Point, Lake Simcoe, removal of sunken vessel, 2005

Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765

Big Interests and Liberal party, 242, 2431, 2678, 2682. *See also* speeches on Budget

Biggar, Colonel O. M.
Resignation from Air Board, 1726. *See also* Chief Electoral Officer

Biggar, Mr., W. H., K.C., qu. 728

Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63

Bills. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker
For Public Bills *See* their individual titles;
For private Bills, *See* Private Bills Discussed

Binder Twine, 257, 265, 2405 2575
Brantford factory, 2375. *See also* Budget

Binders. *See* Agricultural Implements

Binette, Mr. Joseph (Prescott)
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
L'Orignal wharf, qu. 1212
Quebec riots, compensation for damage, qu. 1508
St. Lawrence river waterway, communication with Imperial Govt., qu. 1508

Biological Board. *See* Marine

Bird, Mr. T. W. (Nelson)
Budget, 2704. Political expediency; difficult to modify protective system, 2704; divergence of views of Mr. McMaster and Mr. Raymond; historic Liberalism represented by Progressive party, 2705; revival of Liberal spirit; attitude of Opposition towards Progressives; alleged inaccuracies, 2706; statement as to direct and indirect taxation; tariff a secondary revenue producer; sales tax; free trade and revenue, 2707; inheritance tax; protection and farmers, 2708; labouring man; competition under free trade;

Bird, Mr. T. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian wheat in England; workingman and protection, 2709; small industries and trusts, 2710; Wheat Board; protection and flagwaving; obstacles to united nationhood, 2711
Civil Service salaries, 554
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2786
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 526
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838

Birnie, Mr. Alexander, and others, petition of, 1929

Black, Mr. George (Yukon)
Alien enemy property, qu. 1904
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3483
Civil Service list, qu. 727
House of Commons
Law Branch, qu. 2304
Senate, and,
Chief Accountants, qu. 2583, 2803
Expenditure, qu. 2583
McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation, qu. 2805
Migratory Birds, 1686
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1520
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Committee, final report, 3334
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 838
Senate and House of Commons
Chief Accountants' salaries, ques. 2583, 2803
Yukon Territory
Administration of justice, 1275
Suggested union with British Columbia, 1275
Mining and mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radio-telegraph service, 1749
Silver discovery, 1276

Black, Mr. William (South Huron)
Budget, 2448. Disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister; the tariff; jokers in budget; protection with an excise tax; boots and shoes; building materials and agricultural implements; exorbitant prices charged; manufacturers' rebate on raw materials; loss of population, 2449; immigration; railway situation; national railways; change of management necessary; merchant marine; civil service; mem-

Black, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
bers taking up too much time with speeches; trade relations with United States; export of cattle, 2450; immigration, 2450
Goderich harbour improvements, 2000
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2000

Black, Mr. W. J., Deputy Minister of Immigration
Appointment of, 3500. *See also* Immigration

Blackfoot Reserve. *See* Indians

Blake, Late Hon. Edward
Letter to West Durham electors, 2677
Malvern speech, 2655, 2677
Withdrawal from leadership of Liberal party, 2655, 2657, 2677

Bland, Mr. C. H., Civil Service Commission, qu. 1773

Blankets. *See* Customs Tariff

Blind
Canadian National Institute for, grant, 3540
Soldiers. *See* Pensions Committee

Blood Indian Reserve. *See* Indians

Board of Commerce, 1118
Constitutionality of. *See* Wheat Board
Cost, report, qu. 2583
Salary of secretary, 1715

Board of Pension Commissioners. *See* Pension Commissioners

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boivin, Mr. George H. (Shefford)
Business of the House
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 1698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
St. Malo shops, 1699
Cheque tax, 3261
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Debates Committee, first report concurred in, 1258
Debates, Official, Unrevised Index, 3359
Health of Animals
Hog cholera, 1007
Inspection of dairy herds, 1007
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Unemployment, rail and car repair contracts, 1699

Bolshevism, 1290. *See also* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Bona fide Contractors. *See* Wheat Board bill

Bonds. *See also* Finance; Loans
Five year maturities, qu. 2993
Non-taxable Victory bonds, qu. 2971
Sale by public tender, 1468
Tax-exempt, 2567, 2725

Bonus. *See* Civil Service; Soldiers

Bookmaking. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Bootlegging. *See* Liquor

Boots and Shoes, 3238. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Customs
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Price and labour costs, 2350
Protection of industry, 207-208
Tariff on, 102-103, 152-3, 159, 2341-2, 2465, 2488-9, 2632, 2685, 3236, 3237
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce duty, neg. 3238

Borden, Camp
Air force and civil aviation, 1728

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
Appointment to Limitation of Armaments Conference
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
Imperial Conference of 1918, 1864
Naval defence, on, 1864, 1876
Quebec Harbour, 1475
Report on reduction of naval armaments, 9, 42, 1737, 1743
Withdrawal from directorships, 1089

Bouchard, Mr. George J. (Kamouraska)
Introduction, 1929

Boucher, Mr. Aimé (Yamaska)
Naval policy, 2078
Sorel shipyard, men employed May 1921, qu. 1062

Bounties
Linen yarn, 3128
Steel, 304-5, qu. 3360
Sugar beet industry. *See* Inland Revenue

Bourassa, Mr. J. B. (Levis)
Levis lightkeepers, qu. 2583

Bovine Tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases

Bowen, Mr. Fred W. (Durham)
Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu. 937

Boy Scouts Association, 772

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Big Bay point, Lake Simcoe, wreck, 2005
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Canada Gazette, expenditure Public Works, 1268
Coal, importation for public buildings, 1763
Dredging, 2005
External Affairs, salaries, 412
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Militia-Naval Service, officers, 421
National Defence bill, Air Force, 677
Naval Service
Militia, and, deputy ministers, 421
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Patronage — rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions Board, appeal, 390
Pensions, disability cases, 389
Public Buildings
Coal importations for, 1763
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1267
Expenditure on, 1268
Public works
Appropriations and expenditures, 2002
Estimates, 695, 698
M. to reduce, 695
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1268, 1271
Riley's army, qu. 3364
Soldiers' land settlement, 2132

Brantford
Agricultural implement industries, 255, 2375. *See also* Budget; Raymond
Meighen, Hon. Mr., speech at, 256

Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner of taxation, salary, 2024

Brethen, Mr. G. A. (East Peterborough)
Accredited herds, 1000
Agriculture — Deputy Minister, 653
Automobile tax, 3276-7
Budget, 2693. United Grain Growers and agricultural implement business; income tax — who pays? 2693; economy; reduction in cost of government; national debt; domestic loans; reciprocity, 2694; sales tax; excess profits, 2695; luxury tax; unimproved land values; automobile tax; protective tariff and automobile industry, 2696; Ford car; protection of agricultural implements, 2697; home market; prices

Brethen, Mr. G. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
fixed in markets of world; ability of agriculture and live stock industries to meet world competition, 2698
Customs Dept., estimates, 763
Grants to live stock associations, 1027
Live stock trade with South America, 647
Manufacturers, protection of, 2696, 3232
Oleomargarine, 3430
Woollen clothing and blankets, 3135

Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Bridges. *See also* Public Works
Burlington Channel, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Edmundston, 1239-53
False Creek, 3516
Grand river, York, Ont., qu. 1287
Isle Perrot, federal contribution, qu. 1377
Ottawa, lighting, 1267
Quebec, 1068
Red Deer river, 1964
Victoria, tolls, qu. 1377

Bridgetown, post office accommodation, 1245

Briquetting. *See* Bienfait; Lignite

Bristol, Hon. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Budget, 2407. Congratulation to Finance Minister; nothing for trade or agriculture, a "stand pat" budget; protection against competitors; wages and production costs in Germany, 2407; German exports to Canada, 2408; protection of industries in Great Britain; Safeguarding of Industries Act; United States tariff, 2409; protection against German competition; equalization of conditions; duty valuation based on Canadian selling price; safeguarding of French industries, 2410; Australian Industries Preservation Act; Tom Moore on German labour conditions; protection of Canadian industries, 2411; industrial development and tariff legislation in United States; iron and steel, comparison of English and American prices; steel rails; Germany underselling United States; nails; protection of Nova Scotia coal and steel industry, 2412; tariff revision long overdue, 2413; western farmer and tariff and freight rates; United States farmer opposed to free trade; tariff against Canadian agricultural products; protection against United States commodities;

Bristol, Hon. Edmund — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
free trade; agricultural implements, importation from United States; effect of tariff reduction on implement factories; American factories in Canada; trusts and combines; woolens, 2415; free trade means destruction of Canadian industries and home markets; harmony between eastern and western Canada, 2416; deflation; building costs, coal; railway wages and freights; the amendment, 2417
Canadian ships damaged during war, 1183
Welland canal, 2748
Co-operation with the United States, 2751
Grain transportation, 2750

British Admiralty, war claims, 1752

British Board of Trade, relief of distressed seamen, 1676

British-Born
Disabilities under Immigration and Naturalization Acts, 1389-91

British Columbia
Aerial patrol of forests, 1724, 1730
Asiatics in. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Banff-Windermere road, 1051, 1682
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Canada Temperance Act, 1017
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733, 2997. *See also that title*
Canadian National branch lines, 331
Coal mines in, 178
Coastal services, qu. 3152
Dairymen's Association, 1794
D'Arcy Island, lazaretto, 2021
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1156-63, 1353
United Farmers, and, 1354
Fisheries. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Cost and revenue, 2306
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Transfer to, 2042
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Fruit industry, 162, 225, 3417-3424
Tariff and. *See* Budget; Customs
Fuel Oil, 178, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Liquor traffic, 2018. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act

British Columbia — *Con.*
Natural resources, 328. *See also* Natural Resources
Old age and mothers' pensions, 1375
Oliver, Hon. John, 322
Criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2236-7
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Oriental Aliens. *See also that title*
Competition with, 171, 173, 183, 316-19, 332, 344
Immigration, 167, 872, 967, 2310, 3104
Res. by Legislature, 1511, 1513
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1509
Population, 1512
Voting, 172
Post offices, revenue from, qu. 824
Potlach Indian Institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Public buildings, improvements, etc., 1255
Railway Belt
Forestry, 1046
Survey, 1043
Railway mail service, 2797
Union for judicial purposes with Yukon, 1275

British Columbia House, London, purchase of, 3537

British Empire Steel Corporation, 200, 1106, 1130. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Business profits tax, qu. 1067
Compensation for loss, 1082

British Goods, Importation. *See* British Preference; Customs; Trade

British-Japanese Treaty *See* Limitation of Armaments

British Market. *See* British Preference; Cattle Embargo; Trade

British Ministry of Shipping
Account, 2975
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976

British North America Act, powers under *See* Quebec Fisheries

British Preference, 2111, 2201, 2529, 2624-5. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade
Canadian Seaports, and, 2688
M. (Mr. Logan) 493, 707
Amdt. (Mr. Lewis) 772; withdrawn, 726
Further reduction of duties, 2113
Goods imported via United States, qu. 375
Sugar, 2116

British Shipping Board, credit, 2975

British Subjects, Wives of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

British Valuation. *See* Customs, Valuation

Brockville and Westport Railway. qu. 704

Brown, Hon. George, on political pledges, 2482

Brown, Mr. J. L. (Lisgar)
Address in reply, 332; reciprocity, live stock industry, 333; cattle embargo, 334
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. 2735
Automobiles, refund of taxes, 3600
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canals, traffic through, qu. 705
Canned foods, marking, 3050
Civil Service, economy in, 423
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Experimental farms, 808
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Inaudibility of debates, 1751
Labour Dept. — economy, 568
Militia and Defence
Estimates, 587
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Naval policy, 2069
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1674
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1803
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018
Pensions Committee — final report, 3342
Political alliances, 2095
Prince Rupert Dry Dock Co., claim, 3516
Public Works estimates, 696
Rideau canal, 2765, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 840
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1207
St. Peter's Indian reserve, qu. 472
Soldier land settlement, 2134
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 449
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1345
Statistics, accumulation of, 580
Wheat Board bill, 3180
Wheat Board — point of order, 2949
Woollen goods, duty on, 3232

Brussels Financial Conference, 1138, 1292

Bryce, Dr. Peter, H., pamphlet, 1224

Bud Moth. *See* Forestry

Budget. *See also* Ways and Means
Date of
Announcement, 1721
Inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Debate, on, 2104, 2171, 2216, 2256, 2307, 2358, 2407, 2459, 2519, 2523, 2585, 2640, 2692, 2842, 2859
Amendments
Crerar, Mr., 2473-4; Speaker's ruling 2520-23
Drayton, Sir Henry, 2179, neg. 2912
Divisions
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) neg. 2912
Corrected division list, 2972
Motion (Mr. Fielding) for Ways and Means Com., 2104; agreed to, 2913
Ruling of Mr. Speaker on Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2520-23
Probable time for conclusion of, 2639
Speeches of Finance Minister, 2104, 2842
Speakers, Messrs: Anderson, 2364, Baldwin, 2250; Baxter, 2340; Bird, 2704; Black (Huron) 2448; Brethen, 2693; Bristol, 2407; Caldwell, 2660; Campbell, 2729; Cannon, 2909; Chaplin, 2616; Charters, 2561; Church, 2392; Coote, 2724; Crerar, 2459; 2522; Denis (Joliette) 2887; Drayton, 2127; Drummond, 2272; Elliott (Waterloo) 2348; Fansher, 2229; Fielding, 2104, 2842; Findlay, 2893; Fortier, 2274; Gardiner, 2624; Garland (Carleton) 2300; Good, 2429; Gouin, 2654; Gould, 2711; Guthrie, 2874; Hocken, 2675; Hoey, 2331; Hughes, 2225; Irvine, 2495; Jacobs, 2513; Johnston (Last Mountain) 2220; Kellner, 2280; King (Huron) 2301; King (Mackenzie) 2537; Kyte, 2358; Ladner, 2276; Laflamme, 2895; Lanctôt, 2567; Lapierre, 2628; Lapointe, 2585; Lavigueur, 2398; Leader, 2510; Lewis, 2256; Logan, 2684; Lovett, 2270; Lovie, 2451; Low, 2445; MacKelvie, 2196; Maclean (Halifax) 2859; Maclean (York) 2321; Macphail, Miss, 2384; McBride, 2635; McConica, 2698; McCrea, 2314; McKenzie, 2604; McMaster, 2417; McMurray, 2474; McQuarrie, 2233; McTaggart, 2545; Malcolm, 2387; Manion, 2261; Marcil, 2905; Meighen, 2523; Millar, 2294; Milne, 2239; Morrison, 2699; Motherwell, 2548; Neill, 2307; Prevost, 2577; Putnam, 2282; Raymond, 2373; Robb, 2179; Sales, 2574; Speakman, 2881; Spencer, 2629; Stansell, 2290; Steedsman, 2721; Stevens, 2646; Stewart (Argenteuil) 2216; Stewart

Budget — *Con.*
Debate on — *Con.*
(Humboldt) 2597; Sutherland, 2481; Tolmie, 2591; Turgeon, 2188; Ward, 2400; Warner, 2204; White, 2352; Woods, 2183; Woodsworth, 2242
To continue from day to day, 2101
Resolutions, 2218
Amended, 2854

Building
Costs, 2416. *See also* Housing
Trades
Conference, 582-3
Freight rates affecting, 133

Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Bukowinians. *See* Immigration

Bull Durham Tobacco, comparative prices, 2546

Bureau, Hon. Jacques (Minister of Customs and Excise)
Agriculture Committee Report, Wheat Board, 726
Civil Servants, appeal, 3079
Customs dept.
Drawbacks, 766
Estimates, 762, 1674
Officials, 764
Valuation of imports, 3413
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 2810
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current and past year, 1675
Export liquor warehouses, 768
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
National Defence Bill, Senate amdts., 2807
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal, 1674
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Public ownership, 1331
Quebec Harbour — Park St. Charles, 1470
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1332
Total trade, statement of, 1376

Bureau of Standards, 235, 1372

Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Burlington Channel, Bridge, 2007

Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008

Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, retirement, 742-3, 1145, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence Bill

Business Profits War Tax. *See* Taxation

Butter. *See* Agriculture; Dairying Industry; Oleomargarine

By-Elections. *See* House of Commons

Bylot Island, Mounted Police, 3497

Byng, Lord, Governor General. *See* References in Address

Cabinet. *See* Ministers and Directorships
Personnel of, 241

Cables, Submarine, ques. 3151-2, 3360

Cadets. *See* Militia and Defence

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1860
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1449
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental railway, 1577
Royal Canadian Navy, 1893
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1208
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798

Calder Act. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Calder, Hon. Senator J. A., 1393

Calder, Senator, United States
St. Lawrence river waterway 1206

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. (Victoria and Carleton, N.B.)
Abbatoir and cold storage plants in maritime provinces, 992
Agriculture
Cold storage facilities, 992-3
Department — salaries, 750
Exhibitions, 993
Fertilizer inspectors, 592
Lecturers, 1023
Saunders, Dr., resignation of, 591
Spruce bud moth, 595, 2668
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2734-8
Blankets, duty on, 3131
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 856
Budget, 2660. Congratulations to Finance Minister; Minister of Justice applauded by Opposition; fallacy of the home market argument; wheat and potatoes; reciprocity with United States; Mr. Chaplin; taxation; inconsistency of

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Prime Minister; sales tax burdensome to people least able to bear it, 2661; duty on clothing and silk goods; failure of budget to carry out Prime Minister's ideas; drawbacks and untaxed exports, 2262; a protectionist budget; tools of production; agricultural implements, prices in Canada and United States; fertilizers and the tariff, 2663; Maine and New Brunswick prices, 2664; cost of growing potatoes; reductions of duty on farm machinery; prospect of Liberals implementing tariff planks, 2665; Finance Minister's disavowal of tariff planks of Liberal platform, 2666; free trade; export duty on pulpwood and round logs; Canadian resources used to develop American industries, 2667; spruce bud moth; import and export duties, payment of, 2668; amendment; tariff revision; recent additions to Conservative party, 2669
Business of the House — concurrence, 1842
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
Directors, 2791
Public ownership, 1939
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3602, 3604
Privilege, question of, 3602
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
New polls to be established, two months prior to election day, amdt., 2815
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, qu. 704
Edmundston public building, 1240
Farm machinery, cost of, 769
Fertilizer Act Amdt., 775, 3041, 3194
Fertilizers
Duty on, 3140-3141
Inspectors, 592
Tariff and, 2664
Transportation rates on, 1022
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways in salmon rivers, 2167
Pollution of streams, 2168
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2818
Fishing Schooner race, 3510

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Forests
Destruction by spruce moth, 1049, 2668
Protection by fire towers, 1048
Gasoline tractors, 2123
Grading machines, 3126
Harness, duty on, 3137
Home brewing, 3141
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2791
Indians
Devon Band, proposed removal, 1216
Expenditure, 1225
Tobique reserve, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Insurance returns, 3254
Manufacturers — free traders, 3140
Militia and defence — annual drill, concurrence, 1842
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
National Defence bill, 745
Naval Service, sale of Niobe, 2065
Penitentiary Act Amdt. 789
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3445-56
Pension Board, staff, 1351
Pensions
Committee on, report, 2996, 3310-24
Commutation of, 1281
Disabilities, 390
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
Potatoes, 2661, 2666
Inspection and sale of, 2744. *See also under this title* Root Vegetables
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Privilege, Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec Harbour Commission — Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197
Root Vegetables, inspection and sale, 2744, 3486
Potato grades, 3370
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293-6
St. John, N.B., terminal facilities, M. 639. 844, 850
Saw-mill machinery, 3127
Senate indemnity, 3509
Silk fabrics, duty, 2662, 3137
Soldiers
Disabilities of, 392
Insurance, 3321
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1342-8
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Salaries, 1342
Vocational loans, 1346
Vocational training, 1281

Caldwell, Mr. Thomas W. — *Con.*
Soldier land settlement, 2133, 3408
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2142
Payment of municipal taxation by Govt., 1257
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Steamship service, St. John and Cuba, 2028
Steel plates, delivery of, 3508
Sydney pilotage district, 3508
Widowed mothers, pensions, 1312, 3324
Woollen goods, duty on, 3129

Calgary
Buildings, rental of, 1254
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Live stock branch, qu. 607
Milk inquiry, cost of, qu. 823
Post office building, 1254
Trades and Labour Council, unemployment, 1082

Calydor, sanitarium, 1279

Cameras, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Cameron, Mr. Alex., qu. 606

Campaign Funds and Literature. *See* Elections

Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. (Mackenzie)
Address in reply, 356. Financial position of western farmer, 356; railway and freight problems, 357; maritime provinces and Confederation; financial condition of country, 358
Automobiles, protection of industry, 2730
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2729. Liberal pledges and promises; platform of 1919, 2729; statements of Prime Minister at Yorkton, Sask.; the budget a repudiation; the tariff, automobile industry, 2730; Sir John Macdonald's view of protection; guiding principle of national policy; Mr. Meighen and agricultural implement duties, 2731; tractors and farm machinery: cotton and woollen clothing; protection and the farmer; protected interests and campaign funds; betrayal of the people, 2732
Cadet services, expenditure, 1137
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy — Essex) for Special Com. 1426
Dominion lands, surveys, 1037
Experimental farm, Canora, 805

Campbell, Mr. Milton N. — *Con.*
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment, 2145
Holland, from, 2145
Medical inspection, 759
Indians
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1224
Saskatchewan reserves, qu. 608
Linen yarn from Canadian flax, bounty, 1361
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public Works Dept.
Filing clerks, 693
Officials, 692
Saskatchewan Indian reserves, qu. 608

Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 397

Camp Borden, Air Force and Civil aviation, 1728

Camps, Militia. *See* Militia and Defence, Annual Drill

Canada Status of, 1337, 2324. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget; Limitation of Armaments; Naval Service

Canada-Australia-New Zealand steamship service, 3034

Canada Car and Foundry Company, 1696
Car repair contracts, 1696
Amherst shops, 1702
Port Arthur, 1696

Canada Cement Company, 200, 2297, 2300

Canada Gazette
Expenditure, Public Works Dept., 1268

Canada Grain Act. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry (Mr. Meighen) 1770

Canada-Mexico trade, qu. 606, 699, 700, 2989

Canada-Newfoundland Steamship service, 2027

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Exemption from Pilotage Dues) — Res. 1335, 1487; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 2819; 3r., 2820; Senate amdts. 3437
2. (Appointment of Harbour Masters) — Res. 1578, 3009; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3010

Canada Steamship Company
Life-saving equipment, qu. 1284

Canada Temperance Act
Expenses under, 3499
Plebiscite, 2024

Canada Temperance Act Amdt. Bills
1. (Provincial legislation) 1r., 1017; withdrawn, 2733
2. (Provincial government control of liquor importation) 1r., 2733; 2r., com., 2997; 3r., 3009
Senate amendments
Concurrence, 3614
Non-concurrence in, 3608
Conference, 3613
Subjects and items discussed:
Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 3000, neg. 3006
Carriage or transportation, Amdt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3008
Date of coming into effect, Amdt. (Mr. Shaw 3007; withdrawn, 3008

Canada-West Indies-British Guiana service, qu. 2356

Canada-West Indies, South America service, 2027, 3026

Canada's Contribution. *See* League of Nations; Naval Service

Canadian Air Board. *See* Air Board

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See also* Progressive Party; Wheat Board
Agricultural figures, 2649
Fiscal policy and proposals, 2508-9
Memorandum on Wheat Board referred to Agriculture Com., 377. *See* Agriculture and Colonisation Com.
Platform, 2345
Tariff criticisms and proposals, 2509, 2552. *See also* speeches on Budget

Canadian Deep Waterway and Power Association, 1320. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See also* Pensions; Soldiers Civil Re-establishment
Canteen Funds. *See that title*
First contingent, qu. 1376
Medical inspection, 3317. *See also* Pensions
Repatriation of dependents, 1711
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and, qu. 2038

Canadian Ford Company. *See* Automobiles

Canadian Forestry Association. *See* Forestry

Canadian Freighter. For names of Canadian Government Merchant Marine vessels. *See* Vessels

Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882, 2888. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Naval Service; Shipbuilding; Steamship Services
Canada-Newfoundland service, 2027
Coal from Japan, 2312, 2406
Cost of, 245, 247, qu. 469. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Dominion Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Employees' wages, qu. 3598
Inquiry as to sale of, 3104
Insurance, qu. 605
Lake marine, qu. 3362
Loans to, 3035
Lumber cargoes for Orient, 2311
Ocean and river service, 3507. *See also* Marine
Ocean freights. *See* British Preference
Outstanding claims, qu. 606
Ownership and operation of, 3037
Passenger traffic, qu. 939
Potatoes, shipment to Cuba, 2028
Prince Rupert Drydock and Engineering Co. claim, 3514
Shipments by. *See* St. John terminal; Steamship Services
Ships in Montreal harbour, qu. 2637
Subsidized steamship services, 3027, 3506
Welland canal, 2756-9
Vessels. *See also that title*
Britisher, steamer, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Freighter, qu, 963
Number of, qu. 469
Scottish, steamer, 3514

Canadian Government Railways, 873. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Deficits, qu. 607
Dining car service, qu. 2040

Canadian High Commissioner. *See* High Commissioner

Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237

Canadian Manufacturers' Association, 170. *See also* Budget; Manufacturers
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Tariff, and, 2546

Canadian Mission, Colonel Delphine, 303

Canadian National Institute for the Blind
Grant, 3540

Canadian National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Canadian National Railways. *See also* Address; Budget; Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation
Accounting, 1908-18
Advances
$7,000,000, — 2779
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Amount required for, 381
Annual report, 1928
Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 873; Canadian Government railways; 873; Grand Trunk system, 877; estimates, 879; freight rates, 879; reorganization, 880; Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 882; summaries, 882
Board of Directors. *See under this title,* Directors
Bond sale in New York, 58
Branch lines, 1472, 1476, 1956
Bengough extension, 2770
British Columbia, 331
Eastern Maine railway, 1293
Hanna-Medicine Hat, 1965
Kamloops-Kelowna, qu. 937, 1134, 2797
Policy of Government, 1135
Business methods, 1692
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, and, 3036
Canadian Northern railway, 123
Acquisition of, 2614
Advances to, qu, 471
$42,800,000, — 1905-33-69
Agriculture, contribution to freight tonnage, 1927
Arbitration, 204
Bonded indebtedness, 190, qu. 368
Assumption by Dominion Govt., 2458
Co-ordination, 1907
Deficit, 191, 1907
Electrification of, 1317. *See also* Electrification
Federal subsidies, qu. 1504
Guarantee bill, 1914, legal expenses, 1667
Indebtedness of western provinces, 229
Insurance, qu. 471
Invasion of Ontario by, 202
Liabilities, qu. 368
Loans and subsidies to, 189-90, 204, qu. 1504, 1921
Mackenzie-Mann
Amounts paid to, qu. 935
Subsidy, qu. 607

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway — *Con.*
Mileage, qu. 368
Operating deficit, 1905
Responsibility for loans, 204. *See also under this sub-title,* Loans
Rorketon branch line, 2139
Subsidiary lines, 202
Taking over of, 190, 1907
Canadian Pacific railway, competition with, 65. *See also* Address; Budget; Railways
Car and locomotive contracts
Canadian Locomotive Company, 2794
Eastern Car Company, 2794
Car repairs. *See under this title,* Rail and Car Repair Contracts
Carey, Mr., 2858
Coal
Importations, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Consolidation, 6. 11, 28, 72, 73, 89. *See also* speeches *on* Address; Budget
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2168
Deficits, 1905-69, 1920
Corrected statement, 1919
Dining car and restaurant service, qu. 2040
Menus, cost of printing, qu. 1931
Rivers and Melville, Sask., restaurants, qu. 2038
Directors, Board of, 1924, 2194, 2791
Appointment of, 1936
Connection with supply companies, 2792
Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1924, 1959, 1962
Labour costs, and, 2317
Interested in other companies, 1129
Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 1924
Public ownership, sympathy with, 2852
Representation of employees, 2798
Statement of Prime Minister, 2792
Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46
Edith Cavell road, Jasper Park, 1052
Electrical operation, 1206, 1323. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway; *and under this title,* Public Ownership
Electrification, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627
Estimates, 1905
Fraser, Mr., right-of-way agent, 1134
Freight
Careless handling of, 1965
Rates. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Quebec and, 1472-5
Special Committee, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Grain leakages, qu. 1401, qu. 1930
Grain shipments, 2194. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade
Grand Trunk Pacific railway, 189, 196, 203, 342, 1921
Advances, qu, 471, qu. 2037, 3520
$15,900,000, 1969
Branch lines, 3520
British Columbia in, 331
Cost of to the country, 196
Estimated, 205
Subsidiary lines, 203
Grand Trunk railway, 29. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Acquisition, 190, 235, 1922, 2612, 2616
Administration of, 64
Advances to, qu. 471, qu. 2037
$25,750,000, 1969
American mileage, 191, 204
Amount required, 381
Annual statement of Minister of Railways, 877
Arbitration, 128, 205, 2779
Comments of English newspapers, 374, 821
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772
Bonded security, advances, qu. 935
Coal, qu. 606
Deficit, 191. *See also* Annual Statement *under this title*
Employees
Pension rights and status, M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
English stock-holders, 64, 123
Financial statement, 1933
Government ownership, 125. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Kelley, Mr. H. B., 205
Mortgage trust deed, legal expenses, 1667
Officials, salaries, qu. 728
Portland terminal, 353, 920. *See also* British Preference and Canadian Seaports
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Hotels, 2806
Immigration, 1927, 2147, 2165. *See also that title*
Industrial councils, 1061
Insurance, qu. 471, qu. 610
Intercolonial railway, 106-111, 274, 312, 1967, 2688. *See also* Logan; Macdonald (Pictou)
Administration, 275
Domination by Canadian Northern railway, 193-194
Employees, enlistment of, 3518
Freight rates, 275, 355. *See also that title*

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Intercolonial railway — *Con.*
Gaspé and Bonaventure counties, in, 623
Gulf shore and Caraquet railway, qu. 1504
Local management, 313-314, 192
Management, inquiry, 407-8
Moncton headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Operation of, 107, 192
Passes on, 315
Patronage system, 106
Pension fund, qu. 938
Provident fund for employees, 2769
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Snow-cleaning, 313
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, qu. 2038, qu. 2213
Mail service, qu. 2799
Montreal, employees, 1288
National Transcontinental. *See under this title* Transcontinental
Overbuilding, 2569
Passenger traffic, qu. 927
Pension fund, qu. 938
Prince Edward Island railway, 1249
Public confidence, 1928
Public ownership and operation, 1907, 1933, 2193. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Purchases in anticipation of requirements, 1912
Quebec Oriental and Quebec Western railways, 623
Quebec terminals, 1475
Rail and car repair contracts, 1912, 1925, 1958, 2399
Board of management and, 1688-1710
Defective American cars, 1708
Steel cars, 1702-6, 1709
Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways
Regional control, 1923, 2196
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, qu. 2584
Revaluation, 1925
Right-of-way and lease agent, qu. 1633
Rolling stock repairs, 1212. *See also under this title* Rail and Car Repairs
St. John and Quebec Railway, qu. 1774
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293, neg. 1296
Securities, qu. 3154
Shops
Moncton, 1709
Rivière du Loup, 1690
St. Malo, 1699
Transcona, 1705, 1708
Steel cars, qu. 2213
Repairs, 1702-1709

Canadian National Railways — *Con.*
Telegraphs, qu. 3360
Ties, ques. 934, 2209
Purchases of in Quebec, qu. 1659
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Toronto railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Transcontinental railway, 111, 125, 278, 919, 1921, 2493
Cost, 2193
Enlisted men, allowance to, 3518
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472-5
Grain shipments by, 2194
Lease of Eastern division, legal expenses, 1667
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 545, 2194
St. John valley, 3039
Unification, 1907, 1923-5, 2585. *See also under this title* Consolidation; Public Ownership
Water supply, Ste. Anne-St. Pierre, qu. 2213
Working expenditures, 2779

Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Canadian Northern Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Canadian Pacific Railway, 146, 191. *See also* Address; Canadian National Railways; Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway; Freight Rates
Advance in price of stock, 129
Beatty, Mr. E. W., 126, 127, 1128
Labour costs, 2317
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1606, 1856
Coal lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition with Grand Trunk, 64. *See also that title*
Cost, 2193
Dams impeding ascent of fish, 2167
Directors, voting trust, 1936
Electrical operation, 71, 1206. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See that title*
False creek bridge, removal, 3516
Freight Rates. *See that title*
Immigration and, 351
Indian Department, payment to, 3518
Labour conditions, 2315
Mail contracts, ques. 2040, 2213
New England states, connection with, 1294
Palais station, Quebec, 1068
Public ownership, 1937, 2329
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688-1710
Rates, *See* Freight Rates

Canadian Pacific Railway — *Con.*
Shares held by custodians of alien enemy property, 1672
Success of, 123
Transcontinental railway, opposition to, 2194

Canadian Patriotic Fund bill
Res. 3156, 3366; 1r., 3366; 2r., com., 3477; 3r., 3484

Canadian Press, Limited, 772

Canadian Red Cross Society bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3387; 3r., 3388

Canadian Representation in the United States, 1383, 2026, 2864, 2990
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments Conference. *See that title*

Canadian Seaports, trade through, 104. *See also* British Preference; Steamship Services; Trade

Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co., 1677

Canadian Transit Company. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Canadian Vickers. *See* Vickers

Canadian Wheat Board. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Canadian Wheat Board Bill. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Res. 3174; 1r., 2r., com., 3179; com., 3379; 3r., 3387
Amdts:
(Mr. Johnson, Moosejaw) 3178
(Mr. Maclean, Halifax) 3180
(Mr. Johnson-Mr. Robb) agreed to, 3383

Canadians
Distressed, relief for, 2027
Emigrating. *See* Immigration

Canalization. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland canal

Canals. *See also* Railways and Canals; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Chambly, improvements, 3518
Frankfurt, 1189
Georgian Bay, 1184, 1199, 1200-1209, 1319, 1397-8

Canals — *Con.*
Lachine
Widow of late James Innes, allowance, 2779
Manchester, 1189
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764
Construction of storehouse at Ottawa, 2764
Expenditure on, 2860
Improvements, 2769
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges
Improvements, 2768
Roadway, 2768
Traffic through, qu. 705
Panama, Suez and Soo canals, 1203
Trent
Estimates, 2764
Nassau dam, qu. 2457
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Welland, qu. 827, 1184, 1205, 1207, 2747
Contracts for sections 3 and 4, qu. 3600
Co-operation with United States, 2749-51
Estimates, 2747
Amdt. (Mr. Millar) to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758
Port Colborne elevator, claim of Mr. J. A. Jamieson, 1687
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1321. *See also that title*
Tonnage, qu. 936
Total expenditure on, qu. 1376
Water power rights, 2747. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Cancellation of Leases. *See* Dominion Lands

Canned Fish. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Food

Canned Goods, Marking of. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Canneries, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Cannes Conference, 1716. *See also* Genoa Conference
Submarines, 1845

Canning Licenses. *See* British Columbia Fisheries; Fish and Fisheries

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Budget, 2909. Defeat of Tory party; administration facing serious situation; Progressive party; reasons for

Cannon, Mr. Lucien — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Liberal victory; tribute to Prime Minister; platform of 1919; restoration of constitutional liberty; responsibility for conduct of public officials; responsible government and commission control, 2910; Canadian National Railways; a word to the West; Quebec the friend of the West; provincial autonomy, 2911; railways; Liberalism, hope of the West; division amongst Progressive forces, 2912
Canadian National Railways, public ownership. 1936-42
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases bill, Senate admts., 3615
Limitation of Armaments, 3166
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, payments to, 2772
Militia, arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2092
Naval policy, 2085
Point of order, parliamentary committee, 3354
Public Works estimates, preparation of, 1270
Royal Canadian Navy, 1887-90,

Canteen Funds, undistributed, disposal of, qu. 2215, 3290, 3308, 3328, 3331, 3334, 3346, 3350

Capital Ships. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway, 1183, qu. 1504

Carey, Mr., and Canadian National Railways, 2358

Caribou. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3538, 3603, 3606

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. (Kindersley)
Address in reply, 155. French language; western opinions, 156; financial and economic outlook in the West, tariff question, 157; freight rates; grain speculation, banking conditions, 158
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, amdt. 1606
Deputy Minister of Finance, 753
Experimental farms, 800

Carmichael, Mr. A. M. — *Con.*
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. 3486
Justice Dept. — Private secretary, 1669
Kindersley post office building, 1254
Militia, annual drill, 1177
Public buildings, Saskatchewan, 1253
Telephone lines, Saskatchewan, 2012
Wheat Board, 3181

Carroll, Mr. William F. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Transit Company, bill, 1771
Cold storage, 819
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Dominion Elections Act, Amdt. 2812
Fuel oil, 178
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward Island, 1991
Indians, Sydney reserve, 1215
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Labour dept. increases, 568
Labour men and unions, 228
National Defence bill, 743
Nova Scotia Miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499, 532
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt., appeal, 3024
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442
Pensions Committee, final report, 3316
Pensions — Royal Commission, 3327
Unemployment situation, 1076
Steel rails contracts, 1076
Sydney steel workers, 1076

Carruthers, Mr. John (East Algoma)
Civil Service — patronage, 3086
Little Current harbour improvements, 2002

Cars. *See also* Railways
Governor General's, 1688
Repairs, *See* Canadian National Railways
Shortage of. *See* Freight Rates

Cartier Square militia stores shed, qu. 2038

Carty, Captain, qu. 1062

Carvell, Hon. F. B. *See* Railway Commission

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 2670. Congratulations to Prime Minister upon title of Imperial Privy Councillor; Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; budget proposals; abnormal conditions, 2670; principles of the Liberal party; platform of 1919; Opposition amdt. not to be taken seriously; theories and arguments of the official Opposition and Progressive party; the golden mean; moderate protection, 2671; sales tax; inequality of income tax; burden borne by small wage-earners; proposed exemption of heads of large families; tax on cigarettes and cigars; exemptions from sales tax, 2672; cheque tax; leaf tobacco; tariff reductions; automobile tax, 2673; Borden and Meighen Governments responsible for present conditions; Canadian National Railways, management, board of directors, deficits; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; public debt; economy; Purchasing Commission; Civil Service Commission, 2674; reduction in civil service; public works in Charlevoix-Montmorency; Canada's future, 2675

Casgrain, Mr. Pierre F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 956
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1356
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 642
Steamship service, Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Superintendent of Lighthouses, Quebec, qu. 2584

Cash Grants to Soldiers. *See* Soldiers' Bonus

Cassels, Professor Gustavus, 1292

Cattle. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited herds, Health of Animals; Live stock industry
British embargo on. *See* Cattle Embargo
Decline in prices of, 77. *See* speeches on Address; Budget
Diseases of. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases Bill
Exported to United States, 2450, 2695
Fordney tariff and. *See* United States, Fordney
Markets for, 977

Cattle Embargo, 93, 334, 361, 970, 973, 979, 985, 989, 992, 1002, 1031, 1283, 2182, 2571, 2597. *See also* Live Stock Industry
Alleged statement of Hon. Mr. Larkin, High Commissioner, 1020, 1463, 1502
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283
Removal of, 2597

Cedar Rapids power, 71, qu. 728, qu. 1375. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Census of 1921, 20, 56. *See also* Immigration; Population; Redistribution; Statistics
Agricultural assets and liabilites, 2159
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Appointment of, 1368
Payment of, 1367-9
Irregularities, 1363, 1365, 1367
Population, by ages, qu. 1632
Redistribution, and, 1363-71
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Report of Commissioner, 1366
Verification of figures, 1366

Central Vermont Railway. *See* Grand Trunk Railway

Chair rulings of. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Chairman of Committees. *See* Deputy Speaker

Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497

Chambly Canal. *See* Canals

Champlain, steamship, qu. 1400

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Agriculture Dept.—salary increases, 657
Boots and shoes, duty on, 3237
Budget, 2616. Ross rifle, war wagons and equipment; acquisition of Grand Trunk; congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity treaty, 2616; tariff proposals; automobile tax; tax on soft drinks, grape juice, 2617; consumption of farm produce in Canada; discrepancy as to agricultural exports; padded figures; non-agricultural commodities included in statement of exports, 2618; value of home market; agricultural implements, 2619; home and foreign trade in; prices in Canada and abroad, 2620; trend of tariff legislation in United States; Mr. Crerar's prophecy, 2621; farmers' platform; alleged effect of protective tariff; statement that consumer pays $4 for every dollar of revenue collected, 2622; export freight rates, 2623; cost of collecting customs duties; prices of kodaks in Canada and United States; political pledges; speech of late Hon. J. Israel Tarte, 2624
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

Chaplin, Mr. James D.—*Con.*
Cash bonus to soldiers, 402
Cheque tax, 3260
Dominion lands, temporary employees, 1036
Experimental farm employees, 652
Ford automobiles, 3274
Government printing, 1972
Hamilton-Queenston highway, qu. 471
Harbours and Rivers
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1993, 1997
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Interior Dept., salary increases, 457
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and Defence
Arsenals, 1979
Lindsay, 2086
Quebec, 2091
Military property in Lincoln county, 1980
Pay of staff, 1982
Permanent force, 1983
Staff reduction, 420
Junior clerks, 416, 419
Transport and freight, 1986
Mutual insurance, 3255
Orders in Council, qu. 934
Printing and stationery supplies, 454
Privy Council officials, 410
Public buildings
Maritime provinces, 1244
St. Catharines post office, 1246-50
Rail and car repair contracts, 1709
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls highway, qu. 936
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salaries and officials, 398-9
Salary increases, 386
Welland canal, construction, 2753

Charges of Management. *See* Finance

Charlevoix-Montmorency public works, 2675

Charlottetown, quarantine station, 2021

Chartered Banks. *See* Banks and Banking

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Budget, 2561. Speech of the Minister of Agriculture; Wheat Board; Liberal pledges; introduction of national policy; the amendment; Government's failure to implement promises, 2561; Mr. Murphy at Milton; Government by Order in Council; business and luxury taxes; profiteers; inaction of Minister of Labour, 2562; sales tax; Civil Service Commission; patronage; the tariff; protection and free trade, 2563; statement of Finance Minister;

Charters, Mr. Samuel — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
manifesto of Progressive party; tariff changes; agricultural implements; fruit industry, 2564; pessimistic view of present day conditions; reciprocity; rural population; rural school attendance; value of farm lands; farm production, 2565; automobiles; Ontario Government immigration literature, 2566; future of Canada, 2567
Long Branch rifle range, qu. 372

Cheques. *See* Special War Revenue; Taxation

Chevrier, Mr. E. R. E. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Absence through sickness, 3509
Bonus, 3531
Commission, 3064
Pensions Com., final report, 3337
Senate indemnity, 3509

Chief Architect's Branch. *See* Public Works

Chief Electoral Officer
Assistant, salary of, 3538
Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3539, 3603, 3606
Report of Fourteenth General Election, of 1921, 1258
Report, printing of, 871
Residential qualification, 1297

Children
Dependent. *See* Income War Tax Act
Health of. *See* Daylight saving; Health
Immigration. *See that title*
Infant mortality in cities, 2634
Miners of, in Nova Scotia, 529
Oleomargarine, effect on health, 178. *See also that title*
Pensions to. *See* Pensions Com. report
Save the Children fund, 3516
School attendance, 2565. *See also* Education
Soldiers of
Alleged ill-treatment, 2638
Education. *See* Pensions Com.
Provision for, 3315-16

China
Commissioner of Immigration in, ques. 2026, 2214
Dr. Tsur, Chinese Consul General, 1776
Eggs, importation from, 177
Treaties with. *See* Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty; Far Eastern Treaty

Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161

Chinese Immigration. *See* Oriental Aliens

Chippewa electrical development, 72, 1327. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Chisholm, Mr. A. W. (Inverness)
Civil Service, officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Inverness pier, 1766
Margaree breakwaters, 1767

Church, Mr. Thomas L. (North Toronto)
Address in reply, 116. Congratulations to Speaker; standing of different parties, 116; race and religious differences, 118; Speech of Hon. Ernest Lapointe; Battlefields Commission, 119; taxation methods, 120; unemployment and housing, 121; Good roads; public ownership, 122; Hydro-electric, 123, 131; public ownership of railways, 133; work of Sir Adam Beck, 134; radial railways, 134; St. Lawrence river waterway, 135; German trade; Senate reform; Civil service reform, 138; Conservative and Liberal gains and losses, 138-139; combines; ties with mother land; High Commissioner, 139
Alienation of natural resources, qu. 2992
Backus, Mr. E. W., lease of timber area, 2805
Blind soldiers, pensions, 3310, 3358, 3404
Bonds, sale of by public tender, 1468
Budget, 2392. Tariff not a political question; Tories and Radicals; Conservatives and protection; national policy; home market, 2392; the Progressives; United Farmers' platform; Liberals and free trade; protection and the growth of cities and towns ;tariff increase world wide; protectionist budgets of Liberal governments; tariff reduction and sales tax increase; Progressives and big interests, 2393; farmers and other producers highly organized; time for consumers to get together; tax burden on urban population; cigarette and tobacco taxes; railway problem; Canadian Pacific and Crowsnest pass agreement; trade with Germany, 2394; trusts, combines and war profiteers; tax evaders; taxation in Ontario; war time amusement tax; cheque tax; protest of Toronto and other municipalities, 2395; posterity should pay; Wheat Board; cost of living; Bank Act; Merchants Bank, 2396; judges serving on political com-

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
missions; prison reform; civil service, 2397; St. Lawrence river waterway, 2398
Business of the House, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1462
Cadet corps, 1147, 1973
Canadian battlefields, 119, 771
Canadian Exporter, wreck, qu. 1210
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3038
Canadian National Railways, 68
Carey, Mr., 2858
Directors' sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian representation in the United States, 2990
Civil Service retirement fund, income tax, qu. 937
Coal, price of, qu. 2039
Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902
Committee speeches, relevancy, 555-6
Criminal Code — poolselling, bookmaking, etc., 2973
Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214
Customs receipts, qu. 470
Daylight saving, qu, 372
M. (Mr. Kay) 946
Disability soldier cases, 3318
Elevators
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, qu. 3152
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 489
Federal subsidies to Ontario, qu. 2214
France, trade relations with, 2990
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2563-94
Railway Act Amdt. bill (suspension of agreement) 3594; amdt. 3595
Special Com. on, third report, 3560-4
Fuel, price of, qu. 1774
"General" Macdonald's army, reception of, 2256
Government office building in Ottawa, 1252
Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375
Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Judges' Act Amdt. 546
Judges and commissions, qu, 366, 2397
Labour dept., policy, 464-5, 559
Lake of the Woods control, 2805
Joint board, qu. 2970
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3365
Life-saving stations, qu. 367
Merchant lake marine, qu. 3362
Merchants Bank case, qu. 367, 2396, 3604
Case against D. C. Macarow, qu. 2305

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1177
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177, qu. 1285
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Cadet services, 1147, 1973
Expenditure and policy 1890-1913, qu. 1285
Annual drill, proposed reduction, 1613
First Canadian contingent, qu. 1376
Ministers and directorships, 1125
National Defence bill, 742
Naval policy, 2043
Naval Service
Navy men, travelling expenses, qu. 3156
Royal Canadian Navy, 1894, 2043
Patronage, appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Penitentiary inmates, qu. 3362
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3442-62
Amdt. (Blind soldiers) 3358, 3404
Pensions
Evidence, 3357
Mothers, qu. 1375
Old age, qu. 1375
Pensions Committee final report, 3309
Postal affairs, qu. 368
Post Office, drop letter rate, 1250
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment (Royal Canadians) qu. 1065
Prison reform, 1277, 2397
Inspection by Grand juries, qu. 1773
Jail farms, qu. 1773
Youthful offenders, qu. 1773
Provincial commissions, Hon. Mr. Justice Riddell and Mr. Justice Latchford, qu. 3600
Public buildings
Flags, 1260
Maritime provinces, 1244
Ontario, 1246-51
Rental and purchase of, 1262
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1467, 1482
Railway Act Amdt. bill (special passenger rates) 1460
Rental and purchase of buildings, 1252
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3391
Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu. 3361
St. Lawrence river waterway, 135, 2398
Correspondence with United States, 2357
International Joint Commission report, 2357
M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Toronto
Customs house, qu. 470
Harbour improvements, 1467

Church, Mr. Thomas L. — *Con.*
Toronto — *Con.*
Public buildings, 1246-7
Railway viaduct, qu. 1660
Steam railway freight, qu. 936
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2990
Welland canal, qu. 827
Construction, 1687
Tonnage, qu. 936

Cigars and Cigarettes, tax on. *See* Budget; Inland Revenue; Taxation; Tobacco

Civil Aviation. *See* Air Force

Civil Pensions. *See* Pensions

Civil Service. *See also* Supply. For individual departments, *See their titles.* For references generally, *see* speeches on Address; Budget
Absence through sickness, 3509
Amalgamation of departments. *See* National Defence bill
Appointments, 337, 2559, 3065, 3098
Members, and, 3074-3077
Recommendations of. *See under this title,* Patronage
Outside service, post offices, 3073-4
Procedure, 573
Soldiers, 3380, qu. 3361. *See also* Soldiers
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 733, 1258, 2397-8, 2513, 2801, 2805, qu. 3364, 3531
Announcement by Prime Minister, 1503
Appropriation, 3528
Inquiry as to payment of, 2996
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, nurses, 1342
Withdrawal of from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Calder Bill. *See* Public Service Retirement Act
Classification, 455, 466, 494, 693, 3067, 3089
Appeals against, qu. 1508
Arthur Young Company, 1490
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904
Board of Hearing, 1491
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Militia dept., 416
Post Office, money order branch, qu. 1285
Printed copies of, qu. 1930
Responsibility for, 1491
Commission
Abolition of, recommended, 2563, 2674-5
Appointments agriculture dept., 2599
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773, qu. 1904

Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission — *Con.*
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368
Commissioners
Annual salary and travelling expenses, qu. 364-5
Appointment of, 2659
Cost of, qu. 364-5
Employees
Number of, qu. 364
Salaries, 3093
Estimates, 3102
Exemptions, 3078-9
History of and legislation creating, 3065
Jurisdiction, 736-7
Salaries over, 2801
Militia dismissals, 423
Officials and employes, qu. 364-5, 3093
Organization branch, qu. 935
Putnam, Mr., C.V., qu. 935, 3090
Powers of, 553, 554
Report, qu. 826
Salaries and contingencies, etc., qu. 364-5, 386, 3091, 3509
Secretary, qu. 826
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and. *See that title*
Deputy ministers, qu. 3364
Increase in salaries, 2805
Militia and Naval Service. *See* National Defence
Dismissals, 3083-3090
Economy in, 401, 423, 2057-61, 2371. *See also* Address; Budget
Examination, 871
Hours, 2321, 2371,
Income tax department, 1663
Industrial councils, 1061
List, qu. 727
Married women employed in, qu. 1658
Memorandum of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Militia services amalgamation, 418-19. *See also* National Defence
Overmanning of, 2371, 2450, 3099. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Patronage and, 199, 2563, 3073, 3080, 3094, 3096
Promotions, 576, 3066
Public Service Retirement Act. *See that title*
Qualifications, 3070
Reduction of, 2674-5
Reform, 138, 3075
Reorganization, 2061. *See also under this title,* Classification
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490
Sherbrooke post office inspector, 1507

Civil Service — *Con.*
Responsibility, 3076
Retirement. *See also* Public Service Retirement Act
Fund, qu. 826
Income tax, qu. 937
Lightkeepers, 1496
Rural postmasters, 3079, 3095-6
Salaries and remuneration, 552, 2243, 2321, 2397, 2513, 2805, 3075, 3081, qu. 3364
Employees receiving less than $600, qu. 1067
Hours and, 2321, 2371
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers, 1508
Paying of. *See* Interim Supply
Recommendations, 550
Reductions, 2690-1
Salaries of $960 and less, qu. 1660, 1775
Statement of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 555
Tariff Commission, appointment of, 1663
Temporary employees, 1036. *See also* individual departments
Vacancies, filling of, 792. *See also under this title* Appointments

Clark, Mr. J. A. (Burrard)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 3601
Messrs. Fisher & Oughton, Prince Rupert, qu. 1772, 3606
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1337
Income tax collections, 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Militia and Defence, expenditure and policy, 1335
National Defence bill, 678
Naval Service — Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Northwest Rebellion, pensions of Mounted Police, 3523
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1523
Quebec Harbour, appropriations for, 1486
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3443-55
Pensions Com., 391
Final report, 3327
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3400
Revenues from imports, qu. 827
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Doctors Lovering and Taylor, qu. 1211
Industrial disputes, 679
Northwest Rebellion, pensions and claims, 3523
Royal Canadian Navy, 1878, 2061
Vancouver
Drydock, 3542
Harbour work, 1485
Terminal railway, 1485
War, preparation for, 1335

Clark, Dr. Michael, 295

Clarke Trading Co., transport of supplies, 1681

Classification. *See* Civil Service

Clay Products, 1234

Closure, application of. *See* Interim Supply

Clothing, duty on, 2186, 2465, 2662. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Coal. *See also* Fuel; Mines; Natural Resources; Railways
Anthracite importations, qu. 2356, 2686
Bituminous, 2686
British Columbia, mines in, 178
By products of, 3525
Canadian, 2687
Use of in public buildings, 1759
Canadian National Railways
Imported for, qu. 926, qu. 2213
Purchases, qu. 2306
Canadian Pacific lands, transfer of, qu. 2214
Competition
Fuel oil, 2312
United States Mines, with, 2612
Conservation of supply by power development, 1188. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Drumheller mines, 85
Duty on, 2342
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Freight rates. *See also that title*
Manitoba from, 1763
Japan from, qu. 963, 2312, 3406
Labour. *See also that title*
Canmore employers and miners dispute, 1058
District No. 18 Board, 1058
Drumheller mines, 86
Employers and miners' dispute, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Nova Scotia Miners' strike, 1054. *See also that title*
Oriental aliens, 2312. *See also that title*
Cumberland mines, in, 2407
Wages in Nova Scotia, 1078. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Lands
Transfer by Canadian Pacific, qu. 2214
United States in, purchase of, 2611
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization Board, 1233, 3524

Coal — *Con.*
Lightboats, for, qu. 606
Mineral development, 686
Mining industry, protection, 2312
Montreal requirements, 630
Nova Scotia, 2412
Freight charges on, 193, 194
Miners. *See that title*
Powdered, 2713-5
Price of, 465, 1758, 1774, qu. 2037, qu. 2039
Effect of freight rates on, 132-133
Reduction in, 1490, 1494
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Importation for, 1763
Railways
Canadian National Railways, qu. 926, 2213
Purchases for, qu. 2306
Grand Trunk Railway, qu. 606
Royalties, qu. 375
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316
Smoky river, lease of coal lands, 3465
Supply, control, 71
Transportation. *See* Freight rates
Waterpowers and, 2182

Coats, Mr. R. H. *See* Statistics, Bureau of

Cocaine. *See* Opium

Cocoa and Chocolate. *See* Customs Tariff

Cockshutt, Lieut. Governor, 1128

Cockshutt Plough Company, Minister of Justice and, 242

Codling Moth. *See* Entomology

Coinage. *See also* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nickel, five cent piece, 1132
Silver, millesimal fineness, 1132

Cold Storage. *See* Agriculture

Collective Bargaining, 2322

Colonial Status. *See* Naval Service; Prime Minister's Conference

Combines, 139. *See also* Address; Budget; Trusts

Combines Investigation Act, qu. 1902

Commerce. *See* Board of Commerce; Trade

Commercial Travellers. *See* Budget; Income War Tax Act Amdt.

Commissioner of Agriculture. *See* Agriculture; Marshall

Commissions
Judges serving on, qu. 366, 546, 2397

Committee of Supply. *See* Supply

Committees. *See* House of Commons

Commodity Rates. *See* Freight Rates; Railways; Transportation

Commodity Tax. *See* Taxation

Companies Act, Privy Council appeal, legal expenses, 1671

Compensation. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases amdt.

Compensation for Injuries. *See* Air Board Act Amdt.

Compulsory Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.

Compulsory Legislation. *See* Wheat Board

Compulsory Military Service. *See* Military Service Act 1917 Amdt. bill

Con Rein, sinking of, M. (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 1382, agreed to, 1384

Concurrence. *See* Supply

Condensed Milk tax on, 2492, 3264-71, 3409

Confectionery, tax on, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857

Confederation, basis of, 154
Maritime provinces and, 228. *See also* Intercolonial Railway

Conferences
Brussels Financial, 1138, 1292
Building trades, 582-3
Cannes, 823, 1716, 1845
Genoa, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 1292, 1463, 1675, 1715-6, 1845, 2035, 2337
Expenses, 1715
Europe, in, 1336
Imperial, 1864. *See also under this title* Prime Ministers'
International Labour, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Printing of report, 3601
Limitation of Armaments, 7, 1283, 1731, 1737, 1844-95
Borden, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert, report
M. (Mr. Casgrain) for papers, 373
National Industrial, qu. 1375
Postal, 7, 15
Potato growers, 3367
Prime Ministers', 1624, 1864, 1883, 2042, 2082
Trades Union, Rome, 1060

Conferences — *Con.*
Washington. *See under this title,* International Labour; Limitation of Armaments

Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153

Connor, James, dismissal of, 1674

Conscription, 22, 61, 90-91, 2570, 2685. *See also* Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt.

Conservation Commission, transfer of employees, 3495. *See also* Interior Dept.; White, Mr. James

Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 1210; 2r., com., 3r., 3042

Consortium to re-establish Russian trade, 1463

Constitutional Development. *See* Address; Conferences; League of Nations; Naval Service

Constitutionality of Wheat Board. *See* Wheat Board

Consular Agents. *See* Trade and Commerce

Consular Certificates. *See* Customs; Trade and Commerce

Contagious Diseases. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases; Health; Immigration; Penitentiary Act Amdt.

Contingency Vote. *See* Departments; Estimates; Supply

Coolie Labour. *See* Oriental Aliens

Co-operative Pooling. *See* Wheat Board

Co-ordination. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence

Coote, Mr. G. G. (Macleod)
Agriculture dept., travelling expenses, 657
Automobiles and parts, imports, qu. 1633
Automobile tax, 3276
Banks
Circulation, deposits, loans, etc., qu. 1901
Number, reserves, deposits, loans, etc. qu. 1182
Board of Commerce, cost, report, qu. 2583
Budget, 2724. The amendment; party politics a curse, 2724; the budget a disappointment; national debt; tax exempt bonds; conscription of wealth during war time, 2725; taxation of implements of production; oil and well-drilling machinery; western problems; grasshoppers, 2726; cattle industry; amalgamation of Merchants' Bank and Bank of Montreal, 2727; banking system, ratio of deposits to capital; credit; distribution of products; Wheat Board; tariff a geographical question; treatment of western Canada, 2729

Coote, Mr. G. G. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National railways, freight rates advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 3419, 3423
Dominion notes, qu. 3153
Esquimalt dry dock, 3541
Felt shoe industry, 3239
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Grasshoppers, 2726, 3520
Immigration
Child, 2161
Farmers, 3064
Italian, 2171
Policy, 2161
Indians
Blood reserve, 1219, 1224
Land leased, qu. 2969
Education, schools in Alberta, 1237
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Live stock industry, 991, 2727
Macleod post office, qu. 2804
Penitentiaries, inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Ploughs, duty on, 3123
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., Chairman, 2773-5
Langley, Hon. George, statement, 2773
Redistribution, 1370
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Macleod, 2584
Steel bounties, qu. 3360
Tariff inquiry, 1920-21, cost, report, publication, qu. 2215
Threshing machines, 3125
Total trade, 1900-1921, qu. 1633
Tree-planting on prairies, 1051
Unemployment figures, qu. 3362
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
Wheat Board, 2729, 3182, 3189

Copp, Hon. A. B. (Secretary of State)
Alien enemy property, custodians of, 1672, 3601
Prince Rupert, 3606
Alleged election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Archives Branch, Dr. Doughty, 702
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Civil Service
Commission, 3102
Examinations, 872
Harbour and Rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Lusitania reparation claims, 3599
Moncton car shops, 1709
Naturalization Act, Amdt. bill, 3104, 3436
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1992
Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill, 1661, 3025, 3148
Rail and car repair contracts, 1708
Secretary of State dept.
Estimates, 701, 1671, 2977, 3499
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Privilege, correction of report in Montreal Gazette, 1721

Corporation Control. *See* Railways

Corporation-Owned Railroads in United States, 67-70. *See also* Railways, Public ownership

Correction of Division List. *See* House of Commons Divisions

Correspondence, quoting from. *See* Speaker's Rulings

Cost of Living, 2349, 2359, 2396, 2578. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service Bonus; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Unemployment
Labour Gazette and, 1057
Prices, deflation of, 1216-18
Purchasing power of money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603
Sales tax, and, 2676. *See also that title*
Tariff and, 2882. *See also* speeches on Budget
Taxation on, 2364. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Wages based on, 1303

Cotton Industries
Duties, 2469, 3127. *See also* Customs Tariff
Wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903

Coughlin Shipbuilding Company, 3542

County Courts, establishment in Quebec, 3496

County Fairs. *See* Agriculture, Exhibitions

Courtenay Bay, qu. 365. *See also* St. John Harbour

Courtney, B.C., post office building, 1258

Cow Bay wharf, 1766

Cream Separators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Credits. *See* Banking; Finance; Financial Credits; Housing; Loans; Roumania and Greece; Unemployment

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. (Marquette, Leader of the Progressive party)
Address in reply, 50. Congratulations to Speaker, Miss Macphail, mover and seconder of Address; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 50-51; election campaign, 51; negotiations between Government and Progressives, 51; attitude of Progressive party, 52; condition of agriculture; wheat marketing, 53; production costs; transportation costs; freight rates; tariff revision, 54; Sir Lomer Gouin; railways, public ownership, 55-56; immigration, burden of taxation, 56-57; soldiers' re-establishment, 57; Limitation of Armaments; Genoa Conference; economy, need for; burden of taxation, 58; redistribution; proportional representation, 59
Adjustment of war claims, 1672
Agricultural exports, figures used in budget debate, 2638
Agriculture
Condition and prospects, 53, 2156, 2471
Dept., salary increases, 588
Agriculture and Colonization Com.
McCoig, Senator, attendance before, 1901
Wheat Board report, 780. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Alien enemy property, 1672
American magazines, 3113
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102
Audibility of debates, 708
Board of Commerce, 1715
British Columbia, and, 2234-9
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 716
Budget, 2459. Congratulations to Prime Minister; tribute to Finance Minister; difficult and perplexing problems; unsatisfactory financial position; debt and taxation, 2459; railway expenditures; revenue and expenditure; discrepancy between income and outgo, 2460; limit of taxation about reached; economy; new taxation; reorganization of departments and elimination

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of duplication; new administration buildings; overlapping of Dominion and provincial expenditures, 2461; sales tax, inequitable and unsound; cheque tax; tax on foreign insurance companies, 2462; co-ordination of financial policy; overlapping of taxation; reciprocity with United States; valuation and marking goods; valuation of currency, 2463; trade with Germany; a protectionist budget; no statement of government policy; agricultural implements, 2464; inconsistencies in agricultural machinery schedule; government failure to implement pledges; clothing; boots and shoes; household equipment, 2465; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; tariff platform of 1919; Liberal resolution of 1921; tariff proposals not what country requires; discrimination against United States, 2466; tariff legislation before Congress; American factories in Canada; opposition to protection in United States, 2467; Progressive party unalterably opposed to protection; development of natural resources; home market fallacy; manufacture of rubber goods; cotton; raw material and finished product; protection sectional and selfish; movement of population; exodus of Canadian workmen; maritime provinces under protective policy, 2469; rural depopulation in Ontario; prairie provinces; Vancouver and free port proposal, 2470; agriculture prospers in spite of protection; development of west; prosperity from 1900 to 1912 not due to tariff; export of natural products, 2471; tendency of economic thought in Europe; trade begets friendship; the amendment, 2472; no constructive proposal; amdt. to amdt. proposed, 2473
Business of the House
Budget (amdt. to amdt., Sir Henry Drayton) 2473, 2507, 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2640
Easter adjournment, 820
Empire and Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Government orders, Monday and Wednesday, 1461, 1720
Privilege on Orders of Day, right to raise, 2638*

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3036
Canadian National Railways
Deficits, 1920
Canadian Northern, 1907
Immigration, 1927
Public ownership and operation, 1920
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689, 1707, 1925
Revaluation of, 1925
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Civil Service
Commission, 3078
Patronage, 3080, 3096
Cold storage warehouse, Montreal, 819
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3595
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1414-20-29, 1433, 1454
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 3423
Estimates, 762
Officials, 764
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract for steel plates, 1678
Elevators, terminal, administration, 2980. *See also under this title*, Grain Inquiry Commission
Emigration, record of, 2158
Estimates, accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
Freight Rates
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See under this title* Crowsnest
Immigration and, 2157
Genoa Conference, 1715
Cannes Conference, 823
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Governor General's cars, 1688
Grain and grain trade. *See also under this title* Wheat Board
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision, 1933
Russia, competition in wheat market, 2157
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, 2982, 2895
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Immigration
Central European, 2157
Policy, 2156
Railways, and, 1929, 2157

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1394
Intercolonial Railway, maritime management, 193
Interior Dept., economy, 455
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Justice Dept., contingencies, 1668
Labour
Estimates, 579180
Technical education, 459
Liberal party, negotiations with, 34-35, 51
Limitation of Armaments Conference, 9, 3167
Militia and Defence
Co-ordination of services, 417
Expenditure and policy, 1593
National Defence bill, 739-40
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Naval Service
Empire defence contribution, 2081-2
Fleet 420
Policy, 2081
Nova Scotia miners, 508
M. (Mr. Irvine) 542
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation of M. (Mr. Neill) 1821
Ploughs, duty on, 3121-3122
Political inquesting, 404
Population, need of increased, 2158
Privilege, questions of
Agricultural figures used in budget debate, 2637
Member's right to raise on Orders of day, 2638
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1652
Public ownership, 1920, 1923
Rail and car repair contracts, 1684, 1707, 1925
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass) 3595
Railway policy 1920, 1923
Responsibility as leader of Opposition, 73
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 835
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 444
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Salary increases, 398, 404
Discussion out of order, 398, 404
Speaker, election of, 4
Speaker, Mr., death of father, 496
Steamship services
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canadian Govt. Merchant marine, subsidies, 3032
Revision of, 3034
West Indies, 3032

Crerar, Hon. Thomas A. — *Con.*
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1692
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Tariff, immigration and, 2157
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Treaties of peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3490
Union Government, resignation from, 2490
United Grain Growers, Limited, 2489
Terminal elevator, 2983
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2750
Wheat Board, 377, 2922
Fixation of prices, 2588
Proceedings in Committee, 2934
Wheat Board bill, 3186, 3191, 3384, 3386

Crime. *See also* Criminal Code; Penitentiaries
Foreign immigration and, 1392-4

Criminal Code
Reprinting and revision, 1278, 1717

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Criminal conspiracy and sedition (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 865; com,. 865, 1388; ref. to Special Com., 1395, 1503; report, 1988. *For further stages, see* Immigration Act Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth)
2. Newspaper ownership (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821
3. Scrip Frauds (Mr. Kennedy, Edmonton) 1r., 1062; 2r., 3211-3217; com., 3217; 3r., 3221
4. Age of consent; automobile theft; bribing police commissioners; carrying animals by railways; carnal knowledge; clerk of peace, Quebec; indecent assault; protection of English hall marks; recovery of penalties from corporations by civil process; retention of fines by municipalities in Ontario (Sir Lomer Gouin) 1r., 1841; 2r., com., 2830, 2973; 3r., 2974; Senate amdts., 3607

Subjects and sections discussed:
Age of consent, 2830-1
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Conveyance of cattle, 2831-34
Feeble-minded person, carnal knowledge of, 2973
Game of chance, 2973
Pool-selling, bookmaking, 2973

Criminal Conspiracies. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Cronyn, Mr. Hume, reference to. *See* Pensions Committee, final report

Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See* Freight Rates

Crude Oil. *See* Fuel Oil

Cruelty to Animals. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Society for prevention of, 2831

Cruisers, armed, on Detroit river, qu. 2214

Cuba
Shipment of potatoes to, 2028
Steamship service to. *See that title*

Cultivators. *See* Agricultural Implements

Cumberland, B.C.
Mines, 2407
Voting in, 180

Currency. *See also* Banks and Banking; Finance; Money
Gold standard, 1291
Valuation for customs, 2113, 2173, 2389, 2420, 2463, 2599, 2641, 2859, 2875, 2884, 2897, 3223-4. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.

Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, Res. 1132, 3042; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3043

Currie, General Sir Arthur, 1986

Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill (Dumping clause; consular certificates; valuation for duty; currency) 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477

Customs and Excise. *See also* Budget; Customs Act; Customs Tariff; Imports and Exports; Taxation; Trade
Automobiles, tax on. *See* Automobiles
British goods imported, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
Collections, New Brunswick, qu. 607
Consular certificates, 2114, 3477, 3522. *See also* Customs Act Amdt.
Department
Connor, Mr. James, gratuity, 1674
L'Assomption and Montcalm excise officers, qu. 1774
Montreal employees, 1288
Organization, 1674, 2808
Printing, 1674
Salaries, 762
Veit, Mr. A. E., J. M., qu. 1773
Drawbacks, qu. 764, 828, 1067, 2175, 2186, 2662-3, 2840-50, 2895, 3141. *See also* Budget Speeches; Customs Tariff
Ford Motor Co., 2850
Payments of, 1922, qu. 2356, 2849-50

Customs and Excise — *Con.*
Drawbacks — *Con.*
Sugar on, 2850, 3251, 3476-7
Steel rods, refund, qu. 1774
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3410-13, 3477. *See also* Address; Budget; Customs Tariff
Duties
Cost of collecting, 239, 240, 2623-4
Fruit, 164. *See also under this title,* Dumping clause
Fuel oil on, 178
Militia dept., 1978
Per capita payment, 2691
Rebates of, 2175. *See also under this title,* Drawbacks
Valuation for, 2172. *See also* Currency
Excise tax
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu. 1400, 2114. *See also* Alcohol; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, 2852
Beer brewed for private use, 2856
Beet sugar, 2117, 2855. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue
Tobacco, 2115
Canadian raw leaf, 2853
Cigarettes, 2852
German goods, valuation. *See* Currency; Customs Act; Germany; Imports
Imports and exports
By countries, 2109
Marking and valuation of, 2113, 2174, 2410, 2463, 2879, 2897, 3413. *See also* Currency; Customs Act; Customs Tariff
Amended regulation, 2854, 3413
Revenue, qu. 827. *See also* Imports and exports
1911 to 1922, qu. 1661
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Liquor export warehouses, qu. 1211
Liquor imported, excise duties, qu. 828
Marking Act, 2641, 2877-80
Prohibited goods, 3476-7
Receipts, qu. 470
Revenue, qu. 614, qu. 827
Tariff bill, 3476-7. *See also* Customs Tariff
Tariff resolutions, 2118
Amended, 2854
Toronto customs house, qu. 470
Valuation for Duty. *See* Currency, Customs Act
Wines and spirits
Exportation of, 2854
In bond, 3229

Customs Tariff, 1907, Act Amdt. bill (Marking of imported goods; duties; amended rates; drawbacks; prohibited goods) Res. 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477

Customs Tariff Items
Adzes, cleavers, etc., 3127
Agate ware, 3118
Anti-dumping clause. *See under this title,* Dumping
Blankets, 3128, 3132, 3231
M. (Mr. Spencer), 3234, neg. 3235
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3236
M. (Mr. Shaw) to reduce, neg. 3238
Changes in. *See also* Tariff revision
Chinese. *See that title*
Cigarettes, 3107
Cigars, 3107
Clothes wringers, etc., 3140
Coated papers, 3108
Cocoa, 2116, 3106
Cotton fabrics, 3127
Cultivators, harrows, etc., 3120
Dairy tinware, 3118
Drugs, 3114
Dumping clause, 304, 2184, 2197, 2275, 2494, 2641, 2879, 3188, 3411-13, 3477. *See also* Customs Tariff Act Amdt.
Fishing hooks, etc., 3140
Flannels, 3137
Fruit and vegetable grading machines, 3126
Gasoline, 3115
Glass bottles, etc., 3117
Harness and saddlery, 3137
Hatters' bands, 3139
Hatters' plush, 3141
Incubators, etc., 3126
Iron and steel tubing, 3118
Linen yarn, 3128
Magazines, 3108
Marking Act, repeal, 3104
Milking machines, 3126
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3113-14
Ploughs, etc., 3121, 3229
M. (Mr. Johnston) to reduce, 3121, 3229
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Pump parts, 3127
Sawmill machinery, 3126
Settlers' effects, 3140
Silk cloth, 3137
Street rollers, 3126
Sugar, 3107
Threshing machines, parts, 3124
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Customs Tariff Items — *Con.*
White cotton fabrics, 3128
Window shades, etc., 3127
Wool and cotton yarns, 3127
Wool and woollen goods, 3233
Woollen clothing, 3235

Dairy Cattle. *See* Agriculture, Accredited Herds; Live Stock

Dairying Industry. *See also* Address; Budget; Oleomargarine
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, 1794
Butter. *See that title under* Agriculture
Competition with other countries, 178
Duties on utensils, reduction in, 2115, 2205, 3118
Exports and imports, 209
Grading of products, 655-6
Implements, reduction of duties on, 2115, 2205, 3118
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740. *See also* Agriculture, Accredited Herds, Health of Animals
National Dairy Council and oleomargarine, 1791
Oleomargarine, 1791, 2205. *See also that title*

Dalrymple, Mr. J. E., qu. 728

Dandurand, Hon. Senator, 1128

d'Anjou, Mr. Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply, 306; parliamentary rights of French language, 306; economy in Government expenditure, 307
Military expenditure and policy, 1593

D'Arcy Island lazaretto, 2021

Dartmouth, N.S. air station, 1724

Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dimissal of, 1902, 2458, 2584

Davies, Mr. C. C. (North Battleford)
Wheat Board, participation certificates, funds, qu. 2304

Davies, Right Hon. Sir Louis, K.C.M.G., Deputy of the Governor General, 3610

Daylight Saving, 227, qu. 372
House of Commons, and, 1282
M. (Mr. Kay) for legislation to prohibit, 942, 943
Amdt. (Mr. Duff) 959; Neg. 1314

Deathbed Cases. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306

Debt, Public. *See* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Deceased Soldiers. *See* Soldiers
Insurance claims of heirs, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act
Widowed Mothers. *See* Pensions

Dechene, Mr. A. M. (Montmagny)
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1801

Deep Sea Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

Deep Waterway and Power Association. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Defence. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service

Deficits. *See* Canadian National Railways

Deflation of Credit. *See* Finance

Deflation and Inflation of prices. *See* speeches on Address and Budget

Delinquents. *See* Juvenile delinquents

Delphine, Colonel, 303

Delta, Manitoba, protective works, 3545

Demers, Captain, 1492

Demers, Mr. M. J. (St. Johns and Iberville)
Income tax, Montreal office, qu. 607

Demobilization. *See also* Militia, Annual Drill; War Claims
Estimates, 1171
Expenditure, 1155, 1163, 1171

Denis, Mr. J. Arthur (St. Denis)
Address in reply, 348. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; immigration; Laurier-Fielding tariff, 348
Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Budget, 2887. Tribute to Finance Minister; budget proposals generally satisfactory; extravagance of Union Government; acquisition of Railways; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; credits to Balkan states; revenue and expenditure, 2888; Progressive party; compromise and co-operation Canada a hard country to govern; Wheat Board; freight rates, 2889; railway

Denis, Mr. Jean J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
deficits made good by East; free trade, 2890; tobacco industry, protection of, 2891
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Ministers and Directorships, 1113
Solders' insurance, 3321

Denmark, Expedition to Ellesmere Island, 1751

Dennis Building, Halifax, qu. 3360

Department of National Defence bill. *See* National Defence

Departmental Expenditure. *See* Supply

Departmental Law officers, 683, 2572

Dependency. *See* Pensions, Widowed Mothers

Deportation. *See* Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt.; Oriental Aliens

Depreciated Currency. *See* Currency; Customs

Deputy Ministers. *See* Militia Estimates; National Defence Bill; Naval Service
Salaries of, 752

Deputy Registrar. *See* Admiralty Act Amdt. bill

Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, appointment, 5

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George N. Gordon)
Election of, 363
Rulings and statements of. *See also* House of Commons; Marcil; Speaker
Amendments
Already covered, 3147-8
Anticipatory, 2973
Increasing charge on revenue, 3404
Member having already spoken, cannot move, 3558
Moved separately, 3401
Previous, 3148
Bills
Casting vote of Chairman, 3473
New sections proposed, 3445
Private
Com. may not refer back, 1747
Relevancy, 1858
Public
Amdt. dealt with by another amdt. on order paper, 2973

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rnlings and Statements of — *Con.*
Chair
Decision given, final, 3354
Member may not criticise ruling, 555, 2974
Ruling of non-debatable, 1898
Debate
Inaudibility of, 1755
Member speaking given opportunity to answer questions, 1889
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1361
Debates, Official Report of
Insertion of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Decorum, courtesy to member speaking, 2090
Language, "Breach of duty", 3354
Members
Desiring to speak, must rise, 1985
May ask question but not make statement, 2489
May not criticise ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Must put question without argument, 2340
Not in order in discussing ruling of Chair, 555, 2974
Speaking, need not answer questions unless willing, 2318, 2619, 2710
Opportunity to answer, 1889
To rise if vote desired, 3456
Ministers
Not required to answer questions, 2777
On item, may discuss general policy, 555
Motions
Amdt. to Amdt. in supply, 1579
Involving charge on revenue, must be made by minister, 3404
Non-debatable
That committee rise, 1181
Supply, in, 1579
Two, amending same item, 1982
Questions to be put without argument, 2340, 2489
Railway Commission, salaries not included in vote, 2776-8
Reference to judges and high officials, 2778
Relevancy, 404, 406, 671, 736, 1470, 1476, 1898, 3141
Cash bonus to soldiers, discussion, 404
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway, bill, 1603
Grain Inquiry commission, 2988
Hudson Bay railway, 2780

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements of — *Con.*
Senate, indemnity, 3509
Supply
General policy of department, 560
No question before com. on which to base discussion, 1900
Relevancy, 1135, 2089, 3527, 3545
Lindsay arsenal, 2089
Militia and Defence items to be discussed separately, 1139-40-42
Penitentiaries, 1279
Quebec arsenal, 2095
Quebec riots, 2090
Rails and car repair contracts, 1698
Railway commission, estimates, 2776-8
Railways and Canals, 1135
Two motions, amending same item, 1982
Vote
Casting of, by Chairman, 3473
Desire for in com. to be indicated by members rising, 3456

Derelicts. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Desbarats, Mr. J. B. *See* National Defence

Deserted Wives. *See* Pensions

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Aluminum Electric Co., qu. 728, qu. 1375
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1773
Boon, Mr. W. R., qu. 728
Canada-West Indies steamship service, qu. 2356
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, employees at Montreal, qu. 2992
Canadian National Railways
Electrification, M. 627
Champlain steamer, sale of, qu. 1400
Civil Service
Classification, printed copies of, qu. 1930
Commission, Mr. Putman, 3090
Imperial council, qu. 2803
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu. 1065
Militia and Defence, permanent force, qu. 2637
Montreal Harbour Commission
Paint purchases, qu. 602
Policemen, qu. 2992
Tugs, qu. 600
Occupational diseases, protection against, M., 1378
Personal explanation, Civil Service estimates, 3365
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, qu. 2804
Veit, Mr. A. E. J. M., qu. 1773

Destructive Insect and Pest Act, qu. 472, 3520. *See also* Entomology

Detective Firms, American, 670

Detroit River
Armed cruisers on, qu. 2214
Regulation of navigation, 1498. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Deville, Dr. E. C., 1044, 1048

Dickie, Mr. C. H. (Nanaimo)
Address in reply, 341. Women and the franchise, 341; Pacific and Great Eastern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific and railway problem, 342; coal and fuel oil; Japanese and the fisheries, 344: returned soldiers, problems, 345; depletion of British Columbia fisheries, 346; dry dock at Esquimalt; British Columbia tariff views, 347
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway bill, 1603
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1828
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1523

Digby, N.S., pier, 1760

Digby-St. John Steamship Service, 3035

Dinosaurs, purchase of specimens, 1237

Directors, Board of. *See* Canadian National Railways

Directorships. *See* Ministers and directorships

Disability Soldier cases. *See* Pensions Committee

Disallowance of Ontario legislation, qu. 2805, qu. 2992

Disarmament. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Conference on. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Diseases
Infectious. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt.
Occupational, of workmen. *See that title*

Disfranchisement. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027

Divisions. *See* House of Commons

Dockyards. *See also* Naval Service
Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752

Doctors. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Doherty, Right Hon. C. J.
Payments to, 2572
Reported engaged on Newfoundland-Labrador boundary case, qu. 704, 2572

Doherty, Hon. Manning, 334, 974, 987. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Visit to England, papers, 1283, 1334

Domestic Loans. *See* Loans

Domestic. Servants, Immigration of. *See* Immigration

Domicile of Voter. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. *See* Statistics

Dominion Coal Company. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Dominion Elections. *See* Elections of 1921; Proportional Representation

Dominion Elections Act
Abuses under, 184-5
Amendments, qu. 470
Campaign funds, qu. 1508
Enfranchisement of women of alien birth M. (Mr. Euler) 473, agreed to, 493
Removal from statute books, 184
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1296, agreed to, 1301

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. (Alien women; Domicile of voter)
1r., 1796; 2r., com., 2809; 3r., 3817
Subjects and sections discussed:
Election day, public holiday Amdt. (Mr. Neill) 2812
Elector's residence, change of, 2809
New polls, establishment of Amdt. (Mr. Caldwell) 2815
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486

Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, 2419-20. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Contract for steel plates, claim for damages, 417, qu. 704, 1677-80, 1689, 2170
Legal expenses, 3497
Delivery of seel plates, 3508

Dominion Lands
Contingencies, 1037
Estimates, 1035
Forest reserves. *See* Forestry
Homestead entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries, 1035
Sale of, qu. 376

Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Sub-agencies closed, qu. 1181
Surveys, 1037
Dr. Deville, 1044
M. to reduce, vote, 1039
Reduction of vote by $30,000, 1044-6

Dominion Lands, Notices of Cancellation of Leases bill
1r., 3151; 2r., com., 3465; 3r., 3475
Senate amdts., non-concurrence; free conference 3613; concurrence, 3616

Dominion Lands and Parks
Canadian National parks, 168, 1051
Visitors to, 1052
Migratory birds, 1684
Wolves, destruction of live stock by, 990, 998

Dominion Notes. *See* Finance

Dominion Observatory, Ottawa Building, 1265

Dominion Police. *See* National Defence; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Dominion Public Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Dominion Statistician. *See* Statistics

Dominion Textile Company, 200, 583, 1106, 1130

Dorchester Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Doughty, Dr. A. B., 702

Douglas Credit System. *See* Finance; Irvine

Doukhobors. *See* Immigration

Drainage. *See* Dominion lands

Drawbacks. *See* Customs

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry L. (West York)
Address in reply, 195. Provincial prejudices; Mr. Macdonald of Pictou; Minister of Finance and railways, 196; financial outlook; election, popular support of parties, 197; redistribution, campaign literature, 198; public works and unemployment; Halifax patronage committee, 199; Minister of Labour and trusts and combines; Sir Charles Gordon; Canada Cement and Dominion Textile Companies, 200; British Empire Steel Corporation, 200-1; position of Prime Minister and Mr. Crerar; railway policy, 201; Canadian Northern in Ontario, 202; railway

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Address in reply — *Con.*
lines in United States, 204; national ownership, 205; Sir Lomer Gouin and the big interests, 206; proposed King-Crerar alliance; leader of Opposition and insult to Quebec; 207; tariff present and former, 208; reciprocity; Fordney tariff, 209; imports and exports of agricultural commodities, 209; reciprocity, 208-211
Adjournment, item stands, 596
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2822
Agricultural implements, drawback, 3122
Air Board, 1728, 1735
Air Board Act Amdt. bill, 2821
Alcohol tax, 1213
American magazines, 3110
Auditor General's office, 793
Budget, date of, inquiry, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget, 2127. Loans; congratulations to Minister of Finance; financial situation; revenue, 2171; optimism and work; taxes, estimated revenue from; trade agreements; customs and currency valuations, 2172; German competition, 2173; marking of goods; income tax; tariff changes, 2174; agricultural implements, drawbacks, 2175; alcohol for druggists, 2176; beet sugar industry; new taxation, 2177; trade with United States; unemployment, 2178; political honesty; amdt. proposed, 2179
Business of the House
Members, payment of, 3611
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill, 3010
Pilotage, 2820
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3477-86
Census
Completion of, 1363
Cost, 1363
Civil service bonus, 3530
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 2831
Fines to municipalities, 2832
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com. 1442
Amdt. 1444. *See also under this title* Freight Rates
Customs Act and Dept. of Customs bill, 3477
Customs and Excise Dept., employees, 765

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Customs tariff
Book and coated papers, 3108
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Drugs, 3114
Gasoline, 3116
Marking Act, 3105
Pump parts, 3127
Wool and Woollen goods, 3129, 3130, 3233
Customs Tariff Act Amdt. bill, 3476
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 957
Anonymous letters, 944
Drayton-Acworth report, 126
Elevators, terminal, 2978
Estimates
Accounts chargeable, current or past year, 1675
Discussion of general policy, 767
Exchequer Court, estimates, 1274
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Salaries, 753
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 3011
Fishing tackle, 3140
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3555
Amdt. 3559. *See also under this title* Crowsnest pass
French trade treaty, 3224
German goods, valuation, 2172, 3227
Grain
Inquiry Commission, 2984-6
Shipment of via Quebec, 1466
Grand Trunk arbitration, newspaper comments, 821
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1765
Health dept. estimates, 775
Housing, 774
Immigration facilities at Quebec, 1466
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Inland Revenue
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Sugar beet, tax on, 3242
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Insurance Dept. 792
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Interior dept.
Economy, 456
Salaries, 452
Typewriters, 455
Justice dept.
Appropriations exceeded, 1279
Contingencies, 1669
Labour dept.
Appointments, 462
Salaries, 548

Drayton. Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
League of Nations, 3174
Secretariat, Canada's contribution, 3990
Loans, 2127
New Canadian, 1133
Special Loans bill, 3476
Meat and Canned Foods bill, 3149
Militia and Defence
Amalgamation of services, 419
Naval Service, 422
War claims, adjustment, 2974
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 3199
Naval service, 1737
New departmental buildings, Ottawa, 3541
Non-productive assets, 1467
Nova Scotia miners, 509, 512
M. (Mr. Irvine 540)
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824
Penitentiaries, inmates, increase in number, 1279
Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill, 3043
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3404, 3439-64
Pensions
Commutation of, 390
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Prime Minister, secretaries, 411
Printing plants, tax, 3410
Public Accounts, delay in closing, 1264
Public buildings
Coal for, 1759
Expenditure, 1260
Public Service Retirement bill, 3148
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1465-86, 3195
Quebec harbour, Parc St. Charles Co., 1470
Railway Commission, statement of Mr. Carvell, 2774
Redistribution
Census and, 1363, 1369
M. (Mr. Shaw), 1769
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3389, 3397, 3438
Revenue and Audit Act, 3042
St. Lawrence river waterway, correspondence, 2207
Sales tax collections, 1921-22, qu. 1212
Saskatchewan, export of liquor, 3000, 3002
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Capital expenditure, 1279
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Soulanges canal, 2768
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Cheque tax, 3258
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974
Supreme Court, pre-audit, 1274

Drayton, Hon. Sir Henry — *Con.*
Tariff Commissioner, appointment, 1664
Transcontinental railway, 917
Transportation Costs, Special Com. *See under this title*, Crowsnest pass; Freight Rates
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, bill, 3547
United States, operation of railways in Canada, 192
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822
Vickers, Limited, 2975-7
War claims
Adjustment of, 2974, 2977
Exchange, 1758
War Graves Commission, 774
Weston post office building, 1259

Drayton-Acworth report, 46, 125, 130

Dredges and Dredging. *See also* Marine; Public Works
Estimates, 2005
Plamonder, 2006
Port Nelson, 2006
Quebec harbour, 1483
Red river channel, 2007
St. Lawrence river ship channel
De Beaujeu bank, 1495
New elevator dredge, 1495
St. Marys river, 2006
Shuswap lake, 2006

Druggists, alcohol for, 2114. *See also* Alcohol

Drumheller mines, 85, 1058

Drummond, Mr. J. D. F. (West Middlesex)
Beet sugar industry, 2273, 3251
Budget, 2272. Progressives, attitude towards; public debt; duty on beet sugar, 2272; tariff, duty on agricultural implements; farmers not asking special privileges, 2274
Goderich harbour, improvement, 2002

Drury, Hon. E.C., and Drury Government, 63, 125, 127, 134, 334
Lake of the Woods, control. 2991. *See that title*
Land tax, and, 2491

Dry Docks
Burrard Dry Dock Company, 2008
Esquimalt, 347
Appropriation, 3541
Pacific Coast on, 2401
Subsidies to, 2008
Vancouver, 2005, 2008, 3542

Drysdale, Mr. Justice, retirement of, 1275

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Air Board, qu. 366
Air Force and civil aviation, 1724
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. (Pilotage) bill, 2819
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
Cost, etc., qu. 469
Subsidized steamship services, 3031
Canadian national parks, expenditure, 1681
Canned fish, marking of tins, 3048
Civil Service
Commission, qu. 364
Overmanning, 3099
Patronage, 3094
Rural postmasters, 3095-6
Con Rein, sinking of, 1384
Courtenay Bay works, qu. 365
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) amdt. 959
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation contract, 1677
Fishing schooner race, 1384, 3513
Flags, cost of, qu. 599, 1264, 1268
Halifax terminals, qu. 364
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure, details of, 1272
Ontario, 2000
International deep sea racing
M. for encouragement, 1384, 3513
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1490
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Migratory birds, 1685
Military and naval expenditures, reduction, 1139
National Defence bill, 740
Naval policy, 2052
Naval Service
Aurora, cruiser, 2053
Royal Canadian navy, qu. 366, 1848, 1871, 2052
Navigation off Newfoundland coast, aids to, 1498
Nova Scotia pensioners, qu. 615
Public buildings, flags, qu. 599, 1264, 1269
Toronto harbour works, qu. 365
Tourist traffic, 1683
Unemployment, 1683
War service badge, 1754
Wooden ships, qu. 364

Dumping Clause. *See* Customs and Excise

Duties. *See* Customs and Excise; Customs Tariff

Dynevor Hospital, 1218

Easter Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Eastern Car Company, car repairs, 1706

Eastern La Have Transportation Company. *See* Con Rein

Eastern Maine Railway, 1293

Economic Depression, 6, 10, 85, 157, 237-8, 3299. *See* also speeches on Address; Budget

Economy in Administration, necessity for, 7, 52, 97, 122, 455-6. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget; Civil Service; Supply

Eddie, Captain, 1493

Edison, Mr. T. A., credit system, 2505

Editorial Committee, 1235-6

Edmonton
Indian school, proposed, 1227-9. *See also* Indians
Post office building, alteration, 1254

Edmundston
Post office, qu. 608
Public building, 1239, 1242

Education
Indians. *See that title*
Orientals in British Columbia, 317. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Rural schools in Ontario, 2385, 2565
School boards, refusal of bank to advance money to, 2627
School lands, 339
School system, 2385
Taxes in school districts, 2714

Eggs
Chinese, importation of, 177
Cold storage in, 2562
Exportation, 813
Imported into Canada, qu. 612
Inspection and standardizing, 177, qu. 727, 811-812

Eight-Hour Day. *See* Daylight Saving; Labour

Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Election of Speaker. *See* Speaker

Election of 1921
Campaign, 21, 40-41, 51, 61, 99, 140, 198, 265, 288. *See also* Address; Budget; Proportional Representation

Election of 1921 — *Con.*
Campaign — *Con.*
Brantford at, 255, 256
Charlotte, N.B., county in, 1997
Funds, and protected interests, 2437, 2732
Literature, 99
Statements by Sir Lomer Gouin, 140
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 1258
Deposits refunded, qu. 1067
Liberal pledges, cash grants to soldiers, 102, 400. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Maritime provinces in, 315-316
Minority government, 197. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Number of votes cast, 197
Pledges and promises, 243. *See also* Liberal Convention; Soldiers' Bonus
Rail and car repair contracts, prior to, 1688
Results, 61, 142, 186, 197, 2282, 2654, 2851, 2909-2910,
By provinces, 46
Returning officer, Carleton, 3538, 3602, 3604
Unit of representation, 198
Voters, failure to vote, 1112
Women, 1113

Electoral System. *See* Proportional Representation

Electric Power. *See also* Aluminum Company; Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Campbell river, 1355
Railways and, 1940

Electrical storm in the West, 3493

Electrification of Railways, 133, 630. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
M. (Mr. Deslauriers) withdrawn, 639

Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board

Elk Island Park, fencing, 1051

Ellesmere Island
Danish expedition to, 1751
Royal Canadian Mounted Police at, 3497

Elliott, Mr. William (South Waterloo)
Budget, 2348. Tribute to Minister of Finance; tariff proposals a step in the right direction; national debt; revenue and expenditure; civil service; United States tariff; development of natural

Elliott, Mr. William — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
resources, 2348; markets, building up of industry at expense of agriculture; high cost of living, unemployment; labour conditions; boots and shoes; labour cost; woollen cloth, labour cost, 2350; woollen clothing, price and labour cost, 2350; permanent tariff commission; claims for tariff protection, 2351
Galt post office building, 1247

Embargo
Cattle. *See* Cattle Embargo
Manure, exportation of, 1021

Emigration. *See* Immigration

Empire, British
Foreign policy and defence, 1629. *See also* Limitation of Armaments; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Empire Day adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058

Employment Service. *See* Labour

Enemy Debts. *See* Treaties with Hungary and Turkey

Enemy Property. *See* Aliens, Enemy Property

Enfranchisement
Indians of. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Women of alien birth. *See* Dominion Elections Act

English River water powers. *See* Lake of the woods

Entomology, 813. *See also* Destructive Insects
Spruce bud moth, 1049

Escheats Act Amdt. bill (Time in which action must be brought)
1r., 2456; 2r., com., 2826; 3r., 3026; Senate amdts. 3486

Espionage. *See* Labour; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Esquimalt. *See also* Naval Service
Dry dock; 347, 596-7
Appropriation, 3541
Royal naval college at 2047, 2203, 2450

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Essence de l'Erable, qu. 1774

Estimates. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Interim Supply; Speaker; Supplementary Estimates; Supply. For departments, *See their titles*
Accounts chargeable to current or past year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1269
Classification and preparation, 569
Comparison with last year, 384
Consideration of, 3526
Details of, 1347
Government economy in, 381-382
Information not up to date, 1267
Items, reading of, 3545
Main
Comparison with last year, 381
Tabled, 363
One-fourth vote. *See* Interim Supply
Supplementary, tabled, 1258, 3463
War claims, details of, qu. 1288

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C. (Laval-Two Mountains)
Bankruptcy Act Amdt bill, 1132, 1662
Indians, Oka agent, 1217

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 781
Alien Birth, women of, enfranchisement, M., 473, 480
Canadian National Railways
Canadian Northern deficit, 1906
Public ownership operation, 1948
Re-valuation, 1926
Civil Service, promotions, 576
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 950
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1788
Quebec public utilities, 1912
Railway policy, 1948

European Credits. *See* Loans

European War. *See* War

Evans, Mr. John (Saskatoon)
Address, 300. Agriculture in a deplorable state; rates on grain; railway consolidation, 300; tariff and trade prevention, 301; national policy a failure, 302: freer trade relations, 303; protected combines; railway question, 304; tariff views of different parties; returned soldier farmers, 305
Agricultural implements
Dumping clause, 2360
Importation by United Grain Growers, 3118, 3119
Agriculture dept., professional men, 588
American magazines, 3113

Evans, Mr. John — *Con.*
Apple industry, 3417
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Beef hides, 3138
Blankets, duty on, 3130
British preference and Canadian ports, M. (Mr. Logan) 711
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1963
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1608
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Crowsnest pass agreement
Telegram of Mr. Motherwell to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Customs
Drawbacks, 765, qu. 828, 1067
Dumping clause, 2360, 3417
Fruit-growers, protection, 3417, 3425
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2795
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Immigration
Medical inspection, 759
Money qualification, 3058
Unrestricted, 3062
Live stock industry, 989
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Naval policy, 2072
Post office salaries, 2801
Railway policy, 1963
Saskatoon post office building, 1253
Soldiers' land settlement, 305, 2132
Steamship subsidies, qu. 614
Welland ship canal, 2758

Excess Profits tax. *See* Taxation

Exchange. *See also* Finance
Claim by British Admiralty for refund, 1752
Foreign, 2264
Rate of, 286
Soldiers' money on, 3339, 3348

Exchequer Court of Canada
Admiralty, vacancies, 1275. *See also* Admiralty Act
Estimates, 1274

Excise Taxes. *See* Customs and Excise; Inland Revenue Act Amdt.; Special War Revenue Act

Exemptions. *See* Income Tax Act; Special War Revenue Act
Pilotage dues, from. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Exhibitions, 2582. *See also* Agriculture; Live Stock; Trade and Commerce

Exhibitions — *Con.*
Agricultural. *See that title*
Canadian National, 2990
Estimates, 2026
France, in, 2031, 2990
Grants to, 649, 977, 3521
London, 2027
Tampa, Florida, 2026

Expenditure. *See* Finance; Public Expenditure

Experimental and Illustration Farms. *See* Agriculture

Explosives Act, 1234

Export Liquor warehouses. *See* Liquor

Exports. *See that title under* Imports and Exports; Trade

Ex-service Men, representative. *See* Pensions Committee

External Affairs, Department of
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Doherty, Hon. Manning, 1283
Papers and memorandum, 1334
Salaries and contingencies, 411, 3509
War claims, adjustment of. *See* War claims

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Butter imports, qu. 614
Canadian National railways, water supply, qu. 2213

Fair Wage Clause. *See* Labour

False Creek, removal of bridge, 3516

Fansher, Mr. B. W. (East Lambton)
Beet Sugar industry, 2232, 3246, 3251
M. to reduce duty, 3248
Budget, 2229. Fiscal policy; tariff revision; encouragement of native industries; agricultural implements; sales tax; business profits tax; protected industries, 2230-1; automobiles, duty and tax; beet sugar industry, 2232
Customs drawbacks, qu. 2356

Far Eastern Treaty, 3160. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Farm Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Farm Lands, value of, 2565

Farm Products
Consumption in Canada, 2650. *See also* Budget
Decline in prices, 6, 11, 77, 93, 95, 113, 150, 225, 231. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; Live stock
Fordney tariff, effect of, 209. *See also* United States, Fordney tariff
Exchange value of, 2576
Importation, 209
Trade in, 226. *See also* Trade

Farmers
Block in United States, 69, 210, 988. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade; United States
Eight-hour day and, 227. *See also* Daylight Saving
Geographical advantages, 297-9
Immigration of, 145, 225. *See also that title*
Income tax returns, 226, qu. 1063, 2241, 2631. *See also* Income Tax
Labour, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration; Labour; Unemployment
Loyalty of, 526
Need of encouragement, 252
Profits, comparison of, 2333
Protection and. *See* Agricultural Implements; Budget
Remedial legislation, 157
Representation in Parliament. *See* Progressives
Sons, exemption from military service, 440, 448-9, 2685. *See also*, Military Service Act Amdt.
Transportation problems. *See* Freight rates
Want of confidence in future, 143
Western, 146-7, 357
And wheat marketing. *See* Wheat Board
Grievances, 2652

Farmers' Movement and Party. *See* Progressive Party

Federal Civilian Force. *See* National Defence bill; Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Federal Elections Act. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Federal Representation by provinces, in 1877, qu. 1183

Federal Subsidies. *See* Subsidies

Feed Control Act, 1011

Female Suffrage. *See also* Dominion Elections Act
Failure of women to vote, 1113

Fertilizers. *See also* Agricultural Fertilizers bill
Cost of, 770
Duty on, 3140-3141
Freight rates on, 1022
Ground limestone, 1024
Inspectors, 592
Natural, exportation of, 1019
Tariff and, 2664

Fiduciary Interest. *See* Ministers and Directorships

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance)
Agricultural implements, duty on, 3120, 3141. *See also under this title,* Customs Tariff
Alcohol for druggists, duty on, 2114, 3241
Alleged election promises, Charlotte, N.B. 1997
American magazines, 3108-3111
Appropriation Acts, 363, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Auditor General's office, 793
Auditor General's report
Public Works, expenditure of previous year, 1270
Referred to public Accounts Com., 1462
Automobiles, 2850, 2853, 3275. *See also under this title,* Special War Revenue Act
Refund of taxes, 3600
Value up to $1,000 for settlers, 2116
Banks
Circulation, tax on, 2117
Interest rates, 3602
Beet Sugar. *See under this title,* Sugar
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts, 772-773
British Columbia government, criticism, 2237
Budget, inquiries as to date of, 1018, 1463, 1503
Budget Speech, 2104; Financial position of Dominion, 2104-17; economy, income and expenditure, 2104; public debt, 2106; loans, 2107; trade, 2108; trade agreements and negotiations; tariff revision, 2110-14; British preference; trade with United States, 2111; Marking and valuation; currency, 2113; certificate of trade or consular agent; tariff reductions, 2114; new taxation, 2116; financial situation; tariff resolutions, 2118

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Supplementary statement, 2842. Acknowledgement of tributes and congratulations, 2842; attitude of Progressives towards Budget, 2842; step in right direction; Liberal policy as declared in 1921, supported by Progressive members; a policy of moderation; tariff and sales tax, 2843; land and inheritance taxes; tariff proposals; tariff revision of 1897; predictions of bankers and manufacturers; trade revival; reduction in duties, 2844; change in policy of Sir John Macdonald; British preference; Sir Charles Tupper; reciprocity; "no truck or trade with Yankees"; opposition of Conservative party to trade arrangement; Liberal party ready to discuss question; value of United States market; Windsor Hall speech, 2846; industrial condition of Germany, 2847; depreciated currency; value of mark and commodity prices; trade with Germany; treaty of Versailles; valuation of currency, 2848; increased taxation effect of currency valuation on Italian trade; a protectionist budget; downward revision; Progressives would not have been able to do more; direction in which Liberal party is looking, 2849; drawbacks and refunds; Ford motor company; Atlantic Sugar refineries; goods in transit; manufacture for export, 2850; Opposition amdt.; Liberal platform of 1919; verdict of electors; proposed changes in budget proposals; amended resolutions, 2851; tax on confectionery; soft drinks; ale, beer, porter and stout; cigarettes; fertilizers and dried beet pulp; cheque tax, 2852; bond and stock transfers, 2853; beet root sugar; raw leaf tobacco; receipts; cigars; automobiles; depreciated currency, 2853
Business of the House. *See also under this title,* Estimates; Supply
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473-74, 2522
Civil government items, 374
Daylight saving, 1282
Member interrupting, must ask permission, 255-6
Privilege, right to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Business of the House — *Con*
Special loan bill, 3151
Supplementary estimates, 3365
Supply, concurrence, 1842
Business profits war tax, 1658, 2024
Canadian battlefields, 772
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3156, 3366, 3477-86
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747, 1771
Cattle embargo, reported statement of Mr Larkin, 1023
Chartered banks, returns, 865
Cheque tax, 2117, 2852, 3258
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 2852, 3239, 3240
Commissioner of Taxation, salary, 2024
Confectionery, tax on, 2852
Congratulations to on fortieth year of public life, 3279
Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Currency Act, 1910, Amdt. bill, 1132, 3042
Currency, depreciated, valuation for customs, 2113, 2849, 2853
Customs Act and Dept of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 3222, 3476, 3477
Depreciated currency, 3223, 3224, 3410
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411
German goods, valuation, 3229
Invoices certificates, 3221
Wines and spirits in bond, 3229
Customs drawbacks, 2850, 3141
Customs Tariff
Blankets, 3128, 3131, 3136, 3234
Book and coated papers, 3108
Boots and shoes, 3238
Cigars, 3107
Cocoa, 3106
Cotton, fabrics, 3128
Gasoline, 3106, 3115, 3116
Glass bottles, 3117
Grading machines, 3126
Hatters' bands, 3140
Invalids' wheel chairs, 3115
Marking Act, 3105
Mowers and harvesters, 3118
Paper invalid cups, 3115
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Ploughs, 3121, 3229
Pumping machinery, 3127
Reductions, 3239
Saw-mill machinery, 3126
Silk, 3127
Tools, 3127
Tractors, 3123

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, claim, 2170
Dumping clause, 3225, 3411.
Estimates. *See also under this title*; Supply
Accounts chargeable to current year, 1675
"Appropriations not required", 1269
Items, urgent, 409
Procedure, 409
Tabled
Main, 363
Supplementary, 1258, 2465
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Fertilizers, duty on, 2852, 3141
Finance Dept.
Charges of management, 770
Deputy minister, 753
Estimates, 751, 1663, 3495
Legal expenses, railways, 1667
Loans, 771. *See also under this title*, Loans,
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Fire prevention, 794
Fiscal year, ending of, 1210. *See also under this title*, Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Fisheries, reduction in duties on, 2116
Fishing schooner race, 3512
France-Belgium trade treaties, 3223
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's office, 751
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure in 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward island, 1989-90
Housing, 774
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imports, marking and valuation of, 2113, 2849, 2853, 3229
Income tax
Cost of collection, 2025
Legislation, 3104
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3278-9, 3359, 3484
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Alcohol for druggists, 2114, 3241
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239, 3240
Home brewing, 3141
Sugar beets, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3143, 3607
Insurance officials, 791
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Interim Supply, 373, 378, 383, 598
Bill, 362, 598-9

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Labour and capital, 2117
Liberal platform of 1919, tariff plank, 2529, 2851
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
Loans, 771, 2107
New Canadian, 1131, 1133
Special loans bill, 3476
Merchants' Bank, inquiry, 3604
Nova Scotia miners, 497
M. (Mr. Irvine) 543
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1814
Penny Bank Act Amdt., bill, 1132, 3043, 3148
Pensions to Imperial forces, 864
Personal statement, correction, 681
Private Bills Com., substitution of names, 2355
Public Accounts, closing of, 1210, 1264-66
Public buildings
Flags, 1265
Generally, expenditure, accounts not closed, 1263-66
New, 1256
Public Works estimates, 696, 697, 750
Rail and car repair contracts, 1697
Railways, annual statement, 926
Reciprocity with United States, 2111, 2845-6
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3320, 3392, 3395
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 3042
Root vegetables, inspection and sale of, 2744
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786
Co-operation with the United States, 2755
Sales tax, 2116, 2843, 2851. *See also under this title*, Special War Revenue Act
Save the Children fund, 3516
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 442
Special loans bill, 3476
Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill, 3477
Automobiles, 3275
Ford company, 3276
Cheque tax, 3258
Insurance premiums, tax, 3253, 3255, 3477
Matches, 3263
Mineral waters, 3278
Receipts, 3262
Sales tax, 2116, 3264, 3269
Amdt. (Mr. Speakman) 3271
Condensed milk, 3268, 3409
Job printing, 3409
Steamship services, 2029

Fielding, Hon. W. S. — *Con.*
Sugar
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on beet sugar, 2117, 2853, 3242, 3248
Supply bills, 362, 598-9, 1842-3, 3607
Supply, concurrence, 1769, 1842
Tariff Commission, 1663
Tariff reductions, 2114, 2844, 2851, 3123
Tariff revision, 2110-14, 2844, 2849
Taxation, increases in, 2116, 2843, 2848, 2851-3
Tobacco, duties on, 2115, 2852-3, 3107, 3239
Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill, 1210, 1464, 3142, 3607
United States
Reciprocity with, 2111, 2845-6
Visit to Washington, 2112
War claims, exchange, 1754
War Graves Commission, 774
Wrangel island, 1750

Filled Milk and cream, qu. 963. *See also* Milk; Oleomargarine

Films, Educational. *See* Trade and Commerce

Finance. *See also* Banks; Budget; Financial Credit; Loans
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Bank deposits, qu. 3155
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Banking conditions, 158
Bonds
And stock, transfers, tax, 2853
Tax-free, maturing, qu. 826
Canada's financial position, soundness of, 2497
Commitments, 208
Credit Systems. *See* Financial Credit
Department
Charges of management, 770, 1663
Deputy Minister, 751
Estimates, 1662
Expenditure, economy in, 1475
Dominion Notes, qu. 705, qu. 935, qu. 3153, qu. 3154
Expenditure, monthly statement of, 1271
Legal expenses, 1667
Paper Control inqury, 1673
Salaries, 751, 3504
Unforeseen expenses, 771
Estimate of wealth and production, 2497
Excise profits and watered stock, 2714
Financial position of country, annual statement of Minister, 2104-2118
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Gold standard and credit system, 219

Finance — *Con.*
Grain trade, 2246
Loan department, 220
National wealth, 222. *See also* Natural Resources
Per capita wealth, 2630
Sinking funds, 1663

Financial Conference, Brussels, 1138, 1292

Financial Credit, 208, 219, 221, 2497-8. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money
Banks and, 1290, 2501, 2714
Brussels Conference, 1138, 1292
Community power, use of for private interest, 1291, 2501
Control of, 222, 1292, 2445, 2500
Germany in, 2500
Credit systems, 2634
Attempts to inaugurate
Guernsey Island, 2505
St. Louis Municipal currency, 2506
Definition of Credits, 2503
Douglas system, 220, 222, 2502
Financial organizations, consolidation, 2245-6
Gold standard and, 219, 1291, 2506
Greece and Roumania, qu. 1400
Industrial stagnation and unemployment, 1291. *See also* Industrial depression
Inflation and deflation, 2502
Loans, 1292. *See also that title*
M. (Mr. Irvine) for Parliamentary Com., 1289, 1396
National credit power, 1291, 2499
Private monopoly of, 2501
Purchasing power, 1292
Restricted, 2629-30
Scientific inquiry and experimentation, 1289
Sociological laboratory, 1290
Systems, 2282

Financial Depression and Outlook. *See* speeches on Address; Budget

Findlay, Mr. J. W. (South Bruce)
Budget, 2893. Protection and blind party-ism; reciprocity, 2893; Ontario farmer not a protectionist; Progressives in Ontario; Laurier naval policy; tariff reductions; public morality and political honour; pledges and promises; Senate reform, 2894; debt and increased taxation; expenditure; reduction of sessional indemnity; drawbacks; protective budget, 2895
Potlach, Indian institution, 1578
Indians serving gaol sentences, 1721

Fines, payable to municipalities, 2832. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Finney, Colonel John, 1189

Fire
Insurance. *See* Insurance
Losses, railways from, 628
Prevention, 794. *See also* Air Service; Forestry; Insurance

First Contingent, training, qu. 1376

Fiscal Changes. *See* Budget; Tariff resolutions; Taxation

Fiscal Year. *See* Consolidated Revenue Act Amdt. bill

Fish and Fisheries. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Boats admitted as settlers' effects, 2116
British Columbia. *See also that title*
Depletion of, 346
Orientals engaged in, 167, 171, 344. *See also* Oriental Aliens
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 851, 863
Salmon traps, 346
Transfer, 2042. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods Act
Canning and curing licenses, 3010
Deep sea, conservation and development, 2169
Department of Fisheries, 2166
Dry salting, 3010
Estimates, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishermen's supplies, 2690
Fishing schooner race. *See* International Deep Sea Racing
Fishing vessels, pilotage, 2819
Fishways in rivers, 2166
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
Guardians, salaries, 2166
Hatcheries, 2169
Herring, dry salting, 3010
Herring, in Alaska, 70
Improved methods, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Licenses. *See* Quebec fisheries
Lobster, 1399, 2817, 2996
Market, 2166
Mildred McColl, patrol boat, qu. 3598
Officers and guardians, salaries, 2166
Orientals. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Patrol service, 2166
Boats, qu. 1503, qu. 3598
"Phalarope", qu., 1503

Fish and Fisheries — *Con.*
Pollution of streams, 2168
Prince county, illegal fishing, qu. 371
Protection service. *See* Marine; National Defence; Naval service
Publicity and marketing, 2169
Quebec, transfer of, 142. *See also* Quebec Fisheries
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Rope, twine, etc., duty on, 2359
Salmon, 1399, 2817, 2996
Dry salting, 3010
Sardines, export, qu. 1182
Supplies, reduction in duties, 2116, 2359
Tariff reductions on implements of, 2191
Transportation, 2166
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Fisher and Oughton, Messrs. *See* Aliens

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Protection of Salmon and Lobster Fisheries. 1r., 1399; 2r., com., 2817; com., 2996; 3r., 2997
2. Salmon Curing and Herring Drying. Res. 2306, 3010; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3013

Fisheries Protection Service. *See* Marine; National Defence bill; Naval Service

Fishing Schooner Race. *See* International

Flag-Waving, 1265, 1386, 2711

Flags
Cost of, qu, 599
For public buildings, 1260, 1264, 1268

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 634. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Flax
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2834
Canadian bounty on linen yarn from, 1361

Flour
Exports to United States, 209
Insurance on mills, 3255

Flynn, Mr. Harry, and soldiers' bonus, 394, 402

Fontaine, Mr. J. E. (Hull)
Gatineau Point-Rockliffe ferry, qu. 1399, qu. 1661
Old age pensions, M., 1303
Post Office
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving $600, qu. 1067
Married women, qu. 1658
Money Order branch, qu. 1285

Food and Drug Act, administration, 2017

Food and Drugs. *See* Health; Meat and Canned Foods

Food Inspection, 820

Foot and mouth Disease. *See* Cattle Embargo

Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214

Foran, Mr. W., *See* Civil Service Commission

Ford Car. *See* Automobiles

Ford, Mr. Henry, credit scheme, 2505

Fordney Tariff. *See* Budget Speeches; United States

Foreign-Born wives of British subjects. *See* Dominion Election Act Amdt.

Foreign Currency. *See* Customs, Marking; Currency
Inflation. *See* Customs and Excise Dept. bill

Foreign Fraternal Societies. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Foreign Loans. *See* Loans

Foreign Markets. *See* Trade

Foreign Monetary Standards. *See* Customs; Currency

Foreign Warships. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill

Foreigners. *See also* Aliens
Crime and, 1392, 2517
Foreign-born wives and children of British subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Immigration. *See that title*
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1388-94
Textile industries, engaged in, 2518

Forest, Mr. Médard, qu. 2355

Forestry. *See also* Natural Resources; Research; Timber
Aerial patrol, 1047, 1722
Gaspe, 1733
High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Railway belt, B.C., 1730
Fire losses, 628
Fire towers, 1048
Forest area under federal control, 1048
Protection of timber in West, 1046
Pulpwood and round logs, duty, 2667

Forestry — *Con.*
Spruce bud moth, 1049, 2668
Tree culture in West, 1046
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu. 615

Forke, Mr. Robert (Brandon)
Address in reply, 76. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 76-77; reciprocity with United States; marketing of farm products, 77; tariff revision; railway problems, 78; taxation burdens; immigration, 79
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2149
Assiniboine river floods, 2004, 3546
Boy Scouts, 773
Cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special com., 1424
Distribution of labour and goods, 2149
Fishways, 2168
Freight rates, 1424
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2004
Immigration policy, 2148
Indians
Education, Elkhorn school, 3537
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2086
Naval policy, 2079
Progressives, patriotism, 720
Rideau canal, 2765
Soldier land settlement, taxes, 2134
Soldier Settlement Board, qu. 469
Transportation, 2149
Woollen goods and blankets, 3234

Fort Churchill. *See* Hudson Bay Railway

Fort George, 119

Fort Mississauga, 119

Fort Qu'Appelle Sanitarium, 1345

Fort William
Car repair contracts, 1696-1705
Grain overages, qu. 1210
Terminal elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Fortier, Mr. H. A. (Labelle)
Agricultural exhibitions, 993
Budget, 2274. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Government policy; amendment; revenue requirements and taxation, 2274; income tax; suggested concession to heads of families; population, suggested methods of increasing; railways and public ownership, 2275; economy in public expenditure, 2276
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 961

Fortier, Mr. H. A. — *Con.*
Demonstration farm at Mont Laurier, 994
Military Service Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 643
Ministers and directorships, 1123
Oleomargarine, manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1798

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Carty, Captain, qu. 1062
Chief Architect's branch, Public Works, qu. 963
Civil Service Commission, qu. 826
Bland, Mr. C. H., qu. 1904

Four-Power Treaty. *See* Limitation of Armaments

France
Canadian exhibition in, 2031
Exhibition train from, 2990
Industries, protection of, 2410
Post war conditions, 2643
Trade relations with. 2990. *See also* Trade
Trade treaty with, 2110

Franchise. *See also* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.
Extension of, 2242
Public ownership, and, 1944

Fraser River Fisheries. *See* British Columbia, Fisheries

Fraser Valley Railway. *See* Vancouver and Fraser Valley

Fraternal Benefit Insurance. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Frauds, Scrip, prosecution for. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fredericton
Military property, 1980
Officers' square, 1980

Free Freight outlay, qu. 704

Free Trade. *See* Address; Budget

Freight, careless handling of, 1965

Freight Rates. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Railway Commission; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Transportation
Advertising campaign, qu. 1375
Calgary, free outlay, qu. 704
Coal from maritime provinces, 1763
Comparison between freight and duty, 2175

Freight Rates — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 146, 176, 350, 1412. *See also under this title,* Excessive. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Special Com. to inquire into effect upon Railway Rates
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for, 1213, 1402
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1444; neg. 1457
M. agreed to, 1458
Named, 1502
Reports
First, 1657
Second, 1719
Third, 3546
M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of, 3548
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton, 3559; neg. 3586
Amdt. (Mr. Baxter) 3586; neg. 3586
M. agreed to, 3588
Position of Ministers of Agriculture and Interior on, 242
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Excessive, 33, 47, 54, 78, 83, 131-132, 275, 350, 2219, 2314, 2453. *See also under this title,* Crowsnest Pass Agreement, *and* Speeches on Address; Budget
Export, 2633
Fertilizers, on, 1022
Immigration and, 2157
Lumber industry, 234, 2311
Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
Quebec, and, 1472, 1473
Railway labour, and, 2315
Regulation by water carriage competition, 1688
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1204. *See also that title*
Subsidized steamships, 2028
Wheat on, 235. *See also* Wheat Board

French, early pioneers in West, 2912

French-English Canadians, unity between, 168-9. *See also* Address

French Language, 155
Civil Service classification, qu. 1930
Parliament in, 155, 244, 306, 356
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1351
Soldier Settlement Board, Sherbrooke, qu. 1658

Fruit Industry, 220, 2564
Apple-growing, 171, 967
Importations, qu. 612
Protection of, 225, 2197
Baxter, Mr. Charles W., appointment of successor, 2457
British Columbia in, 2593. *See also that title*
Competition with United States, 2903
Dumping clause, 2280, 2310, 2372, 2593, 2641, 2879 2903. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Freight rates. *See* Crowsnest pass agreement
Fruit Commissioner, qu. 2457
Grape juice, tax on, 2594, 2617
Okanagan Valley, 162. *See also* British Columbia
Oriental Aliens engaged in, 1535. *See also that title*
Protection. *See* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause
Tariff, 2197
Transportation. *See* Freight Rates
Trees, protection from insects. *See* Entomology

Fuel. *See also* Coal; Mines; Natural Resources
Oil, 344, qu. 728
Competition with coal, 2312
Importation, 178
Tank at Louise Basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Peat, 1235
Price, 1490, qu. 1774. *See also* Coal

Further Legislation. *See* House of Commons

Futures, trading in. *See* Wheat Board

Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu. 3599

Galicians. *See* Immigration

Galt post office building, 1247

Gambling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Game. *See* Migratory Birds; Dominion Lands and Parks

Games of Chance. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Gaols. *See* Prisons; Penitentiaries

Garbage Feeding. *See* Hog Cholera

Gardiner, Mr. Robert (Medicine Hat)
Budget, 2624. New national policy, 2624; fiscal plank; substantial reduction of customs tariff; British Preference; free food stuffs; machinery for conversion of natural resources and raw materials; time to be allowed for industrial readjustment; claims for protection to heard in public; parliamentary committee on tariff; tariff commission, 2625; effects of tariff; exploitation of the people; tariff increases prices but not values; tariff reductions; revenue; land tax; inheritance tax; excise tax on manufactured goods; sales tax, 2626; circulation tax; bank interest violation of Bank Act; withholding of credit from municipality; unemployment; an inequitable budge 2627

Gardiner, Mr. Robert — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian National Railways
Branch lines, 1964
Bridge over Red Deer river, 1964
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Cheque tax, 3260
Civil Service bonus, 1258
Dominion lands, oil leases, 1046
Fishing tackle, 3140
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3486
Port Nelson dredging, 2006
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3438
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Steamship services, 2027
Tar Sands, 1236
Timber wolves, 1001
Venereal diseases, 2022
Wheat Board, 785

Garland, Mr. E. J. (Bow River)
Additional currency issue, qu. 3155
Aerial forest patrol, High River, Alta., 1048, qu. 1066, 1723
Agriculture Com. report — Wheat Board, 783
Agriculture dept. — Mr. Duncan Marshall, 651, 652
Bank notes in circulation, qu. 3155
Boy Scouts, 773
Business of the House — eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine
West Indian trade, 3928; amdt. 3031
Canadian National railway, securities, qu. 3154
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half breed scrip) 3216
Dominion lands, surveys, 1038, 1044
M. to reduce vote, 1039

Garland, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Dominion notes, qu. 3154
Dredging, 2006
Fish culture, 2169
Forest aerial patrol, High River, Alta., qu. 1066, 1048, 1723
Gold reserve, qu. 3154, qu. 3155
Immigration of children, 2148, 3063
Indians
Blackfoot reserve, pasture lands, qu. 2215
Greater production, 1224, 1288
International boundaries, 1033
Mixed farming, 983
National gallery, 2011
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2043, 2067
Royal Canadian Navy, 2043
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 522
Parliament, fall session, 2608
Pensions Com., report, 3349
Post office, ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscriber, qu. 3599
Redistribution, meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 3497
Enlistment in Canadian Expeditionary Force, qu. 2038
Soldiers' land settlement, homestead rights, 2135
Steamship services, 2027, 3028, 3506
Amdt., 3031
Tax-free bonds, qu. 826
Telegraph and telephone lines, Alberta, 2012

Garland, Mr. W. F. (Carleton)
Budget, 2300. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war expenditure; Canada Cement Company; income tax; tariff on agricultural implements; British preference; Mr. Fielding's trip to Washington; trade with United States; civil service dismissals; bonus; superannuation, councils, 2300; sales tax, 2301
Canada-Great Britain postal rate, qu. 3364
Civil Service
Bonus, qu. 472, qu. 606, 2300, 3531
Withdrawal from certain civil servants, qu. 3598
Commission, salaries, 407
Councils, 2300
Increase to deputy ministers, bonus, salaries, qu. 2805
Remuneration, qu. 3364
Retirement fund, qu. 826
Superannuation, 2300
Connaught rifle range, qu. 3153
Egg inspection, 811

Garland, Mr. W. F. — *Con.*
Exhibitions, prizes, 654
Experimental farms, 811
Grand Trunk, salaries of officials, qu. 728
Highways
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembrooke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, tree planting, qu. 2039
Mail contracts
Gascons-Quebec, qu. 2213
Lachenaie, qu. 2805
Militia dept. shed, Cartier square, Ottawa, qu. 2038
Poultry inspection, 656, 807
Rideau canal, 2766

Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373

Gascons-Quebec mail contract, qu. 2213

Gasoline, price of, 2106, 2296, 2313, 3115

Gaspé Peninsula
Aerial forest patrol, 1733
Fisheries, qu. 1401
Railways, M. (Mr. Marcil) for papers, 623

Gatineau-Point-Rockliffe ferry privilege, qu. 1399, qu. 1661

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A. (Témiscouata)
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Canadian National Railways
Intercolonial
Pension fund, qu. 938
Repairs to cars, qu. 1212
Rivière du Loup shops, qu. 1181, 1690
Indemnity of members, 3613
Juvenile delinquents, qu. 469
Lighthouse boats, fuel for, qu, 606, qu. 1183
Lighthouses and wireless telegraphy, qu. 370
Prison reform, 1279
Privilege — alleged statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690
Rivière du Loup arsenal, qu. 1181, 1690

Gendron, Mr. R. M. (Wright)
Dennis building, Halifax, qu. 3360

General Election. *See* Election of 1921

"General" Macdonald's Army. *See also* Riley's Army; Unemployment
Government action in regard to, 2458
Reception of, 2256

Genoa Conference, 7, 58, 156, 212, 582, 2337. *See also* Address; Budget; Conferences
Canadian delegation to, expenses, 1715, 2864

Genoa Conference — *Con.*
Cannes conference, documents, 823
Tabled, 865
Correspondence with Govt. of Italy, 1905, 2035
Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 582
Dominion Textile Company, and, 583-4
Money vote for, 1675
Montpetit, Professor, 582
Reported subscription of Canada to consortium, 1463
Submarines, 1845

Geodetic Survey
Estimates, 1033
Ottawa building, 1265

Geological Survey. *See also* Mines and Minerals
Anthropological division
Potlach institution, qu. 1377. *See also* Indians
Camsell, Mr. Charles, 1262
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Estimates, 1233, 1236
Maps, 1237
Publications, 1237
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Specimens, purchase of, 1237

George, Right Hon. Lloyd, 2203, 2337
Empire defence, responsibility of dominions for, 1630

Georgian Bay Canal. *See* Canals

German, Mr. W. M. (Welland)
Freight rates, Special Com., third report, 3587-8
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3441
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1319
Trenton Harbour bill, 3494

German Goods, valuation of. *See* Budget; Customs Act Amdt.

German Mark, decline in value of. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated

Germany. *See also* Budget; Customs Tariff; Imports; Trade
Agents of manufacturers in Canada, 2647
Commercial development, 2643
Competition with, 2114, 2140, 2173-4, 2203, 2412, 2420, 2487, 2878
Credit control, 2500
Exports to Canada, 2408, 2421, 2863
Pocket-Knives, valuation of, 2876
Financial situation, 2499, 2642
Indemnity, payment in goods, 2500

Germany — *Con.*
Industrial condition, 2499, 2847
Labour conditions in, 3227. *See also* Labour
Mark, value of, 2417, 2644, 2848. *See also* Budget; Currency, depreciated
Paper money, 2499
Proposed loan, 2500
Reparations paid to Allies, qu. 375
Tariff wall against goods, 174
Trade relations with, 138, 2183, 2263, 2287, 2347, 2394, 2421-22, 2464, 2487, 2848, 2876
Foreign, 2644
Wages and production costs, 2407, 2499, 2884
War debts, 174
Working hours, 2499

Gervais, Mr. Théodore (Berthier)
Inglis boiler works, qu. 732

Gillen Board. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Girl Guides, grant, 774

Glanders. *See* Health of Animals

Glass
Customs duties on, 3117
Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Globe, Toronto, imaginary speeches of Mr. Meighen, 207

Goderich Harbour improvement, 2000

Gold
Central reserves and gold held in Canadian banks, qu. 2971
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code
Refining. *See* Charges of Management
Reserve. *See* Finance
Standard, 1291

Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration of, 1372

Good, Mr. W. C. (Brant)
Agate and granite ware, 3118
American magazines, 3108, 3113
Automobiles, tax on, 3273, 3277
Beet sugar industry, 3250
Blankets, duty on, 3234-5
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 722
Budget, 2429. Tariff record of Liberal party; repudiation of tariff plank of 1919 platform; history of fiscal legislation, 2429; inception of protective

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*

Budget — *Con.*

policy; position of Liberal party on tariff question in seventies; Liberal convention of 1893; condemnation of protection system; campaign of 1911, 2430; reciprocity agreement; Liberal protectionists; the "great apostacy"; the "interests"; possible explanation of Liberal attitude, 2431; expediency of compromise; geographical considerations; examination of protective system without reference to locality or occupation; social versus individual advantage, 2432; trade a form of co-operation, not competition; protectionist philosophy; political boundaries and tariff walls, 2433; tariffs for revenue and protection; "plucking the goose with the least squawking"; direct and indirect taxes; protection by boundary dather than by tariff; encouragement of infant industries; protection of all industries impossible; favourable trade balance; international trade; cheap foreign labour; real and nominal wages; retaliatory tariffs, 2435; diversified industry; decadence of agriculture; effect on manufacturing industries; free raw material and lower labour costs; free trade and advantage to manufacturers; competition against old established industries, 2436; protective tariffs and monopoly; price-fixing combinations; has protection assisted Canadian manufacturers?; the system corrupting, demoralizing and indefensible; contributions to campaign funds; national existence and integrity, 2437; economic self-sufficiency; sentiment in favour of protection; public opinion distorted; quotation from Mr. J. A. Hobson, 2438; consumers not organized to protect themselves; Canadian Manufacturers' Association propaganda; objects of protection; how has the policy worked out?, 2439; loss of population; indictment of system by United Farmers of Ontario; war profiteering; revenue raising expedients, 2440; excess profits tax; no promise of relief in budget; taxes on consumption; sales tax, 2441; income and inheritance taxes; ability to pay, 2442; property tax; taxation of land value; 2443; increased production; booms and depressions; public works; credit control, 2445

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*

Business of the House

Estimates, consideration of, 3527

Mondays and Wednesdays, 1720

Business profits war tax, qu. 1657

Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1961

Cattle embargo, 991-992

Chamberlin, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3498

Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509

Coated papers, duty on, 3108

Condensed milk, tax, 3269

Contingencies, expenditures for, 415

Cotton fabrics, duty on, 3128

Debates, inaudibility of, 1755, 1996

Ford motor company, 3273

German importations, value of, 3228

Governor General's cars, 1688

Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2001

Hydrographic survey, 1746

Immigration

Passports, 3064

Salaries, 3499

Income war tax act, 3278

Indians

Medical attention, 1220

Six Nation reserve, 1222

Lambton, loss of, 3507

Live stock industry, 992

Military expenditures and policy, 1144

Naturalization expenses, 1671

Naval defence, obligation of Canada, 1745

Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1836

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3019

Pool selling, bookmaking, etc., 2973

Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515

Proportional Representation, M. for adoption, 1633

Public buildings, Ottawa

Elevator attendants, 1267

Expenditure, 1268

Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1485

Quebec harbour, parc St. Charles, 1470

Rail and car repair contracts, 1705

Railway policy, 1961

Root vegetables bill, potato grades, 3376

Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 843

Senate indemnity, 3509

Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436

Steamship subsidies, contracts, 3034, 3506

Supply, discussion, method of, 1142

Tariff amendments, 3238-9

Telegraph and Telephone lines, 2012

Tools, tax on, 3127

Good, Mr. W. C. — *Con.*
Unemployment
Causes of, 3526
Military expenditures, 1144
Relief, 3526
Wheat Board bill, 3187
Woollen goods, duty on, 3130

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Gordon, Sir Charles, 58, 200, 239, 1128
Genoa conference, 1715

Gordon, Mr. George N. (West Peterborough.)
See also Deputy Speaker
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., payments, qu. 2037

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer (Minister of Justice and Attorney General)
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 140. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; statements made in last general election, 140; Order in Council government, 141; Quebec fisheries; results of general election, 142
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
Senate amdts. 3611
Budget, 2654. Fiscal policy, protection and free trade; issue of the election campaign; Liberals not free traders; history of tariff legislation; Hon. Alex. Mackenzie; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, 2655; principles which have inspired Liberal party; fiscal policy of Government found in speeches of Prime Minister and Finance Minister, 2656; budget proposals in consonance with declarations of leaders, 2657; expenditure and debt; revenue necessities; manufacturing important factor in developing Canada, 2657; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier on encouragement of Canadian industries; progress of manufacturers since 1870; exodus during last ten years; investment in industrial establishments, 2658; grievances of the West; proposals for tariff reduction; strict economy needed; immigration policy; the amendment; no deception of electors, 2659; budget proposals consistent with Liberal promises
Canada Grain Act
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1133, 1841, 1932
Chamberlain, Mr. R. S., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills, 1841, 2830, 2973, 3607

Gouin, Hon. Sir Lomer — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Half-breed scrip, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth
M. for reference to Special Com., 1503
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3468-75
Senate amdts. 3615
Exchequer court
Admiralty vacancies, 1275
Estimates, 1274
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
M. for ref. to Special Com., 1502
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 424, 2830
Judges, Quebec, 3497
Justice department of,
Estimates, 1274, 1668
Litigated matters, 1276
Salaries, 451, 4395
Yukon territory, 1275
King v, Manitoba Grain Company, decision, 1133, 1841, 1932
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Nova Scotia Supreme Sourt, vacancy, 3437
Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276
Penitentiaries
Estimates, 1276
Inmates, foreign and native, 1279
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 545, 787
References to, 21, 26, 55, 206, 207, 239, 242, 243, 1128, 2679, 2682, 2718. *See also* Budget; Ministers and Directorships
Revenue and Audit Act Amdt. bill, 3042
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Estimates, 2129
Pensions, 2131
Soldiers' civil re-establishment bill, 3597
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2974
Supreme court estimates, 1274
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux expenses, 1669
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Gould, Mr. O. R. (Assiniboia)
Agriculture department
Officers, 650
Professionnal men, 589
Air force and civil aviation, Saskatchewan, 1724
Allan, Sir Montagu, 872
Bank, loans to directors, 1093
Bee-keeping, 592
Bienfait briquetting plant. *See under this title,* Lignite
Blankets, duty on, 3129

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Budget, 2711. Congratulation to Finance Minister; grievance of the West and its solution; briquetting plant at Bienfait, 2712-15; farmers and the income tax; excessive profits and watered stock; banks and credit, 2714; liquor exportation from Saskatchewan; banking system, 2716; cheque tax; national debt, 2717; taxation; Sir Lomer Gouin and protection; tariff on implements of production, 2718; inconsistent attitude of Conservatives towards tariff; a disappointing budget; failure of Government to carry out platform of 1919; similarity of Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2720; Liberals will not implement pledges, 2721
Civil service economy, 793
Clothes wringers, 3140
Criminal Code, carriage of calves, 2831
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Defence branches, amalgamation, 423
Departments, economy in, 458, 793
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Elevators, complaint of unfair dealing, 2987
Entomology, qu. 472, 590, 817
Export liquor warehouses, 768, 2716
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Grain Growers' Grain Company, 2489
Grasshopper plague, qu. 472, 590, 817
Harbours and rivers, expenditure, 1272
Harness, hides, prices, 3139
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 546
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, qu. 604, 1233, qu. 1632, 2712-15
Utilization board, 3524
Live stock, diseases, 650
Military district No. 12, 1176, 1602, 1987
Military expenditure and policy, 1148, 1175, 1610
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1175, 1600-10
Customs duties, 1978
Permanent force, 1982
Saving in, 418
Temporary clerks, 587
Transport and freight, 1987
Ministers and directorships, 1091
Ministers, salary increases, 1093
Ocean and river service, 3508
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3017

Gould, Mr. O. R. — *Con.*
Public Works, average salary, 750
Quarantine, 2021
Raw materials, duty on, 3131
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 839
Steamship subsidies, 3506
Woodmen of the World, 1905
Woollen goods, 3137

Government Departments
Co-ordination of, 180-181. *See also* National Defence
Payment to each other for services rendered, 1724

Government, Federal, responsibility for unemployment, 1069-94. *See also* Address; Budget; Unemployment

Government, group system of. *See* Proportional Representation

Government-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Government Printing. *See* Printing; Publications

Governor General
Cars, 1688
Deputy of the Governor General, 3610
Secretary's office, 751
Speech on opening of Parliament; new appointment as Governor General; world-wide economic disturbances and industrial depression; unemployment; decline in prices of farm products; Customs tariff revision; co-ordination of government railway systems, 6; immigration, 6-7; re-establishment and medical treatment of soldiers; natural resources of western provinces; co-ordination of defence forces; limitation of armaments; Genoa conference; Postal conference; need for economy, 7
Address in reply. *See that title*
Warrants, 1990
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711
Dominion Iron and Steel Corporation, contract for steel plates, 1677
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Expenditure by, 1353
Genoa Conference, 1716
Penitentiaries, 1670
Unemployment relief, 1719
Welland canal construction, 1687
Yukon territory, 1681

Grading of Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Graham, Hon. George P. (Minister of Militia and Defence and Minister of the Naval Service)
Air Board
Aeronautical research, 3499
Biggar, Colonel O. M., resignation, 1727
Estimates, 1722
Expenditure, details of, 1731
Air Board Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 2357, 2820
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Customs patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol, British Columbia, 1730
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Behring sea patrol, 1736
Business of the House
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742-5, 1900
Canadian institute for the blind, 3541
Canadian Northern, Sir Richard McBride, 202
Civil service salaries, 553
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1411-14
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Ford Motor Company, 3277
Government departments, payment to each other for services rendered, 1724
Gwatkin, General, 422. *See also under this title,* National Defence
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Insurance Act Amdt., 3147
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
Militia and Defence
Adjustment of war claims, 2974
Air force 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Amalgamation, saving, 417-18
Ammunition, reserve of, 2086
Annual drill, 1151, 1179, 1578
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Cadet services, 1972, 1978
Classification, 416
Civil Service Commission, and, 423
Defence forces, 1135
Director of assigned pay, 586
Engineer services and works, 1980
Estimates, 1711, 2974, 3498
Expenditure and policy, 1339
Reductions proposed by Minister, 1578
MacBrien, General, reported utterances of, 1662
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1136-52, 1982
Royal military college, 1985
Schools of instruction, 1985

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. — *Con.*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Temporary employees, 417
Topographic survey, 1985
Transport and freight, 1987
War claims, adjustment, 2098
Ministers and directorships, 1109
Money, purchasing power of, 1151-3
Municipal taxation, payment of by government, 1257
National Defence bill, 363, 417, 547
National Defence bill (No. 27) 644, 657, 668, 733, 746
Air Force, 678
Concurrence in Senate Amdts. 2806
Militia estimates, 421
Services, transfer to, 1747
Naval policy, 2043-72
Naval service
Estimates, 418, 420, 1735, 1843
Fisheries protection service, 678, 1747
Niobe, sale of, 2043-65
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 2043, 2058, 3365
Postponement of debate, 1972
Reduction of naval armaments, 1737
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Trawlers, 1844
War claims, adjustment, 1752
War medals, 1754
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Parents, support of by children, 1308
Pelagic sealing treaty, 1844
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Pensions
Northwest Rebellion, 3523
Widowed mothers', M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., criticism of, 2778
Rideau canal, 2766
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
Salaries, 775
Royal Canadian navy. *See under this title,* Naval Service
Royal naval college, Esquimalt, 2048
Salaries Act Amdt. bill, 363, 746
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3358
Special Loans bill, 3358
Supply, discussion, method of, 1142
Survey and map work, co-ordination of, 1986
War claims, exchange on, 1752
War memorials, 2098, 2100

Graham Miss Nora, qu. 599

Graham, Mr., agent at Regina, 682

Grain and Grain Trade. *See also* Address; Agriculture; Budget; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Acme Grain Company, default of, 2834
Banks and, 2246. *See also that title*
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2834
Canada Grain Act
Administration of, 2834
Constitutionality of, 2837
Decision of Manitoba Court of Appeal, 1132, 1841, 1932
Inquiry, 1770
Canadian National railways, grain leakages, 1401, 1930
Canadian Wheat Board, advance, 3541. *See also* Wheat Board
Car demurrage, 2981
Elevators
Private, 2981
Licenses to, 2838
System of, 114, 233
Terminal, 2980
Excess overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837
Fort William
Inspector, 2983
Port Arthur, and, overages, qu. 1210
Government, 233, qu. 3152
Grain Commission, and, 2980
Maintenance and equipment of, 2978
Quebec, 1466, 1471, 1474, 1483
United Grain Growers, 2983
Freight rates on grain, 146. *See also* Freight Rates
Grades, mixing of, 2839, 2981
Grain Board. *See* Wheat Board
Grain Growers and oleomargarine. *See* Oleomargarine
Grain Inquiry Commission, 49, qu. 705, 777, qu. 1181, 2839, 2842, 2982
Hyndman Commission, 2982
Secret session at Fort William, 2983
Terminal elevators, 2980
Grain leakages on Canadian National railways, 1401, 1930
Handling of. *See under this title,* Elevators; Transportation
Long hauls to market, 146-7
Manitoba Court of Appeal, decision. *See under this title,* Canada Grain Act
Mixing grades, 2839, 2981
In transit, 2838
Montreal harbour, shipment of grain through, 1489
Oats, price of, 225

Grain and Grain Trade — *Con.*
Overages, qu. 609, qu. 1401, 2837, 2838, 2980
Per capita production, 2159
Price fixed in Liverpool, 1203-08
Production and shipment, 1203
Quebec, shipment of grain through, 1466, 1471, 1472
Russia, competition of, 2157
St. Lawrence river waterway, 269, 1183, 1317, 1325. *See also that title*
Sample market, 2838
Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Co., 2989
Screenings, recleaned, 2490
Selling without growers' permission, 2989
Shipment. *See under this title,* Montreal; Quebec; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Shrinkage and leakage in transit, 232. *See also under this title,* Elevators
Speculation in, 158. *See also* Wheat Board Bill
Transcontinental railway, 2194
Transportation, 235, 300. *See also* Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Welland Canal
Water by, 69-70. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
United Grain Growers, terminal elevator, 2983
Wheat
Marketing, 2915, 2951, 2969. *See also* Wheat Board
Production and cost, 2333

Grain Growers Grain Company, alleged contribution to political organization, 2488

Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938

Grand Manan, wharves and breakwaters, 1993

Grand River bridge, qu. 1287

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grand Trunk Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Grape Juice, tax on, 2117, 2594, 2617

Grasshopper Plague, qu. 472, 2726, 3520

Gravel, Mr., Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Great Britain
British Preference. *See that title*
Free trade and, 2526. *See also* speeches on Budget

Great Britain — *Con.*
Imports from, qu. 966. *See also* Imports and Exports; Trade
Income tax reductions, 2860
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368
Merchant Marine, 2379
Protection of industries, 2408-9
Tariff legislation, 2267
Trade with. *See* British Preference; Trade

Great Lakes, life-saving service, qu. 367

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great Lakes Tidewater Association, 1319. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Great War Veterans' Association. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill; Returned Soldiers
Cash grants to soldiers, policy on, 394. *See also* Soldiers Bonus
Charges against Pensions Board, 3041. *See also* Pensions
Housing credits, 3524
Immigration, 2155
Oleomargarine, 1798
Oriental immigration, 1514

Greece
Commission on credit to, 303
Loan, qu. 1400

Grey, Lord, letter to Governor General on military protection, 1136

Griffenhagen and Associates, 1490. *See also* Civil Service, Classification
Montreal post office, 1633
Post office inspectors, 1507

Grimmer, Mr. R. W. (Charlotte)
Charlotte County, Mr. Todd's election promises, 1997
Grand Manan, Campobello and Deer islands, wharves and breakwaters, 1993-7
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1993
Patrol boat Phalarope, qu. 1503
St. George public building, 1240
Sardines, price for export, qu. 1182

Grosse Isle quarantine station, 2021

Guernsey Island of, credit system, 2505

Gulf of St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Company, qu. 1400

Gutelius, Mr. F. P., 192

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (South Wellington)
Air Board
Biggar, Col. O. M., resignation of, 1726
Expenditure, 1725
Details of, 1730
Air Service, forest patrol, 1047
Ammunition, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-68-73
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3025
British Ministry of Shipping, claim, 1752
Budget, 2874. Amended resolutions, 2874; depreciated currency, valuation of, 2875; trade with Germany; pocket knives; effect of Minister's proposal, 2876; marking of goods, effect of repeal; German aluminum goods; German agents seeking orders in Canada; Canadian valuation of German goods; favourable position of German manufacturers; anti-dumping clause; fruit industry, 2879; marking of goods; government by Order in Council, 2880
Burstall, Sir Henry, 742-3
Business of the House
Point of order, bill ref. to Com., 1395
Saturday sittings, 2032
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2997
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian National Railways, enlisted men, allowance, 3519
Census, completion of, 1364
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Carriage of calves, 2831
Scrip frauds, 1396
(Mr. Woodsworth) 1395
Criminal Code, revision, 1717
Criminal Code and Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Demobilization, 1155
Expenditure for, 1163
Vote, 1171
Departmental solicitors, 683
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Women of foreign birth, enfranchisement, 476
Dominion lands and surveys, 1035, 1038
Topographic survey, 1043, 1986
Dominion observatory building, 1266
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women M. (Mr. Euler) 476
Escheats Act. Amdt. bill, 2829, 3026
Finance, loans, 771
Govt. departments, payments to each other, 1726

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh — *Con.*
Govt. publications, demand, 1374
Gwatkin, Major-General, 742
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1997
Amdt. to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Nova Scotia, expenditure, 1269
Ontario, Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1988
Quebec, 1999
Hospital ship, claim for loss of, 2976
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Immigration of farm workers, 3052
Indian Affairs, officials, 683
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 2830
Labour dept., salary increases, 564
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Military expenditures, 1138
Militia and Defence
Ammunition,
Reserve of, 2086
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
Annual drill, 1154, 1155
Artillery ammunition from Great Britain, 1154-73
Liberal attitude in 1920, 1921, and 1922, 1154
Arsenals, Lindsay, 2085
Cadet services, 1972, 1977
Expenditure and policy, 1594
Permanent force, 1983
Reduction of staff, 586
Topograpric survey, 1043, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2976
Ministers and directorships, 1094
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Munitions, shipment from Great Britain, 1154-73
National Defence, Department of, bill, 659, 738, 1747
Bill should be preceded by resolution, 547
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval policy, 2051
Naval service
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Royal Canadian navy, 1846, 1972
Royal naval college, 2049
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Parliament buildings, 2014
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 787
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Progressive party, attitude towards redistribution, 1364

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—Con.
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1238
Ontario, 1251, 1259
Public Service Retirement Act, 3025
Public Works estimates, 964, 747
Contingency vote, 748
Reductions, 698
Quebec harbour advances, 1473
Redistribution and the census, 1364
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Dept.
Amalgamation or abolition of, 1340
Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717
Steamship services, 2020, 3505
Survey and map work, proposed co-ordination, 1033, 1986
Toronto harbour improvement, 1474
War claims, adjustment
Naval service, 1752
Vickers, 2976
War medals, 2977
War memorials, Vimy, 2100
Warlike stores, sale of, 1171
Wheat Board, 2968
Wrangel island, 1751
Yukon territory, 1034
Radiotelegraph service, 1750

Gwatkin, Major-General, 421, 422, 742, qu. 1211. *See also* National Defence bill

Halbert, Mr. Robert H. (North Ontario)
Campbell, Mr. Alex., qu. 606
Cattle embargo, Mr. Doherty, 989
Customs tariff, ploughs, 3231
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., qu. 704
Hatters' plush, duty on, 3141
Labour dept., employees, 566
Lake of the Woods bill, 2309
Lindsay arsenal, 1979
Military expenditure and policy, 1179
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1179
Expenditure and policy, 1597, 1617, 1984
Permanent force, 1984
Plough parts, duty on, 3123, 3231
Riordon Company, taxes, qu. 607, qu. 927
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3373-4

Half Breed Scrip, Frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Halifax. *See also* Naval Service
Dennis building, qu. 3360
Fortifications, 1581
Ocean terminals, qu. 364
Ocean tonnage, 2008

Halifax — *Con.*
Patronage committee, 199
Port of. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Public buildings, expenditures, 1244
Quarantine station, repairs, 1238, 2021

Halkett, Mr. Andrew, 3051

Hamilton
Post office building, 1246-51, 1258
Queenston-Hamilton highway, qu. 471

Hammell, Mr. W. J. (Muskoka)
Parry Sound lighthouse inspector, qu. 827

Haney, Mr. M. J., contracts, 1375

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 192-3, qu. 471. *See also* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Hanna-Medicine Hat line, 1965

Hansard. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. (York-Sunbury)
Alcohol for druggists, 3242
Business of the House, Saturday sittings, 2033
Canada Temperance Act, 2024
Caraquet and Gulf Shore Railway Co., 1183, qu. 1504
Coal
Anthracite, importations, qu. 2356
Public buildings, for, 1763
Defence, deputy ministers, 419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Edmundston public building, 1239, 1251
Election promises in Charlotte County, N.B., 1994
Experimental farms, 795
External Affairs, contingencies, 3509
Graham, Miss Nora, qu. 699
Harbours and rivers
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
High Commissioner, 414
Indians, Devon band, removal, 1215
Insurance premiums, tax, 3256
International operation of railways, 192
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Justice department, contingencies, 1669
Labour investigators, 462
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647
Matches, tax on, 3262
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia and defence
Military property at Fredericton, 1980
Transport and freight, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1987

Hanson, Mr. Richard B. — *Con.*
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1256
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nickel coin blanks, qu. 3152
Nova Scotia
Coal strike, 461
Supreme court vacancy, 3436
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Pension Board, appeals, 391
Post Office Dept.
Printing and stationery, 691
Reorganization, 2800
Rural delivery, 2800
Provincial wharves, New Brunswick, 1991
Public buildings, Maritime provinces, 1243
Public Works estimates, 693
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Reid Newfoundland railway, 2027
Root Vegetable bill, 3369
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 735
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Acquisition by Canadian National railways, qu. 1774
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, survey, 2768
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept.
Salary increases, 391
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers' homes, establishment of, 1348
Sorel shipyard, qu. 605
Statistics, Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Steamship services, 2029, 3506
War trophies, director, 702
Wharves in tidal waters, qu. 2209
White slave traffic, suppression of, 3497

Harbour Masters. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.

Harbours. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway. For individual Harbours, *see their titles*
Advances to. *See* Montreal, Quebec and Harbour Commission bills

Harbours and Rivers
Alberta, 2004, 3547
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Esquimalt, 3541
Estimates, 1269, 1765, 1988, 3541
Expenditures on, 1465
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Little Current, 2002
Manitoba, 2003, 3545

Harbours and Rivers — *Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commission, employees, 1289. *See also* Montreal Harbour Commission bill
New Brunswick, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce item by $20,000, 1998
Provincial wharves, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1765, 3545
Expenditure, 1921-22, 1269
Ontario, 1999
Port Arthur and Fort William, 3541
Prince Edward Island, 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1283. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
St. John
Expenditure, qu. 1401
Improvement, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Shuswap lake, wharf, 3547
Toronto, 3541

Harding, President, 69
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 133, 1184

Hardy, Hon. Senator, A. C., 2695

Harris, Mr. Joseph H. (East York)
Address in reply, 307. Liberals and Progressives, 307; immigration; railway policy; 308; manufacturers and raw material, 309
Aliens, taxation of transient, 2155
Customs department, secretaries, 764
Foreigners, 2155
Hog cholera, garbage feeding, 1007-9, 1028
Immigration
Policy, 2154
Undesirable, 2154
Insurance premiums, tax, 3258
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Militia and defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3464
Pensions Com., final report, 3350
Public buildings, Ontario, repairs, 1250

Harvest Excursions, 337

Hatfield, Mr. Paul L. (Yarmouth and Clare)
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Rural postmasters, 3080

Hatters' Bands, Plush, and bindings, 2855, 3139, 3141

Hawaian Islands, Japanese immigration, 1515

Health. *See also* Immigration; Indians; Tuberculosis
Department
Estimates, 2017
Salaries, etc., 775
Diseases, infectious of prisoners. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Honey, 2017
Housing, and, 121. *See also* Housing
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021. *See also* Immigration
Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act Amdt. bill
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Quarantine, 2021
Unemployment, 86-87
Venereal diseases, qu. 935, 2022

Health of Animals. *See* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases

Hearst Publications, 3111

Herring, Dry-salting. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Hides, price of, 2623, 3138

High Commissioner in London, 58
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Cattle embargo, and. *See also that title*
Alleged statement on, 1020, 1463
Income and taxation, 139
Salaries, etc., 413

High Cost of Living. *See* Cost of Living

High River, Alta.
Aerial Forest patrol, 1050, qu. 1066, 1723

Highways, 63, 75, 122
Banff-Windermere, 1051, 1681
Biggs, Hon. F. C., 63
Dundas Street, Halton county, qu. 1065
Edith Cavell, 1051
Grand Circle tour, 1683
Hamilton-Queenston, qu. 471
Indian reserves, 1216
Isle Perrot bridge, qu. 1377
Ontario, qu. 372
Ottawa-Kingston, qu. 1904, 2794
Ottawa-Pembroke, qu. 1661, 2794
Ottawa-Prescott, treeplanting, qu. 2039
Road materials, investigation, 1234
Road projects, submitted, qu. 2040
St. Thomas-Niagara Falls, qu. 936
Soulanges canal road, 2768
Tourist traffic and, 1682
Transcontinental, 319, 2636

Highways — *Con.*
Transportation, 1939
Unemployment relief, 1082
Windermere road, 1051, 1681

Hikers. *See* Macdonald's Army; Riley's Army

Historic Sites, 119. *See also* Battlefields Monuments, qu. 469

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 785
American magazines, importation of, 3108-09, 3112
Budget, 2675. Expected modifications in budget proposals, 2675; taxes on cheques, confectionery and cigars; sales tax and cost of living; dissatisfaction of Agrarian party with budget; tariff record of Liberal party; pledges and promises broken, 2676; reduction in agricultural implement duties; protection and the maintenance of industries; record of Conservative party; inconsistencies of Liberals; Mr. Blake's Malvern speech; his letter to West Durham electors, 2677; unrestricted reciprocity; commercial union; Mr. Fielding's disavowal of tariff items of Liberal platform; concealment of views on public questions; reciprocity; government created by big interests, 2678; big business behind Sir Lomer Gouin, 2679; Proposed coalition of Agrarians and Liberals; national railways; responsibility for railway building, 2680; effort to form Liberal-Progressive government; progressives and reactionary factions in government; Minister of Marine and Fisheries; conflicting opinions in Liberal ranks; national railways; speech of Minister of Justice; full value for support of big interests; protection; diversified industries, 2682; relief from burdens not to be had through tariff reduction; feeling between East and West; rural depopulation of Ontario; agricultural conditions; manufacturers in unsatisfactory position, 2683; amenities of rural life, 2684
Canada's credit, 1919
Canadian National railways, deficits, 1919
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1298
Empire-Ascension Days, adjournment, 1905
Finance, deputy minister's salary, 752

Hocken, Mr. H. C. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Income taxes, qu. 705
Labour dept.
Mr. Harrison, 575-6
Promotions, 576
McDonald, Mr. John N., qu. 3361
Military expenditure, 1137
Military hospitals, expenditure, 1261
Public buildings
Expenditure, 1261
Flags, 1265
Water, 1266
Public works estimates, 747, 748, 1261
Reciprocity, Mr. Putnam, 2286
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 833
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1314
Welland canal, and, 2754
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 388, 398
Toronto Suburban railway, qu. 2456
Welland ship canal, 2754

Hodgins, Mr. A. L. (East Middlesex)
Animal contagious diseases, 2103
Telegraph and telephone lines, 2013
Water powers, surveys, 1051

Hoey, Mr. R. A. (Springfield)
Budget, 2331. Financial obligations; precarious position of agriculture; Canadian workman, purchasing power; unemployment, 2331; Western Canada; statements prepared by Manitoba Agricultural College staff; wheat production and cost, 2332; farmers' profits compared with those of other businesses, 2333; probable permanency of conditions; rural discontent; the solution, 2334; drastic tariff reductions; lower freight rates, wider markets; tendency to lean on government, 2335; protection and the agricultural industry; Fordney tariff; opportunity for reductions in Canadian tariff; Genoa Conference; Mr. Lloyd George and spirit of nationalism; source of revenue; development of basic industries, 2337; the amendment, 2338; broken promises; tariff commission; redistribution; party system of government, 2339
Census, completion of, 1365
Cost of living, 1175, 2331
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Immigration statistics, 756-7
Labour dept., salaries, 551

Hoey, Mr. R. A. — *Con.*
Military expenditure and policy, 1175
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1175
Quebec arsenal, 2097
Ministers and directorships, 1111
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Winnipeg river, bridge, 2011

Hogs
Cholera. *See also* Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases bill; Health of Animals
Compensation, 1028
Extermination of, 2594
Grading, 2594

Holiday on Election Day. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill

Holland, immigration from, 2144

Holland, Lee, order for deportation of, 1283

Holland, Major, death of, 2821

Holstein Cattle trade with United States in, 2695

Holt, Sir Henry, 1128

Home Brewing. *See* Inland Revenue

Home . Markets. *See* Budget; Markets; speeches on Address

Homesteads. *See* Dominion Lands; Immigration; Soldiers' Land Settlement
Re-entry, 1041

Honey, 2017

Honorary Advisory Council of Industrial and Scientific Research. *See* Industrial and Scientific Research

Horse Power. *See* Electric Power; Water Power

Horse Racing, Federal control of, 2596

Horses. *See* Live Stock

Hose, Captain. *See* Naval Service

Hosmer, Mr. Charles R., 1128

Hospital Ships
Claim by British Ministry of Shipping for loss, 2975
Exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act

House of Commons. *See also* Deputy Speaker; Speaker
Acoustics, 1053, 1751, 3544, 3612. *See also under this title,* Audibility of Debates
Adjournments
Easter, 546, 820, 823
Empire day and Ascension day, 1760, 1769, 1905
To discuss matter of urgent public importance
M. (Mr. Irvine) Nova Scotia miners, 497; withdrawn, 545
Audibility of debates, 385, 411, 658, 708, 1053, 1578, 1721, 1751, 1755, 1996, 2831, 3544, 3613
Bills, money, to be preceded by res, 547
Business of the House
Budget debate, probable date of conclusion, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Further legislation, 2996, 3041, 3103, 3151, 3364-5
Government orders, Mondays and Wednesdays, 1460, 1719
Private members', 1719
Public accounts, closing of, 1210
By-elections. *See under this title* Vacancies
Chamber, acoustics. *See under this title,* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Committees, Select Standing, 8, 323. For proceedings and reports, *See* titles of the several Committees
Changes in, 497, 545, 596, 871, 1398
Powers of, 326
Criminal Code, reprinting of, 1717
Debates
Audibility of. *See under this title* Acoustics; Audibility of Debates
Official Report of
Committee
Appointed, 325
First report, 1132, 1258
Second report, 3359
Incorporation of documents not read, 1539, 3526
Tabulated statements in answer to questions, 1132, 1660
Decorum
Conversation, 1755, 2640
Courteous bearing to member speaking, 2090
Deputy Speaker, election of, 363. *See also that title*
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5
Divisions
Budget
Amdt. to Amdt. (Mr. Crerar), ruling of Mr. Speaker on, 2523

House of Commons — *Con.*
Divisions — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton), neg. 2912
Correction of division list, 2971; Corrected list, 2972
M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. of Ways and Means, agreed to, 2913
Crowsnest Pass Agreement
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) and amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) 1457-8
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, amdt. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1163
Freight Rates, amdt. (Sir Henry Drayton) to M. (Mr. Maclean, Halifax) for adoption of third report of Special Com. on Transportation Costs, 3586
Lake of the Woods Regulation bill, 3435
Ministers and Directorships, M. (Mr. McMaster) neg. 1131
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and Importation, discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) neg. 1840
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) and amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) 1577
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) neg. 843
Soldiers' Bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) neg. 450
Estimates, 2026. *See also that title*
Discussion of particular item on M. to go into Com. of Supply, 1337
Expenditure, qu. 2583
Expense of sittings and cost per hour, 1476, 2170, 2635
Hansard. *See under this title,* Debates, Official Report of
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Indemnity
Payment of, 361
Proposed reduction, 2513, 2690, 2895, 3613
Internal Economy Commission, 8
Members
Attendance of, 2513
Deceased
Baker, the late Colonel G. H., memorial to, 1929
McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Argenteuil) 39
New
Election and introduction of
Bouchard, Mr. Georges (Joseph) 1929
King, Hon. J. H., 496
Ouimet, Joseph Rodolphe, 323
Private, business of, 1719

House of Commons — *Con.*
Members — *Con.*
Speeches, length of, 2450, 2635
Ministers and directorships. *See that title*
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar) 2473, 2507
Speaker's ruling, 2519
Non-debatable
That Com. rise, 1181
Oleomargarine (Mr. Neill) time fixed for discussion, 1719
Redistribution, M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion, 1719
Supply in, 1579
Orders for returns. *See under this title,* Returns
Orders of the Day
Right of member to raise qu. of privilege, 2638
Pairs. *See under this title,* Divisions
Petitions, Birnie, Mr. Alex. and others, 1929
Privilege
Baxter, Hon. Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3492
Caldwell, Mr. — Carleton, N.B., returning officer, 3602
Copp, Hon. Mr. — Correction of report respecting War claims, 1721
Crerar, Hon. Mr. — Budget debate, agricultural figures quoted in, 2637
Deslauriers, Mr. — Correction of speech, 3365-6
Fielding, Hon. Mr. — Clerk Assistant, 687
Gauvreau, Mr. — Statement of Miss Macphail, 3221
Hoey, Mr.—Denial of newspaper reports. 2458
Johnston, Mr. (Last Mountain) — Charge that Progressives are delaying budget debate, 2692
Kay, Mr. — Wheat Board, 872
Maclean, Mr. (York) — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Right of member to raise qu. on orders of the day, 2638
Questions
Lengthy answers to, 1660
Tabulated statements in official report of debates, 1132
Returns
Inquiry for, 1283, 1988, 2042
Questions requiring tabulated answers, 1132
Rules, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Senate, and, expenditure, qu. 2583
Sergeant-at-Arms
Parliamentary messengers, qu. 1376, 1335

House of Commons — *Con.*
Sittings
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, 1769
Saturday, 1905, 2032, 2458
Suspended, 3611-14
Wednesday at 3 p.m., 49
Wednesday evenings, 1905, 2033, 2170
Speaker. *See that title*
Speeches, length, 2450, 2635
Staff
Chief accountant, salary, qu. 2583, qu. 2803
Chief of stationery division, 3608
Law branch, 2304
Organization, 3221
Amended, 1335
Reading room, assistant curators, 1335
Stenographers and messengers, pay, qu. 1376
Statutes, reprinting of, 1717
Supply
Amendment to amendment, 1579
Discussion of particular item of estimates on M. to go into Supply, 1337
Motion, movers of, 1579
Motion for, latitude in discussion, 2238
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459

House of Commons and Senate Act Amdt. bill. *See* Ministers and Directorships; Salaries Act Amdt.

Housing, 121, 219, 774, 3524. *See also* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment
Building costs, 2417
Returned soldiers, for, 271, 3304, 3314, 3321-22, 3329, 3332. *See also that title*
Shortage of, 1072
Unemployment, and, 3524

Howe, Hon. Joseph, 1387

Hubbs, Mr. John (Prince Edward)
Alcohol tax, retail druggists, 1213

Hudson, Mr. A. B. (South Winnipeg)
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444
Immigration-Criminal Code bills, 3283
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3199, 3210

Hudson's Bay Company
Northwest country and, 148
Supplies to northern Indians, 1712

Hudson Bay Railway, 2602
Completion of, 2779

Hudson Bay Railway — *Con.*
Hudson Bay
Navigability and fishery resources of, 2781, 2779-99
Port Nelson, 1970
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1208, 1325
Senate committee, report, 2781

Hueston, Captain, inquiry into death of, qu. 2993, 3314

Hughes, Mr. J. J. (King's P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 224. Reciprocity and class legislation, 224; immigration and unemployment, 225; Prince Edward island markets and government inspection; income tax, administration of Act, 226; sales tax; daylight saving; eight-hour day and farmers, 227; labour unions; railways and the maritime provinces, 228
Administration, economy in, 3077-8
Budget, 2225. Financial situation, debt, expenditure, economy; borrowings, 2225; the amendment, 2226; income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227; sales tax; extravagant war expenditures, 2228; Wartime Elections Act, 2229
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1925, 1956
Canned goods, inspection of, 3049
Civil Service Commission, 3076
Civil Service, economy, 2060
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1989
Income tax, comparison with systems in other countries, 2227
Military expenditures and policy, 1143
Militia, annual drill, 1144
Montague, P.E.I., post office building, 1264
Railway policy, 1956

Humane Society, Criminal Code Amdt., 2831

Humphrey, Mr. L. W. (West Kootenay)
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1526
Pension Board, charges against, 2994
Postal revenue, qu. 2040
Remuneration of railway employees — Mr. McCrea, 2316

Hungary, Treaty with, 3359, 3490, 3547. For Bill, *See* Peace Treaties

Hutterites. *See* Immigration

Hydro Electric, 632, 1326, 1937, 2327, 2747. *See also* Electrification; Maclean, Mr. (York); St. Lawrence River Waterway; Water Powers
Commission, 1937
Difference with Ontario Government, 1080
Power development in Ontario, 63, 71, 131, 1950
St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1188-9. *See also that title*

Hydrographic Survey, 1736, 1746. *See also* Naval Service

Hyndman Commission. *See* Grain Inquiry Commission

Ice-breakers
Claim of Canadian Towing & Wrecking Co., 1677
Repurchase of, 1490
Thunder Bay, at, 1677
Vickers company contract, 320

Iceland, immigration from, 2144

Immigration, 6-7, 56, 79, 80, 82, 88, 145, 164, 182, 236, 282, 297, 311, 336, 348, 2243, 2254. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Labour; Oriental Aliens; Unemployment
Advantages, 2516
Agents,
Bonus to, 3062
Promises by, 3058, 3063
Agricultural labourers, 297, 2143, 2161, 2193, 2514, 3053-5
Agriculture, condition and prospects, 2147
Alien enemies, 2146
Asiatic. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Attitude towards the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
British, 2144, 2150, 2515
Artisans, 2258, 2516
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Buildings, repairs, etc., 1757
Bukowinians, 2159
Canadian National railways, and, 1927
Canadians emigrating, qu. 1182. *See also under this title,* Emigration
Central European, 2154-8, 2166, 2477
Child, 2144, 2148, 2153, 2161, 2163, 3063
Chinese, 2026. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Commissioner at Canton, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

Immigration — *Con.*
Classes prohibited after May 9, 2514
Crime, and, 1392-4, 2517
Deportation. *See* Immigration-Criminal Code Bills (Mr. Woodsworth)
Aliens trafficking in drugs, 2019
Desirable, 3057
Domestic servants, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Doukhobors, 167, 2160
Eastern Canada, 2165
Eastern Europe, 80
Emigration from Canada, 2260, 2372, 2516, 2865. *See also* Population
Canadians, qu. 1182
Exodus from Canada, 2478, 2516
Losses through, 2516
Record of, 2158
Europe, from, 308. *See also under this title,* Central European
Follow up policy, 2160
Foreign-born and crime, 1392-4, 2517
Galicians, 2159
Great Britain, from, 2480
Growth of wealth under, 13
Highland family, alleged unjust treatment of, 2145
Holland, 2144
Holland, Lee, deportation of, 872, 1282
Household workers, 2143, 2514, 3053-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Icelandic, 2144
Industrial centres, from, 236
Inspection, 2143
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 1711
Italian, 2171
Japanese. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Land, speculation in, 2152-9
Language qualification, 2515
Literature, Ontario Government, 2566
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2151, 2153, 2518
Manitoba Liberal Convention, res. 2478
Maritime provinces, and, 2165
Meals for immigrants, qu. 2971
Medical inspection, 2021, 2143
Mennonites, qu. 723, 2160, 3060
Emigration to Mexico, qu. 732, 2160
Mentally unfit, 2145
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148, 2208, 3058
Montreal Board of Trade res. 2517
"Nomination system", 3056
Oriental, 319, 2143. *See also* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)
Asiatic, 173, qu. 732
British Columbia in, 167

Immigration — *Con.*
Oriental — *Con.*
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction of, qu. 1289, qu. 1399
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Oriental Aliens, 319. *See that title*
Poland, 2145
Policy
Criticisms, 2579
Minister's statement, 17, 2143, 2476, 2481
Physically fit, 3055-6
Printers, 3055
Problems of, 350
Qualifications, 2479
Quebec, facilities at, 1465
Racial groups, 236
Assimilation, of, 2517
Rate of, 269
Reception of the immigrant, 2151, 2157, 2160
Regulations, 249-250, 2148, 2215, 2513-14
Res. of Manitoba Liberal Convention, 2478
Restricted, 167, 2513-14, 3056
St. John immigration buildings, 2027
Scandinavian, 2144
Shandro's plan, 2153
Sifton, Sir Clifford, and, 268
Undesirable, 1389, 2154
Ukrainians, 3061
Unemployment, and, 151, 182, 225, 1071. *See also that title*
Union of Canadian municipalities resolution, 236, 2155
United States, from, 658, 2147, 2150, 2162, 2477. *See also that title*
Work, lack of, 251. *See also under this title*, Unemployment

Immigration Act
Disqualification of British-born under, 1389-91

Immigration Act Amdt. bills
1. Trial by jury, deportation, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1r., 364; 2r., 493, 864
Ref. to Special Com., 1388-94, 1502
Additions to Special Com., 1719
Special Com. reports, 1988, 2519, 3104, 3156.. *See also* Criminal Code bill (Mr. Woodsworth)
Final report, 3280
M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to refer back, 3282-83
Amdt. neg. 3286
M. (Mr. Archambault) to concur
M. agreed to, 3286
(Subjects and sections discussed)

Immigration Act Amdt. bills — *Con.*
Trial by jury — *Con.*
Arrest without warrant, 1390
Assumption of powers of government, 1391
British subject, naturalization of, 1391
Decision of immigration authorities, 1389
Deportation of British subject without trial, 1390
Domicile, 1389
Enemy aliens, 1389
Foreigners, 1392
Organized Government, disbelief in, 1389
Overt acts and thoughts, 1390
Prohibited or undesirable classes, 1389
Repeal of provisions of 1919 Act, 1392
Retroactive legislation, 1391
Trial by jury, 1388
2. Intending Immigrants to make written application. (Mr. Neil) 1r., 2207

Immigration and Colonization Department
Civil government estimates, 3499
Contingencies, 3051
Deputy Minister, qu. 2970
Estimates, 1711, 2026 2143, 3499
Representative at Canton, China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214
Salaries, etc., 754, 3502

Imperial Conference. *See also* Conferences; Prime Minister Conference
Naval defence, 1864

Imperial Convention of Teachers, grant, 1673

Imperial Council, qu. 2803

Imperial Defence. *See* National Defence bills

Imperial Forces, pensions. *See* Pensions

Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237

Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire, 2517

Implements. *See* Agricultural Implements

Imported Goods, marking of. *See* Budget; Customs; Imports

Imports and Exports. *See also* Budget; Customs; Germany; Trade
Agricultural figures, 209, 2618-19
Automobiles and parts, qu. 1633. *See also that title*
British goods, qu. 966
Via United States, qu. 375
By countries, 2109
Coal for public buildings, 1759
Duties, 2668. *See also* Customs

Imports and Exports — *Con.*
Exports
Decrease, 2579
Fiscal years, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu. 1376
Restriction of exports, 2883
United States, to, 209. *See also* United States
1911-1922, qu. 1661
Germany, from, 2421, 2644. *See* Germany
Marking, 2113, 3476-7. *See also* Customs
Meat, of, qu. 610
Quantity, and, value of, 2182
Revenue from, qu. 827
Statement for last three years, 2109
Structural steel, qu, 1931
Valuation, 2113, 3413
For duty, amended regulation, 2854

Income Tax. 2174, 2220, 2691, 2693. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation; Ways and Means
Administration of, 226, 2024
Aliens, non-residents, 1301
Amount collected, qu. 366
Average, by classes, 2298
Banks, payments by, 1400
Branch, appointments to, 1663
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Civil Service retirement fund, qu. 937
Classification of taxpayers, 1063
Collections, 60
In 1919-20-21, qu. 1063
Manufacturers, from, 60
Commercial travellers, 2174, 3484. *See also* Income War Tax Act Amdt.
Comparison with systems of other countries, 2227
Exemptions, 2275
Farmers, and, 352, 2714
Great Britain, reductions in, 2860
Inequalities, 2672
Inquiry for legislation, 3103
Montreal office employees, qu. 607, 1288
Payments by grades, qu. 3362
Revenue and classification of taxpayers, 1063, qu. 1399
By provinces, qu. 705, qu. 1340
Winnipeg, qu. 1340
Riordon Paper Company, qu. 927
St. John, N.B., office, qu. 826
Systems in other countries, 2227
Widows and widowers, 2174

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res. 3478; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
Sections and subjects discussed:
Banks not entitled to deductions, 3485

Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill — *Con.*
Sections and Subjects discussed — *Con.*
Exemptions, 3359
Children, 3484
Forms, 3486
Non-resident aliens
M. (Mr. German) 1301, agreed to, 1303
Taxation of American citizens, 3485
Travelling expenses of trainmen and commercial travellers, 3485

Indecent Assault. *See* Criminal Code

Indebtedness. *See* Budget; Finance; Loans; Public Debt

Indemnity of Members. *See* House of Commons

Index, Unrevised Edition. *See* House of Commons, Debates

Indian Act Amdt. bill (Enfranchisement of Indians; Ownership of land)
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3191; 3r., 3194

Indian Affairs, Department of
Estimates, 1214, 1712, 3536
Salaries, etc., 681

Indians
Agents. *See also under this title,* Reserves
Oka, 1217
Sturgeon Falls, qu. 1285
Agitation and unrest, 1223
British Columbia, 1713
Lands, 330
Legal expenses, 3536
Bryce, Dr. Peter H., pamphlet, 1220, 1224
Complaints, 1223
Destitute, relief for, 1712-14
Edmonton school, proposed, 1227-9, 3536
Education, 1227, 1715, 3536
Edmonton school, 1227-9, 3536
Elkhorn school, 3537
Morley school, 1218, 3536
Red Deer school, 1229
Round Lake school, 3537
Stony reserve, qu. 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Enfranchisement. *See* Indian Act Amdt.
Expenditure, 1216, 1225
Field and garden seeds, 1712
Food allowance, 1220
General expenses, 1226, 1712
Greater production campaign, 1216-20, 1224, 1288
Half-breed scrip frauds, 148-9. *See also* Criminal Code
Health, 1220, 1230
Hospitals and medical attention, 1218-24, 1713

Indians — *Con.*
Janse brothers, land in Ermineskins reserve, 1713
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and northwest, 1218
New Brunswick, 1215
Nova Scotia, 1214
Number in Canada, 685
Ontario and Quebec, 1216
Potlach Institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Indians serving gaol sentences for, 1578, 1721
Reserves
Blackfoot, 1224
Greater production, 1288
Pasture land, qu. 2215
Blood, 1219
Land leased, qu. 2969
Devon band, proposed removal, 1215
Ermineskins, 1712
Keeseekoose-Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Oak lake and Pipestone, 1223
Oka, Indian agent, 1217
St. Peters, qu. 472
Saskatchewan, qu. 608
Six Nation, 1220-1
Stony, 1218
Education, qu. 965, 1227, 3536
Sydney
Medical attendance, qu. 2216
Proposed transfer, 1215
Tobique, illegal cutting of timber, 1233
Settlers. *See* Indian Act Amdt. bill
Smallpox and other diseases, 1714. *See also under this title,* Health
Treaty No. 11, 1219, 1227
Tuberculosis, 1714
Yukon, 1226

Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372

Industrial Conference. *See* National Industrial Conference

Industrial Depression, 6. 10, 52, 85, 105, 210, 212, 218, 219, 223, 235. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade

Industrial Disputes. *See* Labour
Investigation Act, 1054, 1058. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners

Industrial Re-establishment. *See* Labour; Returned Soldiers; Unemployment

Industrial Warfare. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Industries. *See also* Address; Budget; Trade
Basic and secondary, 2384
Boot and shoes, cost of labour, 2350

Industries — *Con.*
Canadian, encouragement, 2658. *See also* Budget
Exhibitions of industrial products in France, 2031
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1289, 1396
Home, 2149, 2229. *See also* Budget
Key, 2379
Infant, encouragement, 2434
Manufacturing, 2377
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Protection and maintenance of, 144, 2677, 2409-11
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1318
Subsidizing, 2402
United States, branches in Canada, 2389, 2546
Woollen, cost of labour, 2350

"Industry and Humanity", reference to, 253, 534

Infant Mortality, 1380, 2634

Infectious Diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Inglis Boiler Works, qu. 732

Inheritance Tax. *See this title under* Taxation

Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill (Excise duties changed). Res. 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Sections and subjects discussed:
Alcohol for druggists, 3241
Beet sugar, 3246
Amdt. (Mr. Fansher) negatived, 3252
Cigars and cigarettes, 3239
Home brewing, 3141, 3142, 3252
Molasses, 3242
Raw leaf tobacco, 3241
Sugar, 3242

Inquiry for Returns. *See* House of Commons, Returns

Insect Pests. *See* Agriculture; Destructive Insect and Pest Act; Grasshoppers

Inside Service. *See* Civil Service

Inspection and Sale of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Insular Dominions. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Insurance
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 605
Canadian National railway, qu. 471, qu. 610

Insurance — *Con.*
Claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance
Fire prevention, 794
Foreign companies, tax, 2462
Fraternal benefit societies, 3143
Mutual companies, 3477. *See also* Special War Revenue
Premiums, tax on, 2117
Returned Soldiers, 3306, 3313. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers Insurance bill
Beneficiaries, 3328
Returns. *See* Special War Revenue bill
Soldiers, etc., 791
The People's Insurance Act, Great Britain, 1304
Unemployment, 1069-84
Sickness, and old age, qu. 1375
Woodmen of the World, 1905

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3143; 3r., 3148; Senate admts. 3607

Inter-Allied Permanent Committee on Disabled Soldiers, 3403

Intercolonial Railway. *See that title under* Canadian National Railways

Interest, 1921. *See also* Banks; Finance; Loans; Money

Interim Supply. *See also* Estimates; Supply
Committee, 378, 598
One-fourth vote suggested, 373
Position of Opposition last year, 378-385

Interim Supply Bill. *See also* Appropriation Acts
Res. 378; 598; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 599

Interior Department
Canadian National parks, 1681
Conservation Commission employees, transfer to, 452-3
Dominion lands and parks, 1681
Estimates, 452, 1033, 1270, 1680, 3517
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Migratory Birds, 1684
Nelson, Mr. Frank, salary, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
Statistics, 1366
Topographical maps, qu. 1632
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275

Interlocking Directorates, 2503. *See also* Ministers and Directorships

Internal Economy Commission. *See* House of Commons

International Boundary Commission, 1033

International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373

International Deep Sea Racing, M. (Mr. Duff) 1384, 3510

International Disarmament Conference. *See* Limitation of Armaments

International Harvester Company, 2382

International Institute of Agriculture, 969

International Joint Commission, 70. *See also* Electrification; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Report on St. Lawrence river waterway, 136, 1185, 1191, 1193, 1197, 1199, 1206, 1315, 1396, 1469
Welland canal, 1688

International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070

International Operation of Railways. *See under* Canadian National Railways, Grand Trunk lines in United States

International Opium Convention, qu. 1066

International Waters. *See* Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence

Intoxicating Liquor. *See* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor

Inverness Pier, 1766

Invoice Certificates. *See* Customs Act Amdt.

Ireland-Halifax cable, qu. 3360

Iron and Steel Industry. *See also* Steel
Structural steel importations, qu. 1931

Irrigation
Preservation of forests and, 1723
Southern Alberta, 761

Irvine, Mr. William (East Calgary)
Address in reply, 211; death of Prime Minister's brother; congratulations to Mr. Speaker, important matters contained in Speech from Throne, 211; industrial problems; social evolution, 212; complicated political system, 213; Labour party, 214; party system of government, 215; origin of parties, 216;

Irvine, Mr. William — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
official Opposition; speeches of Prime Minister and leader of Opposition, 217; co-operation in government; production, consumption and unemployment, 218; unemployment insurance; industrial disturbance, 218; housing; gold standard and credit system; 219; protection and wages; home markets, 221; credit systems, 222; trade competition, 223; industrial problems — British labour party, 224
Agriculture and unemployment, 3058
British Empire Steel Corporation, 1082
Budget, 2495. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; taxation; public debt; chasing the financial blue-bird; colossal lie upon which budget is based; credit proposal to meet expenditures and debt; panic of national leaders, 2496; soundness of Canada's financial position; bank balances and real wealth; estimate of wealth and production, 2497; difference between production and consumption; average income of Canadian bread-winner; purchasing power, 2498; credit question at centre of national problems; Germany's industrial and financial position, wages, working hours; paper money, 2499; payment of indemnity in goods; proposed German loan; control of credit, 2500; the banking system; starting a new bank; issues of new money; issue of currency by Govt.; interest; private monopoly of social credit; indebtedness of Canada, 2501; inflation and deflation; under consumption; shut off interest taps of financiers; the Douglas system, 2502; definition of credit; ability to produce and deliver goods; a social asset; banking and interlocking directorates, 2503; regulation of prices, 2504; schemes proposed by Mr. Henry Ford and Mr. T. A. Edison, 2505; practical attempts to inaugurate credit system; island of Guernsey, 2505; St. Louis municipal currency; the gold basis; collapse of financial system; investigation of banking system, 2506; taxation of consumer; the amendment; attitude of Opposition; amendment to the amendment, 2507; attitude of Progressives; Farmers' platform; fiscal policy of Canadian Council of Agriculture; speech of leader of Progressive party; tariff proposals of Canadian Council of Agriculture, 2509; tax on unimproved land values; inheritance tax, 2510
Debate, M. for adjournment, 2448, 2451, 2455
Business profits war tax, 2024
Calgary live stock branch, qu. 607
Canadian exhibition in France, 2032
Canadian Government railways, deficits, qu. 607
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1953
Canadian Patriotic Fund Act, 3478-84
Customs department, estimates, 769
Ex-service men, qu. 3152
Financial credit, M. 1290
Free freight outlay, qu. 704
Gold in central reserves and chartered banks, qu. 2971
Immigration-Criminal Code bills (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393, 3285
Immigration, medical inspection, 2022, 3060
Labour department
Employment specialist, 461
Statisticians, 462
Wage investigators, 463
Labour and unemployment, 3060
Loans, five year maturities, qu. 2993
Mackenzie-Mann subsidies, qu. 607
Military expenditure and policy, 1150, 1617
Ministers and directorships, 1120
Non-taxable bonds, qu. 2971
Nova Scotia miners
M. to adjourn House to discuss, 497, 539; withdrawn, 545
Quarantine. immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3456
Pensions Com., final report, 3345
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1745
Rail and car repair contracts, 1705
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Shoe industry, protection, 3238
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 436
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1617
Tariff against France, 2032
Unemployment
Insurance, 1081
National Conference, 1082
Public works and highways, 1082
Relief, 2023
Situation, 1080
Standing committee, 1082
War, causes and effects of, 1618

Isle Perrot bridge, *See* Bridges

Italy
Genoa Conference, correspondence, 1905, 2035
Immigrants from, 2171
Trade, effect of currency valuation, 2849

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. (George Etienne Cartier)
Air Board, 1722
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Archives branch, 703
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (petition in bankruptcy) 1395
Budget, 2513. Immigration, restrictive regulations; certain classes of immigration prohibited after May 9; agriculturists; farm labourers and domestic servants, 2514; discrimination in favour of British immigrants; language qualification; attempt to secure farmers bound to fail, 2515; artisan class should be admitted; immigration of the last ten years; exodus; loss of a million people; advantages of immigration; immigration into the United States, 2516; resolution of Montreal Board of Trade; curious notions in regard to immigration; Imperial Order of Daughters of the Empire; assimilation of races; foreign-born and crime, 2517; Miss Macphail's objection to sheepskin coats; foreigners engaged in textile and other trades; government by Order in Council, 2518
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, amdt., 3000, neg. 3006
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, appointment of, 1368
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3498
Cigars and cigarettes, tax, 3240
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Criminal Code revision, 1717
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 477
"Foreigners and crime" propaganda, 1392, 2517
Grecian and Roumanian loans, qu. 1400
Immigration, 2513-2517
Department of, 3500
Deputy Minister, Mr. W. J. Black, qu. 2970, 3500
Dutch, 2144

Jacobs, Mr. S. W. — *Con.*
Immigration — *Con.*
Lord Kitchener's death, foreigners and, 2155
Meals for immigrants, 2971
Immigration Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Woodsworth) 1391, 1392
Insurance premiums, taxation, 3254-5
Linen yarn bounty, 1362
Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Palestine, mandate over, 1716
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Steamship subsidies, qu, 614
Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill, 2974

Jamieson, Mr. J. A., claim of, 1687

Japan
Army reduction, 1610
Coal, importation from, 2406. *See also* Coal
Immigration from. *See* Oriental Aliens
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights and disabilities of Canadians in, qu. 1289, 1511, 2208
Treaty with, 1510. *See also,* Limitation of Armaments

Jasper Park, Edith Cavell road, 1051

Jelliff, Mr. L. H. (Lethbridge)
Air force and civil aviation, High River, 1734
Customs tariff, woollen clothing, 3235
Irrigation, Southern Alberta, 761
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Live stock, loss through wolves, 990, 1001
Rotary rod weeders, duty on, 3121
Sales tax, 3272
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, salary increases, 406

Job Printing. *See* Special War Revenue, Sales Tax

Joggins, breakwater, 1767

Johnson, Mr. R. M. (Moosejaw)
Address in reply, 112. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; position of Progressive party, 112; agricultural conditions, 113; marketing of grain, 114; tariff; natural resources of western provinces; public ownership of railways, 116
Agriculture, retirement of Dr. Saunders, 590, 3522
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103, 2737

Johnson, Mr. R. M. — *Con.*
Canada Grain Act
Constitutionality of, 2837
Overages, 2838
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3009
Canadian National railways. Bengough extension, 2770
Canadian Wheat Board, qu. 472, 2951. *See also under this title*, Wheat Board bill
Advance to, 3541
Customs, dumping clause, 3419
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2810
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Freight rates, Quebec and, 1472
Goderich harbour, grain shipment through, 2002
Government publications, 1374
Grain companies, default of, 2837
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 427
Justice dept, estimates, 1668
Labour dept.
Temporary clerks, 567
Wage investigators, 462-3
Lignite Utilization Board, 3526
National Defence bill, 2808
Portable and traction engines, 3231
Public buildings
Heating, 1759
Western provinces, discrimination against, 1254
Quebec harbour advances, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity, 590, 3522
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, Fort Qu'Appelle sanitarium, 1345
Threshing machines, 3124-25
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2762
Wheat Board bill, 3177, 3180, 3182, 3188, 3384
Amdt. 3178

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Accredited herds, diseases, 968
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2220. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reciprocity; financial situation, 2220; revenue and expenditure; debt; war obligations; profiteering; failure to tax wealth; tariff reductions; sales tax, 2221; income tax; immigration; increased production, 2222; markets; trade with United States; Wheat Board; amendment, 2223; failure of Government to propose progressive policy, 2224

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu. 469
Cultivators, etc., duty on, 3120
Customs Act, valuation, 3415
Dominion lands, sale of, qu. 376
Hudson bay railway, 1970
Immigration
Deputy Minister, 757
Officials, 760
Implement parts, duty, 3120
Lighthouses and lightkeepers, 1497
Militia and Defence, pay of staff, 1982
Ministers and Directorships, 1120
Ottawa public buildings, 1252
Ploughs, etc., duty on, 3121
M. to reduce, 3121
Printing Bureau, plant and publications, 1971
Privilege, Progressives and delay in budget debate, 2692
Redistribution and the census, 1370
Rural and urban population, qu. 376
War memorials, 2101

Joint Industrial Councils. *See* Labour

Jones, Mr. George B. (Royal)
Canadian National railways, coal importations, qu. 2213
Grand Anse, C.B., mail service, qu. 938
Le Blanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773
St. John terminal facilities, 848

Judges. *See also* Bankruptcy Act Amdt.; Exchequer Court; Justice; Supreme Court
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Admiralty, local judge in, 1274
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment at, 3496
Judges Act, Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Nova Scotia Supreme Court vacancy, 3436
Political commissions, on, 2397
Provincial commissions, on, qu. 366
Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu. 3600
Salaries, 2512, 3496
Yukon territory, 1275

Judges Act Amdt. bill (Saskatchewan Court of Appeal
Res. 424; 1r., 429; 2r., com., 546; 3r., 547
Senate amdts., 2830

Judicial Districts. *See* Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill

Justice
Administration of
Exchequer Court, 1274

Justice — *Con.*
Administration of — *Con.*
Litigated matters, 1276
Pecuniary Claims, 1276
Penitentiaries, 1276
Supreme Court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Civil Government, 1668
Estimates, 1274, 1668, 3495
Minister of, directorships and, 242-3. *See also* Ministers and Directorships
Pecuniary claims convention with United States, 1276
Prisons and penitentiaries, inspection of by Grand Juries, 1279
Salaries and contingencies, 451
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, expenses, 1669

Juvenile Delinquents
Prison farms for, qu. 1773
Special schools for, qu. 469
16, 17, and 18 years old, qu. 1773

Kamloops
Model city, 318
Post office building, 1255

Kamloops-Kelowna Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Kamouraska, vacancy, 1459

Kay, Mr. W. Fred (Missisquoi)
Agricultural implements
Standardization of parts, 2406
Appearance of Senator McCoig before Com. on Agriculture, 2406
Agriculture and Colonization Com. reports
McCoig, Senator, attendance of, 1900
M. for concurrence in fifth report, 2915
Wheat Board, 657, 703, 726, 776, 865, 1929
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial to, 2101
Daylight saving, M., 942-3
Privilege, Wheat Board, 872
Reference to, 1282

Kelley, Mr. Howard G., qu. 729

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. (East Edmonton)
Air force and civil aviation, 1723
Animal contagious diseases, compensation, 2806
Budget, 2280. Congratulations to Minister of Finance, 2280; attitude of Progressives to old parties; little change in policy indicated by budget proposals; new taxes; principle of taxation; depression throughout the country, 2281; position

Kellner, Mr. Donald F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
of the farmer; workingman and business man; labour and capital; public debt; credit system, 2282
Canteen funds, undistributed, qu. 2215
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3216
Immigration regulations, compliance with, qu. 2215
Soldier land settlement, 2141
Soldiers' pay, exchange on, qu. 826
Winnipegosis wharf, 3545

Kemp, Sir Edward, ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169

Kennedy, Mr. Donald M. (West Edmonton)
Address in reply, 142. Constituency of West Edmonton, 141-142; conditions in western Canada; tariff question, 143; protection of industries, 144; immigration, 145; Wheat Board; freight rates on grain; Crowsnest pass agreement, 146; soldier settlers, 147; railways, western provinces, natural resources, 147-8; half-breed scrip, 148
Air force and civil aviation, 1724
Banks, income and note circulation taxes, qu. 1400
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Scrip frauds) 1062, 1395, 3213, 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for steel plates, 1680
Edmonton bridge, 2007
Harbours and rivers, Alberta and Saskatchewan, 2005
Indians, 1232
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3515
Public buildings, furniture, etc., 1758
Public Works dept., average salary, 749
Rural mail contracts, subletting, 2801
Steamship subsidies, fair wage clause, 3506
Steel industry, 769

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred (Glengarry and Stormont)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2737
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Liquor, export of, 3005
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, wheat carriage, 3039
Customs
Drawbacks, 769
Officials, 765
Valuations, 3416

Kennedy, Mr. J. Wilfred — *Con.*
Dairy Grading Act, 652
Director of Commercial Intelligence, 700
Immigration figures, 758
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425
Railway finances, qu. 471
Sugar beet industry, 3245

Kennedy, Hon. William C. (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan to, 3035
Canadian National railways
Annual statement, 873
Branch lines, Bengough extension, 2771
Canadian Northern, advance to, 1905
Consolidation, 1963
Deficits, 875-86
Corrected statement, 1919
Directors, 2791
Appointment of new board, 2772, 2794
Representative of employees, 2794
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Grand Trunk Pacific
Advances to, 3520
Branch lines, 3520
Intercolonial, employees' provident fund, 2769
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, 1135
New board of directors, appointment, 2772, 2794
Rolling stock, repairs, 1212
St. John and Quebec railway, 1295
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Transcontinental, allowance to enlisted men, 3518
Canadian Transit Co. bill, 1772
Canals. *See also under this title,* St. Lawrence
Rideau, 2769
Soulanges, 2768
Trent, 2764
Welland, 2747
Construction, 1687
Port Colborne elevator, Jameson claim, 1687
Crowsnest Pass Agreement. *See under this title,* Freight Rates
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
Freight Rates, M. for Special Com., 1213, 1402-3, 1502
Gaspe railways, 627
Governor General's cars, 1688
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 1970, 2798
Ottawa-Kingston highway, 2794
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689

Kennedy, Hon. William C. — *Con.*
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
Motherwell, Hon. Mr., alleged statement, 2774
Representation of labour, 2776
Railway estimates, 407-8, 1133, 1905, 1933, 2747
St. John valley railway, 3039
St. Lawrence river waterway, surveys, 2768
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2768
Shipbuilding, cost of, 3508

Key Industries Act, 2424

Kindersley, post office building, 1254

King, Hon. J. H. (Minister of Public Works)
Big Bay point, sunken vessel, removal of, 2006
British Columbia govt., reply to criticism of, 2237
Courtenay Bay, 2014
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Introduction, 496
National gallery, 2011
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1547
Public buildings
Appropriations and expenditures, 1921-22, 1259
Calgary, 1254
Coal for, 1758
Edmundston, 1240
Flags, 1264
Furniture purchases, 1757
Galt, 1247
Generally, expenditure, 1260
Halifax expenditures, 1244
Hamilton, 1246-51, 1258
Heating, 1758
Kamloops, 1255
Maritime provinces, 1243
Montagu, P.E.I., 1264
Ontario, 1245
Ottawa, 1252
Dominion observatory, Geodetic survey, 1266
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
New departmental, architects' designs, 3541
Water, 1266
Parliament buildings, 2014
Architects' fees, 2014-16
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
Tower, 2016
Quebec, 1245

King, Hon. J. H. — *Con.*
Public Buildings — *Con.*
Rentals, 1259
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
St. Catherines, 1258
St. John quarantine station, 1240-1
St. George public building, 1240
Saskatoon, 1253
Swift Current, 1253
Toronto, 1246-7
Victoria, 1255
Weston, 1260
Public Works
Dredging, 2005
St. Marys river, 2006
Drydocks,
Esquimalt, 3541-2
Vancouver, 1255, 2005, 2010
Harbours and rivers, 1988
British Columbia, 2005
Icelandic river improvements, 2004
Manitoba, 2004
New Brunswick, 1991
Provincial wharves, 1992
St. John, 2014
Nova Scotia, 1765
Expenditure, 1269
Inverness pier, 1760
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Ontario, 1999
Goderich, 2000
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Quebec, 1998
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2005
Selkirk, wharf, 2004
Shuswap lake wharf, 3547
Winnepegosis wharf, 3545
Public Works dept.
Employees transferred, 696
Estimates, 692, 747, 749, 1238, 1270, 1755, 1988, 3541
River guaging and metering, 2011
Roads and bridges, 2007
Edmonton, bridge, 2007
St. John, N.B.
Harbour improvement, 2014
Terminal facilities, 849-50, 851
Telegraphs and telephones, 2012
Humbolt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Yukon radio-telegraph service, 1750

King, Mr. J. W. (North Huron)
Budget, 2301. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressives from Ontario; fiscal policy; small percentage of land under cultivation; drift towards the cities; infant industries; reciprocity with the United States; tariff proposals, 2302; friendly relations between Canada and United States, 2303
Grand Trunk railway, employees pension rights and status, 2041

King, Mr. J. W. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie (Prime Minister; Secretary of State for External Affairs; President of the Privy Council
Acoustics of the Chamber, 3613
Address in reply, 38. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, mover and seconder, 38; welcome to Lord Byng; late Mr. Peter McGibbon; Miss Macphail, 39; remarks of the leader of the Opposition; followers of Mr. Meighen in present Parliament, 40; campaign literature and election results, 40-41; natural resources of western provinces, 41; treaties; Imperial Conference, Limitation of Armaments, 42; customs tariff revision, 43-44; position at Liberal Convention, 44; railway situation; government ownership, 45-46; marketing of wheat, 46-47; railway freight rates; party formation and names, 47; negotiations with Progressive party, 48; Liberal administration, 48-49; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) and Mr. Motherwell, 49
Ammunition, artillery, shipment from Britain, 1154, 1156, 1163, 1165, 1172
Annual drill, 1155, 1165
Demobilization expenditure for, 1155-65
Annuities, 776
Armorial bearings of Canada, Welsh emblem, 3601
Assiniboine river floods, 1842
Auditor General's report, 424
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 2803
Banff-Windermere road, 1681
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, (Mr. Ethier) 1662
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Jacobs) 1395
Board of Commerce, 1715
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert
International disarmament conference, papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
British Columbia house, London, purchase, 3537
Budget, 2537. Conflicting amendments evidence of wisdom of budget proposals, 2537; taxation, re-adjustment of; speeches of Progressive and Op-

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
position leaders; extreme points of view; amendment to amendment; a protectionist budget; repeal of protectionist legislation; reduction of duties; effort to carry out Liberal policy; protection versus free trade not the issue, 2538; tariff revision; amendment; no constructive suggestions; Sir Henry Drayton's tariff proposals of 1920, 2539; platform of National Liberal Conservative party; trade with the mother country; disregard of political honour; promised revision of tariff, 2540; pledges of Liberal party; Liberal Convention of 1919; chart, 2541; statement of policy last session; budget consistent with campaign utterances; no deception of electorate, 2542; Mr. Meighen's London speech; Liberal handbook, 2543; tariff revision on basis of revenue; duties on instruments of production and necessaries of life; pledges fulfilled; tribute to Finance Minister; stability and confidence, 2544
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Customary procedure, 7
Debates on naval service estimates, 1899
Easter adjournment, 546, 821, 823
Eleven o'clock adjournment, 2033
Empire and Ascension days, adjournments, 1769, 1905
Estimates, 569, 2167, 3527
Govt. orders on Monday and Wednesday, 1460
Legislation to be introduced, 2996, 3041, 3102, 3103, 3365
Mines and Minerals Com., 1398
Mondays and Wednesdays, 49, 1719, 2169
Order of, 374
Private members', 1719
Prorogation, 3365
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Quotations from anonymous letter, 1480
Saturday sittings, 2033, 2458
Wednesday sittings, 49
Evening, 2169
Canada Grain Act, Manitoba Court of Appeal decision, 1770
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts. 3613-4
Canadian Expeditionary Force, repatriation of dependents, 1711

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3104
Coal importations, from Japan, 2406
Canadian National Institute for the Blind, 3540
Canadian National parks, 1681
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation of system, 2585
Co-ordination, 73
Directors, sympathy with public ownership, 2858
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian representation in the United States, 1384
Canadian Wheat Board bill. *See under this title,* Wheat Board
Cattle embargo, alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1463
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., claim of, 3498
Chief Electoral Officer, report, 871
Civil Service
Appointments, 573-4
Bonus, 733, 1258
Appropriation, 3528-36
Inquiry as to payment, 2996
Economy, 424
Salaries, 552
$960 and less, 1660
Civil Service Commission, salaries, 3509
Coal
Importation from Japan, 2406
Mined by Orientals, 2407
Con Rein sinking, 1384
Contingencies, vote for, 415
Criminal Code Amdt. (Half-breed scrip) 3220
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Woodsworth) 865, 1719
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting, 1717
Crowsnest pass agreement. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Telegram from Minister of Agriculture to Calgary Board of Trade, 2358
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, 2458
Death of brother, Dr. MacDougall King, 211, 224, 230, 276
Debates, Official Report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeau, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Deputy Speaker, election, 363
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1334
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion Lands, cancellation of leases bills, Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1236

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Estimates, classification of, 569, 2167, 3527
External Affairs
Salaries, 412, 3509
Secretaries, 411
Fielding, Hon. Mr., congratulations to, 3279
Financial credit, M. (Mr. Irvine) 1293
Freight Rates (Crowsnest pass agreement)
Special Com., ref to
M. (Mr. Kennedy), Essex) 1213, 1432-8, 1453-4
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Reports, 3546, 3560
"General" Macdonald's army, 2256
Genoa Conference, 582, 823, 1715
Cannes documents tabled, 865
Correspondence tabled, 865
With Italy, 2035
Reported subscription to consortium, 1463
Grand Trunk Arbitration
British newspaper article, 374, 822
Grand Trunk railway, pension rights and status of employees
M. (Mr. Boys) 863, 1382, 2041, 3437
High Commissioner
Alleged statement re cattle embargo, 1463, 1502
Office of, 414
House of Commons. *See also under this title,* Business of the House
Organization, amendment of, 1335
Sittings suspended, 3611-14
Staff, 3221
Immigration
Chinese, 3437
Investigation of conditions in Europe, 1711
Oriental. *See under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864, 1388, 1394, 1719
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Indians
Estimates, 1712
Potlach institution, 1578
Number serving gaol sentences, 1721
Interim Supply bill, 379
Interior dept., printing and stationery, 1680
International Disarmament. *See under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
International Labour conference, 3437, 3490
Report and printing of, 3601
Japan
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Rights of Canadians in, 1289, 2208

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Labour dept. estimates, 564, 569, 577
Lake Huron marine allowance, 1930
Lake of the Woods repeal bill, 3206, 3211, 3435
League of Nations
Permanent secretariat
Canada's contribution, 2990
Expenses, 3173
Protocols of proposed amdt. to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171
Limitation of Armaments, 786
Papers, 1283
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Res., 3157
Treaty tabled, 9
Liquor importation, 733. *See also under this title,* Canada Temperance Act
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 639
Ministers and directorships, 1098
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Munitions, shipment from Britain, 1154-65-72
National Defence bill, 547, 662, 680
Natural resources transfer to western provinces, 1017
M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence 1509
Provincial governments, correspondence with, tabled, 1769
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval defence, 1873-1899
Naval service
Gift of ships to Canada, 2051
Royal Canadian navy, 1873-1899
Newmarket, speech at, 35
Norris, Premier, statement on freight rates and natural resources, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 536, 597
Occupational diseases, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 1381
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3427-35
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill), time for discussion, 1719
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
Immigration
Chinese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1554, 1573-6
Japanese, restriction of
M. (Mr. Stevens) for papers, 1776
Parliament, fall session, 3608
Pensions, Insurance, etc.
Special Com., appointed, 496-7
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1308
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Prime Ministers' Conference, 5
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, reported statement of Lord Lee, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Proceedings tabled, 8
Prime Ministers' secretaries, 411
Privy Council
Estimates, 410
Private secretaries, 410
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1655
Public buildings appropriations, 1259
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Quebec fisheries, 8
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3588
Railway Commission, Hon. Mr. Motherwell, 2774, 3491
Redistribution, 733
Bill to be introduced next session, 3608
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719, 1769
References to, (Sir Henry Drayton, "jilting Quebec") 206, 1365, 1754, 2969. *See also* Address; Budget
Regional Bureau of the International Catalogue of Scientific literature, 3528
Returned soldiers. *See also under this title,* Pensions; Soldiers
Announcement of Govt.'s policy, 2637
Unemployment of, 2458. *See also under this title,* Unemployment
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Industrial disputes, and, 666
M. (Mr. Woodsworth), 834
Macleod detachment, reported removal of, 2585
Russian relief, 3516
St. Lawrence river waterway
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Correspondence with United States Govt., 2357, 2583, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
International Joint Commission, report, 2357
Treaty with United States Govt., 2207, 2760
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Soldiers' bonus, 396
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 431, 437
Speaker, Mr.
Bereavement of, 496
Congratulations to, 3489
Election of, 1

King, Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie — *Con.*
Steamship services, 2027
Tariff commissioner, appointment of, 1666
Tourist traffic, 1682
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Unemployment. *See also under this title,* Returned Soldiers
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Federal, provincial and municipal obligations, 1073-9
Insurance, 1073
Relief, 1719
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1073-9
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Vancouver dry dock, 3544
War memorials, 2099
Washington conference papers, 1283. *See also under this title,* Limitation of Armaments
Wheat Board, 378, 783, 2921, 3179
Concurrence in report of Special Com., delay, 2306
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Wheat Board bill, 3190, 3383
Wrangel island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208
Yukon territory, administration of, 1681

King-Crerar Alliance, negotiations, 48, 206. *See also* references in Address

King v. Manitoba Grain Company, decision. *See* Canada Grain Act

Kingston
Election petition, 2692
Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Klim, competition with milk, 981

Knives, German production of. *See* Budget; Customs Act; Currency; Guthrie; Stevens

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal royalties, qu. 375
Customs tariff, ploughs 3230
Easter adjournment, 546
Experimental farms, 800
Hudson bay railway, 2750, 2779
Mines dept., field work, 690
Natural resources of western provinces, 457-8
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted Police, 3523

Knox, Mr. Andrew — *Con.*
Port Nelson, examination of masters and mates, 1491
Rideau canal, 2769
Riordan Company, taxation, qu., 372
Royal Canadian Mounted Police pensions Inadequate, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1495
Welland ship canal, 2750

Kodaks, prices in Canada and United States, 2547, 2624

Kootenay, Burlington channel bridge, 2007

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
American magazines, 3109
Budget, 2358. Congratulations to Finance Minister; testimony of opposition to wisdom of Minister's proposals, 2358; tariff an issue no longer, burden of taxation; revenue tariff; sales tax; the workingman; cost of living; articles which do not pay the tax; interpretation of customs law; fishermen's rope; lumber; technical ruling of officials; agricultural implements, 2360; revenue tariff; England's tariff policy; protective duty counterbalanced by excise tax; origin of protective tariff in United States, 2361; manufacturers and war profits; propaganda of Canadian manufacturers; alleged reconstruction committee, 2362; election campaigns of 1896 and 1911; reciprocity with United States; increase of population under Liberal and Conservative rule; immigration, 2363
Migratory birds, 1685
Militia, civil pensions, 3499
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Rail and car contracts, 1693, 1694
Unemployment at Sydney, rail orders in advance, 1691

Labour. *See also* Civil Service; Housing; Immigration; Industrial Disputes; Oriental Aliens; Returned Soldiers; Shipbuilding; Unemployment
Administration, 1058
British labour party, 224
Bureaux, 3314
Canadian Government Merchant Marine Wages, qu. 3598
Canadian National railways
Representation on Board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors

Labour — *Con.*
Canadian Pacific, conditions on, 2315
Capital and, 2117, 2191, 2250, 2282. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Coal. *See also* N. S. Miners
Canmore and Drumheller, miners' dispute, 1058
Competition with foreigners, 2154, 2435
Orientals, with, 317, 345. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Conditions, 2350
Cost of living, 1175, 1303, 2331. *See also that title*
Costs, 2317, 2349-50
Cotton industry, wages, hours, etc., qu. 1903
Lower, 2436
Department
Annuities branch, 776
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu. 937
Classification, 494
Director of Technical Education, 578
Estimates, 1053, 1719, 1970
Officials and economy, 464-5
Printing bureau, 1970
Salaries and contingencies, 458, 493, 548
M. (Mr. Stevens) to reduce item, 562, 579, agreed to, 581
Statistical branch, 1366
Technical education, 459, 460, 578
Temporary clerks, 548
Wage investigators, 462
Departments employing organized and unorganized labour, qu. 2303
Distribution of, 2149
District No. 18, board, 1058
Economic injustice to, 2323
Eight-hour day, 184, 2311. *See also* Daylight Saving
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Espionage, 670-9
Exodus of workmen, 2469
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Farms, on, 79, 87, 251, 337, 1153. *See also* Address; Budget; Immigration
Genoa Conference. *See that title*
Germany, conditions in, 2411. *See also* Germany
Hours, 2317. *See also under this title,* Eight Hour Day
Housing, 219. *See also that title*
Immigration of farm workers and domestics, 2480, 3053-4. *See also* Immigration
Industrial centres, 236
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1054, 1058

Labour — *Con.*
Industrial disputes, Mounted Police and, 667, 679. *See also* Royal Canadian Mounted Police
M. (Mr. Woodsworth)
International Labour Conference, qu. 824, 1060, 1070, 3437, 3490
Report, printing of, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour Gazette, 1053, 1057
Leaders, 2118
McAdoo award, 1707
Mounted Police and, 670. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth): National Defence bill
Nova Scotia miners. *See that title*
Occupational diseases, protection against M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 829, 1378, withdrawn, 1382
O'Dell, Mr., on cost of labour in boot and shoe industry, 2350
Old age pensions, 1303. *See also that title*
Organized, 2321, 2324
Oriental, 2330. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Party, composition of, 214
Public ownership and, 130
Quebec harbour commission, wages of employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 2315
Canadian National, 2315
Representation on board of directors. *See* Canadian National Railways, Directors
Canadian Pacific, 2315
Costs, 2317
Wages, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Railway Commission, representation on, 2776
Skilled, protection of, 2379
Specialization of, 2149
Strike-on-the-job, 1054
Strikes, 2320, 2322
District No. 18, miners' strike, 1058
Nova Scotia miners. *See also that title*
Gillen board, 1054
Railway employees, 2324
Winnipeg, 841, 1068
Cost of trials, qu. 1182
Literature, 837
Trades Union Conference, Rome, 1060
Unemployment. *See also that title*
Agriculture and, 2158, 2331
Calgary Trades and Labour Council, 1082
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Relief, 1719, 1970, 2022, 3526
Situation, 1069
Steel workers, Sydney, 1076
Trades and Labour Congress, and, 1081

Labour — *Con.*
Unions, 228, 2295, 2317-8, 3059
International, 2317
Unorganized, 2628
Unrest, 14, 17, 90. *See also* Address; Budget
Wages
Average income, 2498
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, qu. 3598
Fair wage clause, 1469, 1486, 3506
Germany, in, 2407
Investigators, 462
Protection, and, 2298
Quebec Harbour Commission, employees, 1465, 1469, 1486
Railway, 357, 1707, 2315, 2417
Shops, 1707
Real and nominal, 2435

Labour Gazette, 1053-7
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu. 1903

Labrador Boundary, qu. 704, 2572

Lachenaie, Que., mail service, qu. 2805

Ladner, Mr. L. J. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply, 321, 326; four parties in politics, 321; Liberal party in British Columbia; Hon. John Oliver, 322; national railway, 326; returned soldier problems, 327; natural resources of prairie provinces, 328; British Columbia claims, 329
Belgium, trade with, 3223
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3538
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 720
Budget, 2276. Tribute to Minister of Finance; Budget of sixteen years ago; promises and policy of Liberal party, 2277; the amendment; tariff changes; British Columbia industries and protection, 2298; danger of Japanese competition; results of protective policy; weakness of budget; trade with Germany, 2279; sales tax; dumping clause and fruit industry, 2280
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Canneries, inspection of, 3048
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1448
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3191
Labour estimates, increase, 495
Oleomargarine
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Importation, 654

Ladner, Mr. L. J. — *Con.*
Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Manufacture and importation of, 1797
Regulations under Act, qu. 1902
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2824, 3014
Appeal, 3023
Penalty, whipping, amdt., 3015, 3020
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1528
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-56
Pensions Com., final report, 3339
Potlach Indian institution, qu. 1377, 3191
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1650
Vancouver dry dock, 1255, 1484, 2010
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 2822

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., 1225

Laflamme, Mr. J. N. K. (Drummond-Arthabaska)
Budget, 2895. World war and its consequences; motion and amendment; opposition arguments; Liberal platform of 1919; pledges and promises, 2896; Agrarian party; amendment to the amendment; standard of public life; currency valuation; dumping clause; marking of goods, 2897; insufficient reasons given for vote to defeat Government, 2898
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1944
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1566

Lafortune, Mr. D. A. (Jacques-Cartier)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 959

Lake Marine. *See* Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Grain; St. Lawrence river Waterway

Lake of the Woods
Control board, 2025
Joint board, 2805, qu. 2970

Lake of the Woods Regulation Act, 1921, Repeal bill
1r., 2991; 2r., com., 3199; 3r., 3435

Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507

Lamontagne, Mr. Ernest, qu. 824

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Annual drill, 1154
Budget, 2567. Beer tax; war and taxation; tax free bonds, 2567; commercial patriotism; national railways, 2568;

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
responsibility for overbuilding of railways; proposal to sell system to Canadian Pacific; freight rates, 2569; public ownership will lead to ruin; war and conscription, 2570; preparation for war; naval service; militarism; cattle embargo; public debt, 2571; parliamentary counsel; Hon. C. J. Doherty, reported engagement in Labrador - Newfoundland boundary case; payments to, 2572; departmental lawyers; co-ordination of law branches, economy, 2573
Civil Service classification, appeals, 1508
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract, 1678
Farm labour, cost of, 1163
Foran, Mr. J. J., qu. 2214
Lawyers, employment of by department of Justice, 1678
Manure, exportation of, 1018
Military expenditure and policy, 1153
Militia and defence
Military districts, 1775
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Militia council, qu. 2039
Naval council and officers, qu. 1774

Lands. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Accessible for homesteads, 87
Location of. *See* Criminal Code, Scrip frauds
Percentage under cultivation, 2302
Private ownership of, 1927
Public. *See* Natural Resources
Right of Canadians to hold in Japan, 2209
Settlement, 182-3. *See also* Soldier Land Settlement
Speculation in, 2404. *See also* Immigration
Undeveloped, settlement of, 236
Unimproved values, tax on, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation
Unoccupied, 2603
Western, cost to the immigrant, 2157

Langley, Hon. George, statement respecting Railway Commission, 2773

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. (Nipissing)
Budget, 2628. Congratulations to Finance Minister; the great unorganized body of wage-earners; clerks, book-keepers, commercial travellers and office assistants; cheerful acceptance of burden of citizenship; union government; day of reckoning; debt; curtailment of expenditure, 2628; restoration of pur-

Lapierre, Mr. E. A. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
chasing power; adjustment of tariff to financial exigencies; retail trade and prices, 2629
Georgian Bay canal, 1199
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1199
Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu. 1285
Postmaster, qu. 1285
Sudbury mail contract, qu. 1285

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 857
Budget, 2585. Congratulations to Finance Minister, 2585; leader of Opposition; amendment; no violation of Liberal platform; political pledges and honour, 2586; a Liberal budget; no political party in favour of free trade; campaign bogeys; an academic question; protection an economic heresy; national as opposed to individual interest; geographical considerations, 2587; United States farmers and protection; Wheat Board, fixation of prices; financial and economic consequences of war; tariffs of Switzerland, Belgium, Holland and Spain, 2588; Government tariff proposals, 2589; Liberal platform of 1893; reciprocity; not free trade but freer trade; revenue tariff; protection and revenue features of tariff legislation; exaggerated statements as to Canada's condition, 2590; hatred and class war; the future; fair play for the government, 2591
Business of the House, questions, 1660
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bills
Harbours and harbour masters, 1578
Pilotage dues, 1487, 2819, 3009
Coolie labour on British ships, 2043
Criminal Code Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 865
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Dominion Iron and Steel Co.
Contracts, steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., settlement of, 2170
False Creek bridge, 3516
Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Marine and Fisheries
Department of, 2166
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2167
Marketing, 2109
Protection service, 678

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 2306, 2817, 2996, 3010
Fishing schooner race, 1387, 3510
Genoa Conference, expenses, 1715
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 864
International deep sea racing, 1387, 3510
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 428
Lambton steamer, loss of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Limitation of Armaments, 3169
Marine and Fisheries. *See also under this title,* Fisheries
Biological board, 3051
Capt. Demers, 1492
Department, estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Icebreaking, 1677
Life saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Lambton, steamer, wreck of, 1497, 3365, 3507
Marine agencies, 1496
Marine signal service, 1499
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, Capt. Eddie, 1493
Ocean and river service, 1494, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1496
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
Port Dalhousie, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Dredges, 1494
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3045, 3149
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, amdt. to amdt. to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091
Montpetit, Prof., 582
Montreal Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Revenue, 1465
Montreal Harbour Commission bill, 1488, 3199
Naval Service
Niobe, sale of, 2067
Transfer of services to Marine and Fisheries, 3611
Navigation, Rainy river lights, 1499
Pilots and pilotage, administration, 1499
Fees, regulation of, 1500
Prince Rupert Dry dock and Engineering Co., claim, 3514

Lapointe, Hon. Ernest — *Con.*
Quebec fisheries, 377
M. (Mr. Marcil) 619, 622
Quebec harbour
Parc St. Charles Co., Limited, 1470
Revenue and expenditures, 1471
Quebec Harbour Commission
Papers, 1584
Political patronage, 1477
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464-86, 3195
Fair wage clause, 1469
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3399
Steel plates
Contracts, 1677
Delivery, 3508
Trenton harbour bill, 3493
Vancouver
Ballantyne pier, 1485
Drydock, 1485
Vancouver Harbour Commission bill, 1929, 2821, 2996

Larkin, Hon. P.C. *See* High Commissioner

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu. 2355
Lightkeepers, qu. 1904, qu. 2215

Latchford, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu, 366, qu. 3600

Laurier, Sir Wilfrid. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Canadian military responsibilities, 1629
Canadian Northern loan, 1957
Canadian ports and German submarines, 2089
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Monument, qu, 936
Naval policy, 1849
Old age pensions, 1305
Railway administration, 202
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1333, 1398

Laurier-Fielding Tariff, 141, 144, 208, 290. *See also* Address; Budget

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Budget, 2398. Tribute to Finance Minister; extravagance and mismanagement of former government; public debt; unfair treatment of province of Quebec, 2398; no confidence in public ownership of railways; transcontinental railway; Champlain market station; St. Malo repair shops; car repairs, 2399; St. Charles river improvements; wharf at Ste. Pétronille;

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
wharf at St. Grégoire de Montmorency; expenditure and economy, 2400
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 643
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1474

Law, Bowman B., M.P., the late, memorial tablet, 2835

Law Officers
Departmental, 1678, 2573
Opinion of. *See* Canada Grain Act, constitutionality

Leader, Mr. Harry (Portage la Prairie)
Accredited herd system, 2739-41
Animal Contagious Diseases Act, qu. 2739, 3362
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2003, 3545
Budget, 2510. Finance Minister's proposals disappointing; tariff reductions counterbalanced by sales tax increase; better trade relations with United States; apology for having voted against reciprocity; rejection of treaty a disaster; live stock industry; little difference between two old parties; origin of Progressive party; promises and performance of Liberals; the amendment; broken promises of Conservatives; Mr. Meighen's declarations on tariff policy; salaries of Ministers and judges, 2512; proposed reduction in indemnities of Senators and Members; Civil Service bonus; shortening of session; absence of members from House, 2513
Harbours and rivers, Manitoba, 2003
Health of animals, tuberculosis, 3522
Immigration, Hutterites, 3060

League of Nations. *See also* Limitation of Armaments
Article X of the Covenant, 3170
International Labour Conference, 1060
Permanent secretariat, 2026
Canada's contribution, 2990
Protocols of proposed amendments to covenant, 2583, 2692, 3171

Leases, Cancellation of. *See* Dominion Lands

Leblanc, Dr. B. A., Arichat, qu. 1773

Lee, Lord, of Fareham, 1852. *See also* Limitation of Armaments

Legal Expenses, 1668. *See also* Justice; Law Officers
Companies Act, appeal, 1671
Departmental counsel, 1678, 2572-3
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., damage claim, 1677
Employment of outside lawyers, 1678
Trial of Indian murderer, Lebeaux, 1669

Legal Officers, concentration of, 683, 2572-3

Léger, Mr. A. T. (Kent, N.B.)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu. 2209
Experimental farms, 806, 808
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1991
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495
Migratory birds, 1685
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1792
Richibucto repair works, qu. 375
St. John income tax office, qu., 826

Legislation. *See also* House of Commons; Senate
House of Commons, 2026
Printing, 1972
Senate, 2026

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe. *See* Speaker

Lemieux Agreement with Japan, 1459

Lepers, Number of, 2021

Lesueur, Mr. R. V. (West Lambton)
Sugar beet industry, 3243-4

Letter Carriers. *See* Post Office

Letters, Anonymous, quoting from, 943-944

L'Evénement, Quebec, 1480

Levis
Gravel, Mr., resignation from Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477
Lightkeepers, qu., 2583

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. (Swift Current)
Address in reply, 149. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; common platform in politics, 149-50; real conditions in the West; Great War burdens, 150-151; unemployment; wider markets, agricultural and economic conditions, 151-152; tariff and protection; natural resources of western provinces, 153-154; consolidation of railways, 155
Blankets, duty on, 3233
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) Amdt. 722

Lewis, Mr. Arthur J. — *Con.*
Budget, 2256. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; Progressive party and government; fiscal policy; free trade; similarity of Liberal and National policies, 2257; forty-four years of protection; tariff for revenue; reductions in tariff and increases in sales tax, 2258; economy; Welland canal; St. Lawrence river waterway; emigration and race suicide; cigar and cigarette duties; automobiles; luxury tax, 2260; British preference; reciprocity with United States, 2261
Canadian National railway, public ownership, 1954
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Canned fish, marketing, 3049
Cattle embargo, 1020
Cigars and cigarettes, duty, 3239
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1368
Dominion Election Act, residential qualification, 1301
Dominion lands, 1036
Experimental farm, Swift Current, 796, 3521
Grand Trunk Pacific branch lines, 3520
Gravelbourg, Sask., appointment of Judge, 3496
Indians, education of, 1230
Mines dept., field work, 690
Mixed farming, dairying, 996
Naval service, 1737
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
O'Connor, Mr. James, dismissal of, 1676
Paper cups, 3115
Pilotage dues, 1500
Post Office estimates, 692
Proportional representation
M. (Mr. Good) 1645
Public Works estimates, 692
Rail and car repair contracts, 1689
Railway policy, 1954
Railways, branch lines, 1688, 3520
Residential qualification, 1301
Royal Canadian navy, 1852, 2065
Saskatchewan liquor export, 3000
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldier settlement, land purchase, 2140
Swift Current
Experimental farm, 796, 3521
Post office building, 1253
Tractors, duty on, 3123
Welland canal construction, 1688, 2260, 2749

Liberal Convention of 1919. *See also* Address; Budget
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 397, 429

Liberal Convention of 1919 — *Con.*
Old age pensions, 1305
Platform, 25, 2529, 2541, 2896, 2910
Tariff, 2466, 3235
Mr. Fielding's disavowal, 2666
Res. of 1921, 2466
Position of Mr. King, 44-45

Liberal Party
Administration of railways before 1911, 189
Appointments, 138
Big interests and, 242. *See also* Big interests; Ministers and Directorships
Caucus, 1338
Fiscal attitude, 2430. *See also* Address; Budget
Gains and losses, 138-9. *See also* Elections of 1921
Government, 188
History of, 2430, 2548-9. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Interpretation of Liberalism, 26
Opposition in, and Estimates, 378-385

Library of Parliament
Joint Committee on, 211, 326
Salaries, 3517
Staff, 3091-2

Life-Saving Service. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Lights and Light-Keepers. *See also* Marine and Fisheries
Fuel for lightboats, qu. 1183
L'Assomption and Montcalm, qu. 1904, qu. 2215
Lévis, qu. 2583
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677, 3508
Maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, 1498
Parry Sound inspector, qu., 827
Pensions of lightkeepers, 1496
Salaries and allowances, 1497
Superintendent, Quebec district, qu. 2584
Wireless telegraphy, qu., 370

Lignite. *See* Coal

Limitation of Armaments, 7, 10, 20, 42, 58, 1143, 1174, 1179. *See also* Military Policy; Militia and Defence; National Defence
Air service, 1731
Approval of treaties signed at Washington, 786, 3157
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert, 1283
Report of, 1737, 1743
Canada's representation, 43

Limitation of Armaments — *Con.*
General Smuts, 1283
Naval armament, reduction of, 1737, 1844-5. *See also* National Defence; Naval Service
Naval holiday, 1737
Report tabled and ordered printed, 596
Sherman, General William T., 1336
Submarines, 1845
Treaty tabled, 9

Lindsay Arsenal. *See* Militia and Defence

Linen Yarn
Bounty, 1361
Dominion Linens, Limited, 1362
Duty, 3128

Ling, Mayor. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Liquor. *See also* Alcohol; Canada Temperance Act; Inland Revenue; Special War Revenue
Ale, beer, porter and stout, tax on, 2117, 2852, 2857
Beverages, containing 2½ per cent proof spirit, 2857
Bootlegging, cost to country, 2282
Confiscation of, 2997
Export, 2716
Warehouses in Saskatchewan, 767-8, qu., 1211, qu. 1660, 2997
Government, sale of, 1017
Importation, 733. *See also* Canada Temperance Act
British Columbia into, 1017
Excise duty on, qu. 828
Saskatchewan into, qu. 2037, 2303
Quebec government, and, 71
Sales tax on ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2852, 2857

Little Current
Harbour improvement, 2002
Tugboat, 3086-7

Live Stock, 333, 971, 2511. *See also* Accredited herds; Address; Agriculture; Animal Contagious Diseases Act; Budget; Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals
Animals, cruelty, to. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Associations, grants to, 1027
Bacon, 1025
Bovine tuberculosis. *See* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Carload and free freight policy, 1029
Commission men, 1031
Competition, 2695, 2698
Destruction by wolves, 990, 998

Live Stock — *Con.*
Estimates, 1018
Exhibitions, 3521. *See also* Agriculture
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Fordney tariff, effect on, 2453-4. *See also that title*
Garbage feed, 1029
Grants to exhibitions, 3521
Hog cholera, compensation, 1028
Hogs, grading, 1025
Industry, 334. *See also* Cattle Embargo
Marketing in United States, 94
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
National live stock records, 1026
Pure bred sires, 1032
Sheep-raising, 2592
Stallion clubs, 1031
Stockgrazing and feeding, 3522
Stockyards, 1030
Trade with South America, 647
Tuberculosis, 2595

Lloyd George. *See* George, Lloyd

Lloyds, steel plates, delivery, 3508

"Loafing-on-the-Job". *See* Industrial Disputes; Labour; Nova Scotia Miners

Loan Companies, 2299
Proposed taxation of, 2299
Renewal of loans, 1476

Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; Com., 3142; 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Loans. *See also* Finance; Special Loans bill, 2107, 2171
Domestic, 2694
Five-year maturities, qu. 2993
German, proposed, 2500
Grecian, qu. 1400
Morgan, Messrs, J. P., & Co., 1131
New Canadian, $100,000,000, announcement of, 1131, 1133
New York, 2107-27
Roumanian, qu. 1400
Soldiers, to. *See* Soldier Settlement
Special Bill. *See* Special Loans bill
$100,000,000, 1292, 1131

Lobster Canning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Lobster Fisheries. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt. bill

Local Council of Women, Hamilton, Oleomargarine, 1835

Logan, Mr. Hance J. (Cumberland)
Acoustics of Chamber, 708, 3612
Address in reply, 105. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 105. Intercolonial railway, management and operation, 106; history of the Intercolonial; 107; separate operation necessary, 111
British preference
And Canadian seaports, M. 493, 707, 725
Goods imported through United States, qu., 375
Budget, 2684. Mr. Hocken's flirtation with Progressives; official Opposition; Bourbons; decline of Conservative party; optimism should give place to despair; the amendment; platform of 1919; changed conditions, 2684; public promises; conscription of farmers by Union Government; tariff; not sufficient time for investigation; boot and shoe industry; problem of unemployment, 2685; leader of Progressive party; revenue necessities; transportation; income, inheritance and land taxes; no question of free trade or protection; revenue tariff; incidental protection; not a protectionist budget; anthracite and bituminous coal; suggested duty on anthracite; bituminous coal duty, 2686; distinction between revenue and protective tariffs; importance of Canadian coal industry; imports; valuation of imports for duty purposes, 2687; British preference and Canadian seaports; direct shipments; transportation question as it affects the maritime provinces; South African railways, 2688; Intercolonial railway; sales tax; exemptions, 2689; fishermen's supplies; economy; civil service salary reductions; indemnity of members; equality of sacrifice; Opposition and budget; compromise on tariff issue; reciprocity; a united Canada, 2691
Canadian National railways
Intercolonial, 106-111, 2688, 2689
Employees, enlistment, 3519
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702, 1925
Revaluation, 1926
Transcontinental, enlisted men, allowance, 3518
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Coal
Anthracite and bituminous, suggested duty on, 2686
Investigation of low grade, 3525
Public buildings for, 1759

Logan, Mr. Hance J. — *Con.*
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Joggins breakwater, 1767
Lignite Unitilization board, 3525
National defence, 422
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 523
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 790
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1310
Prison reform, 1278
Rail and car repairs, 1702, 1708, 1925
Unemployment
Canadian coal miners, 1759
Rail and car repair contracts, 1702

Logan, Mr. R. S., 728

Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372

Long Sault. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

L'Orignal wharf, 1212

Louisburg quarantine station, 2021

Lovering, Dr., qu. 1211

Lovett, Mr. L. J. (Digby-Annapolis)
Bridgetown post office accommodation, 1245
Budget, 2270. Waste of time in useless discussion; slow progress of Nova Scotia, 2270; freight rates and trade restrictions; reciprocity; emigration; sectional interests, 2271; public debt; financial chaos; taxation; tariff reductions, 2272
Civil Service patronage, 3084
Rural postmasters, 3080

Lovie, Mr. W. J. (Macdonald)
Bovine tuberculosis, Carman, Man., deputation, 2743
Budget, 2451. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions not sufficient; handicap upon agriculture, 2451; farmer cannot pass on taxation; manufacturer beneficiary of protection; agriculture the basic industry; implements sold cheaper in foreign countries than in Canada; agricultural depression, 2452; injustice of protective tariff to farmers; freight rates reduction; marketing of wheat; export markets; reciprocity with United States; effect of Fordney tariff on live stock industry; potatoes and poultry products; garden truck; Kubanka wheat; freight rates; statement of Mr. Sandford Evans; wheat and commodity prices, 2454; war profiteering;

Lovie, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
income tax; religious institutions penalized, 2455
Civil Service bonus, 3535

Low, Hon. Thomas A. (South Renfrew)
Budget, 2445. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff views of Mr. Good; serious problems confronting government; effort to reduce expenditure, 2445; the tariff; the home market; agricultural production; ratio of exports to domestic consumption; agricultural implements; reciprocity agreement; railways, 2446; freight rates; history repeating itself; cheap transportation for the West; national ills and financial burdens; progressive immigration policy, 2447; settlers from the United States, England and northern Europe and countries

Lucas, Mr. W. T. (Victoria, Alta.)
Canada Grain Act, car demurrage, 2981
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1861
Elevator overages, qu. 609
Immigration, Mr. Shandro's proposed colony, 2159
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1519

Lumber. *See also* Tariff resolutions; Timber
Cargoes for the Orient, 2311
Dressed on one side only, duty, 2360
Freight rates on, 175, 234, 2311. *See also that title*
Japanese, acquisition of timber in British Columbia, 2310
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Orientals in industry. *See* Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie)

Lusitania reparation claims, qu. 3599

Macarow, Mr. D. C. *See* Merchants' Bank

Macbrien, General, 1151, 1169, 1179, 1617
Reported utterances, 1662
Topographic survey, 1986

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. (Pictou)
Address in reply, 186. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker and previous speakers, 186; results of election, 186-7; Mr. Meighen's political campaign, 186-8; responsible government once more restored; public ownership of railways, 188; Canadian Northern and government railways 190; Grand Trunk lines

Macdonald, Mr. E. M. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
in United States, 191; Intercolonial railway management, 192; deficits on railways, 194; financial burdens, 195
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 783
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (pilotage) 1487
Canadian National railways, 190
Coal
Importations, qu., 926
Purchases of, qu., 2306
Insurance, qu., 471, qu., 610
Operation, 66
Public ownership, 1924
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3480
Civil Service classification, 494-5
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1440-2
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2814
Dominion notes and gold reserve, qu., 705
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3570
Grand Trunk, coal for, qu., 606
Judges Act Amdt. bill, 427, 429
Labour dept., temporary employees, 566
Naval defence, 1743
Naval service
Reduction in, 1743
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
Rail and car repair contracts, 1706
Redistribution of 1914, 1369
Reference to, 2536
Royal Canadian navy, 1870, 2062
War claims, loss of hospital ship, 1753
Washington disarmement conference, 1743
Yukon territory
Administration, cost of, 1681
Population, and expenditure, qu., 2456

Macdonald, "General", army of, 3315
Reception of, 2256

MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C., payments to, 2772

MacInnes, Mr. W. W. B., Immigration Commissioner in China, qu. 1901, qu. 2214

MacKelvie, Mr. John A. (Yale)
Address in reply 159. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; boots and shoes, tariff on, 159-160; statements of Mr. Meighen and Sir Lomer Gouin, 160; Tory party, 161; tariff revision, 162; fruit-growing in British Columbia; protective tariff and fruit; railway situation, 166; immigration; Orientals in British

Mackelvie, Mr. John A. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
Columbia, 167; natural resources; soldiers' re-establishment; attitude of Sir Lomer Gouin, 168; unity between French and English-speaking Canada, 168-9
Budget, 2196. Congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff; fruit-growing industry; Liberal platform of 1919, 2197; promises and performances; British preference, 2198; reciprocity; dumping clause, 2199; fruit growing industry, 2200; taxation; retrenchment; militia expenditure; cadet training, 2202; naval service; German trade and competition, 2203; the amendment, 2204
Cadet training, 2202
Canadian National railways, Kamloops-Kelowna line, 1134
Customs, dumping clause, 2199, 3422
Dominion lands, sub-agencies closed, qu., 1181
Entomology, codling moth, 814, 816
Fruit growers, protection, 2197, 2200, 3422
George, Rt. Hon. Lloyd, 2203
Interior dept., publicity agent, 454
Militia, expenditure and policy, 2202
Naval college, Esquimalt, 2047, 2203
Naval service, 2203
Royal Canadian navy, 2047
Oriental Aliens, M., (Mr. McQuarrie) 1534
Telegraphs and telephones, Okanagan district, 2008

Mackenzie and Mann, 189. *See also* Canadian National Railways
Loans to, 189-190
Subsidy, qu. 607, qu., 935

MacLaren, Mr. Murray (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Address in reply, 353; national railway system; Grand Trunk railway and Portland terminus, 353; Intercolonial railway, 354; natural resources of Prairie Provinces, 355; returned soldiers, 356
American magazines, 3110
Biological Board, 3051
British preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 721
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, steamship services, and, 3033
Canadian National railways, Intercolonial employees, 3519
Canadian Red Cross Society, 3387
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771

MacLaren, Mr. Murray — *Con.*
Canned goods, marking, 3048
Cold storage, 3521
Edmundston public building, 1240
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1273
Immigration
Medical inspection, 3052
Officials, 756
Imports of British goods, qu., 966
Inter-allied permanent commission, 3403
Military expenditure and policy, 1149
Militia estimates, 588
Naval policy, 2053
Negro point, breakwater, 2013
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3403, 3442
St. John Ambulance Association, 3387
St. John harbour, 2013
Submarine cables, qu., 3151, qu., 3360
Tracadie lazaretto, 2021
West Indies subsidies steamship services, 3033

MacLean, Mr. A. E. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply, 335. The Prime Minister and Prince Edward Island, 335; Progressive and Liberals; potato trade, 336; harvest excursions; civil service; railway situation in Prince Edward Island, 337; Intercolonial railway; tariff; natural resources and Prince Edward Island, 338-9
Census enumerators, 1366
Civil Service Commission, 364
Hog cholera, 1029
Illegal fishing, Prince county, qu., 371
Migratory birds, 1684
Rail and car repair contracts, 1710
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Theshing machines, 3125
Tormentine reef, buoy, 1490
Unemployment, Canadian National railways, 1710

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Halifax)
Budget, 2859. Amended resolutions; effect of taxation on trade; depreciated currency; Germany, trade with; debt and revenue necessities, 2859; income tax expenditure, reduction of, 2860; economic problems and proposed remedies; Progressive party not an occupational group; class organization; restriction of output; consequences of the war; European recovery; interdependence of nations; international trade; international politics, 2862; German rehabilitation; reparation payments; restriction of German exports, 2863; Canadian representation at Genoa Conference; reciprocity with the United States; tariff legislation of Congress; Canadian representation at Washington; business conditions, 2864; emigration; reconciliation of adverse interests; Maritime Provinces commercial relation with rest of Canada, 2865; Ontario and Quebec, industrial development; Prairie Provinces, 2866; British Columbia; depression of trade; exchange value of commodities; primary products low in price; manufactured products abnormally high, 2868; wages, labour conditions and production; deflation of manufactured products; effect of taxation on prices; amendment, 2869; Liberal platform of 1919; tariff revision vertically and horizontally; chart and compass; Prime Minister's utterances at convention and in campaign, 2870; protection and free trade, 2871; United States competition; compromise on fiscal policy; tendency in United States towards reduction of tariff, 2872; imports and interests, 2873

Maclean, Hon. A. K. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Canadian Government Merchant Marine
Ownership and operation of, 3036
Subsidized steamship services, 3029
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1420-6. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases bill, 3469
Freight Rates, Transportation costs, Special Com., Third report, 3456
M. for adoption of, 3548-55
Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3143, 3145
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Naval policy, 2055
Naval service
Royal Canadian navy, 2055
Royal Naval college, 2055
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against western provinces, 1254
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1464
Rideau canal, 2764
Welland ship canal, 2763
Wheat Board powers, 781
Wheat Board bill, 3175, 3180, 3380, 3385
M. Com. rise, neg., 3383

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York)
Address in reply, 63. Public ownership of utilities; hydro-electric developments, 63; public ownership of railways, 64;

Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
competition of C.P.R. with government-owned railways, 64-66; corporation-owned railways in United States, 67; water transportation, 69-70; electrical developments, 71; transportation and marketing of wheat, 72; co-ordination of government railways, 73; railway grades and duplication; community centres, 75; goods roads, 75-76
Alien enemy property, 1672
Blake, Hon. Edward, 2655
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 723
Budget, 2321. Mr. McCrea and organized labour, 2321; war profiteering; pulp and paper industry; speculation in paper stocks; collective bargaining, 2322; farmers and strikes; the farmers' bloc in United States Congress; economic injustice to labouring population; railways, public ownership; consolidation of national railways, 2323; strikes of railway employees; organization of capital, labour and industry; Canada's status; federation of dominions with written constitution; court of last resort; the war and defence, 2324; scientific methods of destruction; race aggression; transportation; bill of rights of Canadian public services; nationalization of transportation communications, banking, marketing, waterways, finance, 2325; post office, express, telegraph and telephone services, cables; community centres, 2326; St. Lawrence river waterway; water-borne competition with railways, 2327; national banking system of United States; watered stock; co-ordination of railways, 2328; opposition to public ownership from Canadian Pacific Railway; new taxation; soft drinks; cheque tax; immigration, 2329; Oriental labour; redistribution, 2330
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 2733
Canadian National railways
New board, appointment of, 2722
Shares held as alien property, 1672
Census
Completion of, 1365
Enumerators, 1366
Cheque tax, 3259

Maclean, Mr. William F. — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, 175-6. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 632
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 491
Freight Rates, Special Com., on, third report, 3564
Grand Trunk lines in United States, 191
Hydro-electric Commission and Ontario Govt., 1080
Hydro-electric power developments in Ontario, 1937
Manufacturers and profiteering, 3275
National Defence bill, 680
Prison reform, 1278
Privilege — Crowsnest pass agreement, 3608
Public ownership, 1933
Quebec fisheries, 622
Railway Act Amdt. bill (Crowsnest pass agreement) 3595
Railway policy, 1933
Redistribution and the census, 1365
Returned Soldiers'
Bonus, 3290
Early announcement of government's policy, 2637
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3319, 3392
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 831
St. Lawrence river waterway
M. (Mr. Church) 1326
United States, co-operation with, 2752-55
Sugar beet industry, 3249
Toronto and York county, representation, 1365
Traffic charges on boat services, 182
Unemployment situation, 1080
Water-power rentals, 2747
Welland canal, 2747
Co-operation with United States, 2752-55
Wheat Board, 2967

MacLennan, Mr. Justice, Admiralty Court at Quebec, 1275

Macleod, Alberta
Post Office, revenue, building, qu., 2804
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, detachment at, 2584

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. (Southeast Grey)
Alleged statement, denial of, qu. 3221
Annual drill, 1174

MacPhail, Miss Agnes C. — *Con.*
Budget 2384. Liberal party and protection; no material gain in budget proposals; argument of Mr. Raymond; basic and secondary industries; effect of protection, rural depopulation, 2384; protection of industries at expense of agriculture; rural schools; United States farmers demanding protection; unsatisfactory school system; farmers' credits; high transportation costs; taxation of all for the benefit of the few, 2385; proof that farming does not pay; importance of agriculture in development of Canada; trade and national greatness; high protection and revenue; the manufacturer the principal beneficiary, 2386; infant industries; cotton and woollen goods; discrimination against goods used by common people in favour of luxuries; direct and indirect taxation; national expenditure, 2386
Immigration
Child, 2153
"Man with the sheepskin coat", 2153
Policy, 2153
Military expenditure and policy, 1174
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 533
References to. *See* Address; Budget
Rural population, movement towards cities, 2153, 2384
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Supervisor of expenditure, 405

McAdoo Award, 2315, 2317. *See also* Canadian National Railways

McBride, Mr. T. G. (Caribou)
Address in reply, 316. Oriental question in British Columbia, 316-17, 319; soldier settlement, 318; unemployment; transcontinental highway, 319; Oriental immigration, 319
Budget, 2635. Length of speeches; free trade; tariff on farm implements and mining machinery; dumping clause, 2635; transcontinental highway, 2636
British Columbia and Progressive party leader, 2239
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 3039
Loan to, 3036
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1746, 1770
Chinese, arrival of at Vancouver, 3437, 3604
Civil Service
Bonus, 3533-5
Commission, 3072

McBride, Mr. T. G. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt., branding of cattle, 2833
Customs, dumping clause, 2635, 3419
Debates, inaudibility of, 1053
Dominion lands, Cancellation of leases, bill, 3465
Dredging, Shuswap lake, 2006
Elevators at Vancouver, 2980
Experimental farms, 804-5
Fuel oil, tariff against, 1761
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2984
Housing, 774
Hudson bay railway, completion, 2797
Immigration, Chinese, 3437, 3604
Income War Tax Act Amdt. bill, 3485
Kamloops-Kelowna railway, qu., 937, 3797
Kamloops post office building, 1255
Lambton, steamer, loss of, 3507
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, 1978
Lindsay arsenal, 2088
Quebec arsenal, amdt. to reduce item by $110,000, 2091
Milking machines, 3270
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1531
Pensions Com., report, 3351
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 3196
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2762
Shuswap lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547
Soldier land settlement, 2142
Steamship services, 2027
Telegraphs and telephone lines, 2008
Woollen blankets and clothing, 3135

McCoig, Senator, leave to attend Agriculture Com., 1900, 2406

McConica, Mr. T. H. (Battleford)
Agricultural exhibitions, 984
Agriculture Com., report, Wheat Board, 748. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Budget, 2898. Amendment; political promises; tariff revision, 2898; tribute to Finance Minister; old and new taxes; reciprocity, 2899; Sir George Foster's trip to Australia and China; treaty of 1854; abrogation; efforts at renewal; trade routes; acquisition of railways in United States, 2900; trade complications; wheat market; manufacturers of Eastern Canada, 2901; purchasing power of West; position of the farmer; changed conditions, 2902; self-

McConica, Mr. T. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
contained country or world power; production costs in United States; hothouse industries; competition with United States; fruit industry; debt; financial problem of the United States after Civil War; work; opportunities multiplying; high protection, 2964; substantial reduction of tariff; congratulations to Prime Minister, 2905
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canadian Pacific Railway Company bill, 1856
Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1609
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1772
Dominion Iron and Steel Co. contract, 1678
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 428
Live stock industry, 985
Mixed farming, 985
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 525
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Soulanges canal, 2769
Welland ship canal, 2743, 2753
Wheat Board, 3183
Point of order, 2935
Wheat Board bill, 3381

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Budget, 2314. The railway situation; high freight rates; deficits, 2314; Government ownership; international labour unions; McAdoo award; eight hour day; labour costs in general, 2317; remuneration of railway employees; specialization of work; strikes; thrift and industry, 2316; reduction of labour costs necessary; incorporation of labour unions; formation of labour board; walkouts and lockouts should be made illegal; arbitration for settlement of labour disputes, 2319; civil service, 2320
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1857
Organized labour, 2321-2

McDonald, Mr. Angus (Timiskaming)
Multigraph machines in departments, 1508
Population by ages, qu., 1632
Quebec Harbour Commission, wages of employees, 1465
Unemployment, 2318

McDonald, Mr. John N., qu., 3361

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. (Ottawa)
Civil Service
Bonus, 1503, 3529

McGiverin, Mr. Harold B. — *Con.*
Civil Service — *Con.*
Commission, 3071
Ottawa, Gas Company bill, 1657
Pensions Com., final report, 3331

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. (Solicitor General)
Admiralty Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2822
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2735
Baddeck wharf, repair to, 1765
Big Bras d'Or wharf, 1765
Budget, 2604. Group representation in Parliament; Progressives; duties of citizenship, 2604; public men; tribute to Finance Minister, 2605; Liberalism in Nova Scotia; one change of government in fifty years; Hon. George Murray, 2606; Right Hon. Sir John Thompson; opposition criticisms; responsibility of former government for public debt, 2607; methods of collecting revenue; new taxes; war debt; extravagance; unfit men mobilized; patronage, 2608; Ross rifle; purchase of military equipment; amendment; no suggestion to offer; Liberal platform of 1919; trade with United States, 2610; reciprocity; transportation facilities; purchases of railways in United States; seaports at New London and Portland; purchase of coal lands in United States, 2611; competition with Canadian mines; taking over of Grand Trunk, 2612; Liberal opposition to proposal, 2613; Canadian Northern railway; Grand Trunk Pacific; verdict of the people, 2614; campaign promises made good; record of Liberal party; administration of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 2615; time to restore prosperity, 2616
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim of, 2837
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill
First reading, 1017
Withdrawn, 2733
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, (No. 132) 2733, 2997
Date of coming into effect, 3007
Senate amendments, 3608
Canadian National railways
Amalgamation, 916
Public ownership, 1939
Criminal Code Amdt. bill., 2831
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2809
Concurrence in amdts., 3486
Residential qualification, M. (Mr. Rinfret) 1299
Dominion franchise, 1300

McKenzie, Hon. D. D. — *Con.*
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3473
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 2456, 2826, 3026
Senate amdts. concurred in, 3486
Grain trade, alleged abuses of, 2840
Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia, 1765
Interruptions, point of order, 558
Lake of the Woods regulation bill, 2991, 3202
Opium and Narcotic drugs, prosecutions, 2017, 3019
Public buildings, Ontario, 1248-51
Statutes, arrangement with Mr. W. J. O'Connor for revision, 1718
Sydney-Whycocomagh steamship service, 2031
Transcontinental railway, 917
Wheat Board, point of order, 2933

McKillop, Mr. Hugh C. (West Elgin)
Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3362

McLachlan, Mr. J. B. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

McMaster, Mr. A. R. (Brome)
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734
Audibility of debates, 411
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Boy Scouts, 773
Budget, 2417. The Tariff a tax; German competition; purchasing power of the mark in Germany; working hours and conditions; production costs; Mr. Bristol's speech "made in Toronto"; prosperity of the United States; tendency towards free trade, 2418; Nova Scotia coal and steel industries; Dominion Iron and Steel Co.; watered stock; free trade in Australia; western farmers and protection; congratulations to finance Minister; inflation and depreciated currency; German competition, 2420; German imports and exports; cheap labour; international hatred and bitterness; treatment of French Canada after siege of Quebec, 2421; spirit of international peace and comity; trade with Germany; German rehabilitation necessary for stabilization of world conditions; fiscal policies of Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, 2422; free trade Great Britain; the big industries; the Safeguarding of Industries Act; history of free trade movement in England; the carrying trade of Great Britain and the United States, 2424; budget proposals; sales tax, 2425; cumulative payment by consumer; tariff reductions; Liberal

McMaster, Mr. A. R. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party and tariff; revisions of 1904 and 1907, 2426; reciprocity agreement of 1911; Liberal platforms of 1893-1919, 2427; abuses of protection; price-fixing by manufacturers; tyranny of the trusts; collars and silk stockings; the new feudalism; the amendment, 2428; Liberal party stands for progress and freedom, 2429
Criminal Code Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Customs dumping clause, 3418
Depreciated currency, 2420, 3411
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, 3467-75
Empire defence, Canada's responsibility, 1629
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 483
Essence de L'Erable, qu. 1774
German valuation of goods, 3227
Girl guides, 774
Immigration figures, 758
Insurance premiums, tax, 3257
MacBrien, General, utterances of, 1662
Militia and defence, expenditure and policy, 1628
Ministers and Directorships, M., 1084, 1128
Paired members inadvertently voting, 1462
Point of order, reading of documents, 560
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1648
Public Accounts Com., first report, 1460
Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. (Mr. Jacobs) 821
Root Vegetables bill, 3376
Sales tax, 3265
Special War Revenue, flour, 3265
Voting when paired, explanation, 1462
Wheat Board, 2957, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3189, 3380
Amdt, 3384; agreed to, 3385

McMurray, Mr. E. J. (North Winnipeg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech moved, 10. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Miss Macphail; Lord Byng, 10; abnormal conditions at home and abroad; financial burdens; state-owned railways; agriculture unprofitable; tariff revision, 11; natural resources of western provinces, 11-12; seat for Hon. Mr. Stewart; unemployment; returned soldier problems; forest and mineral wealth, 12; immigration; wider markets, 13; War-time Elections Act; labour troubles; harmony between races, 14

McMurray, Mr. E. J. — *Con.*
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068, qu., 1182
Budget, 2474. Serious financial conditions, 2474; national debt; railroad deficits; legacy of the war; no constructive proposals; shifting the burden; production of wealth; Canada's future, 2475; immigration policy of former Liberal government; development of the West; prosperity interrupted by war; aggressive immigration policy needed, 2476; immigrants from central Europe; settlers from United States, 2477; exodus from Canada; statement of Lord Shaughnessy; declaration of Manitoba liberal convention; qualifications of the immigrant; criticisms of immigration policy answered; conditions in West improving, 2479; immigrants from the British Isles; foreigners and Canadian national life; the labour argument; policy of the United States; Canada's problems less than those of other countries, 2480; probable results of active immigration policy, 2481
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1439
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 3205
Natural resources, prairie provinces, 1017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1527
Winnipeg strike, cost of trials, qu., 1182

McPherson, Mr. Duncan, superannuation of, 2805

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. (New Westminster)
Asiatic immigration, qu., 732. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
British Columbia fisheries, M., 851
Budget, 2233. Progressive party' attitude towards Government; tariff reductions, 2233; reciprocity; British Columbia, protection of farms, mines and fisheries, 2234; free trade; immigration; unemployment; the amendment; pledges and moral code of the Liberal party; "political trickery"; Hon. John Oliver, Premier of British Columbia, criticism of by Vancouver Sun; alleged purchase by provincial government of warehouse site from President of Liberal Association; Vancouver World; resignation of provincial Attorney General, 2237; Minister of Public Works; national debt, 2238

McQuarrie, Mr. William G. — *Con.*
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, coal mined by Orientals, 2407
Carriage of mails, qu., 825
Census enumerators, payment of, 1367
Civil Service bonus, 733
Patronage, 3084
Salaries $960 and less, qu., 1660, qu., 1775
Condensed milk tax, 3269
Exhibitions, grants to, 1026
Indians, New Westminster agency, 3536
Oliver, Hon. John, criticism by Vancouver Sun, 2026, 2236-37
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3018, 3016
Oriental aliens, 872, 967, 3104
M. for exclusion or, 1509
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 169, 622. *See also under this title,* British Columbia Fisheries
Small manufacturers, 2710
Vancouver and Fraser Valley railway, 798
Widowed mothers, pensions, 3293

McTaggart, Mr. Neil H. (Maple Creek)
Budget, 2545. Congratulation to Finance Minister; budget proposals disappointing; speeches of leaders; debt, taxation, idle factories; unemployment; abandonned farms; readjustments in economic structure; downward revision of the tariff; failure of protection, 2545; sales tax; suggestion from Canadian Manufacturers Association; protectionist budget; revenue; investment of American capital in Canadian industries; abuse of Customs tariff by United States companies, 2546; duty on cigarettes, cameras; comparative prices in Canada and United States, 2547; tariff reduction; ability to compete with outside industries; Progressive party, 2548
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Customs revenue, 770
Dominion lands, surveys, 1041
Saskatchewan, liquor export, 3006

Machinery. *See* Agricultural Implements

Madawaska customs collections, qu., 607

Magazines, American, imports of, 3109

Magna Charta, 1388

Mail Carriers. *See* Post Office

Mail Contracts. *See* Post Office

Mail Services. *See* Post Office; Railways; Steamship Services

Malcolm, Mr. James (North Bruce)
British Preference and Canadian seaports, M. (Mr. Logan) 719
Budget, 2387. Tariff and taxation proposals of Minister of Finance, 2387; consideration given to all sections of country; sales tax; stamp and stock transfer taxes; automobiles tax; the tariff, 2388; United States tariff; reciprocity; British preference; American branch industries and export trade; marking and depreciated currency acts, 2389; income tax; effect on capital; confiscation; enterprise should not be discouraged; immigration, 2390; emigration; the farmer and industrialism; problems of prairie provinces; markets; transportation costs; fiscal policy, 2391
Goderich harbour improvement, 2001
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 2002
Lake Huron, harbour of refuge, 2002
Soldier Settlement Act, 1919, Amdt., 2035

Management, Charges of. *See* Finance

Manion, Hon. Robert J. (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply, 263. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; speech of Mr. Raymond, 263; different tariff policies of Liberals, 264; election campaign, 265; record of Union Government, 266; defeat of Union Government, 267; immigration; national debt and railway problem, 268; natural resources; St. Lawrence river waterway, 269; race and creed bigotry, 270; soldiers' re-establishment and pensions, 271; housing; tariff and protection, 272; railway rates, 273
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2261. Congratulations to Finance Minister; loans; Liberal and Progressive platforms, 2261; resolution moved by Minister of Finance while in opposition; the tariff, 2262; farmers and the budget; trade with Germany, 2263; foreign exchange; protective legislation in the United States; tariff for revenue; free trade not possible, 2265; sectional demands; Wheat Board; Crowsnest pass agreement; St. Lawrence river waterway; the home market; sales tax, 2266; Great Britain and tariff legislation; 2267; free trade

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
and protection, 2268; advisory tariff board or commission; cheque tax, 2269; receipt tax; the amendment, 2270
Burstall, Sir Henry, 743
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, claims qu., 606
Canadian National railways
Grain leakages, qu., 1401, 1930
Orders in anticipation of requirements 1698
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3481
Canadians emigrating, qu., 1182
Census, remarks by Mr. Johnston (Last Mountain) 1370
Civil Service Commission, 3087
Cost of living, 1057
Daylight saving, 948-9, 961
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1366
Dominion lands and surveys, 1037, 1039
Election pledges, cash bonus to soldiers, 403
Empire and Ascension days, 1760
Employment offices, 1058
Fisheries estimates, discussion, 2166
Forest protection, 1048
Harbours and rivers, Ontario, 1999
Health, department of, 2017
High Commissioner's office, 414
Immigration
Estimates, opportunity for consideration, 2162-4
Physically fit, 3055-6
Policy, 756
Immigration dept., labourers, 3054
International Labour Conference, 1060
Labour Gazette, 1057
Labour, technical education, 460
Militia and defence
Arsenals, Quebec, 2093
Expenditure and policy, 2092
Officials, 586
Staff reduction, 422
Naval service staff, 418, 422
Navigation lights in Rainy River, 1499
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017, 3016
Prohibition, and, 2017
Parliament buildings, tower, 2016
Patronage, rural postmasters, 3083
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 788
Pension Board, 392, 1350
Regulations, change, 2995
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1361
Widowed mothers, 1311
Pensions Committee, final report, 3302-3

Manion, Hon. Robert J. — *Con.*
Point of order, general policy, 556
Public building, location of services in, 1757
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1698
Returned soldiers, alleged treatment of children of, 2638
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill, 3394, 3400
Revenue and protective tariffs, 719, 2265
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1200
Co-operation with United States, 2760
Grain transportation, 2758
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 445
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Estimates, details of, 1347
Expenditure, 1340
Hospital staff, 1345
Salary increases, 387
Soldiers' disabilities, 392
Unemployment relief, 1352
Vocational loans, 1346
Soldiers, land settlement, 2023
Statistics, co-ordination of work in, 1366
Steel industry, subsidies to, 1697
Tariff, permanent advisory board or commission, 2269
"Tories and militarists", 1598
Unemployment
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Situation, 1074
Vancouver and Fraser Valley bill, 798
Welland ship canal, grain transportation, 2758
Wheel chairs for invalids, 3115
Wrangel island, 2208

Manitoba
Agricultural College, western agricultural conditions, 2332
Court of appeal decision on Canada Grain Act, 1770, 1841, 1932-3. *See also* Wheat Board
Flags on public schools, 1265
Forestry in, 1046
Harbours and rivers, 2003
Liberal Convention, res. on immigration, 2478
Natural resources, control of, 24, 1018. *See also* Western Provinces
Norris, Premier, on freight rates and natural resources, 1017, 1213
Unemployment conference, 1069
University of, percentage of students of foreign extraction, 2151, 2157
White Mud river fishway, 2167

Manufactured Goods, tax on. *See* Customs Tariff

Manufacturers. *See also* Canadian Manufacturers' Association
Eastern Canada in, 2901
Income tax paid by, qu., 1063-4
Production of wealth by, 2378
Progress since 1870, 2658
Propaganda, 2362
Protection of, 55, 102-3, 144, 153, 303, 343, 2435-2440. *See also* Speeches on Address; Budget
Sales tax. *See* Special War Revenue

Manure, exportation of, 1018. *See also* Fertilizers

Maple Products. *See also* Health

Maple Products Act, administration of, 2017

Maps, Topographical. *See* Dominion Lands and Surveys

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Air force and civil aviation, 1733
Budget, 2905. Twenty-two years of parliamentary life; interest in the West; 2905; Liberal party and western development; a united Canada; hardships of pioneers, 2906; conditions and advantages of the western railways; market for the farmers; employment for the workingman; reciprocity; opposition of manufacturers; 2907; trade relations with United States; tariff reductions; British preference; development of St. Lawrence waterway; better understanding between East and West; the amdt., 2908
Business of the House
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Sub-amendment (Mr. Crerar), 2473
Canadian National railways, public ownership, 1938
Canadian representation in the United States, 1383
Canned goods, marking, 3050
Census enumerators
Appointment of, 1371
Payment of, 1368
Census figures, verification, 1366
Civil Service
Commission, 3072
Patronage, 3074
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Debates, official report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2813
Fisheries, Gulf and Gaspesian coasts, qu. 1401
French-Belgian treaty, 3223

Marcil, Hon. Charles. — *Con.*
Gaspe railways, M. for papers, 623
House of Commons staff, stenographers and messengers, qu., 1376
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1393
Insurance claims of heirs of deceased soldiers, 1349
Meat and canned foods, 3047
Montreal Harbour Commission, Capt. Landry, 1481
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1800
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 3019
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444
Pension Commissioners, Quebec representation, 1350-1
Pensions, widowed mothers, 3293
Proportional representation, M. (Mr. Good) 1656
Quebec fisheries, 377, M., 493, 616
Receipt tax, 3262
References to, 1298
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3395
Root Vegetables, potato bags, 3377
Rulings as Acting Speaker:
Member moving res. has right to close debate, 540
Member withdrawing motion, 545
Relevancy, 3539-40, 3542
Res. involving charge on revenue, 3476
Supply, point of order, 1337
Vocational loans to fishermen, 1346

Marcile, Mr. J. E. (Bagot)
Bankruptcy Act, qu., 703
Dominion Elections Act, qu., 470
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, qu., 377

Marconi Company, 1736, 1749

Margaree breakwater, 1767

Marine and Fisheries. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdts.; Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine; Fish and Fisheries; Naval Service. For vessels, *see that title*
Barkhouse, Captain, 1748
Biological Board, 3051
Demers, Captain, 1492
Deputy Minister of Fisheries, 2166
Derelicts, removal, Windsor, N.S., 1493
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Estimates, 1489, 1676, 2166, 3507
Examination of masters and mates, 1490

Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Life-saving
Equipment, qu., 1284
Services, 1494
Stations, qu., 367
Lighthouse and coast service. *See that title*
Little Current tug boat, 3086
Marine agencies, 1495
Marine signal service, 1499
Meteorological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Newfoundland coast, 1498
Rainy river lights, 1499
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 1676, 3507
Expenditure, 1494
Murphy, Capt. Frank, compensation, 3508
Relief of distressed seamen, 1676
Steel plates, 3508
O'Hara, Captain, 1490
Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Exemption from dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Prince Rupert Drydock Co., claim, 3514
Publicity and marketing division, 2169
Range lights for fishermen, 1498
Removal of obstructions from navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, maintenance, 1494
Select Standing Com. on, changes, 1398
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Sorel shipyard
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, 1062
War claims, adjustment of, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, etc., 1493
Wrecks, investigation, 1492
Lambton, 1497

Maritime Provinces
Coal fields, 108, 2611. *See also* Coal
Condition prior to Confederation, 107
Intercolonial and, 107, 192. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Natural resources, 340. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1243
Railways, 131
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1316

Mark, value of. *See* Currency, depreciated; Germany

Marketing of Wheat. *See* Wheat Board

Markets, Foreign, 221. *See also* Trade
Necessity for, 2149. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Reciprocity and. *See that title*
Restricted, 343

Marking Act. *See* Customs

Marking of Goods. *See* Budget; Customs Tariff

Marler, Mr. Herbert (St. Lawrence-St. George)
Address in reply, 243; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; unity of purpose in government; elections and the province of Quebec, 244; government by co-operation; railway situation, 246; merchant marine, 247; tariff revision, 248; Liberal tariff views; immigration, 249, 250
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, 246-247
Insurance, qu., 605
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 486
Mines and Minerals, Com., on, 1398
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3444-55
Pensions Committee
First report, 726
Final report, 3286, 3348
Adoption of, 2253
Meetings, 3335
Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act, 3393
Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3408
Speech on tariff before election, 240
Vickers, dry dock, qu. 936

Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 647, 754, 1012, 1032. *See also* Agriculture
Cattle embargo and, 1032

Martell, Mr. L. H. (Hants)
Agricultural exhibitions, 995-6
Barkhouse, Capt., 1748
Biological Board, Mr. Halkett, 3051
British Empire Steel Corporation, taxation, qu., 1067
British Preference and Canadian seaports, 719
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, passenger traffic, qu. 939
Canadian Pacific Railway bill, 1859
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1771
Canned lobsters, inspection, 3048
Civil Service
Inside service, 580-1
Overmanning, 3081, 3100
Patronage, 3087

Martell, Mr. L. H. — *Con.*
Coal transportation on national railways, 1763
Cold storage, 818, 996
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 951
Departmental law officers, 683-4
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1163
Fisheries Act Amdt. bill, 2818
Fisheries Protection service, 678, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Food inspection, 820
Income tax, qu., 366
Indians Sydney reserve, medical attendance, qu., 2216
Labour department salaries, 549
Legal costs, 2772
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. Halifax, payments to, 2772
Marine and Fisheries
Capt. O'Hara, 1491
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
Ocean and river service, 3507
Select Standing Com., on, 1398
Wrecks, investigation, Capt. Demers, 1492
Meighen, "the King-maker", 35
Military expenditure, 1137, 1141
Militia dept., officials, 741
Motion transferred, 942
National Defence bill, 665, 737
Nova Scotia miners, 524
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3489
Opium and Narcotic Drugs bill, 3022
Parents, support of by children, 1310
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2015
Pelagic Sealing treaty, 1844
Pensions
Limitation of time for application, 2995
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Pensions Act Amdt. bill, 3445-62
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim, 3504
Removal of derelict in channel at Windsor, N.S., 1493
Royal Canadian navy, 1855, 1890
St. John terminal facilities, 849
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, staff, 1343
Steamship services, freight rates, 2028, 3032
Welland ship canal, 2749
West Indies steamship services, 3032
Wheat Board, 3182
Windsor, N.S.,
Lease of wharves to C.P.C., 2749
Wreck at, 1493
Women and the franchise, 483

Massey-Harris Company, 1106, 2175. *See also* Agricultural Implements

Masters and Mates. *See* Marine and Fisheries

Matapedia Valley. *See* Quebec Oriental Railway

Match Industry, Occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Matches
Bill respecting, 1r., 3598
Tax on, 3262

Maybee, Mr. M. E. (Northumberland, Ont.)
Baxter, Mr. Charles, successor to, qu., 2457

Meat and Canned Foods Act, administration of, 967

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3044; 1r., 2r., 3050; com., 3050, 3149; 3r., 3150

Meat Inspection, 226. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases; Cattle Embargo

Meat Products. *See also* Live stock

Meats, Cold storage. *See* Agriculture

Medical Advisory Board. *See* Pensions Committee

Medical care. *See* Indians

Medical Examinations. *See* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act

Medical Inspection. *See* Immigration

Medicines. *See also* Opium and Narcotics
Duties, reductions in, 2116

Mediterranean of America, 1202. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur (Leader of the Opposition)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Adamson, Mr. Justice, appointment of, 1670
Address in reply, 19. Congratulations to mover and seconder; Miss Macphail; New Prime Minister; Limitation of Armaments conference, 19-20; census returns; expansion of trade, 20; Liberal speeches and campaign literature; Sir Lomer Gouin and Mr. Mitchell, 21; natural resources of western provinces, 22; tariff revision, 24; Liberal platform; speeches of Sir Lomer Gouin, 26; Hon. Walter Mitchell; the Prime Minister on the tariff, 26-27; Mr. Raymond, 27; Mr. Marler, 28; public ownership; 30; wider markets; Minister of Agriculture, 32; reciprocity pact; reduction of freight rates, 33; Liberal administration; negotiations with Progressives, 34; Mr. Crerar, 34-35; Newmarket speech; Union Government negotiations, 35; Mr. Gardiner's statement, 36; responsible government, 37; Orders in Council, 37-38

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Agricultural implements, duty, 3119
Agriculture Com. report, 726, 776, 1929. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Agriculture dept., Mr. Duncan Marshall, 645
Air Board, 1722
Details of expenditure, 1728
Estimates, 1722-35
Alien property, custody at Prince Rupert, 3606
Alpine Club, 794, 1053
Archives, 702
Assiniboine river floods, relief measures, 3491
Australia, reciprocity with, 9, 10, 2802
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Birthday, congratulations on, 3102
Borden, Sir Robert, correspondence, 373
International disarmament conference, 1283
Budget, 2523; Tribute to Finance Minister; financial position; debt; taxation and fiscal policy; moderate protection, 2524; free trade principles; the Netherlands, Belgium, 2525; Great Britain; abandonment of protection would mean disaster to Canada; ability to compete abroad; reciprocal trade; peculiar situation of Canada; United States an intermediary between us and the outside world, 2526; east and west routes of trade; reciprocal arrangement with United States; rejection of Reciprocity treaty; Fordney tariff, 2527; American farmers and competition in home market, 2527; free trade in wheat; results seen in United States tariff legislation; amendment, 2528; Liberal pledges broken; brazen apostacy; British preference; microscopic reduction in duties; Liberal platform of 1919, 2529; Finance Minister should have declared his position; tariff; general reduction and detailed adjustment, 2530; voters betrayed; contract broken; revised policy of Liberal

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
party; declaration of Prime Minister; promised reductions in duties on food, 2531; clothing, building materials; failure to implement pledges, 2532; responsibility of Progressive party; invitation to Government to abandon pledges; grant to returned soldiers; Mr. Crerar's position, 2533; amendment to amendment; failure of Progressives to achieve their desire; responsible government; agricultural implement duties; 2534; Opposition votes for government; freight rates; faults of the budget; German and Austrian trade; exchange; inflation of currency; marking of imports, 2535; Government by Order in Council; dumping clause; possible tariff reductions; sales tax; Mr. Raymond and agricultural implement duties; Hr. Macdonald (Pictou) and steel and coal duties, 2536; special platforms for individual constituencies; Government's difficulties of their own creation, 2537
Budget amendment, 2338
Building trades, 583
Business of the House, 373
Amdt. to amdt., (Mr. Crerar) 2522
Budget debate, conclusion of, 2639
Daylight saving, 1282
Debate on naval service estimates, 1742, 1900
Debates, Official, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Decorum, 2090
Delay in proceeding with, 7
Further legislation, inquiry, 2996, 3102, 3365
Government orders on Mondays and Wednesdays, 1461, 1720
Privilege, right of member to raise on orders of the day, 2638
Questions standing as orders for returns, 1660
Supplementary estimates, 3364
Wednesday, hour of sitting, 49
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill (Pilotage) 1487
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, Senate amdts., 3614
Canadian National parks, 1053
Canadian National railways
Accounting, 1918
Amalgamation of system, delay, 2585
Canadian Northern, 1907
Deficits, 1918

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Estimates, 1907-54
Minister's annual statement, 912
Canadian offices in England, co-ordination, 414
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1747
Cash grants to soldiers, 393, 394, 2533
Liberal pledge, 400
Relevancy, 404
Cattle embargo, 985
Alleged statement of High Commissioner, 1022, 1463
Census enumerators, appointment, 1368, 1372
Chamberlin, Mr. R. G., grant to, 3497
Chinese customs tariff, 3168
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service Act, 1368
Civil Service
Classification, Arthur Young Co., 1491
Economy, 2057
Marine and Fisheries department, 1491
Militia services, organization of, 423
Reorganisation of, 2061
Griffenhagen and Associates, 1491
Russell, Mr. T. A., superannuation of, 1667
Coal for public buildings, 1758
Committees, changes, 497
Criminal Code Amdt. bills
Half-breed scrip, 3103, 3211, 3219
Mr. Woodsworth Special Com., second report, 1988
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 104-11-21-24-49-53. *See also under this title,* Freight Rates
Customs
Drawbacks, 766
Dumping clause, 2535-6, 3119, 3413, 3421
Estimates, 763
Valuation for duty, 3225, 3414
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Debates, Official Report of, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Defence, preparation for, 1621. *See also under this title,* National Defence
Demobilization, military hospitals, 1262
Deville, Dr., 1044, 1048
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Distressed seamen, relief of, 1676
Doherty, Hon. Manning, visit to England, 1283, 1334
Dominion Elections Act, 470
Dominion Iron & Steel Company
Contract for steel plates, 1677
Damage action against Govt., 2170

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Dominion lands
And surveys, 1044
Homestead re-entry, 1042
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases, bill, 3466-75
Senate amdts., 3614
Editorial Committee, 1235-6
Election campaign, 21, 187
Election of Speaker, 2
Election promises, 21
Liberal handbook, 400
Ellesmere Island, 1751
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 479
Estimates
"Appropriations not required," 1269
Information not up-to-date, 1267
This year's accounts charged to previous years, 1715
Exemption of farmers' sons, 440
Experimental farms, expenditure, 1264
Extra-territorial rights, 1068
False creek bridge, 3516
Finance, deputy minister, 751
Fire prevention, 794
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Freight rates. *See also under this title* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
Crowsnest pass agreement, 3589
Railway Act Amdt. bill, 3589
Special Com., ref. to, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) 1213
Third report, 3589
Gasoline tax, 3116
Gaspé railways, 627
Genoa conference, expenses, 1715
Geological survey, co-ordination of survey work, 1236
German goods, valuation, 3225
Government departments, payments to each other, 1724
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50
Grand Trunk Railway
Arbitration, British newspaper article, 375
Financial statement, 1933
Harbours and rivers
Expenditure for 1921-22, 1269
Prince Edward Island, 1270
High Commissioner
Alleged statement of, 1022, 1463
Office, 414
Hydrographic survey, 1746
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Mr. Woodsworth) 1503, 1988
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Immigration dept., 3051
Black Mr., appointment, 3500
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 755
Work of, 760
Immigration of Hutterites, 2160
Imperial Convention of Teachers, 1673
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1238
Income tax
Comparison with systems in other countries, 2228
Naturalization, and, inquiry as to legislation, 3103
Non-resident aliens, M. (Mr. German) 1303
Income War Tax Act. Amdt., 3359
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 3192
Indian Affairs
Estimates, 681, 684, 1712
Indians
Agitation and unrest, 1223
Complaints, 1223
Expenditure, 1216
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Six Nation reserve, 1222
Soldiers Settlement Board, 1222
Stony reserve school, 1229
Insurance department, 792
Interim Supply bill, 380
Interior Department
Conservation Commission employees, transfer, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and stationery, 1680
International Labour Conference, 3437
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 424, 428
Justice dept. salaries, 452
Labour department
Duplications, 577
Salaries 550
Lake of the Woods Repeal bill, 2991, 3200, 3207, 3435
Lawyers, employment in Justice dept., 1679
League of Nations, 3162, 3171, 3174
Limitation of Armaments, 43
Loyalty of western Canada, 1023
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Com. on Agriculture, 1900
Marine and Fisheries
Life-saving service, 1494
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Steamers and icebreakers, 1490
Marler, Mr., and railway situation, 28, 247
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, appointment, 3501
Meat and canned foods, 3045, 3050

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 640
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, proposed reduction of vote, 1620-9
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2091, 2096
War claims, adjustment of, 417
Mines department
Additional officials, 689
Estimates, 686
Ethnologist and ornithologist, 687
Ministers and directorships, 1104
Montreal Harbour Commission, 1489
National Defence bill, 663, 674, 734, 738, Senate amdts., 2807
Natural resources, transfer to western provinces, 41-42
M. for correspondence, 1509
Naturalization Act Amdt. bill, 3436
Naval defence, 1862-1900
Naval policy, 2056-81
Naval service, 1738
Empire defence, contribution to, 2081
Niobe, sale of, 2065
Royal Canadian navy, 1741, 1862-1900, 2056
Empire defence, needs of, 1741
Minister's proposals, criticism of, 1741
Staff, 418
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 503, 524-539, 544, 597, 1054
Nova Scotia Supreme Court, vacancy, 3437
Ocean and river service, expenditure, 1494
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3426-32
Orders in Council, government by, 663, 2535-6
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1561, 1567, 1575
Paper milk bottle caps, 3114
Parliament buildings, lighting, 1755
Parliament, fall session, 3609
Peace and war, 1621
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 789
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 1350, 1351
Charges against, 3041
Representation of Quebec, 1351
Pensions
European war and active militia, 1353
Expenditure under report of Special Com., 3522

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Ploughs, duty on, 3123, 3125
Amdt. (Mr. Johnston, Last Mountain, 3230
Political alliances, 2097
Political promises — Mr. Hoey, 2338
Portage la Prairie exhibition, qu., 1391
Post Office estimates, 691
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3504
Prices, deflation of, 1216
Prime Minister, private secretaries, 410, 412
Prime Ministers' Conference, 1629
Correspondence, 1068
Naval defence, 1742
Lord Lee, reported statement of, 1742
Report, reference to, 5
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Privy Council, increases, 410
Promises of Union Government, 2339
Public buildings
Coal for, 1758
Flags, 1264, 1268
Generally, expenditure, 1262
Heating, 1758
Maritime provinces, 1243
Ontario
Alleged neglect by former government, 1249
Appropriation and expenditure, 1245-59-60
Ottawa
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, 1267
Water, 1266
Public expenditures, 1249
Public Works
Classification, 693
Estimates, 692, 697, 699, 747
Public buildings, 1755. *See also under this title,* Public Buildings
Salaries, 749
Quebec fisheries, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493 622
Quebec Harbour Commission
Inquiry for papers, 1283
Political patronage, 1477
Resignation of former commissioners, 1477-8
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, 1477
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission
Chairman, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 3491
Freight rates, 193

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Railway estimates, 409
Railway policy of Government, inquiry, 407
Railways, annual statement of minister, 921
Raymond, Mr., and the tariff, 255, 2536-7
Reciprocal trade with Australia, 10, 2802
Inquiry for correspondence, 9
Reciprocity with the United States, 2845
Redistribution, 733, 3611
Census, and, 1364, 1367, 1371
Resolution should embody bills, 3179
Returns, inquiry for, 1283
Rideau hall, fuel and light, 1756
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 734
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 673
Estimates, 2129
Ruling of Chair, 3354
St. John quarantine station, 1241
St. John terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 844
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Secretary of State, estimates, 701
Seed grain advances, 1053
Seed grain commission, 1011
Soldier land settlement, 3294, 3296
Estimates, 2135
Homestead rights, 2135
Land purchase, irregularities charged, 2139
Taxes, collection of, 2135
Soldiers' bonus, 393, 394, 400, 404, 436, 2533
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Hospitals, 1262
Medical treatment, 392
Parliamentary Com., 393
Salary increases, 385
Unemployment relief, 1352
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment bill, 3597, 3609
Sorel shipyards, dismissal of employees, 1283
Speaker, Mr., bereavement of, 496
Speaker's election, 2
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 580, 1366
Statutes, revision of, 1718
Steamship subsidies, 3505
Steel, structural, importation, qu., 1931
Stefansson expedition, 1750
Supply. *See also under this title,* Estimates
Concurrence, 1769
Method of discussion, 1142
Motions in, 1579
Latitude in discussion, 2238
Supreme Court estimates, 1274
Tariff Commissioner, appointment of, 1663
Tariff revision, 2540
Tourist traffic, 1682

Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur — *Con.*
Tractors, duty on, 3124
Trade and Commerce officials, 700-01
Treaties of Peace with Hungary and Turkey, 3490
Trial of Indian Lebeaux, expenses, 1669
Unemployment
Banff-Windermere highway, 1682
Canadian coal, use of by railways, 1759
Insurance, 1080
Policy of government as to, 3491
Relief, 1719
Situation, 1079
Welland canal, 2750
United Grain Growers, agricultural implements, 3120
United States, discriminatory legislation 1303, 2527-8
Washington conference. *See also under this title,* Naval Service
Empire naval defence, 1744
Papers, 1283
Welland canal, 2750
Western provinces, natural resources. *See* Natural Resources
Wheat Board, 2915, 2924, 2953, 3175, 3184, 3190, 3381, 3386. *See also under this title,* Agriculture Committee
Concurrence in report of special Com., delay, 2306
White, Mr. James, employment of, 3495
Winnipeg strike, Mr. Alfred J. Andrews, 1069
Wrangel island, 1750
Yukon territory
Administration of, 1681
Expenditure, 1275
Radiotelegraph service, 1749

Melchior, Dr., on value of German mark, 2645

Mellish, Mr. Justice, 1275

Melville, Sask., railway restaurant, qu., 2038

Members. *See* House of Commons

Memorials, War. *See* Baker, Lieut. Col.; Battlefields; Historic Sites; War Graves Commission; War Memorials

Mennonites. *See* Immigration

Merchant Marine. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine

Merchants' Bank. *See that title under* Banks and Banking

Mercier, Mr. Paul (Westmount-St. Henri)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, seconder, 15. Change of government; Baron Byng of Vimy, 16; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; encouragement of agriculture, commerce and industry, 16-17; immigration; labour, 17; financial burdens; political parties, 18
Electrification of railways, M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 638
St. Lawrence river waterway, 786, 1333
M. (Mr. Church) 1396

Meredith, Sir Vincent, 1128

Messengers and Stenographers, qu., 1376

Metal File Cabinets, 1252

Metals. *See* Mines and Minerals

Meteorological Service, magnetic observatory, 1501

Mexico
Postal rate to, qu., 3364
Trade with, 699, 700, 2989

Mewburn, Hon. S. C. (East Hamilton)
Ammunition shipment from Great Britain, 1169
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Hamilton post office building, 1246
Military expenditure and policy, 1152, 1579
Militia and defence
Annual drill, 1152, 1579
Expenditure and policy, proposed reduction, 1579
Services co-ordination, 416
National Defence bill, 665, 666, 737, 744, 745
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, industrial disputes, 667
Royal commission on pensions, 386

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Audibility of debate, 385
Criminal Code Amdt., fines, payment, 2832
Customs revenue, qu., 607
Damage by floods in New Brunswick, 3492
Edmundston
Post office, qu., 608
Public building, 1242
German reparations, qu., 375
Lighthouse and coast service, 1496
St. John terminal facilities, 847
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2753
Welland ship canal, 2753

Migratory Birds, 1684

Military Forces, preparedness. *See* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Servicee

Military Hospitals, 1261, 1341, 1344, 3287-9, 3345. *See also* Pensions Com. report; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1339-48

Military Service. *See also* Pensions Com.
Medical inspection, 3317

Military Service Act, powers under, 780

Military Service Act, 1917, Repeal bill (Mr. Woodsworth
1r., 424; order for 2r., stands, 493; M. for 2r., 639; Mr. Speaker rules bill out of order, 644

Militia and Defence. *See also* National Defence bill
Adjustment of War claims, 1155, 2098, 2974
Air force, 1722
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Ammunition, 2085
Shipment from Great Britain, 1156-63, 1337
Small arms, 1979
Annual drill, 1137, 1139, 1144, 1146, 1151, qu., 1285, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2835
Amdt. (Mr. Power) to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1174, 1578
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $400,000, 1579; agreed to, 1631
Expenditure for 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries
Fittings and alterations, 1261
Quebec, qu., 1287
Arsenals
Danger of attack by aeroplanes, 2085-98
High explosive shells, 1170
Lindsay, 1165, 1171, 1979
Site, purchase of, 2087-8
Quebec, 1165, 1171, 1978-9, 2085
Amdt. (Mr. Lapointe) to reduce vote by $50,000, 2091; agreed to, 2098
Amdt. (Mr. McBride) to reduce vote by $110,000, 2091; neg., 2098
Customs duties, 1978
Rivière du Loup, qu., 1181
Burstall, General Sir Henry, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Cadet camps, 1147, 1973, 2202
Militarism, 1974
Cadet services
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce vote by $100,000, 1972; agreed to, 1978

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by, $21,000, 1978
Defensive forces, 1135
Demobilization expenditure, 1155, 1163
Department
Estimates, 415, 586, 1578, 1610, 1972, 2974, 3498
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Salaries and contingencies, 415, 586, 1985
District auditors, 1145
Engineer services and works
M. Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Expenditure
Policy and, 1174, 1335, 1578, 1610, 2202. *See also under this title,* Arsenals, Naval Service
Reductions proposed by minister, 1578
Reduction of, 1135
1890-1913, qu., 1285
1911-22, qu., 1287
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
General staff, 1145
Generals, 1145
Gwatkin, General, retirement of, qu., 1211. *See also* National Defence
Lindsay arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Long Branch rifle range, qu., 372
Lord Grey on military protection, 1136
MacBrien, General, 1151
Reported utterances of, 1662
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Military districts, 1580, 1775
District No. 12, 1602
London, 1983
Toronto, 1983
Military holiday, 1146, 1338
Military hospitals, 1341. *See also that title*
Militia council, qu., 2039
Montreal ordnance stores building, 1245
Munitions. *See also under this title* Ammunition
Shipment from Great Britain, 1154-63
Officers and men at headquarters, 1775
Ordnance arms and lands
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Pensions. *See also that title*
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Permanent force, 1136, 1147, 1152, 1580, 1982
Estimates, 1982

Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Permanent force — *Con.*
Expenditure, 1140
Royal Canadian Artillery, 1982
Strength of, 1136
Ten years' service or more, qu., 2637
Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065
Quebec arsenal. *See under this title,* Arsenals
Rental of buildings, 1764
Royal Military College, 1985
Schools of instruction
M. (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $50,000, 1985
Service overseas, 1140-80
Shed on Cartier square, Ottawa, qu., 2038
Staff, 661
Pay of, amdt., (Mr. Murdock) to reduce item by $10,000, agreed to, 1982; amdt (Mr. Sutherland) to reduce item by $25,000, neg., 1982
Tobin, Lieut. Col., and 29th Battalion, 1975
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Training camps, qu., 2584
Transport and freight, 1986
Amdts. (Mr. Hanson) to reduce by $60,000 and (Mr. Spencer to reduce by $10,000, 1987
War claims, adjustment of, 1155, 2098, 2974
Warlike stores, 1137, 1154-63
Sale of, 1171-3

Milk. *See also* Dairying Industry
Competition with Klim, 981
Condensed, tax, 2492, 3264-5, 3271, 3409
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Herds supplying. *See* Accredited herds
Paper caps for bottles, 3114
Products, taxation, 3263-4

Milking Machines, 3270

Mill Feeds, adutleration of, 1012, 2490. *See also* Grain and Grain Trade

Millar, Mr. John (Qu'Appelle)
Agricultural implements, price of, 1476
Agriculture
Condition and prospects of, 1475, 2163
Plant pathologist, 593-4
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2736
Banks, interest rates, 3601
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Budget, 2294. Congratulations to Finance Minister; war indebtedness; failure

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
to meet larger proportion of cost during the war; public debt; revenue and expenditure; encouragement of basic industries; agriculture bled white, 2294; monopolies and political contributions; labour unions; extracting profits from the consumer, 2295; insufficient tariff reductions; agriculture languishing; price of gasoline; Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Meighen on the tariff, 2296; the tariff and mergers; increased prices of textiles; white lead, protective duty added to price; sales tax, the poor man hit, 2297; free food, boots and shoes; protection and wages; average income tax by classes; cost of fostering home industries, 2298; income tax, introduction of; loan companies, 2299
Canadian National railways
Branch lines, 1476, 2772
Freight, careless handling of, 1965
Census
Completion of, 1363
Registration of Canadians, 1363
Civil Service, overmanning, 401
Dairy industry, 980
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Estimates, 401
Expenditure, necessity for economy in, 401, 1475
Export liquor warehouses, Saskatchewan, 767, qu., 1211
Legality of, qu., 1660
Fish culture, 2169
Fishing schooner race, 3513
Fort William-Port Arthur terminal elevators, qu., 1210
Hudson bay railway, completion of, 2784
Immigration
Foreigners, loyalty of, 2163
German, 3052
Policy, 2163
Indians
Education and health, 1228
Round lake school, 3537
Liquor
Export warehouses, 767, qu., 1211, qu., 1660, 3001
Importation into Saskatchewan, qu., 2037, qu., 2303
Loan Companies Act Amdt. bill, 3142
Loan companies, renewal of loans, 1476
Parsons, W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Millar, Mr. John — *Con.*
Quebec harbour advances, 1475
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1198
Grain transportation, 2756
Saskatchewan liquor export. *See under this title,* Liquor
Soldier land settlement, land purchases, 2139
Terminal elevators, overages, qu., 1210, 2837
Welland canal
Estimates, amdt. to reduce vote by $4,000,000, 2758; neg., 2764
Grain transportation, 2756
Wheat Board bill, 3385, 3181
Woollen goods, duty on, 3136

Milling Combines, 304, 2633. *See also* Wheat Board

Milne, Mr. Robert (Neepawa)
Agriculture dept., officials, 654
Budget, 2239. A six country; new fiscal policy needed; amendment; no solution; loss of faith in political parties, 2239; economy; tariff inconsistencies; unfairness as between manufacturer and farmer; free raw materials and protected product; sales tax, 2240; farmers and the income tax; agriculture the mainstay of the country, 2241
Fishways in White Mud river, 2167

Milton, speech of Hon. Mr. Murphy, at, 2562

Mineral Resources Bureau. *See* Imperial Mineral Resources

Mineral Waters, tax on. *See* Taxation

Mines and Minerals. *See also* Coal; Geological Survey; Natural Resources
Assay office, Vancouver, 1236
Canadian Institute of Mining and Metallurgy, 1237
Clay products, 1234
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Lignite Utilization Board, 3524
Machinery and tools, reduction in duties, 2116
Mineral rights. *See* Soldiers' Settlement Act Amdt.
Miners' strike, district No. 12, 1058
Mines dept.,
Estimates,, 685, 1233
Salaries, 685
Statistical branch, 1366
Topographical maps, qu., 1632
Ore dressing plant, 1236

Mines and Minerals — *Con.*
Publications, 1234-6
Resources, 12
Investigation of, 1234
Reduction in vote, 1236-62
Road and materials, 1234
Select Standing Com., 1398
Tar sands, 1236
Yukon, mineral discoveries, 1276

Ministers and Directorships, 241-243
M. (Mr. McMaster), 1084; neg., 1131
Bank directors, 1091
Bank of Montreal, 1129
Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
Borden, Sir Robert, 1089
Directors of large corporations, names, 1128
Government's attitude, 1095-1117, 1124
Great Britain, practice in, 1089-99, 1107-1128
House of Commons and Senate Act, 1088, 1100, 1111, 1113, 1129
Interlocking directorates, 1086, 1100, 1115, 1129
Judges' Act, 1088
Merchants' Bank, 1085, 1096, 1121
Practice in other countries, 1090, 1096, 1101, 1114
Tariff beneficiaries, 1088
White, Sir Tomas, 1089, 1102

Ministers of the Crown
Salaries, 1093, 2895
Trips to Europe, 14

Minority Candidates. *See* Elections

Minority Government. *See* Elections

Minors, sale of drugs to. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Miscou-Shippegan Islands, service, 2029

Mitchell, Mr. A. J., 46, qu., 471

Mitchell, Mr. Walter (St. Antoine)
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3002
Carriage or transportation, amdt., 3008
Canadian National railways
Deficits, 1910
Investigation proposed, 1908-17
Public ownership and operation, 1907
Rails and car repair contracts, 1694, 1709, 1961
Reference to by Mr. Meighen, 21, 207

Monckton Papers, purchase of, 1673

Moncton
Intercolonial headquarters, 313, 355, 2289
Railway shops, 1709

Money. *See also* Banks and Banking; Currency; Finance
Gold standard, 1291
Purchasing power of, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603, 2629. *See also* Address; Budget
Mark, German. *See* Germany

Money Bills. *See* Appropriation; Supply

Montpetit, Professor. *See* Genoa Conference

Montreal (city)
Bank of. *See* Banks
Canadian National railways' employees, 1288
Census figures, 1366
Clerks of the peace. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.
Cold storage warehouse, 819
Customs and excise employees, 1288
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392-4
Income tax office, qu., 607, 1288
Merchants' Association, 1392
Ordnance stores building, repairs, 1245
Post office employees, 1288
Post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Soldiers' civil re-establishment, staff, 1342
Suburban steam service, 135
Wages of workmen, 1465

Montreal (port). *See also* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, qu., 2631
Employees, qu., 2992
Expenditure to date, 1488
Facilities, 1472, 1473
Grain shipments through, 1489
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Revenue, 1465
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-1209, 1315-34

Montreal Gazette
Canadian National railways, 1923
King-Crerar alliance, 206
Montreal Harbour Commission, resignation, 1481

Montreal Harbour Commission, 1289, 1335. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission
Employees, 1289
Harbour master, Capt. Landry, 1481
Paint purchased, qu., 602
Policemen, qu., 2992
Resignation of commissioners, 1478-81
Tugboats, qu., 600

Montreal Harbour Commission Advances bill
Res., 1335, 1488; 1r., 1489; 2r., com., 3r., 3199

Monty, Hon. Mr., and conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill

Monuments. *See also* Battlefields; War Memorials
Historic sites, 119, qu., 469
New Brunswick, historic sites, qu., 469
Parliament hill, qu., 936

Moore, Mr. Tom, and immigration, 3053

Moosejaw public building improvements,

Morgan, J. P., & Company, 1131, 1133

Morganatic Alliances. *See* Alliances

Morin, Mr. L. S. René (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Canadian Northern railway, qu., 368
Wheat Board, 2926

Morphine. *See* Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Morrison, Mr. John (Weyburn)
Budget, 2699. Comparative prices of wheat and farm implements in Saskatchewan and North Dakota; shifting burden of taxation, 2699; exports of farm implements; competition in foreign markets; protection of industries; customs tariff inadequate to raise revenue, 2700; excise duty on manufactured goods; expense of running the Government; to much overhead, 2701; comparative development of Canada and the United states; freight rates and Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702; export rates on manufactured goods and agricultural products; prices of hides, wool, boots and shoes and clothing; exchange value of wheat and commodities, 2703
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3005
Crowsnest pass agreement, 2702
M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1425-6
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) 836
Sales tax collections, qu., 375
Saskatchewan liquor exports, 3005
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 435

Morrissy, Mr. John (Northumberland, N.B.)
Harbours and rivers, New Brunswick, 1992
Provincial wharves, 1992

Mothers, Widowed, pensions to. *See* Pensions

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. (Minister of Agriculture)
Abattoir inspectors, 969
Accredited herds, 649, 999
Diseases, 969
Valuation, 1003
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1012
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 1282, 3041, 3043, 3195
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1013
Agricultural lecturers, 1024
Agriculture department
Deputy Minister's salary, 653
Employees, 651
Estimates, 644, 1718, 3504, 3520
Lynton, Mr. T. J., 588
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 645, 651, 1013
Officials, 654-5
Professional men, 589
Salary increases, 588, 657
Saunders, Dr., 590
Alderson claim, hog cholera, 1004
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2102, 2734-43, 2806
Bacon, production and marketing, 1025
Budget, 2548. Fulfilment of election pledges; Liberal platform of 1893, 2548; tariff pledge; British preference; reciprocity, defeat of, 1911; free trade, 2549; unrestricted reciprocity; cry of annexation; opposition of manufacturers to proposal, 2550; Canada's tragic mistake; protection; infant industries; protection for the farmer, 2551; not a protectionist budget; a substantial step in right direction; Liberal platform of 1919; revision of Progressive platform, 2552; excise duty on manufactured articles; revenue, 2553; free trade and revenue duties; motor cars; Mr. Crerar's pre-election statements; gradual reduction of tariff, 2554; elimination of protective feature; Regina speech; time inopportune for drastic action, 2555; Department of Agriculture; accredited herds; tuberculosis in cattle, 2556; cold storage; experimental farm system, 2557; staff; Civil Service Commission, 2559; patronage, 2560
Canada Temperance Act Amdt bill, 2998
Carvell, Hon. F. B., 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Cattle embargo, 970, 979, 1021
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Cold storage, 818, 998, 1024, 2557, 3521

Motherwell, Hon. W. R. — *Con*
Criminal Code, cruelty to animals, 2834
Dairies, inspection of, 1006
Dairy produce, grading, 652, 656
Dairying industry, 982
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology
Botanical section, 816
Insect pests, 815
Exhibition grants, 649, 979
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 804, 812, 1014, 2557
Illustration farms, 3521
Fertilizers
Inspectors, 692
Manure, exportation of, 1021
Grasshoppers, 3520
Health of animals. *See also under this title,* Accredited Herds
Contagious diseases, 967
Hog cholera, 1008
Compensation, 1028
Tuberculosis, 2556, 3521
Hogs, grading of, 1025
Hudson Bay railway, completion, 2784
International Institute of Agriculture, 969
Klim, competition with milk, 981
Liquor, export of, 2998
Live stock industry, 978
Feed shortage in western Canada, 1030
Grazing and feeding, 1719, 3522
National live stock records, 1027
Provincial governments, overlapping, 997
Stockyards, 1030
Wolves, destruction by, 998-999
Milk supply, inspection of herds, 2740
Mixed farming, 998
Oleomargarine, 654
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1804
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3358, 3425-32, 3487
Pure bred sires, 1032
Railway Commission
Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement in regard to, 2773, 2774, 2778-9
Root Vegetables, sale and inspection of, 1282, 2724, 3142, 3194, 3369, 3486
Rust investigations, 594
Saskatchewan liquor export, 2998
Saunders, Dr. C. E., gratuity to, 3522
Seed Grain Commission, 1011
Spruce bud moth, 595
Wheat Board, 377, 2940
Wheat Board bill, 3382
Wool industry, 997

Motor Cars, Theft of. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Motor Trucks for transportation, 134

Mounted Police. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Moving Pictures. *See* Trade and Commerce

Mowing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Mulvey, Mr. Thomas, qu., 3363

Municipal Prison Farms, 1277. *See also* Prison Reform

Municipal Taxation, payment of by Government, 1256

Municipalities
Unemployment relief, 1069

Munitions. *See* Guthrie; King, Mackenzie, Militia and Defence; War

Munro, Mr. E. A. (Fraser Valley)
Oleomargarine, manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1793
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1537

Murdock, Hon. James (Minister of Labour)
Building trades, 583
Canmore and Drumheller coal miners' dispute, 1058
Civil Service, report of Hon. Mr. Robertson, 554
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1054
Cost of living, 1058
Employment offices, 1058
Gordon, Sir Charles, 584
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour department
Classification of employees, 494, 575
Director of technical education, 578
Economy and work, 465
Estimates, 1970, 3526
Outside employees, 493, 494
Permanent and temporary employees, 460-1
Staff and salaries, 458-9, 562, 575
Statistical work, 580
Wage investigators, 462
Labour Gazette, 1058
Militia and Defence
Cadet services, M. to reduce item by $100,000, 1972

Murdock, Hon. James — *Con*
Militia and Defence — *Con.*
Clothing and necessaries, M. to reduce item by $21,000, 1978
Engineer services and work, M. to reduce item by $50,000, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., M. to reduce item by $9,000, 1982
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item by $10,000, 1982
Nova Scotia miners, 46, 1054
Labour department officer, 585
M. (Mr. Irvine) 505
Printing Bureau, 1970
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696, 1701
Unemployment relief, 1074, 1719, 2022, 3526
Policy of government, inquiry, 3491
Rail and car repair contracts, 1696
Whitley councils, 1061
Winnipeg strike, correspondence with Mr. Andrews, 2042

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Postmaster General)
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Militia expenditure and policy, 1582
National Defence bill, 677
Post Office department
Employees
Bonus, 2801
Salaries, 691, 2801, 3504
Estimates, 1711, 2799
Inspectorates, reorganization, 1507
Outside service, 2799
Railway mail service, 2800
Reorganization, 2800
Rural mail delivery contracts, 2800, 2801
Subletting, 2802
Yukon, parcel post, 2802

Murray Bay-Tadoussac service, 3035

Musk Ox in northern Canada, 2785

Mutton, imported, qu., 610

Mutual Insurance. *See* Insurance

Nanaimo, B.C Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Nanton, Sir Augustus, 1128

Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Opium and Narcotic Drugs
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1289

Nassau Dam, qu., 2457

National Battlefields Commission. *See* Battlefields Commission

National Debt. *See* Public Debt

National Defence. *See also* National Defence bills
Department of
Ashton, Major General, 661
Burstall, Major General Sir Henry, 661, 742
Canadian air force and civil aviation, 1722
Currie, Sir Arthur, 659, 743
Elmsley, Major General, 661
Gwatkin, Major General, 742
MacBrien, Major General, 661, 742
Morrison, Sir Edward, 661
Naval students in armories, physical drill, 1741
Services, co-ordination, 91, 97, 1747

National Defence, Department of, bills respecting
1. No. 15. 1r., 363-4; order for 2r., discharged, 547-8
2. No. 27. Res., 644, 657; 1r., 2r., com., 681; com., 733; 3r., 787; Senate amdts., 2806
Sections and subjects discussed:
Air Service, 658, 677
Amalgamation of services, 658
Appointment of officer to exercise powers of deputy, 737
Controller, 741
Defence Council, 746
Deputy Minister, 737
Desbarats, Mr. J. B., 737
Federal laws, enforcement of, 680
Holder of position abolished may be appointed to another, 741
Militia, 658
Naval Service, 658
Officers, retirement of, 661, 742
Officials, 736
Orders in Council, 661
Powers of Minister and deputy, 746
Regulations, 746
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 658
Secret service, 670-9
Services included, 733

National Gallery, 2011

National Industrial Conference, unemployment insurance, qu., 1375

National Livestock Records, 1026

National Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

National Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

National Status. *See* Canada

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways

Nationalists, 187
Conservative alliance with, 2095. *See also* Naval Service
Naval policy and, 1849, 1877

Natural Resources. *See also* Forestry; Mines and Minerals
Alienation of, 2245, 2992
Coal lands, 3465, *See also* Coal
Development, 269
Foreign ownership of, 2243. *See also* United States
Investigation of mineral resources, 1234
Northern Canada, in, 2779-99
Water powers, 1051. *See also that title*
Western provinces of, 88, 89, 100, 116, 154, 168, 223, 229, 339
Aerial patrol, 1722
Agreement with Government of Manitoba, 1018
Claims of prairie provinces, 1017
Conference with premiers, 1017
Tabled, 1769
Norris, Premier, reported statement, 1213
Transfer of, M. (Mr. Meighen) for correspondence, 1509

Naturalization. *See also* Dominion Elections Act

Naturalization Act, 1388, 1390
Disabilities of British-born under, 1389-91
Expenses, 1671, 2024
Further legislation, inquiry, 3103

Naturalization Act, 1914, Amdt. bills
1. Residence (Mr. Archambault) 1r., 1062
2. Method of application (Mr. Copp) 1r., 3436

Naval Armaments. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval College. *See under* Naval Service, Royal Naval College

Naval Defence. *See* Naval Service

Naval Fortifications. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Naval Service. *See also* Marine; National Defence
Aurora, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, 1898. *See also that title*

Naval Service — *Con.*
Canadian navy, members stranded, 3365
Cruisers and destroyers, expenditure, qu., 2039
Department
Deputy Minister. *See* National Defence
Estimates, 1843, 1862, 2043
Reduction in, 2371
Naval council and officers, qu., 1774
Salaries, 418, 1735, 1745
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, officers, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 665, 678, 1736, 1740, 1747
Gift of ships to Canada, 2050
Hydrographic service, 1736, 1746
Naval college, 2047, 2203, 2458
Naval defence
Contribution of dominions, 1742
"Five trawler policy", 1741-5
Naval policy, 2043-84
Naval volunteers, 2058
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Pensions, widowed mothers, 1305
Protection of fur seals, 1844
Radiotelegraph service, 1736, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, qu., 366, 1843, 1862
Aurora, cruiser, qu., 827, 1736, 2051
Debate postponed, 1742-5, 1900, 1072
Dreadnoughts, contribution of, 1876
Esquimalt naval station, 1740
Estimates, 2043
Gift of ships to Canada, 1880-7, 2050
Halifax, protection and service at, 1740
Naval reserve force, 1739
Naval volunteer force, 1740
Niobe and Rainbow, 1736
Patricia, 1736, 2051
Patriot, 1736, 2051
Policy adopted, in 1913, 1876
Resolution of 1909, 1873
Ships to be taken out of commission, 1740
Submarines, 1845
Training, 1740
Travelling expenses, qu., 3156
Trawlers, 1740
Units, cost, etc., qu., 965
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827
Royal Naval college, Esquimalt, 2044
Closing of, 2047, 2203, 2458
Tidal surveys, 1736
Transfer of services to Minister of Marine and Fisheries, 3611
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
War service badge, 1754

Navigation. *See also* Marine
Aids to, 1498
Detroit river, 1498
Life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Rainy river lights, 1499
St. Lawrence river waterway, M. (Mr. Church) 1183
Schools of, 1492

Navy. *See* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; National Defence; Naval Service; Royal Canadian Navy

Neill, Mr. Alan W. (Comox-Alberni)
Address in reply, 169. Congratulations to preceding speakers; Miss Macphail, 169; comparison of parties; British Columbia and protection, 170; Mr. Crerar, 170-171; Orientals in British Columbia, 171; personal position and platform, 172-3; unemployment; wider markets, 174; railway rates, 175; the tariff; free trade and protection, 176; Chinese eggs, 177; butter and oleomargarine, 177-8; coal mines in Vancouver Island; fuel oil importations, 178; Hon. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Clements; vote in Cumberland district, 179; railways and government ownership, 180; necessaries and luxuries, 182; immigration, 182-3; Asiatics, competition with; soldier settlement, 183; inheritance tax; eight hour day; old age pensions; removal of Dominion Elections Act from statutes, 184
British Columbia
Coastal services, qu., 3152
Fisheries, cost and revenue, 2306
Fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 860
Post offices, qu., 824
Public buildings, 1258
British Columbia house, London, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2307. Free trade and protection: a question of geography, 2307; the tariff, a compromise; economic position of British Columbia; support of government during session; expenditures in Vancouver and Victoria; rural constituencies neglected, 2309; political arguments for Conservative members; fruit industry and dumping clause; Oriental aliens; exclusion of, 2310; acquisition of British Columbia timber areas by Japanese; immediate action demanded; the workingman and the eight hour day; lumber industry and freight rates, 2311; protection of coal mining industry against fuel oil; importation of coal from Japan; fishing industry; reduction in gasoline practically no benefit to fishermen; dairy industry; fruit industry; dumping clause; industries of Comox-Alberni, 2313; country districts suffering injustice; views of constituents, 2314
Canadian Freighter, Japanese coal imports, qu., 963
Civil Service reform, 3100
Courtney post office building, 1258
Criminal Code, carriage of calves under three weeks' old, 2831
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1438
Debates, official report, insertion of documents not read, 1540
Debeaux, Mr. Robert, claim of, 2306
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2811
Election day a public holiday, 2812
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women M. (Mr. Euler) 485
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1354, 1439, 1602-6
Amdt. 1156, neg., 1163
Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3012
Fuel oil, British Columbia, qu., 728, 2312
Gasoline for fishing boats, 2313, 3116
House of Commons, accoustics, 3544
Immigration
Methods, 3057
South-eastern Europe, from, 3057
Immigration Act Amdt. bill (Intending immigrants to make application) 2207
Indians, medical attention, 1219
International Labour Conference, qu., 824
Japanese in British Columbia, 2310. *See also under this title,* Oriental Aliens
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 521
Oleomargarine, Manufacture and importation, M., 1777, 1836
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3016
Oriental Aliens
Japanese, acquisition of timber areas in British Columbia, 3210
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1539
Paper mills, 3113
Pensions Com., final report, 3332
Point of order
Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rule 19, offensive words, 1361

Neill, Mr. Alan W. — *Con.*
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1469
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt., 3407
Special War Revenue Act
Sales tax, 3269
Stumping powder, 3268
Statistics, co-ordination of, 581

Neill, Mr. C. E., 1128

Nelson post office revenue, qu., 2040

Neutrals and Non-Combatants. *See* Limitation of Armaments

New Brunswick
Floods, 3492
Harbours and rivers, 1991
Amdt. (Mr. Guthrie) to reduce vote, 1998
Immigration and, 2165
Public buildings, 1239
St. John and Quebec railway, 1293, qu., 1774
Salmon rivers, fishways, 2167
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1344
Wharves
Provincial, 1991
Tidal waters in, qu., 2209
Transfer of, qu., 2305

New London, Conn., seaport, 2611

New York Central Railway, 128

New Zealand
Butter. *See* Oleomargarine
Government ownership of railways, 181

Newfoundland
Canada-Newfoundland steamship service, 2027
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Reid-Newfoundland railway, 2027
Trade between Prince Edward Island and, 226

Newfoundland-Labrador Boundary
Reference to Privy Council, 1276
Doherty, Hon. C. J. reported engagement of, 2572
White, Mr. James, technical adviser, 3495

Newmarket, speech of Prime Minister at, 34-35

Newspapers
Censors, 1069
English, comment on Grand Trunk arbitration, 374, 821
Extracts. *See* Speaker, Rulings

Niagara Power Development, 134. *See also* Electrification; St. Lawrence river waterway

Nickel. *See also* Coinage

Nickel Coin Blanks, qu., 3152

Nickel Currency. *See* Currency Act Amdt.

Niobe and Rainbow, 1736. *See also* Naval Service

Non-Taxable Bonds. *See* Bonds; Finance

Norman Dam. *See* Lake of the Woods

Normand, Hon. Dr., references to. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Norris, Hon. T. C., Premier of Manitoba
Natural resources, 1017
And freight rates, reported statement on, 1213

North Sydney quarantine station, 1238, 2021

Northern Islands and Waters
Patrol. *See* Naval Service
Policy respecting, 1750

Northwest Rebellion
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, pensions. *See* Pensions
Smith, Mr. Leo, pension to, 3523

Notices of Cancellation. *See* Dominion Lands

Nova Scotia
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Air station at Dartmouth, 1724
Coal industry, protection of, 2412
Coal strike, 461. *See also* Nova Scotia Miners
Harbours and rivers, estimates, 1269, 1765
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Liberal party in, 2606
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Pensioners in, qu., 615
Public buildings, 1238
Shipbuilding, 1387
Supreme Court, vacancy, 3436
Unemployment, 1075-6

Nova Scotia Miners, qu., 605, 1054. *See also* Labour
Inquiry, 597
McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
M. (Mr. Irvine) 497, 539, 545

Noxious Gases and Chemicals, use of. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Observatory. *See* Dominion Observatory

Occupational Diseases. *See* Labour

Ocean
Ports, 1464-86
Tonnage, 2008
Vessels
Quebec, 1471
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1183-95, 1205

Ocean and River Service. *See* Marine

O'Connor, Mr. James, Snowflake, Man., dismissal, 1674

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C.
Payments to, qu., 2037
Revision of statutes, 1718

Official Report of Debates. *See* House of Commons

O'Hara, Captain, 1490

Oil. *See also* Natural Resources
Duty on oil drilling machinery, 2726
Fuel Oil, 344, qu., 728
Competition with coal mining industry, 2312
Importations, 178
Tank at Louise basin, 1484
Tariff against, 1761
Leases, speculation in, 1046
Mackenzie and Peace river, cost of surveys, 1044

Okanagan Valley, fruit growing, 163. *See also* Budget; Customs, Dumping clause; Fruit

Old Age Pensions, 184, 1070, qu., 1375. *See also* Pensions
And mothers' pensions, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303-5

Oleomargarine, 2205. *See also* Agriculture; Butter; Dairying
British Columbia Dairymen's Association, res., 1794
Children fed on, 178
Competition with butter, 177
Further legislation, inquiry, 3041
Great War Veterans' Association, 1798
Importation and Manufacture, qu., 613, qu., 1506
Discontinuance of, M. (Mr. Neill) 1720, 1776, neg., 1840

Oleomargarine — *Con.*
Local Council of Women, Hamilton, 1835
Materials, importation of, qu., 704, qu., 727, 3270
National Dairy Council, and, 1791
Regulations under Act, qu., 1702
Retail Merchants' Association and, 1797

Oleomargarine Act, 1919, Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res., 3358, 3425; 1r., 3435; 2r., 3487; com., 3489; 3r., 3489

Oliver, Hon. John, Premier of British Columbia, criticism of by Vancouver Sun, 2236, 2237

One-Fourth Vote. *See* Interim Supply

Onion Grades, 2744. *See also* Root Vegetables

Ontario
Alienation of natural resources, qu., 2992
Canals, 2779. *See also that title*
Flags on public schools, 1265
Harbours and rivers, 1999
Historic battle sites, 119-120
Hydro Electric Power Commission. *See that title*
Public buildings, 1245
Appropriations not required, 1259
Improvements, repairs, etc., 1258
Rural population, loss of, 301. *See also* Budget; Population
Taxation of, 131
Water powers. *See* Lake of the Woods

Ontario Athletic Commission, cadet camps, 1973

Ontario Temperance Act. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Opium and Narcotic Drugs. *See also* Health
Chinese, 2018
Cocaine, 2019
Correspondence with wholesale druggists, 1377
Enforcement of Act
Prosecutions, 2017
Japanese, 2017
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Morphine, 2019
Oriental traffic in, 1529, 2017. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Production and export of, 2019
Prohibition and, 2017
Smuggling, 2020

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1841, 2823; 1r., 2826; 2r., com., 3013; 3r., 3025; Senate amdts., 3607

Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. — *Con.*.
Sections and subjects discussed:
Appeal, restriction of right, 3020
Dealing in drugs, 3013
Deportation, 3013, 3024
Penalties, 3013, 3014, 3020
Whipping, 3015

Opposition. *See also* Progressive Party
Attitude of, 60-61. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Position of. *See* Interim Supply
Representation in Parliament, 40
Status of leader of, 73

Orchards, protection of. *See* Entomology; Fruit Industry

Orders in Council, qu., 935
Canadian National railways, management, 192
Government by, 38, 141, 660, 662, 2518, 2536, 2562, 2880
Intercolonial railway operation, 107
Number passed, qu., 934, qu., 935

Ordnance Lands, local improvements fronting, 1681

Orient, trade with, 85. *See also* Trade

Oriental Aliens, 967
Australian legislation, 1536
Birth rate, 317
British Columbia in, 167, 171, 316, 332, 855
Resolution of legislature, 1513
Restrictive legislation, 1510
Canadians, disabilities in Japan, 1511, 2208
Chinese, 1510, 2026 3437
Arrival of at Vancouver, 3604
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2020
Coal mined by, 2407
Coolie labour on British ships, 2042
Demands for exclusion of, 1513
Education, cost of, 317
Fisheries, engaged in, 345, 855
Franchise and, 483, 485
Fruit growing and, 1535. *See also* Fruit Industry
Gentlemen's agreement, 1511
Immigration, 319, 2161. *See also that title*
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Chinese Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776
Inquiry for opportunity to discuss, 967, **1461, 3104**
Japanese
Restriction of, M. (Mr. Stevens) 1776

Oriental Aliens — *Con.*
Rights of Canadians in Japan, 1511, 2208
Minister's statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2148
Written application by intending immigrants, 2207
Japan, treaty with, 1511
Japanese, qu., 1399, qu., 1459, 1510
Acquisition of timber limits in British Columbia, 2310
Competition in British Columbia, 2279
Lemieux agreement, 1459
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017. *See also that title*
Labour, competition with, 317
Land occupation by, 1534
Number in Canada, 1512
Motion (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1509
Amdt. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil) for "effective restriction", 1567; agreed to, 1577
Canada's right to legislate, 1550
"Effective restriction", 1567
Opium and Narcotic drug traffic, 1529, 2017

Osler, Sir Edmund, 1128

Ottawa
Cartier square Militia dept., shed, qu., 2038
Daly building, purchase of, 1252
Daylight saving, 1282
Dominion observatory and geodetic survey building, 1265
Local improvements fronting ordnance lands, 1681
New departmental buildings, 3541
Noon gun, 1756
Ottawa Gas Company bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed
Ottawa-Kingston highway, qu., 1904
Parliament buildings, 2014. *See also that title*
Proposed donation of Rideau canal to, 2764
Public buildings, 1245, 1252, 1265, 1755
Char service, 1756
Elevator attendants, 1266
Lighting, including roads and bridges, 1267
Rental of buildings in, 1252, 1764
Rideau hall, maintenance, 1756
Telephone service, 1757
Water, 1266

Ouimet, Mr. Joseph Rodolphe (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Introduction of, 323

Outside Service. *See* Civil Service

Overages. *See* Grain and Grain Trade; Elevators

Pacific and Great Eastern Railway, 342

Pacific Naval Powers. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Pairs. *See* House of Commons, Divisions

Palais Station, Quebec, 1068

Palestine, mandate over, 1716

Panama Canal, 191, 1326-9. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Panet, Mr. L. C., appointment as Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, 5

Paper Control Inquiry, 1673

Paper ror magazines, taxation, 3108

Parc St. Charles, 1469, 3197. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission

Parent, Mr. George (Quebec West)
Appraisers, Paris and London, 1068
Civil Service examinations, 871
Insurance premiums, 3253
Labour dept., organized and unorganized labour, qu., 2303
Military Service Act Amdt. bill, 641
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Quebec bridge, 1068
Quebec riots, qu., 1508
Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370

Parents, support of by children, 1310. *See also* Pensions; Widowed Mothers

Paris Agency, 2025

Parks. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks

Parliament
Fall session, 3608
Opening of, 1
Prorogation of, 3616
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183

Parliament Buildings
Architects' fees, 2014
Cost to date, 2014
Estimates, 2014
Furniture, purchase of, 1757
House of Commons Chamber, accoustics, 1751, 1755, 1996, 3613. *See also that title*
Lighting, 1755
Tower, 2016

Parliament Hill monuments, qu., 936

Parliamentary Counsel, 2572

Parliamentary Guide, 2024

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Parliamentary Restaurant
Com. appointed, 326
Loss in, 184

Parry Sound
Lighthouse inspector, qu., 827
Postal receipts, qu., 938

Parsons, Mr. W. Reuben, qu., 3362

Party Representation, 214

Party System of Government, 2339. *See also* Address; Budget

Party System of Politics, 117-118, 214, 215. *See also* Address; Budget

Passenger Rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Passport Office, 2066

Patent Record, 2026

Paternalism. *See* Pensions Committee

Patricia, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriot, warship, qu., 827. *See also* Naval Service

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund

Patronage, 2608. *See also* Budget; Civil Service; Speeches on Address
Appointments to penitentiary, 1277
Census enumerators, appointment of, 1368, 1372
Civil service, 1663
Civil Service Commission, 2559, 2563
Intercolonial railway and, 106
Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Peace River block, 330

Peace Treaties. *See* Limitation of Armaments; Treaties

Pears, Vice Admiral Sir Edmund, 2061

Pearson, Mr. John A., Architect. *See* Parliament Buildings

Pearson Institute, Toronto, 3457

Pease, Mr. E. L., 1128

Peat. *See also* Fuel; Natural Resources
Committee, 1505
Deposits, experiments and production, qu., 1505
Investigational work, 1235

Pecuniary Claims Convention with United States, 1276

Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844

Penitentiaries. *See also* Justice; Prisons
Appointments, 1277
Death of inmates, qu., 3362
Dorchester, prison reform, 1278
Estimates, 1276
Supplementary, 1670
Infectious diseases. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill
Inmates
Foreign and native, 1279
Increase in number, 1277, 1279, 1670
Inspection by grand juries, 1743. *See also* Prison Reform
Kingston, overcrowding, qu., 3362
Patronage, appointments, 1277
Population, increased, 1277, 1279, 1670
Prison reform. *See that title*
St. Vincent de Paul, employees and number of convicts, qu., 2804

Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, (Infectious diseases) 1r., 545; 2r., 787; com., 787; 3r., 967

Penny Bank Act Amdt. bill
Res., 1132, 3043; 1r., 3043; 2r., com., 3r., 3148

Penny Banks, depositaries for money received, 1132

Pension Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3402; 1r., 3405; 2r., com., 3439; com., 3459; 3r., 3463; Senate amdts., 3612
Sections and subjects discussed:
Application for pension, 3445
Blinded men, 3456
Bonus payments continued, 3451
Deserted mothers, 3439
Disability at or prior to discharge, 3452
Disability attributable to, incurred or aggravated during military service, 3453
Pension to widow, 3447
Power to cancel pension of prostitute, 3451

Pension Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Sections and subjects discussed — *Con.*
Residents in Canada, 3446
Time within which application must be made, 3445
Total and helpless disability, 3446
Widowed mother, 3439

Pension Commissioners, Board of
Amalgamation with Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment dept., 1339-40
Charges by G.W.V.A. against, 2994, 3041. *See also* Speeches on Address
Memorandum of Chairman in reply, 2994
Royal Commission to investigate, 3156, 3304, 3312, 3327, 3336, 3345, 3352, 3355-6
Expenditure, 1349
Imperial pensions, 1347-51
Medical examinations, 1343
Salaries and contingent expenses, 1339, 1349
Secondary boards, 1350
Staff, 1351

Pensions. *See also* National Defence bill; Railways
Civil, 1711
Commutation of, 390, 1281, 1349
Crimean war, 3315
Disabilities, 390
European war and active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Fabre, Madame, 2024
Fenian raid, 3315
Grand Trunk railway employees, 2041. *See also that title* under Canadian National Railways
Imperial Forces, M. (Mr. Ladner) 864, 1347-51
Increased, 184
Investigation. *See under this title,* Roya Commission
Lightkeepers, 1496
Maternity benefits, 1070
Mothers, qu., 1375
Deceased soldiers, of, M. (Mr. Power) 1313
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Nova Scotia, payment in, qu., 615
Old age, 184, 1070, qu., 1375
M. (Mr. Fontaine) 1303, agreed to, 1305
Returned soldiers, 320, 327. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Royal Commission on, suggested, 386. *See also* Pensions Board
Sickness, 1070
South African war, 3315
Total expenditure on, 1349

Pensions — *Con.*
Widowed mothers, 1312, 3324
M. (Mr. Power) 1305, 1313
Widows, 1070
Wrenick, Mrs., 3457

Pensions, Insurance and Re-establishment of Returned Soldiers
Special Committee appointed, 496-7
Change in names, 596
First report, 726
Final report, 3286
M. (Mr. Marler) for adoption, 3286
Amdt. (Mr. Shaw) to refer back, 3308; Withdrawn, 3349
Recommendations, expenditure under, 3522

Pilotage
Administration of, 1499
Dues, exemption from, 1500. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt. bill
Fees to pilots and regulation of, 1499

Pleuro-Pneumonia. *See* Cattle Embargo; Health of Animals

Ploughs, duty on. *See* Agricultural Implements

Pocket-Knives, Competition, 2646, 2876. *See* Budget; Currency, depreciated; Customs Act; Germany

Police Commissioners, bribing of. *See* Criminal Code

Political Alliances, "Morganatic", 2095. *See also* Nationalists; Progressive Party

Political Contributions, by Monopolies, 2295. *See also* Election of 1921

Political Patronage. *See* Patronage

Polls. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Pollution of Streams, 2168

Pool Selling. *See* Criminal Code Amdt. bill

Population. *See also* Budget; Census; Immigration
By ages, qu., 1632
Drift towards the cities, 2153, 2302
Increase under Liberal and Conservative govts., 2362, 2365
Loss of, 2439-40, 2449
Rural. *See under this title,* Rural
Ten years, in, 2516
Need of increased, 2148-58, 2275

Population — *Con.*
Oriental in Canada, 1512. *See also* Oriental Aliens
Rural, 2564-5
Decline in, 2153, 2156, 2158, 2384, 2439-40, 2449, 2683
Loss in Ontario, 2369, 2683
Movement to cities and towns, 2153, 2302, 2403
Urban, and, qu., 376
Infant mortality and, 2634
Slow growth of, 2158
Yukon territory, 1681

Pork Imports, qu., 611

Port Arthur
Canadian Towing and Wrecking Co. claim, 1677

Port Dalhousie, 1493

Port Hood breakwater, 1768

Port Nelson, dredging, 2006

Portage La Prairie
Assiniboine river floods, 1842, 2004
Exhibition grant, qu., 1931
Post office revenue, qu., 2040

Porter, Mr. E. G. (East Hastings)
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3457
Trenton harbour bill, 3494
Wrenick, Mrs., pension, 3457

Portland Terminus, 2611
Competition with Canadian ports, 104, 2611. *See also* Grand Trunk Railway; British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)

Ports, United States in preference to Canadian, 353-4

Postal Conference, 7, 15

Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Post Office
Department
Appointments, 3073
Belley, Mr. Alfred, salary, 3504
Classification, 3089
Employees receiving salary of $600, qu., 1067
Estimates, 1711
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary and duties, qu., 3599
General superintendent of postal service, 1711
Married women employees, qu., 1658

Post Office — *Con.*
Department — *Con.*
Money Order branch, qu., 1285
Outside service, estimates, 2799
Postal employees, 3075
Printing and stationery, 1741
Salaries and contingencies, 69, 3504
Drop letter rate, 1250
Letter rate, Canada-Great Britain, qu., 3364
Mail, carriage of, qu., 825
Mail contracts
Canadian National railways, qu., 2038
Canadian Pacific railway, and, qu., 2040, qu., 2213
Gascons-Quebec, qu., 2213
Grand Anse, qu., 938
Lachenaie, qu., 2805
Richmond and Wolfe, qu., 1505
Rigaud-St. Rédempteur, 1776
Sudbury, qu., 1285
Money orders tax, 2857
Montreal
Employees, 1288
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599
Post offices and business done, qu., 1065
Postal receipts, qu., 938
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm, 1775
Sturgeon falls, qu., 1285
Post offices in British Columbia, qu., 824
Railway mail service, 2797
Reorganization, 2799
Revenue, qu., 2040
Richmond and Wolfe post offices, qu., 1507
Ruling respecting newspaper or magazine subscription, qu., 3599
Rural mail routes, qu., 3152
Savings banks, reduction in interest rate, qu., 1932
Sherbrooke inspectorate, qu., 1507
Subsidized steamships and carriage of mails, 2028
Toronto, revenue, qu., 368, 1250

Potatoes
Conference of growers, 3367
Cost of growing, 2665
Duty on, 239, 2601
Grading machines, 3126
Market for, 225
Marking and grading. *See* Root Vegetables
Prices of, 94
Shipment to Cuba, 2028
Shipping cost. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Trade with United States, 336. *See also* Budget

Potlatch Institution. *See* Indians

Poultry Industry, 226, 807

Power, Mr. C. G. (Quebec South)
Admiralty Court, vacancy at Quebec, 1275
Cash grants to soldiers, 394
Fishing schooner race, 3510
MacInnes, Mr. Hector, K.C. (Halifax) payments to, 2772
Militia
Annual drill, amdt. to reduce vote by $1,100,000, 1173, 1174, neg., 1631
Engineer services and works, 1980
Expenditure and policy, annual training, 1611
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3402, 3443
Pensions
Mothers of deceased soldiers, M., 1313
Widowed mothers, M., 1305, 1312
Point of order — not permissible to read evidence to controvert member, 3540
References to, 1339
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3396
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 398

Power Development. *See* Electrification; Hydro Electric; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Prairie Provinces
"Annexation of", 1020
Forestry in, 1046
Natural resources. *See* Western Provinces

Pratt vs. Delphine, 302

Preference, trade. *See* British Preference; Trade; United States

Premiums, Insurance tax on. *See* Special War Revenue

Prescriptions, refilled. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Preservation of Industries Act, 2648

President Harding, St. Lawrence river waterway, 1326

Press. *See also* Canadian Press; Newspapers
Censors, 1068

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., rent of house in London, 3503

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. (Terrebonne)
Bertrand, Mr. T., qu., 937
Budget, 2577. Tribute to Finance Minister, his difficulties and responsibilities; the

Prevost, Mr. Jules E. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tariff, 2577; proposals in harmony with Liberal policy; new taxes; inheritance of debts from former governments; effort to lower cost of living; economy, 2578; national debt; militia or naval expenditure; expansion of external trade; decrease in exports; restoration of normal conditions, 2579; Canadian market insufficient for natural products and manufactured goods; trade with Great Britain and the United States; Fordney tariff; transportation; interior systems of communication, 2580; direct intercourse with foreign countries; duty of the department of Trade and Commerce; consuls and trade agents; information; trade commissioners; qualifications, 2581, fairs and exhibitions; serious problems; the future; new political groups; development of Canadian national spirit, 2582
Civil Service Commission report, qu., 826
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, 1298
Imports and exports, 1911-1922, qu., 1661
Militia and Defence
Annual drill
Expenditure 1911-21, qu., 1287
Armouries in Quebec, qu., 1287
Expenditure 1911-22, qu., 1287
Stationery, purchase of by Government, 1288

Pribyloff Islands, protection of fur seals, 1844

Prices. *See also* Budget; Cost of Living; Finance; Trade
Price-fixing combinations, 2428, 2437
Regulations of, 2504

Prime Minister's Bereavement, reference to death of brother. *See* King

Prime Ministers' Conference, 42. *See also* Naval Service
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 168
Correspondence, 1068
Empire naval defence, 1629, 1883, 2082
Canada's contribution, 1742
Resolution respecting, 1742
Opportunity for discussion of, 2042
Report, 5
Tabled, 8
Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Prince County, illegal fishing, qu., 371

Prince Edward Island
Harbours and rivers, 1270, 1988
Migratory birds, resolution of legislature, 1684
Natural resources, 339
Potato-growing, 225, 337
Public lands, 229
Railway, 229, 337, 1249. *See also* Canadian National Railways

Prince of Wales Leinster regiment, qu., 1065

Prince Rupert
Alien property, custodians of, 3601
Post office building, 1257
Post office revenue, qu., 2040
Prince Rupert Dry Dock & Engineering Co., 3514
Rental of buildings, 1257
Vessels constructed at, qu., 606

Princess Mary, marriage of, 39

Printers, immigration of, 3055

Printing. *See also* Printing Bureau; Publications
Canadian National menus, qu., 1931
Customs and excise, 1674
Joint Committee on, 211, 326, 1132
Public archives, 1673

Printing Bureau
Government printing, 1373
Government publications, distribution of, 1971
Legislation, 1972
Plant
New, 1970
Repairs and renewals, 1970
Statutes, 1972
Supreme Court reports, 1274

Printing and Stationery
Criminal Code, 1717
Interior, 1680
Post Office department, 1711
Statutes, 1717

Prison Reform, 1277-8; qu., 1773, 2397
Atlanta penitentiary, 1278
Dorchester penitentiary, 1278
Inspection by grand juries, qu., 1773, 2397
Jail farms, 1277-9; qu., 1773
Youthful offenders, qu., 1773

Prisoners, Contagious diseases of. *See* Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill

Pritchard, Mr. John (North Wellington)
Address in reply, 250. Congratulations, etc., parliamentary groups and class representation, 250; manufacturers and the tariff, 251; agricultural conditions, 252
Experimental farms, 806, 810

Private Bills, Committee, 374
Bouchard, Mr., substitution for Mr. Stein, 2035
Vien, Mr. substitution for Mr. Ouimet, 2355

Private Bills Discussed
Canadian Pacific Railway Company
Amdt. (Mr. Carmichael) 1606, 1856
Canadian Transit Company, 1746, 1770
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490, 3495
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Co., 1353, 1439
Amdts. (Mr. Neill) 1156, neg. 1163; 1354, neg. 1357; 1602, neg. 1606
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 1577
Montreal, Joliette and Transcontinental Railway Company, 1577
Niagara River Bridge Company, 1486
Ottawa Gas Company, refund of fees, 1657

Private Bills Undiscussed. *See* Journals of the House

Private Secretaries. *See* Privy Council

Privilege, questions of. *See* House of Commons

Privy Council
Appeals, 139
Salaries and contingencies, 410

Proclamation. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Progressive Party, 295. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Council of Agriculture; Crerar; United Grain Growers; Wheat Board
Alleged split, denial, 2458
Alliances of, 2095-7
Attitude towards Government, 2233, 2507, 2842
Big interests and, 2393-4
Budget debate and, 2692
Canadian Pacific, and, 130
Class legislation and, 224. *See also* Address; Budget
Liberal negotiations with, 34, 48, 51, 240-1
Oleomargarine, attitude on, 2380. *See also that title*

Progressive Party — *Con.*
Ontario in, 2301, 2893-4
Origin of, 2512
Platform, revision, 2552
Redistribution, attitude towards, 1364-70

Prohibition. *See also* Canada Temperance Act; Liquor
Opium and Narcotic drugs, 2017

Property, alien enemy. *See* Aliens

Proportional Representation, 59. *See also* Dominion Elections
M. (Mr. Good) for adoption of alternative vote method, 1633
Residential qualification, 1301

Prorogation of Parliament, 3616

Proscription. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip frauds)

Protection, 143, 228. *See also* Address; Budget
Boots and shoes, 102
Manufacturers and, 2435-40. *See also* Budget
Policy of, 1088
Tariff and, 170, 2110. *See also* Tariff

Protocols. *See* League of Nations

Provinces. *See also* Natural Resources. For individual provinces, *See their titles*
Air Force and civil aviation, 1722
Unemployment relief, 1069
Western. *See that title*

Provincial Rights, infringement. *See* Lake of the Woods bill

Ptomaine Poisoning. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Public Accounts. *See also* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act
Committe, report, 1460, 3359
Date of closing, 1264-66
Non-productive assets, 1467

Public Archives
Estimates, 702, 1673, 2025
Monckton papers, purchase of, 1673

Public Buildings, 1755. *See also* their respective titles; Public Works; Supply
Alberta, 3545
Appropriations and expenditures for 1921-22, 1259-60
Chambers, Mr., 1244
Char service. *See* Ottawa

Public Buildings — *Con.*
Coal, importation of, 1759
Estimates, 1238, 1258, 1755
Expenditure, accounts not closed, 1262-66
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Flags, qu., 599, 1264
Generally, 1260-5
Heating, 1755-1758
Immigration, repairs, 1757
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
New, 1255, 2461
New Brunswick, 1239
New departmental designs, 3541
Nova Scotia, 1238
Ontario, 1245-59, 1258, 3544
Alleged neglect of, 1248
Ottawa, 1245-52, 1265, 1755. *See also that title*
Parliament buildings. *See that title*
Penitentiaries, 1277
Quebec, 1245
Rental and purchase of, 1764
Calgary, 1254
Ottawa, 1252
Prince Rupert, 1257
Waterbury, Mr., retirement of, 1244

Public Debt, 2106, 2225, 2370, 2496, 2501, 2895. *See also* Address; Budget; Finance; Loans
Taxation and, 2459

Public Expenditure, 1249, 2276, 2860
Capital expenditure on harbours and rivers, 1472
Comparison by departments, 1137
Debt, and, 2557
Dominion and provincial overlapping, 2461
Economy in, 1475. *See also* Address; Budget
In 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
Income and, 2104
Reduction of. *See* Address; Budget; Militia and Defence; Naval Service

Public Harbours. *See* Harbours

Public Health. *See* Health

Public Lands. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Natural Resources

Public Ownership. *See* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway

Public Service Retirement Act Amdt. bill (Extension for one year)
Res. 1661, 3025; 1r., 2r., com., 3025; com., 3148; 3r., 3149

Public Services, nationalization of, 2324, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian National Railways

Public Works. *See also* Public Buildings; Supply
Bridges. *See that title*
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal of, ques., 1902, 2458, 2584
Department
Carty, Captain, 1062
Chief Architects' Branch, qu., 963
Estimates, 1238, 1755, 1988, 3531
Estimates branch, 1270
Expenditures, 1249
Minister, selection of from British Columbia Government, 2238
Salaries, etc., 692, 747
M. (Mr. Boys) reduce item, 695, 699
Harbours and rivers. *See that title*
Miscellaneous, 2008
New public buildings, 1256
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Public buildings. *See that title*
Roads and bridges, 2007
Burlington, 2007
Edmonton, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Unemployment relief, 1082
Yukon territory, expenditure in, 1275

Publications, Government. *See also* Editorial Committee
Co-ordination and economy, 1374
Demand and distribution, 1344, 1971
Geological survey, 1237
Mines, 1234-6
Printing and translation, 1373. *See also* Printing Bureau
Printing, unnecessary, 1374

Publicity Agent. *See* Labour

Pulp and Paper Industry, 2322. *See also* Natural Resources; Paper Control
British Columbia in, 175
Export duty on pulpwood, 2667

Purchasing Commission, 2674
Coal, for public buildings, 1758
Estimates, 2025
Goods purchased, origin of, 2042
Suggested abolition of, 2674
Warlike stores, sale of, 1173

Purchasing Power of Money, 1151-3, 1175, 1177, 1292, 2331, 2603. *See also* Address; Budget; Civil Service; Cost of Living; Money

Putman, Mr., C. V., qu., 935

Putnam, Mr. Harold (Colchester)
Address in reply, 309. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 309; Progressives and the party spirit, 310; leader of the Opposition; immigration; tariff; railway problems, 311; Intercolonial railway, 312; elections and campaign literature, 315

Budget, 2282. Election issues and results; congratulations to Finance Minister; tariff reductions; no time for drastic changes; Liberal platform of 1919, 2283; interprovincial trade; geographical, physical and climatic difficulties, 2284; reciprocity with the United States, 2285; tariff reductions, 2286; trade with Germany; sales tax; the amendment, 2287; political pledges and promises, 2288; Liberal platform of 1919; record of the Opposition party, 2288; Union government; public honour; War Time Elections Act; tariff commission; intercolonial railway; promise of Mr. McCurdy to restore headquarters to Moncton, 2289; the Progressives, 2290
Canadian National railways, ties, qu., 934
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3478
Civil Service, returned soldiers, 3088
Condensed milk, tax on, 3265
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3425-34
Rural postmasters, 3080

Quadruple Pacific Treaty, 3160

Qualification of Voters. *See* Dominion Elections Act

Quarantine. *See also* Health; Immigration
Detention at Partridge Island, 2021
Estimates, 2021
Immigrant refusing vaccination, 2022
Stations
Grosse Isle, repairs, 1245
Halifax, repairs, 1238
North Sydney, repairs, 1238
St. John, repairs, 1239-40
William's Head, improvements, 1255

Quebec (City)
Admiralty, local judge in, 1275
Arsenal, 1979, 2085, 2091
Customs dues, 1978
Canadian National railway terminals, 1475
Champlain market station, 1475, 2399
Newspapers, political policies of, 1480
Palais station, 1068
Plains of Abraham, 1467
Riots, 676, 3089
Compensation for damage, qu., 1508

Quebec (Port). *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Appropriations for, 1486
Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert and, 1474
Elevators, 1471, 1483
Grain shipments through, 1466, 1471
Harbour Commission, 1283, 1464. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Parc St. Charles Co. Ltd., proposed payment to, 1469
Political patronage, 1478
Revenue and expenditure, 1471

Quebec (Province)
Attitude of towards Opposition, 168-9, 187, 206-7, 290. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address
Attitude towards West, 2912
Board of Pensions Commissioners, representation, 1350
Canals, 2779. *See also that title*
Census figures, 1366
Chaudière valley floods, 3492
Conscription and. *See* Military Service Act Amdt. bill
Election issues and results, 245
Fisheries, 142
Transfer to province, M. (Mr. Marcil) 377, 493, 616, 623
Order in council tabled, 8
Request for order in council, 5
Harbours and rivers, 1998
Harmony with, 14, 270, 291, 362, 2421
Public buildings, improvements, 1245
Public expenditure in, 1468
Public ownership and, 71. *See* Address; Budget
Superintendent of lighthouses, qu., 2584
Unfair treatment, alleged, 2398

Quebec and Western Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé Railways

Quebec Battlefields Commission, 119

Quebec Chronicle, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission
Gravel, Mr. 1477
Inquiry for return, 1283
Tremblay, General, 1477
Watson, Major-General Sir David, 1477

Quebec Harbour Commission bill (Further advances)
Res. 1464; reported, 1486; 1r., 1486; 2r., com., 3195; 3r., 3198

Quebec, Oriental and Atlantic Railway. *See* Canadian National Railways; Gaspé

Questions. *See their several titles.* For rulings, *See* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Speaker

Questions Passed as Orders for Returns
Accounts branch, Dept., of Militia and Defence (Mr. Vien) 2994
Animal diseases, compensation for, (Mr. Sutherland) 940
Armouries (Mr Baldwin) 1288
Army Service Corps (Mr. Lanctôt) 1905
Auditing, payments for, (Mr. Vien) 2993
Bankruptcy Act, Montreal district trustees (Mr. Archambault) 1183
Binder twine and rope (Mr. Gordon) 1905
Blackfoot reserve, greater production (Mr. Garland, Bow River) 1288
British Columbia fisheries (Mr. Neill) 2306
Calgary, Government office buildings, (Mr. Shaw) 939
Canadian National railways, coal purchase (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Canadian Northern, payments from, 1914 (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry), 615
Chief Architect's branch employees, (Mr. Fournier) 1067
Civil Service
Appeals against classification (Mr. Lanctôt) 1508
Bonus and statutory increases (Mr. Lanctôt) 939
Number and salaries paid, 1912 and 1922 (Mr. Séguin) 1832
Officials receiving more than deputy ministers (Mr. Chisholm) 1508
Permanent employees, 1920-1922, (Mr. Demers) 706
Coal importations
Canadian National by, (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 2306
Government, by, (Mr. Logan) 939
Doherty, Right Hon. C. J., amounts paid to since 1855, (Mr. Lanctôt) 472
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific, amounts paid to since 1914, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 615
Halifax dry dock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
Harbours, improvements and expenditures, (Mr. Church) 828
From 1900 to 1921 (Mr. McBride) 372

Questions passed as Orders for Returns — *Con.*
Homestead pre-emptions, areas, (Mr. McTaggart) 732
Hotels owned and operated by Canadian National railways (Mr. Coote) 2806
Military districts (Mr. Lancôt) 1775, 2305
Militia and Defence
Buildings occupied (Mr. Lanctôt) 2305
Officers and men at headquarters (Mr. Lanctôt) 1775, 2305
Ministers' trips to Europe (Mr. Lanctôt) 1402
Multigraph machines (Mr. McDonald, Timiskaming) 1508
Montreal
Canadian National railways, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Customs, Income Tax, Post Office, employees (Mr. Archambault) 1288
Drydock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Parry Sound customs collections (Mr. Arthurs) 967
Postmasters
L'Assomption-Montcalm (Mr. Séguin) 1775
Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) 1508
Prince Rupert dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec dry dock (Mr. Stevens) 706
Quebec Harbour Commission, advances to Sir Henry Drayton) 615
Railway systems, purchase of bonds (Mr. Baxter) 828
Rental of public buildings (Mr. Lucas) 615
St. John drydock, (Mr. Stevens) 706
School lands, sale of (Mr. Spencer) 1661
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and Pensions, 615
Stationery, purchase of, (Mr. Prevost) 1288
Trade agents (Mr. Prevost) 1661
Transcontinental railway, amounts paid, (Mr. Kennedy, Glengarry) 165
Vancouver drydock, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
Victoria, drydocks, 706 (Mr. Stevens)
War
Advances to Imperial Government (Mr. Vien) 1288
Material furnished British Govt. (Mr. Vien) 1067

Race and Religious Differences, 14, 270, 291-2, 362, 2421

Race Disqualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act M. (Mr. Euler)

Racing, Fishing schooners. *See* International

Radial Railways. *See* Hydro-Electric

Radiotelegraph Service, 1749

Radium. *See* Nanaimo and Esquimalt Railway

Rail Contracts. *See* Railways

Rails, Steel, bounty on, 304-5

Railway Act, 1919, Amdt. bills
1. Return Tickets. (Mr. Jacobs) 1r., 821; 2r., ref. to Railway Com., 1395
2. Special passenger rates (Mr. Church) 1r., 1460; 2r., 1719
3. Transportation Costs. (Crowsnest pass agreement (Mr. Kennedy, Essex.) 1r., 3588; 2r., com., 3595; 3r., 3597

Railway Commissioners, Board of. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways
- Applications to, 201-202
- Board of Railway Commissioners Act, 1088, 1101
- Campbell, Mr. W. E., qu., 937
- Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement at Calgary, 2775
  - Statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2773, 3491
- Chairman of, 233. *See also under this title,* Carvell
- Chief Traffc Officer, qu., 1377, qu., 2215, qu., 2457
- Coastal boat service, and, 182
- Commodity rates, 234
- Drayton-Acworth report, 125
- Freight rates, 234, 276, 2773. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement
- Intercolonial rates, 193, 312
- Norris, Premier, reported statement of, 1213
- Official report of proceedings, 2776
- Rates. *See also* Freight Rates
  - Grain on, 300
  - Increases, 131
- Recommendations to by Drayton-Acworth report, 126
- Tenure of office, 2777

Railway Transportation Costs, Special Committee on. *See* Freight Rates

Railways. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Speeches on Address; Budget
- Advances to, qu., 471
- Annual statement by Minister of Railways, 872
- Branch lines, 1688
- Canada Car Company, 1696

Railways — *Con.*
- Canadian in United States, 312
- Canadian National railways. *See that title*
- Canadian Railway Board of Adjustment, No. 1, 1060
- Car demurrage, 2981
- Car repairs, 1688, 2399
- Car shortage, 166
- Caraquet and Gulf shore, qu., 1504
- Carriage of mails by, qu., 825. *See also* Mail Contracts
- Co-ordination of, 2328. *See also* Address; Budget
- Deficits, 2314, 2890
- Drayton-Acworth report, 45-46, 1921
- Duplication and waste, 125
- Eight-hour day and, 228, 2316-17
- Electric and steam locomotives, 630, 1188
- Electrification of, 70, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330, 1940
  - M. (Mr. Deslauriers) 627. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
- Expenditure on in last 25 years, 111
- Exploitation, 2245. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address
- Freight and commodity rates, 131, 175, 233, 234, 261, 273, 357. *See also* Freight Rates
  - Coal on, 193
  - Legislation, qu., 934
  - Tonnage into Toronto, qu., 936
- Government-owned, administration in United States, 67
- Harvest excursions, 337
- Labour conditions, 2315. *See also* Labour
- Loans and subsidies to, 1921
- Mileage in 1877, qu., 1183
- Nationalization of, 235. *See also* Address; Budget
- New Zealand, 181
- Overbuilding of, 202, 2569
- Paralleling of existing lines, 203
- Passes in maritime provinces, 315
- Passenger rates. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills
  - Increase, 132
- Policy, 201, 1905, 1920, 1933
- Prince Edward Island, cost of, 229
- Problems. *See* Address; Budget; Freight Rates
- Provincial obligations, 229
- Public ownership, 2570. *See also* Budget; Canadian National Railways; Freight Rates; Speeches on Address
- Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
- Shipping facilities. *See* St. John terminal facilities

Railways — *Con.*
Steel rails
Bounty on, 304-5
Purchase of, 1912
South Africa, 2688
United States, purchase in, 2611. *See also* Canadian National Railways; Grand Trunk
Vote for, saving in, 384
Wages, 2317, 2417. *See also* Labour
Water transportation competition, 69. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Western provinces, indebtedness for, 229

Railways and Canals. *See also* Canals
Department
Estimates, 1133, 1687, 1905, 1933, 2747, 3035, 3518
Salaries and contingencies, 407, 1133
Governor-General's cars, 1688
Loan to the Canadian Goverment merchant Marine, 3035
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Welland ship canal. *See that title under* Canals

Rainbow. *See* Naval Service

Rankin, Mr. J. P. (North Perth)
Canadian Transit Company bill, 1770
Penitentiary Act Amdt. bill, 791

Rates, Special. *See* Railway Act Amdt. bills

Raymond, Mr. W. G. (Brantford)
Address in reply, 253; congratulations to Mr. Speaker; Liberal party and big interests, 253; Mr. Church and Toronto; Mr. Meighen's reference, 254; election campaign, 255; Mr. Meighen's election manifesto, 255-6; attitude of Brantford manufacturers, 257-258; binder twine industry; liberty of the franchise, 258; War Time Elections Act; manufacturers and taxation, 258; basic and key industries, 259; tariff policy to build up country, 260; transportation rates, 261; national railway system; Liberal party and big interests, 262
Budget, 2373. Tariff; "Liberal protectionist"; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2373; amendment; duties of members; Liberal party and protection; free trade, 2374; agricultural implements; reduction of duty on; Brantford factories closed; binder twine factory, 2375; basic industry argument; manufacturing industries and

Raymond, Mr. W. G. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
production of wealth, 2377; United States competition, 2378; key industries; Great Britain's mercantile marine; world trade; protection for the skilled labourer; United States tariff; capital, 2379; Progressive party and oleomargarine; Wheat Board, 2380; revenue tariff giving incidental protection; duty on binders, 2381; International Harvester company; principles of the two old parties; history of Liberalism; Toryism and tyrannical power, 2383
Customs duties on agricultural implements, 3230-1
References to, 27, 255, 263, 2384, 2536, 2705

Receipt Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act Amdt.

Reciprocal Trade. *See* Reciprocity

Reciprocity. *See also* Trade
Australia with, 9, 33, 2900
United States with, 33, 53, 77, 94, 102, 208, 224, 278, 333, 2201, 2234. *See also* Address; Budget; United States

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill

Redistribution, 59, 198, 283, 2330, 2339, 3611. *See also* Proportional Representation
Announcement of Prime Minister, 3608, 3611
Census, completion of, 1363-71
Former, 1369
Inquiry, 733
M. (Mr. Shaw) opportunity for discussion of, 1719, 1769
Meeting of defeated candidates in Alberta, 2858
Progressive party, attitude towards, 1364-70

Re-establishment. *See* Pensions; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Reed, Mr. William S. (Frontenac)
Mixed farming, Kingston fair, 992

Refills. *See* Opium and Narcotics

Regina, Speech of Hon. Mr. Motherwell at, 2555

Regional Bureau, International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 3528

Reid-Newfoundland Railway, 2027

Relief Work. *See* Canadian Patriotic Fund; Unemployment

Rental of Buildings. *See* Public Buildings

Reparations. *See* Germany; War Claims

Repatriation Expenses, 3503

Representation. *See also* Census; Proportional Representation; Redistribution
Unit of, 198

Research. *See also* Industrial and Scientific Research
Promotion of, 235. *See also* Natural Resources
Research Council, lignite plant, 1233

Residence Qualification. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Resources. *See* Natural Resources

Restaurant. *See* Parliamentary Restaurant

Retail Merchants Association of Canada
Oleomargarine, resolution on. *See that title*
Oriental immigration, 1513

Retirement Fund. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement

Returned Soldiers. *See also* Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Pensions; Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Alleged ill-treatment of children of, 2638
Blind, 3358
M. (Mr. Church) 3404
Pensions, 3310
Cash bonus to. *See* Soldiers' Bonus
Civil Service salaries, 549
Disabilities, 386 *See also* Pensions
Government's policy, early announcement of, 2637
Housing, 271. *See also that title*
Insurance, 3294. *See also* Returned Soldiers Insurance Act Amdt.
Pension regulations, 327
Repatriation, 3403
Special Committee on. *See* Pensions
Tubercular, 318. *See also* Hospitals
Unemployed
Hikers, qu., 3153
Inquiry as to Government's policy, 2458
Unemployment, 3290, 3304, 3307, 3331, 3335, 3339, 3345-7, 3356. *See also that title*

Returned Soldiers' Insurance Act Amdt. bill
Res. 3358, 3388; 1r., 2r., com., 3402; com., 3437; 3r., 3439

Returning Officers. *See* Baxter; Caldwell

Returns. *See* House of Commons

Revenue, 2171-2. *See* Address; Budget; Consolidated Revenue Act
Expenditure and. *See* Public Expenditure
In 1877, qu., 1211

Revenue Act. *See* Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act

Revenue Bills
1. Customs Act and the Department of Customs and Excise Act Amdt. bill, 1r., 2r., com., 3222; 3r., 3477
2. Customs Tariff Act, 1907, Amdt. bill
Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3476; 3r., 3477
3. Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. bill
Res., 3278; 1r., 3359-3360; 2r., com., 3484; 3r., 3486
4. Inland Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3239; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
5. Special War Revenue Act, 1915, Amdt. bill
Res., 3252; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477

Rice Jones, Mr. Cecil, statement of, 2489-2490

Richibucto, repair works, qu., 375

Rideau Canal. *See* Canals

Rideau Hall, fuel, maintenance, etc., 1756

Riddell, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366, qu., 3600.

Right of Appeal. *See* Opium and Narcotic Act Amdt.

Riley's Army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's army

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand (St. James)
Canadian National railways
Canadian Northern, subsidies, qu., 1504
Public ownership, 1942
Canadian navy, qu., 965
Cost of living, purchasing power of the dollar, 1177
Dominion Elections Act, residential qualification, M., 1296
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22; qu., 1376
Military expenditure and policy, 1176
Militia and Defence
Annual drill, 1177
Expenditure and policy, 1584

Rinfret, Mr. Fernand — *Con.*
Montreal Gazette editorial comment, 1584
Montreal post offices, business done, qu., 1065
Peat, deposits and experiments, qu., 1505
Railway mileage, in 1877, qu., 1183
Railway policy, 1942
Representation of provinces in 1877, qu., 1183
Revenue and expenditure in 1877 and 1922, qu., 1211
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1195
Topographical maps, qu., 1631

Riordon Company
Income tax, 60
Collections, qu., 372; qu., 607; qu., 927

Ritchie, Mr. Hugh, qu., 3361

River St. Lawrence ship channel. *See* Marine and Fisheries; St. Lawrence

Rivière du Loup
Arsenal, qu., 1181, 1690
Car shops, qu., 1181, 1690

Roads. *See* Highways; Public Works

Roads and Bridges. *See* Bridges; Highways; Public Works

Robb, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Budget, 2179. Reforms long overdue; the amendment; tariff reductions; Liberal platform of 1919, 2180; war time extravagance; restoration of confidence; economy; markets; Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington, 2181; trade with Great Britain and United States; cattle embargo; imports and exports, quantity and value of; uniform development; coal and water power, 2182; tariff policy; German trade; marking of goods, 2183
Campbell, Mr. J. A., claim for flax shipment, 2836
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Car demurrage, 2981
Complaints of unfair dealing, 2987
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian Wheat Board, advances, 3541. *See also under this title,* Wheat Board
Census
Cost, 1363
Enumerators, 1366
Payment of, 1369
Registration of Canadians, 1363

Robb, Hon. J. A. — *Con.*
Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1363
Dominion Chain Company, Limited, 3490
Elevators
Licenses to private, 2838
Ontario, in, 2978
Terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Government publications, 1373
Demand and distribution, 1374
Grain Inquiry Commission, 50, 2982
Implements, agricultural, duty on, 3120
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1372
Linen yarn bounty, 1361, 3128
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3429, 3488
Pratt vs. Delphine, 303
Redistribution and the census, 1363-71. *See also under this title,* Census
Statistics, co-ordination of work, 1366
Steamship services, 2027, 3505
Canada, Australia, New Zealand, 3034
Canada, West Indies, South America, 3026
Freight rates, 2028
Quebec and north shore ports, 3034
St. John-Cuba, 2028
Trade and Commerce department
Director of commercial intelligence, 700
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3505, 3541
Officials, 700
Trade commissioners and agents, 2989
Trade with Mexico, 700
Wheat Board, 50
Wheat Board bill, 3174-5, 3184, 3188, 3380, 3383, 3386

Robb, Mr. W. D., qu., 728

Robertson, Hon. Senator, 505
Statement on Civil Service, 555

Robertson, P. L. Company, refund of duties, qu., 1774

Robinson, Mr. E. W. (Kings, N.S.)
Root Vegetables bill, potato grading, 3378

Robitaille, Mr. Clement (Maisonneuve)
Address in reply, 320. Public ownership of railways; Wheat board; returned soldiers' pensions, 320

Rockefeller Foundation, 61

Rods. *See* Steel

Rome, International Institute. *See* Agriculture

Root Vegetables, Sale and Inspection of, bill
Res., 2743; 1r., 2747; 2r., ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 2972; com., 3142, 3194, 3367; 3r., 3487

Ross, Mr. A. E. (Kingston)
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3482
Militia expenditure, policy, 1587
Niobe, sale of, 2068
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3450
Pensions Com., final report, 3343
Soldiers' civil re-establishment
Hospital staffs, 1345
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Venereal diseases, qu., 935

Ross, Mr. Thomas E. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply, 95. Congratulations to Miss Macphail; decline in prices of farm products, 95; soldier settlers, 96; re-establishment; economy in administration; increase in sessional indemnity, 97

Ross Rifle, 2609, 2616

Roumania, loan to, qu., 1400, 2888

Round Table, 3170-1

Routhier, the late Sir Adolphe, 1275

Royal Assent, 722, 1988, 1995, 3617

Royal Canadian Artillery, qu., 370, 1982

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. *See also* National Defence bill
Amalgamation with Dominion Police, 675
Barracks, Fairmont, improvements, 1255
Buildings, 2129
Canadian expeditionary force, in, qu., 2038
Detachments in Arctic regions, 3497
Discontinuance of, qu., 377
Enlistments from A and B squadrons in Canadian expeditionary force, qu., 2038
Estimates, 2129
Income tax office, Hamilton, 1253
Indians, relief to destitute, 1715
Labour espionage and, 670
Lethbridge, Drs. Lovering and Taylor, qu., 1211
Macleod detachment, removal of, 2584
Naturalization, investigations, 1671, 2024
Opium and Narcotic Drugs Act, reports, 1289, 1377
Pensions, 2131
Northwest rebellion, 3523
Removal from British Columbia, 173, 184, 327, 522

Royal Canadian Mounted Police — *Con.*
Salaries, 775
Secret service, 670-9
Unorganized territories in, M. (Mr. Woodsworth) to confine to, 829; neg. on div., 843
Winnipeg strike, 671
Zaneth, Corporal, 671

Royal Canadian Navy. *See* Naval Service

Royal Military College, 1985

Royal Naval College, 2047, 2203, 2458

Royal Trust Company, 1085

Rubber Goods, manufacture, 2469

Rubber Industry, occupational diseases. *See* Labour

Rulings. *See* Deputy Speaker; Speaker

Rural Depopulation, 301, 2470. *See also* Address; Budget; Census; Population

Rural Mail. *See* Post Office

Rural Postmasters. *See* Civil Service; Post Office

Russell, Mr. T. A., 1663, 2695

Russia
Competition in wheat market, 2157
Consortium to re-establish trade, 1463
Public ownership, 1942
Re-establishment of business in, 1463
"Save the Children Fund", 2516
Wrangel Island, 1751

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. (East Toronto)
Address in reply, 284. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker, 284; economy in government; Mr. Church's record, 285; protective tariff; Great Britain and the tariff, 286; protection for farmers, 287; Liberal tariff and election campaign, 288; speeches of Prime Minister and Minister of Justice, 289-90; Sir Lomer Gouin and Quebec attitude, 291; sectionalism in politics, 292
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2088
Quebec, 2093
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3006
Canadian National railways, consolidation, 1962
Cigars and cigarettes, tax on, 3241
Dominion lands and surveys, 1038

Ryckman, Mr. Edmond B. — *Con.*
Dominion Textile Company, 584
Lambton, loss of, 3508
Mines department, economy, 688-9
Parliament buildings, architects' fees, 2014
Public buildings, heating, 1761
Sales tax, 3269
United States tax on German goods, 3411

Ste. Agathe Sanitarium, 1342

Ste. Anne Hospital, 1342

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, water supply, qu., 2213

St. Catherines Post office building, 1246-50

St. Charles Park. *See* Parc St. Charles

St. Charles River Improvements, 2400

St. George, N.B., public building, 1240

St. John, N.B.
Cold storage, 3521
Courtenay bay, 2013
Harbour, qu., 1401
Improvements, 2013
Immigration buildings, 2027
Income tax office, qu., 826
Negro Point breakwater, 2013
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Port. *See* British Preference, M. (Mr. Logan)
Quarantine station, 1239-40, 2021
Terminal facilities, M. (Mr. Caldwell) 639, 844; withdrawn, 851

St. John Ambulance Association, 3387

St. John and Quebec Railway
Acquisition by Canadian National, qu., 1774, qu., 1293
M. (Mr. Caldwell) 1293; neg., 1296

St. John River
Pollution of by United States mill owners, 2168
Wharves on tidal waters, qu., 2200

St. John Valley Railway, 3039

St. Lawrence River Ship Channel
De Beaujeu bank, dredging, 1495
Elevator dredge, 1494
Maintenance and operation, 1494
Pilotage dues, 1499
Self-propelling hopper barge, 1495
Sorel shipyard, 1494. *See also that title*

St. Lawrence River Waterway, 70, 121, 134, 137, 269, 2266, 2327, 2398. *See also* Address; Budget; Canals; Quebec Harbour Commission; Transportation; Waterpowers; Welland Ship Canal
Calder, United States Senator, 1206
Climatic conditions, 1187
Coal, conservation of supply, 1188
Co-operation with United States, 2750, 2767
Correspondence with United States Government, 2207, 2583, 2755, 2760, 2767
Tabled, 2256
Cost, 269, 1191, 1195-99, 1203-07, 1315, 1320, 1329
Deep Waterways Association, 1206-8
Electric power development, 1188, 1205, 1317, 1319, 1321, 1326, 1397
Export of power, 1203
Niagara river, 1322, 1327
Electrification of locomotives and railways, 133, 1188, 1317, 1323, 1326, 1330. *See also* Electrification; Railways
Finance, 1189, 1195, 1318, 1320
Finney, Col. John, 1189
Freight rates, 1204
Georgian bay canal, 1199, 1204, 1209
Grain production and shipment, 1203
Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association, 1319
Harding, President, 133, 1184
History of project, 1185
Imperial Government, communication with, qu., 1508
Industrial development, 1318
Information available, 1195
International Joint Commission, 1191, 1199, 1206, 1315-21, 1469
Report, qu., 377
Distribution of, 2357
International partnership, 1191, 1199, 1209, 1315, 1332, 1396
Land adjacent to development, 1200
Long Sault, 1199
Manchester ship canal, 1190
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1314, 1396
Navigation, 1195
Negotiations, inquiry, 786
New York state commission, 1197
Progress report, 2969
Ocean steamers, 1193-95, 1205
Opportunity for further discussion, 1462
Opposition to project, 1184, 1193, 1199, 1202, 1206, 1209
Proposed bond issue, 1318, 20
Public ownership, 1189, 1318-31
Support of western states, 1184

St. Lawrence River Waterway — *Con.*
Surveys and investigations, estimates, 2765
Taschereau, Premier, 1191
Ten Eyck, Congressman, letter re acquisition of land adjacent to development, 1200
Traffic through Panama, Suez and Soo Canals, 1203
Transportation, 1186, 1201, 1208, 1315, 1325, 1327
Treaty with United States, 2207, 2760, 2767. *See also* Welland Ship Canal
United States and, 1396
Water power, 629, 1188, 1197, 1199, 1205
Welland canal, 1205, 1207

St. Lawrence Shipping and Trading Co., 1400

St. Louis, Municipal currency, 2506

St. Malo Car shops, 1699, 2399

St. Père, Mr. Edouard C. (Hochelaga)
Address in reply, 281. Immigration, 281, 282; Public ownership of railways; Race harmony, 284; Tariff; unemployment, 282; Wheat Board, 283
Canadian Navigation Company, qu., 1284
Cotton industries, wages and hours, qu., 1903
Parliament hill monuments, qu., 936
Warships and torpedo boats, qu., 827

St. Peters' Reserve. *See* Indians

St. Pierre water supply, qu., 2213

St. Thomas-Niagara Falls Highway, qu., 936

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. *See* Penitentiaries

Sabotage. *See* Labour; Nova Scotia Miners; Strikes

Safeguarding of Industries Act, 2409, 2423-4

Salaries. *See* Civil Service

Salaries Act and the **Senate and House of Commons Act Amdt.** bill; 1r., 363; 2r., com., 746; 3r., 787

Sale and Inspection of Root Vegetables. *See* Root Vegetables

Sale of Agriculture Fertilizers. *See* Agricultural Fertilizers

Sales, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2103

Sales, Mr. Thomas — *Con.*
Binder twine, 257, 2575
Budget, 2574. Sales Tax; Canada a dear country to live in; burden on the poor man; automobiles, 2574; protection; binder twine; success of a free trade industry; agricultural implement manufacturers; successful competition in other markets, 2575; infant industries; farming conditions; distribution and marketing; exchange value of farm products; intermediary between producer and consumer, 2576; bleeding the victims white, 2577
Canada Grain Act, 2838
King vs. Manitoba Grain Co., decision, 1132
Licenses to private elevators, 2838
Canadian National railways, restaurants at Rivers and Melville, Sask., qu., 2038
Customs
Dumping clause, 3420
Officials, 764
Dredging, Saskatchewan, 2006
Elevators
Excess overages, qu., 1401
Private, 2981
Terminal, 2839
Exhibitions, 982
Experimental farms, 799, 807
Grain Commission, 2839
Grain, selling without growers' permission, 2989
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2008
Mixed farming, 981
St. Lawrence river waterway, 2761
Saskatchewan Elevator Company, 2989
Welland canal, grain transportation, 2761
Wheat Board, 3181
Wheat Board bill, 3386

Sales Tax, 2297, 2425, 2661, 2843. *See also* Budget; Special War Revenue; Taxation
Automobiles, 2177
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2177
Exemptions, 2672, 2689
Dried beet pulp, 2858
Fertilizers, 2858
Increase, 2365
Lumber, 2177
Regulations, 2858

Salmon Canning. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.; Meat and Canned Foods

Salmon Fisheries. *See* Fisheries

Sanitarium. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Sardines, export of, qu., 1182

Saskatchewan
Aerial patrol, 1724
Canada Temperance Act Amdt., 2997. *See also that title*
Dry areas, 1042
Harbours and rivers, 2004
Indian reserves, qu., 608
Liquor
Export of, 2977
Warehouses, qu., 1211; qu., 1660
Importations, qu., 2037; qu., 2303
Public buildings, improvements, 1253
Second homesteads, 1042
Wheat marketing, 115. *See also* Wheat Board

Saskatchewan Court of Appeal. *See* Judges Act Amdt. bill

Saturday Sittings. *See* House of Commons, Sittings

Sault Ste. Marie, Algoma Steel Co. rail contracts, 1704

Saunders, Dr. C. E., resignation of, 590, 3522

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Canadian National railways, right of way and lease agent, qu., 1633

Save the Children Fund, 3516

Savoy, Mr. J. Clovis, qu., 3363

Sawmill Machinery, 3126

Scandinavia
Immigration, 2144
Trade relations with, 2990

Schools. *See also* Education
Closing in West, 152
Lands, 339. *See also* Dominion Lands; Natural Resources
Nova Scotia in. *See* Nova Scotia Miners
Refusal of banks to advance money to, 2627

Scientific Research. *See* Research

Scott, Mr. Frank, qu., 728

Scrip Frauds. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Sea-Going Vessels. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Seals, destruction by. *See* British Columbia Fisheries

Seaports, Canadian. *See* British Preference

Secondary amendments. *See* House of Commons; Speaker

Secord Case. *See* Criminal Code (Scrip Frauds)

Secret Proceedings. *See* Prime Ministers' Conference

Secret Service. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Secretariat. *See* League of Nations

Secretary of State department
Adjustment of War claims, 1672, 2977
Estimates, 601, 1670, 3499
Public archives, 1673

Sedition. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Seed Grain
Advances, 1053
Freight on, 3522
Purchasing Commission, 1011

Séguin, Mr. P. A. (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
Forest, Mr. Médard, customs officer, qu., 2355
Gaboury, Mr. L. J., salary, qu., 3599

L'Assomption and Montcalm
Excise officers, qu., 1774
Employment and dismissal of, qu., 2355
Lightkeepers, qu., 1904, qu., 2215
Postmasters, 1775
Tobacco experimental station, 1776

Select Standing Committees. *See* House of Commons

Selective Conscription. *See* Military Service Act Amdt.

Senate
Amendments concurred in:
Agricultural Fertilizers bill, 3607
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, 3607
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Escheats Act Amdt. bill, 3486
Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. bill, 3607
Loan Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
National Defence Department bill, 2806
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act bill, 3607

Senate — *Con.*
Amendments concurred in — *Con.*
Trust Companies Act, 1914, Amdt. bill, 3607
Amendments, non-concurrence:
Bankruptcy Act Amdt. bill, 3611
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3608
Dominion Lands, Cancellation Leases bill
Concurrence, 3616
Conference, 3614
Chief accountant, salary, qu., 2583, qu., 2803
Expenditure, qu., 2583
Free conferences with, 3613, 3616
Indemnity, proposed reduction, 2513, 3509
Reform, 138, 2894
Salaries and contingent expenses, 2026

Senate and House of Commons Act. *See* Salaries Act Amdt.

Senn, Mr. Mark C. (Haldimand)
Corn-borer, destruction by, 818
Grand River bridge, York, Ont., qu., 1287

Sergeant-at-Arms. *See* House of Commons

Serums. *See* Accredited Herds; Agriculture

Sessional Indemnity. *See* House of Commons; Members

Settlers. *See* Immigration

Sexsmith, Mr. Edward J. (Lennox and Addington)
Address in reply, 293. Change in administration; agriculture; railway problems, 283; soldier settlement, 294
Dominion Elections Act Amdt. bill, 2812
Soldiers bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447

Sexual Offences. *See* Criminal Code

Shaughnessy, Lord
National railway scheme, 89-90, 127
On immigration, 2478

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. (West Calgary)
Agriculture Com. report, Wheat Board, 782
Banff-Windermere road, 1683
Blankets, duty on, 3136
Boots and shoes, M. to reduce duty, 3238
Calgary, post office building, 1254
Canada-Australia, steamship service, 3034
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3003
Date of coming into effect, 3007; Withdrawn, 3008
Canadian National railways
Representation at meeting of steamship companies, 2584
Canadian Patriotic Fund bill, 3484
Coal lands, transfer of by Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 2214

Shaw, Mr. Joseph T. — *Con.*
Criminal Code Amdt bill, fines, 2832
Expenditure, comparison by departments, 1137
Explosives Act, 1234
Freight rates, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1444-8
Grain companies, security of, 2837
Indians
Education, 1227, 3536
Stony Reserve school, qu., 965, 1218, 1227, 3536
Military and other expenditures, 1137
Militia and defence
Expenditure and policy, 1590
Permanent force, 1983
War medals, 2976
Ministers and Directorships, 1126
Naval service, 1738
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 3022
Pensions Com., final report, 3305
Amdt., 3349, 3358
Prime Ministers' Conference, naval defence, 1742, 1745
Railway Commission, Carvell, Hon. F. B., alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2775, 2779
Redistribution
Inquiry as to intention of Government, 3611
M. (Mr. Shaw), opportunity for discussion, 1719
Reply to leader of Opposition, 3611
Royal military college, 1985
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Alberta hospital, 1345
Tariff commissioner, 1665
Tariff, reciprocal arrangement with France, 2032
Tourist traffic, 1683
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 2989
War memorials, 2101
Wheat Board, 3182
Wrangel island, 1751

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply, 294. Congratulations to Mr. Speaker; defeat of Meighen Government due to taxation, 294; Progressive party; railway problem, 295, 296; immigration; tariff and protection, 297
Criminal Code Amdt. bill, docking of horses, 2833
Soldier Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 386

Sheep Industry. *See* Agriculture; Live Stock

Shelburne wharf, 1768

Shellfish. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Shells. *See* Ammunition

Sherbrooke
Post Office inspector, qu., 1507
Soldier Settlement Board employees, qu., 1658

Sherman, General William T., war, 1336

Shibley, Mr. A. D., Secretary-Treasurer of Union of Canadian Municipalities, 1392

Ships and Shipbuilding. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Labour; Limitation of Armaments; Marine; Naval Service; St. Lawrence River Waterway; Steamship Services; Unemployment; Vessels
British Ministry of Shipping, claim for hospital ship, 1752
Canada Shipping Act. *See that title*
Canadian navigation companies, life-saving equipment, qu., 1284
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Coolie labour, 2042
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., steel plates, 1677
Drydocks. *See that title*
International deep sea racing. *See that title*
Nova Scotia, 1387
Pilotage dues, 1499. *See also* Canada Shiping Act
Registration of, 1493
Sorel shipyard, 2169
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605, 1283
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed, qu., 1062
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steel plates, cost of delivery, 3508
Vickers Company, elevator dredge, 1494
Wooden ships constructed at Victoria, B. C., qu., 364

Shuswap Lake
Dredging, 2006
Wharf, 3547

Siberia, Service of Mounted Police, in, qu., 2038

Silk Fabrics, duty on, 2662, 3137

Silver. *See also* Coinage; Mines and Minerals
Coins. *See* Currency Act Amdt. bill
Discovery in Yukon, 1276
English hall marks, protection of. *See* Criminal Code

Simpson, Mr. T. E. (West Algoma)
Dredging, St. Mary's river, 2006
Good roads, Ontario, qu., 372
Lambton, wreck of, 1497, 3508
Rail and car repair contracts, 1703
Receipt tax, 3262
Sales tax, workmen's clothing, 3272
Sault Ste. Marie wharf, 2006
Unemployment
Insurance, 1075
Rails and car repair contracts, 1704

Sinclair, Hon. J. E. (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Harbours and rivers, Prince Edward island, 1990
Root Vegetables bill, potato grades, 3375

Single Tax, 2191. *See also* Budget; Taxation

Six Nation Reserve. *See* Indians

Slaughter Houses, Inspection. *See* Meat and Canned Foods

Smuts, General, International Disarmament Conference, 1283

Socialism, 1290

Soft Drinks, tax on, 2329, 2617, 2852, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Soldier Land Settlement, 83, 96, 147, 183, 252, 294, 305, 318, 327, 345, 3294, 3298, 3307, 3333, 3338. *See also* Address; Budget; Pensions Committee
Abandoned farms, 2132
Building loans, 3475
Cost and results, 2159
Estimates, 2023, 2131
Expenditure, statement of, 2132
Foreclosure, 2132
Homestead rights, 2132
Inflated values, 2133
Land speculation, and, 2136
Municipal taxation, payment by Government, 1257
Revaluation of land, 2136-42
Taxes, collection of, 2134

Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bills
1. Mineral rights. (Mr. Malcolm) 1r., 2035
2. Consolidation of Indebtedness. (Mr. Stewart, Argenteuil)
Res. 3358, 3405; 1r., 3409; 2r., com., 3475; 3r., 3476

Soldier Settlement Board, qu., 608
Amounts loaned, etc., qu., 469
Estimates, 2023, 2131-43
Comparison with last year, 382

Soldier Settlement Board — *Con.*
Loans, 147
Sherbrooke office employees, qu., 1658
Six Nation Indians, 1221

Soldiers. *See also* Pensions Returned Soldiers; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Unemployment
Bonus, 394, 402, 1618, 2533, 3337
M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg. 450
Exchange on pay, qu., 826
Homes, establishment of, 1348
Insurance, 1349. *See also* Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill
Land settlement. *See that title*
Pensions, 271. *See also* Pensions

Soldiers' Aid Commission, 3315-16

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 168, 271, 1617
Building requirements, 1261
Calydor sanitarium, 1279
Department, decrease in activities of, 1340
Doctors, 1343, 1351
Employers' Liability, compensation, 1348
Estimates, 1279, 1339
Expenditure on, 266
Reduction of, 1339
Hospitals, 1262, 1341, 1344, 1348
Nurses, salaries of, 1342
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Patients, care and medical examination of, 1280
Pension Commissioners, Board of, 396, 1339, 1349. *See also* Pensions
Ste. Agathe sanitarium, 1342
Ste. Anne hospital, 1342
Salaries, 385, 1339
Reduction of vote, 1339-46
Waddington, Mr., 385, 398
Staff, reduction of, 3602
Tubercular patients, treatment of, 1344
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
Fishermen, to, 1346
Vocational training, 1281, 1340
War Service gratuity interest, 1346

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department bill (Report of Re-establishment and Pensions Committee)
1r., 3597; 2r., com., 3609; 3r., 3610

Soldiers' Re-establishment and Pensions Committee. *See* Pensions Committee

Sorel Shipyard
Dismissal of employees, qu., 605. 1283
Estimates, 2169
Maintenance, 1494
Men employed in May 1921, qu., 1062

Soulanges Canal. *See* Canals

South America Steamship service. *See* Steamship Services

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux. *See also* Deputy Speaker; House of Commons; Marcil
Rulings and statements of
Acoustics of Chamber
Member speaking from centre of Chamber, 632
Member speaking from front seat, 3286
Agreement between Whips as to 11 o'clock adjournment, 173
Amendments, 3284
Imposing tax, cannot be moved by private member, 722
Secondary amendments (amdts. to amdt.) 2473-4, 2519
Baker, the late Col. G. H., M.P., memorial, 1929
Bills
Introduction by unanimous consent, 3597
Military Service Act Amdt., 644
Money, must be preceded by res, 548
Private
No sponsor, first reading postponed, 2102
Refund of fees, 1577, 1657
Reference from Com. of Whole to Special Com., 1395
Repealing legislation, 644
Second reading on day of introduction, 1460
Trade or money, to be preceded by res., 1282
Chair to be addressed, 2415
Clerk Assistant, correctness of record, 1843
Committees
Leave to sit while House in session, 1988
Motion in advance of report of, 1901
Refund of fees, 1577
Special, members opposed to principle of bill not to be chosen, 1502
Congratulations to on 25th anniversary, 3489
Criminal Code and statutes, reprinting of, 1717

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Crowsnest pass agreement, suspension of Rule 11, 1502
Daylight saving, discussion in order, 944
Debate
Closed by mover, 835, 1295, 1836
Relevancy
Criticism of British Columbia Government during Budget debate, 2238
Hon. John Oliver, quotation from Vancouver Sun, 2236
Debates, Official Report
Insertion of documents, 942
Decorum, conversation in Chamber and lobbies, 2640
Election of, 1, 4
Kingston election petition, 2692
Language, "False" or "falsely", 3603
Libellous statements reflecting on honour of Canada, 822
Letters, anonymous, 944
Library of Parliament, 3517
Salaries, 3517
Members
Customary to speak from seats, 632, 3286
May speak only once on motion for 3r., 3487
Must address Chair, 2415
Must address other members in third person, 165
Payment of, 3611
Speaking, not to be interrupted, 2361
Motions
Amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Crerar on Budget) 2473-4, 2519
For concurrence in, notice required, 703
In advance of report of Com., 1901
Non-debatable, 865
Notice given in Votes and Proceedings, 378
Ministers and Directorships, seconder, 1084, 1094
Private members, involving expenditure, out of order, 844
Re-drafted, in order, 844
Newspaper extracts, 821
Orders of the Day
Arguments not permissible, 822, 1721, 1842, 2256, 2995, 3492, 3601
Member may make personal explanation or ask question, 3602-3
Question not debatable, 3602
Reading newspaper extracts, 303, 374-5
Right of members to raise question of privilege on, 2638

Speaker, Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux — *Con.*
Rulings and Statements — *Con.*
Pairs, 1463
Petitions, irregular, 1929
Privilege
Member may make personal explanation or put question, 3602-3
Member must confine himself to question, 3366
Must affect honour of member, 3493
Right of member to raise on Orders of the day, 2638
Prorogation of Parliament, 3610
Questions
Argumentative, 2805-2806
Discretion of Ministers respecting, 1775
Standing as orders for returns, 1660, 1775
Reading of letters, 948
Resolution
Adopted, binding on Government, 639
Affecting civil rights of provinces, 829
Money, should originate with Government, 639
Must be positive, 644
Royal Assent, 1988
Rule 11, suspension of, 1502
Senate, free conference, 3613
Sergeant-at-Arms to prevent disorder in lobby, 3606
Supply
Concurrence, 1843
Discussion of particular item on motion, 1337
Redress of grievances before going into Com., 1337
Tedious repetition, 944
Unanimous consent, 703, 726, 3597
Bill, introduction of, 3597
Vacancies
Kamouraska, 1459
War memorials, 2100
Wheat Board, point of order, 2935, 2949

Speaker, Mr., Bereavement of, 496, 596

Speakman, Mr. Alfred (Red Deer)
Address in reply, 80. Co-operation necessary; agricultural prosperity, 81; tariff for revenue; taxation forms; immigration, 82; unemployment; soldier settlement, 83
Agriculture, subsidies to, 1698
Budget, 2881. Alleged selfishness of prairie provinces; Budget as it affects the West; protection, 2881; tariff and cost of living; textile industry; protection and prices; price of agricul-

Speakman, Mr. Alfred — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tural products set by export market; policy of give and take, 2882; tariff as means of taxation; commodity tax fundamentally wrong; restriction of export market and reduction of prices, 2883; excise duty on protected goods; depreciated currency; cost of manufacturing in Germany, 2884; agriculture and lower costs of production; transportation; marketing; compromise; reciprocity, 2885; attack on the Progressive party; the amendment; political morals, 2886; idealism in politics, 2887
Dredging, 2006
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, 490
Estimates, reclassification, 455
Fishing schooner race, 3511
Imperial Mining Resources bureau, 1237
Indians
Education, 1715
Red Deer school, 1229
Militia, purchasing agents, 587
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1833
Pensions
Committee
Expenditures, 3523
Final report, 3297
Widowed mothers, M. (Mr. Power) 1309
Promotions and salaries in Civil Service, 577
Rail and car repair contracts, 1698
Sales tax, 3269, amdt., 3269
Soldier settlement
Board, qu., 608
Revaluation, 2141
Special Com., work of, 2141
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406

Special Loans Bill
Res., 3252, 3358; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3476-77

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. bill
Res., 3252, 3409; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 3477
Subjects and sections discussed:
Automobiles, 3272-3
Cheques, stamp tax, 3258
Condensed milk, 3264-3271, 3409
Drawbacks, 3263
Excise tax of two and a half per cent, 3263
Insurance premiums, 3253
Lumber, 3263
Matches, 3262
Receipt tax, 3262

Special War Revenue Act Amdt. — *Con.*
Subjects and Sections discussed — *Con.*
Sales tax, 3409
Condensed milk, 3264-71, 3409
Exemptions, 3263, 3410
Job printing, 3409
Taxation under, 2116, 2857. *See also* Taxation

Speech from the Throne. *See* Address

Spence, Mr. David (Parkdale)
Egg inspectors, qu., 727
Entomology, 913-14
Meighen, Right Hon. Arthur, 406
Militia expenditure and policy, 1592
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3463
Root Vegetables bill, 3142, 3194, 3367
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, royal commission, 406
Stamp tax on cheques, 3260

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. (Battle River)
Agriculture, condition of, 2158
Banks, circulation, interest, qu., 3598
Blankets, duty on, 3128, 3132
M. to reduce, 3234
Budget, 2629. Congratulations to Finance Minister; public men, 2629; Mr. Fielding and the Liberal platform of 1919; conditions in Canada; restricted credit; purchasing power; home market; per capita wealth; labour troubles; after affects of war; statement of Mr. W. Bell; private financing of public production, 2630; capital investment in agriculture and manufacturing; foreign and home markets; returns from agricultural and industrial enterprise; farmers and the income tax; agricultural products; prices and cost of production, 2631; prices of hides and boots and shoes; woollen goods; profits of textile industries, 2632; profits of milling industry; food, shelter, and clothing; Mr. Stewart (Argenteuil) on the tariff; driving capital out of business; conscription of wealth, 2633; no radical taxation proposed; credit system; urban development and infant mortality, 2634
Calgary milk inquiry, qu., 823
Canadian National railways
Dining car service, qu., 2040
Mail contracts, qu., 2038, qu., 2213
Canadian Pacific railway
Bill, 1608
Mail contracts, 2040

Spencer, Mr. Henry E. — *Con.*
Census, agricultural assets and liabilities, 2159
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1423
Dominion notes, qu., 935
Fabre, Madame, pension, 2024
Farming industry, 809, 2158, 2159
Grain, per capita production, 2159
Grain Growers' Grain Co., alleged contributions to political organizations, 2488
Immigration
Central European, 2158
Land speculation, 2159
Pamphlets, 759
Policy, 2158
Imported liquor, excise duty, qu., 828
Income tax-payers, qu., 3362
Livestock industry, 984
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 590
Militia and Defence
Transport and freight, amdt. to reduce item, 1987
Mixed farming, 983
Naturalization Act, 2024
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 515
Population
Rural, decline in, 2158
Slow growth of, 2158
Post office saving banks, interest, qu., 1932
Soldier settlement, cost and results, 2159
Steamship services, 2027
Welland canal, qu., 3600
Wheat Board, 3185
Wheat Board bill, 3380

Sportsmen's Patriotic Association, cadet camps, 1973

Spruce Bud Moth, 595, 815, 2668. *See also* Entomology

Stamp Tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act

Standard of Living. *See* Oriental Aliens

Standard of Valuation. *See* Customs

Standard Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Standards, Bureau of, 235, 1372

Stanfield, Dr., Bienfait briquetting plant, 1234

Stansell, Mr. J. L. (East Elgin)
Accredited herd system, 995, 999
Address in reply, 359. Definition of party names; farmers and protection, 360;

Stansell, Mr. J. L. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
defeat of late government; economy; cattle embargo; railway situation, 361; racial differences, 362
Agriculture dept., estimates, 994
Budget, 2290. "Grit and "Tory"; suggested identity of Liberal and Progressive policies, 2290; tribute to the Minister of Finance; attitude of Progressives, 2291; sales tax; income tax, 2292; constructive criticism; tariff and the masses; protection; adjustment of tariff to changing conditions; revenue, 2292; encourage maximum production; sales tax; increase of burden upon consumers, 2293; income tax,; taxes passed on to consumers, 2294
Canned milk industry, 3264
Civil service patronage, 3087
Commissioner of Agriculture, qu., 609
Experimental farms, 809
Freight rates, Special Com. report, 3596
Live Stock industry, 994
Ministers and directorships, 1124
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1825
Railway Act Amdt. (Crowsnest pass) 3597

State-Owned Railways. *See* Canadian National Railways

Stationery. *See* Printing and Stationery

Statistics. *See also* Census; Population; Trade
Concentration of, 580
Dominion Bureau of, 1363
Dominion Statistician, Mr. R. H. Coats, 1364-71

Statutes
Printing of, 1972
Revision of, 1717

Steamship Services, qu., 614. *See also* Trade and Commerce
British Columbia coastal, qu., 3152
Canada-Australia-New Zealand, 3034
Canada-Newfoundland, 2027
Canada-West Indies-British Guiana, qu., 2356
Canada-West Indies-South America, 2027, 3026
Charlottetown-Pictou-New Glasgow, 3506
Charlottetown-Victoria-Halliday's Wharf, 3506
Competition with railways, 182
Freight rates, 2028
Halifax-Canso-Guysboro, 3507

Steamship Services — *Con*
Mails, carriage of, 2028
Miscou-Shippegan Island, 2029
Mulgrave-Arichat-Petit de Grat, 2029
Murray Bay-Tadoussac, 3035
Newcastle-Neguac-Escuminac, 2029
Pelee Island and mainland, 3034
Pictou-Mulgrave-Cheticamp, 3050
Port Mulgrave-St. Peters-Irish Cove, 3507
Quebec Natashquan-Bras d'Or, 2029, 3034
St. Catherines Bay-Tadoussac, 2029
St. John-Bay of Fundy-Minas Basin, 3507
St. John-Bear River, 3507
St. John-Cuba, 2028
St. John-Digby, 2030
St. John-St. Andrews, 2030
St. Stephen-Deer Island-Campobello, 2030
Sydney-Bras d'Or lakes, 2031
Sydney-Whycocomagh, 2030, 3035
Vancouver-Howe Island, 2027
Victoria-Vancouver-Skagway, 2027

Steedsman, Mr. James (Souris)
Budget, 2721. Inconsistencies of the tariff; implement duties; opportunities for manufacturing in British Columbia, 2721; prairie farmers paying tribute to manufacturers and fruit growers; cost of wheat production beyond market value; farming unprofitable, 2722; survey of conditions in West; boot and shoe industry, 2723
Tractors, 3124
Turtle Mountain reserve, qu., 615

Steel. *See also* Railway estimates; Rail repairs
Bounties, 304-5, qu., 3360
British Empire Steel Corporation. *See that title*
Dominion Iron and Steel Company, contract for ship plates, 1677, 2170
Drawbacks, 2175
Industry, subsidies to, 1692, 1696
Plates, 1677, 2170
Delivery of, 3508
Prices, 2411-12
Rails
Competition with Germany, 2412
Contracts for, 1688
Price of, 1680-1709, 2412
Purchases of, 1913
Unemployment, 1077
Rods, refund of duties, qu., 1774
Steel plates, 1677
Damage claim of Dominion Iron and Steel Co., 1677
Settlement of, 2170
Structural, importation of, qu., 1931

Stefansson Expedition, 1750

Stevens, Hon. H. H. (Vancouver Centre)
Address in reply, 230. Death of Prime Minister's brother; debate on address opportunity for vigorous discussion, 230; importance of aids to agriculture; marketing of wheat, 231; Wheat Board, 232; elevator facilities, 233; freight rates on commodities, 234; bureau of standards, industrial and scientific research, 235; immigration, 236; Bank Act, revision of; unemployment, 237; the tariff question; customs taxes, cost of collecting, 239; tariff, platform of Liberal Convention; speech of Mr. Marler, 240; survey of ministers, 241; Minister of Justice and big interests, 242; minister and directorships, 242-3
Air board, 1722
Air Force and civil aviation
Customs aerial patrol, Vancouver, 1730
Forest patrol in Railway Belt, 1730
Archives, book binder, 703
British Columbia house, purchase of, 3537
Budget, 2640. Tariff announcement will allay alarm of manufacturing interests; cheque tax, 2640; discriminatory tax on confectionery; repeal of anti-dumping clause; fruit; marking act and depreciated currency clause, 2641; German situation; depreciated currency, 2642; post war industries and commercial development of Germany; position of France; reparations; physical suffering; Germany's budget deficits; issues of paper currency; unemployment; comparison of conditions in 1915 and 1921, 2643; Germany's foreign trade; adverse balance; Canada's imports from Germany; purchasing power of the mark; internal and external value; Mr. Maynard Keynes; Dr. Melchior; situation in France, 2645; Austria, Hungary; prohibitory tariffs in central Europe; German exports to Canada; pocket knives, 2646; German goods, method of distribution; agents of German manufacturers in Canada, 2647; sale of brokers' goods; enormous profits of German manufacturers; congratulations to Prime Minister on recently bestowed honour; Australian Preservation of Industries Act; direct and indirect taxation, 2648; inaccurate statements issued by Canadian Council of Agriculture; Mr. Crerar's figures

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
as to agricultural exports, 2649; consumption of agricultural products in Canada, 2650; taxation of capital; income tax — who pays?; per capita payment of customs duties, 2691; grievances of western farmers; technical and not fiscal problems, 2652; the tariff; business profits and taxation; United Grain Growers; watered stock, 2653; business principles enunciated in Grain Growers' report, 2654
Canadian exhibition in France, 2031
Canadian National railways, deficit, 1919
Canadian Pacific railway bill, 1858
Cash grants to soldiers, Liberal pledge, 399, 433
Chinese immigration
Agent in China, 2026, qu., 2214
Estimates, 2026
Civil service bonus, inquiry, 2996
Coal, Canmore and Drumheller miners' dispute, 1058
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053, 1054
Congratulations to Mr. Fielding, 3279
Customs Act, depreciated currency, 2642, 3224, 3410
Dredging, 2005
Shuswap lake, 2006
Dumping provision, 2641, 3412
Employment offices, 1058
Enfranchisement of foreign-born women, M. (Mr. Euler) 487
Fisheries, salmon canners' license fees, 1748
Ford automobile company, 3274
Forests, depletion of, 1046
Fraser Valley and Southern Railway, 1577
Fruit growers, protection, 2641, 3423-4
German valuation of goods, 2642-48, 3226
Government publications, 1373
Grain Inquiry Commission, qu., 705; qu., 1181, 2842
Harbours and rivers
British Columbia, 2005
Quebec, 1998
Hides, price of, 3138
Immigration
Commissioner of at Canton, China, qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Foreigners admitted as farmers, 1068
Industrial and scientific research, 235, 1372
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Interior dept., economic adviser, 455
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Job printers, taxation, 3264

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Labour department
Employees, 460, 468
Estimates, 571
M. to reduce item, 562, 579
Salary increases, 562
Liquor importation, 733
McCoig, Senator, attendance before Agriculture Com., 1901
McInnes, Mr. W. W. B., qu., 1901, 2026; qu., 2214
Marine and Fisheries
Eddie, Capt., 1492
Ice-breaker, repurchase of, 1490
Lightkeepers, salaries, 1497
Navigation schools, 1492
Steamers and ice-breakers, 1490
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 754
Mennonite emigration, qu., 732
Mexico, trade with, 699
Militia and Defence
Purchasing agents, 416-17
Training camps, qu., 2584
National Defence bill, 739
National Liberal-Conservative platform, trade, 2540
Naval Service
Royal Canadian navy, 1882-91
Royal Naval college, closing of, qu., 2458
Niagara River Bridge Company bill, 1486
Northwest rebellion, pensions for Mounted police, 3523
Nova Scotia miners strike, 1054
Opium and Narcotic Drugs, 775, 3017
Oriental aliens, and, 2018
Prohibition, and, 2018
Oriental aliens
Immigration
Chinese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
Japanese, restriction, M. for papers, 1776
M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion of, 1548, 1573
Pilotage dues, 1500
Point of order
M. in advance of report of Com., 1901
Right of member to complete speech, 3540
Unfinished statement of member ruled out of order, not debatable, 3603
Post office, railway mail service in British Columbia, 2799
Public buildings, heating, 1758
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Railway Commission, Hon. F. B. Carvell, statement, 2777

Stevens, Hon. H. H. — *Con.*
Returned Soldiers' Insurance bill, 3393
Senate indemnity, 3509
Soldier settlement, 2024
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 433
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Pension Board officials, 404
Salary increases, 386
Special War Revenue Act, exemptions, 3263
Standards, bureau of, 235, 1372
Steamship services, 2027
Atlantic and Pacific, Canadian ports, 3026
Unemployment
Relief, 1061, 2022
Employment offices, 2023
Tariff and, 3527
Vancouver drydock, 2005, 2008
Vancouver Harbour Commissioners bill, 2996
War, payment of cost of, 2405
Wheat Board, 2931
Point of order, 2933
Proceedings in Agriculture Com., 2931
Special Com. report, delay in concurrence, 2306
Women, the franchise and, 485
Yukon radiotelegraph service, 1749-50

Stewart, Hon. Charles (Minister of the Interior; Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; Minister of Mines)
Alpine Club grant, 1053
Assiniboine river floods, 3491
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Budget, 2216. Congratulations to Minister of Finance; review of agricultural and industrial conditions from introduction of national policy, 2216; prosperity following change of government in 1896; reciprocity; depression of 1914; agricultural implements; tariff reductions; public debt; war conditions, 2217; railways, 2218; tariff proposals; markets; freight rates, 2219; United States, trade with; taxation; sales, income tax, 2220
Canadian national parks, 1501
Chinese. *See also under this title,* Immigration; Oriental Aliens
Arival of at Vancouver, 2026, 3604
Criminal Code Amdt. (Scrip frauds) 3220
Calhoun, Mr., telegram from, 3601
Deville, Dr., 1045
Dinosaurs, museum specimens, 1237
Dominion lands
Homestead re-entry, 1041
Reclamation by drainage, 1051
Salaries of staff, 1035

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Dominion Lands — *Con.*
Surveys, 1037
Expenditure, 1045
Mackenzie-Peace river districts, 1044
Reduction of vote by, $30,000, 1044
Dominion Lands, Cancellation of Leases, bill, 3151, 3465-74
Senate amendments, 3615
Editorial Committee, 1235
Electrical storm in the West, 3493
Emigration, record of, 2160
Explosives Act, 1234
Forbes, Mrs. E. S., compassionate allowance, 3517
Forestry, 1046
Spruce bud moth, 1049
Tree planting on prairies, 1051
Geological museum specimens, 1237
Geological survey
Co-ordination of survey work, 1236
Reduction of vote, 1237-62
Immigration, 3054
Agents, bonus to, 3063
British artisans, 2208
Chinese, 2026, 3604
Doukhobors, 2160
Hutterites, 2160, 3060
Italian, 2171
Medical inspection, 3052
Mennonites, 2160, 3060
Ministers' statement, 2143
Money qualification, 2208
Policy of department, 3051-2
Reception of immigrant, 2160
Shandro, Mr., proposed colony, 2159
Unemployment, 2143, 3058
Immigration and Colonization, estimates, 754, 758, 2143, 3499
Immigration — Criminal Code bills, 3284
Imperial Mining Resources Bureau, 1237
Indian Act Amdt. bill, 2991, 3192
Indian Affairs Dept., estimates, 681, 685, 1214, 3536
Indians
Blood reserve, 1221
Devon band, proposed removal, 1216
Education, 1227, 1231, 3536
Edmonton school, 1231, 3536
Stony reserve, 1228, 3536
Expenditure, 1216
General expenses, 1226
Greater production, 1224
Health, 1228
Hospital grants, 1218
Medical attention, 1218
Potlach institution, 3192

Stewart, Hon. Charles — *Con.*
Indians — *Con.*
Six Nations, 1221
Enfranchisement, 2991
Soldier Settlement Board, 1221
Sydney reserve, proposed transfer, 1215
Interior department
Employees, transfer to, 457
Estimates, 3517
Printing and supplies, 454
Salaries, 452
International boundaries, 1033
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
Mines and Minerals
Clay deposits, investigation of, 1234
Estimates, 685
Investigation of resources, 1234
Reduction of vote, 1236-62
Officials, 687
Ore-dressing plant, 1235
Tar sands, 1236
Nelson, Mr. Frank, 3517
Oriental aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) for exclusion, 1565
Amdt. "effective restriction", 1567, 1574
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., claim of, 3503
Public buildings expenditure, 1262
Research council, 1233
Seat for, in Quebec province, 12
Seed grain advances, 1055
Soldier settlement, 2024
Estimates, 2131-42
Land purchases, irregularities, 2140
Taxes, collection of, 2134
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3405, 3475
Water powers, surveys, 1051
Wheat Board bill, 3189
Yukon territory government of, 1034

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace (Humboldt)
Budget, 2597. Progressive amendment, 2597. Amendment; does not express progressive view; budget proposals; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2598; the average citizen and public affairs; taxation; revenue; debt; economy; reciprocity with the United States; direct taxation; freer trade; marking and valuation of currency acts, 2599; tariff reductions; agricultural implements; sales tax; undue burden on people with small incomes, 2600; political pledges; constructive criticism; income tax; business profits tax; inheritance tax; land tax; estimated revenue from, 2601; conditions of

Stewart, Mr. C. Wallace — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
western farmers; need of wider markets; Wheat Board; transportation; Hudson Bay railway; branch lines, 2602; purchasing power; re adjustment of taxation; immigration; unoccupied lands, 2603
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2602, 2789
Insurance premiums, tax on, 3255
Macphail, Miss, alleged statement of, 3221

Stewart, Major Duncan, qu., 823

Stewart, Mr. H. A. (Leeds)
Brockville and Westport railway, qu., 704
Canadian Ford company, taxes, qu., 3599
Canadian National railways, passenger traffic, qu., 927
Condensed milk, tax, 3271
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 955
Militia and defence, cadet services, 1978
Nova Scotia miners, McLachlan correspondence, qu., 704
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1791
Returned Soldiers Insurance bill, 3391-2

Stewart, Hon. John A. (Lanark)
Alcohol for retail druggists, qu., 1400
Canadian National railways
Board of management, 913
Minister's statement, 912
Public ownership and operation, 1956
Rail and car repair contracts, 1914, 1958
Toronto Globe editorial, 1134
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1427-32
Genoa Conference, 582
Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific railways, qu., 2037
Intercolonial railway management, 408
Labour department
Director of technical education, 577
Policy, and building trades, 582
Publicity agent, 466
Supplies clerk, 585
Public Works estimates, 698
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1694, 1700. *See also under this title* Canadian National Railways
Railway Commission, alleged statement of Mr. Motherwell, 2777
Railways
Administration, 408
Co-ordination, 408
Freight rates, legislation, qu., 934
Policy, 1956

Stewart, Hon. John A. — *Con.*
Railways and Canals dept., salaries, 1134
Rideau canal, 2764
Soulanges canal, 2768
Trent canal, construction and betterments, 2764
Unemployment, car repair contracts, 1690
Welland ship canal, 2747

Stewart, Mr. T. J. (West Hamilton)
Hamilton post office building, 1251
Mineral waters tax, 3278
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1835
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Stock, Transfer, tax, 2117

Stockyards. *See* Live Stock

Stony Reserve. *See* Indians

Stork, Mr. Alfred (Skeena)
Address in reply, 330. Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific railways in British Columbia, 331; oriental question, 332
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 962
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 3013
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1516
Prince Rupert post office building, 1257

Strike-on-the-Job. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Strikes. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Sturgeon Falls
Indian agent, qu., 1285
Postmaster, qu., 1285

Submarine Cables, qu., 3151-2, qu., 3360

Submarine Construction. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Submarines, 1845. *See also* Naval Service

Subsidies. *See also* Steamship Services
Canadian Northern, 189-190, qu., 1504, 1921
Federal, Ontario, qu., 2214
Provinces to, 330
Steel companies to, 1692-96. *See also* Steel

Sudbury mail contract, qu., 1285

Suez Canal, 191. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Sugar
Atlantic refineries, refund, 2850
Beet industry, 2177, 2232, 2273, 2373, 3246, 3251
M. (Mr. Fansher) to reduce duty, 3248

Sugar — *Con.*
British preference increased, 2116
Excise duty on, 2116-7, 2232, 2273, 2853-5, 3267. *See also* Budget Speeches; Inland Revenue

Superannuation. *See* Civil Service; Public Service Retirement Act

Supervisor of Expenditure. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Supplementary Estimates. *See also* Estimates;; Supply
Tabled, 1258

Supply. *See also* Interim Supply
Committee of, 378, 385, 429, 451, 493, 548, 598, 644, 681, 747, 791, 873, 967, 1018, 1040, 1133, 1163, 1214, 1339, 1361, 1489, 1578, 1662, 1722, 1747, 1843, 1905, 1933, 2010, 2043, 2129, 2747, 2834, 2975, 3026 3051, 3495

Supply, Committee of
Amendments
Cash bonus to soldiers, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 429; neg., 450-1
Defence Forces, remarks of Mr. Clark on motion for Supply, 1335
Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts
Concurrence, 1769, 3489, 3547
Estimates. *See that title*
Procedure, motion to reduce vote, 1579
Subjects and items discussed
Agriculture, 588, 644, 1018, 3504
Cold storage, 818, 3521
Destructive Insect and Pest Act, 3520
Entomology, 813
Experimental farms, 795, 799, 3521
Fruit, 967
Health of animals, 967, 3521
Livestock, 971, 1018, 3521
Seed, Feed and Fertilizer Control, 1011
Stock-grazing and feeding, 1718
Air Board, 1722
Air Force and Civil Aviation, 1722
Annuities, 776
Assay Office, Vancouver, 1236
Auditor General's Office, 793
Board of Commerce, 1715
Boy Scouts Association, 772
Canada Temperance Act, 3499
Canadian National parks, 1051, 1681
Canadian National railways
Advances
Canadian Government railways ($7,000,000) 2779

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Canadian National railways — *Con.*
Advances — *Con.*
Canadian Northern ($42,800,000) 1905, 1933
Grand Trunk ($25,750,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($15,900,000) 1969
Grand Trunk Pacific ($800,000) 3520
Rail and car repair contracts, 1688
Canadian Press, Limited, 772
Canadian Representation in United States, 2026, 2990
Canals
Chambly, 3518
Ontario-St. Lawrence, 2779
Quebec, 2779
Rideau, 2764, 2769
St. Lawrence ship canal, 2767
Soulanges, 2768
Staff and repairs, 2779
Trent, 2764
Welland ship canal, 1687, 2747
Civil aviation, 1722
Civil Service
Bonus, 3528
Commission, 3064
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Customs and Excise, 762, 1674
Distressed Canadians, relief of, 2027
Dominion lands, 1035, 1051
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Employment offices, 1058
Exhibitions, 2026
External affairs, 411, 3508
Finance, 770
Charges of management, 1663, 3495
Paper Control inquiry, 1673
Tariff commissioner, 1663
Forestry protection, 1046
Geodetic survey, 1033
Geological survey, 1233, 1236
Genoa Conference, 1715
Girl guides, 774
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 751
Grain Inquiry Commission, 2982
Harbours and rivers. *See also under this title.* Public Works.
Nova Scotia, 1269, 3545
Prince Edward Island, 1270
Health, 775
Immigration, medical inspection, 2021
Quarantine, 2021
High Commissioner's office, 413
House of Commons, 2026
Housing, 774

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Immigration, 754, 1711, 2143, 3051
Adjustment of war claims, 1711
Chinese, 2026
St. John immigration building, 2027
Salaries, 3499
Indians, 681, 1215, 3536
British Columbia, 1713
Destitute, 1712-14
Education, 1715, 3536
Field and garden seeds, 1712
General expenses, 1712
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Insurance, 791
Interim. *See* Interim Supply
Interim Supply bill, 378, 598
Interior, 452, 1033
Dominion lands and parks, 1681, 3517
Migratory birds, 1684
National parks, 1051, 1681
Printing and stationery, 1680
Yukon, administration of, 1681
International Labour Conference, 1060
Joint Industrial councils, 1060
Justice, 451, 1274
Civil government, 1668, 3495
Exchequer court, 1274
Litigated matters, 1276
Supreme court, 1274
Yukon territory, 1275
Labour, 458, 493, 548, 1053
Conciliation and Labour Act, 1053
Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 1058
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1058
Unemployment relief, 1970, 2022
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Lignite
Bienfait briquetting plant, 1233
Utilization board, 3524
League of Nations, Permanent Secretariat, 2026
Lighthouse and coast service, 1495, 1677
Live stock, 971, 1018, 3521
Marine and Fisheries, 1676, 3051
Deep sea fisheries, conservation, 2169
Examination of masters and mates, 1490
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2166
Investigation into wrecks, 1492
Life-saving service, 1494
Lighthouse and coast service, 1405, 1677
Salaries and allowances, 1497

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Marine and Fisheries — *Con.*
Marine signal service, 1499
Meterological service, 1501
Navigation, aids to, 1498
Navigation schools, 1492
Ocean and river service, 3507
Pilotage, administration of, 1499
Prince Rupert Drydock Co. claim, 3514
Registration of shipping, 1493
Removal of obstructions in navigable waters, 1493
St. Lawrence ship channel, 1494
Salaries of officers and guardians, 2166
Sorel shipyard, 1494, 2169
Steamboat inspection, 2169
Steamers and icebreakers, 1489
War claims, adjustment, 1677
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 1493
Militia and Defence, 415, 586, 1163, 1578, 1601, 1922, 2974, 3498
Allowances, active militia, 1135
Annual drill, 1163, 1578, 1610
Arsenals
Lindsay, 1979, 2085
Quebec, 1979, 2091
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Cadet services, 1972
Civil government, 415, 586, 3498
Civil pensions, 1711, 3499
Clothing and necessaries, 1978
Customs duties, 1978
Engineer services and works, 1980
Maintenance of military properties, 1980
Ordnance arms, lands, etc., 1982
Ordnance building, Quebec, repairs, 1711
Permanent force, 1982
Reductions, 1174, 1578, 1631, 1972-87, 2091-98
Royal Military College, 1985
Salaries and wages, 1985
School of instruction, 1985
Staff, pay of, 1982
Topographic survey, 1985
Training areas, 1986
Transport and freight, 1986
War claims, adjustment of, 2098, 2974
Mines and Geological Survey, 1233, 3524
Mines and Minerals, 685, 1234
Naturalization Act, 2024
Naval Service, 418, 1735
Dockyards, Halifax and Esquimalt, 1752
Fisheries protection service, 1747
Hydrographic survey, 1746

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Naval Service — *Con.*
Patrol of northern waters, 1750
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Salaries and contingencies, 1745
War claims, adjustment of, 1752
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276
Paris agency, 2025
Parliamentary guide, 2024
Passport office, 2026
Patent record, 2026
Penitentiaries, 1670
Pensions, 3522
European war and active militia, 1349
Madame Fabre, 2024
Post Office, 691, 1711
Outside service, 2799
Printing and stationery, 1711
Printing Bureau, 1970
Privy Council, 410
Public Archives, 702, 2025
Public health, 2017
Public Works, 692, 747, 1238
Dredging,, 2005
Harbours and rivers, 3541
British Columbia, 2005, 3547
Manitoba, 2003, 3545
New Brunswick, 1991
Nova Scotia, 1269, 1765, 3545
Ontario, 1999
Prince Edward Island 1270, 1988
Quebec, 1998, 3545
St. John harbour improvements, 2013
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2004, 3547
Miscellaneous, 2008
Public buildings
Alberta, 1254, 3545
British Columbia, 1255
Fittings, supplies and furniture, 1757
Generally, 1260-4
Immigration buidings, 1757
Lighting, etc., 1755
Maritime provinces generally, 1243
Ontario, 1245-68, 3544
Ottawa, 1265
Parliament buildings, 2014
Rents, repairs, etc., 1238, 1265, 1764
Rideau hall, 1756
Quarantine stations, 1238-45
Halifax, 1238
St. John, 1238-45
Williamshead, 1255
Quebec, 1245
Saskatchewan, 1253

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Public Works — *Con.*
Telephone service, 1757
Roads and bridges, 2007
Telegraphs and telephones, 2007, 2012
Purchasing Commission, 2025
Railway Commission, 2773
Railways and Canals, 407, 3518
Arbitrations and litigation, 2772
Canadian Govt. Merchant Marine, loan, 3035
Canadian National railways, 1933. *See also that title*
Canadian Northern advance, 1905, 1933
Canals. *See under this title,* Canals
Governor Generals cars, 1688
Grand Trunk arbitration, 2779
Hudson Bay railway, 1970
Intercolonial, 2767
Port Colbourne elevator, 1687
Railway policy, 1905, 1933
Salaries and contingencies, 1133
Surveys and inspections, 2779
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 775, 2129
Royal Canadian navy, 1735, 1843, 1972, 2043
Secretary of State, 701
Civil government, 1670
Naturalization expenses, 1671
Public archives, 1673
War claims, adjustment of, 1672, 2977
Seed Grain advances, 1053
Senate, 2026
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 385
Capital expenditure, 1279
Employers' liability compensation, 1348
Operating expenses and working capital, 1347
Pensions
European war, active militia, 1349, 1353, 1361
Salaries, 1339
Unemployment relief, 1347, 1352, 3524
Vocational loans, 1346
War service gratuity, interest on, 1346
Soldier settlement, 2023, 2131
Statutes, reprinting, 1717
Steamship services, 2027, 3026, 3505
Supplementry estimates, 1662
Taxation, business profits, income, 2024
Trade and Commerce, 699, 3541
Canada Grain Act, administration of, 2834
Dominion Bureau of statistics, 1363
Gas and electricity, inspection, 1373
Gold and Silver Marking Act, administration, 1372

Supply, Committee of — *Con.*
Subjects and items discussed — *Con.*
Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Industrial and Scientific Research, 1372
International Customs Tariff Bureau, 1373
Linen yarn bounty, 1361
Printing of publications, 1373
Steamships services, 2027, 3026, 3505. *For individual services see that title*
Terminal elevators, 2978
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2989
Unemployment relief, 1061, 3524-6
Victorian order of nurses, 772
War Graves Commission, 774
Water powers, 1051
Wheat Board, 3541
Yukon territory, 1034, 1275

Supreme Court
Cameron, Mr. E. R., K.C., estimate and expenditure, 1274
Decision. *See* Wheat Board
Estimates, 1274
Library, 1274
Reports, 1274

Supreme Court Act Amdt. bill (Appeal from provincial courts of final resort) 1r., 2456; 2r., com., 3r., 2974

Survey and Map Work. *See also* Interior Department
Co-ordination of, 1986

Surveys. *See also* Dominion Lands; Geodetic; Geological; Topographic
Water power resources, 1051

Sussex public building, 1239

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Accredited herds, diseases, 1001
Adulteration of mill feeds, 1011, 2490
Agricultural implements, duty, 3134
Agricultural Instruction Act, 1012-1013
Air Force and civil aviation, 1731
Alderson claim, 1002-3
Beet sugar industry, 3251
Blake, late Hon. Edward, 2657
Budget, 2481. After war conditions; tribute to Finance Minister, 2481; election promises not carried out; breach of faith; the amendment; leader of Progressive party making excuses for Government; Hon. George Brown and violation of political pledges, 2482; statement of Prime Minister; Liberal declarations in favour of free trade;

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
Finance Minister chastises colleagues; opposing views in government party, 2483; a policy to suit every constituency; tacit understanding between Progressives and Liberals; public statements as to fiscal policy of Liberal party; Mr. Fielding and protection; duty on agricultural implements, 2484; reciprocity agreement; attitude of United States towards Canada; proposed duties under reciprocity, 2485; importation of agricultural products from the United States; world tendency to increase tariff barriers; valuation of currency, 2486; trade with Germany; labour costs; marking of goods; United States legislation to prevent unfair competition; industrial development of the West; sectionalism; two-party system;, 2487; Progressive party, origin and policy; record of the old Tory party; Union government tariff policy; Wartime Elections Act; tariff concessions to western Canada; Grain Growers' Grain Company contributions to political organizations, 2488; resignation of Mr. Crerar from Union government; statement of Mr. Rice Jones; Mr. Crerar's salary as president of United Grain Growers, 2489; oleomargarine; recleaned screenings; adulteration of mill feed, export duty on dairy produce; Mr. Rowell and Mr. Clark on tariff proposals of Union government; protective policy; Premier Drury and land tax, 2491; tax on unimproved land values; free trade; sales tax; condensed milk, 2492; railway situation; debt; inheritance from former Liberal government; Transcontinental railway, 2493; dumping clause; value of German mark; economy in administration, 2494; amendment, 2495
Cattle
Embargo, 1002, 1031
Free carriage of, 1029
Freight on, 1010
Stockyards, 1030
Condensed milk tax, 2492, 3266
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1437, 1455
Customs revenue, qu., 614
Drainage tiles, 3270-1

Sutherland, Mr. Donald — *Con.*
Experimental farms, number of, 797, 801, 805, 813, 1015
M. to reduce item, 812
Farm tractors, duty on, 769
Feed Control Act, 1011
Filled milk and cream, qu., 963
Freight on hay for stock, 1007
Health of animals, Alderson claim, 1002-3-5
Hides, price of, 3139
Hog cholera, 1009
Alderson claim, 1005
Immigration
Bonus to agents, 3062
Unemployment and, 3058
Imports into Canada, qu., 610; qu., 612; qu., 613
Marshall, Mr. Duncan, 1032
Meat and Canned Foods Act, 3050
Militia and Defence
Arsenals
Lindsay, 2091
Quebec and, 1982, 2087-97
Expenditures and policy, 1981
Military properties, 1981
Naval Service, co-ordination with, 420
Pay of staff, M. to reduce item, 1982
Milk herds, tuberculosis, 1006
National Defence, department of, 1732-4, 1981
Naval policy, 2073
Royal Canadian navy, 2073
Oleomargarine
Importation of materials, qu., 613; qu., 704; qu., 728
Manufacture and importation, M. (Mr. Neill) 1816
Materials for, 3270
Oleomargarine Act Amdt. bill, 3432, 3487
Parliament buildings, purchase of furniture, 1756-7
Pensions Board investigation, 3156
Pensions Committee, 3348-9, 3357
Final report, 3351
Sales tax, 3270
Soldiers' bonus, M. (Mr. Arthurs) 447
Stallion clubs, 1031
Standard of living, 3139
Sugar beet industry, 3267
Wheat board, 2947
Wool, duty on, 3132-35

Sutherland, Hon. Mr. Justice, qu., 366

Swift Current post office building, 1253

Sydney, N.S.
Pilotage district, 3508
Reserve. *See* Indians

Sydney, N.S. — *Con.*
Steel workers, unemployment, 1076
Unemployment contracts for steel rails, 1688

Tadoussac-Murray Bay steamship service, 3035

Tampa Exhibition, 2026

Tar Sands. *See* Mines and minerals

Tariff, 1290. *See also* Budget; Customs; Trade. *For items discussed See* Customs Tariff
Amended resolutions, 2854
Australia, preferential treatment, 2110
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2230. *See also* Budget
Book paper for magazines, 2855
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Changes, 2174, 2851
Cigarettes, 2855
Commission, proposed permanent, 2269, 2339, 2351, 2625
Commissioner, 1663
Salary, 3504
Comparison with Laurier-Fielding tariff, 208
Dumping clause, 2184, 2197. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Duty on boots and shoes, 159-160
Fordney. *See* United States
France, 2032
Fruit, 2197. *See also that title*
Fuel oil, 344, 1761
Immigration and, 2157
Inquiry, 1920-21, cost, etc., qu., 2215
Legislation, history of, 2184, 2429-30, 2655
Liberal policy. *See* Liberal Convention of 1919
Ministers and Directorships, 1088
Prohibitory Central European, 2646
Reduction, 2111, 2114, 2286, 2844
Resolutions, 2118. *For items See* Customs Tariff
Amended, 2851, 2874
Bill, 3476-7
Revision, 2110-14
Former, 2426
Necessity for. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Shoe manufacturers and, 141. *See also* Boots and Shoes
Tractors, 2115. *See also* Budget
Unemployment and, 3527
Valuations for duty, 3413-15

Taschereau, Premier, and St. Lawrence river waterway, 137, 1191

Taxation, 2496. *See* speeches on Budget; Revenue Bills
Amusement, 2395
Automobiles. *See under this title,* Sales tax
Bachelor, 82
Bank circulation, 2117
Beer, ale, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Bond and stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Bonds held in United States non-taxable, 1133; qu., 2971
Breadner, Mr. R. W., Commissioner, salary, 2024
Burdensome, 2242, 2248, 2600, 2661. *See also* speeches on Address; Budget
Urban population on, 2394
Business profits, qu., 1657, 1658, 2024, 2172-9, 2281, 2562, 2653
Administration of, 2024
British Empire Steel Corporation, qu., 1067
Canadian Ford Company, qu., 3599
Cheque tax, 1036, 2117, 2177, 2269, 2329, 2462, 2640, 2676, 2852, 2856, 3258
Protests against, 2395
Classification of income tax-payers, 1063
Condensed milk, 2492, 3264, 3271, 3409
Confectionery, 2177, 2641, 2676, 2852, 2857
Commodity tax, 2883
Consumer of, 2507
Customs. *See* Customs Tariff; Tariff
Debt and, 2459. *See also* Public Debt
Direct and indirect, 2386, 2402, 2648, 2707
Effect on trade, 2859
Estimated revenues from, 2172
Evasions, 2395
Excess profits, 2441, 2695
Express money orders and travellers cheques, 2856
Garbage collection tax in Ontario, 1256
Income, 2442, 2686. *See also that title*
Administration of, 2024
Banks, payments by, qu., 1400
Forms, 3485
Members of provincial legislature, 3486
Railway men and commercial travellers, 3485
Revenue and classification, 1063; qu., 1399-1400
Inequalities, 2255
Inheritance tax, 184, 2442, 2510, 2601, 2626, 2686, 2708, 2844
Insurance
Foreign companies, 2462
Premiums, 2117, 3253

Taxation — *Con.*
Land values, 2191, 2405, 2443, 2492, 2510, 2626, 2686, 2695-6, 2844,
Estimated revenue from, 2601
Loan companies, 2299
Luxuries, 2260, 2561, 2696
Modification of, 230. *See* Speeches on Address; Budget
Municipal, payment of by Government, 1256, 1257
Mutual insurance companies, 3477. *See also under this title,* Insurance
New, 2116, 2177, 2329
Non-taxable bonds, 1133, 2971
Overlapping, 2463
Per capita, 2341
Post Office money orders, 2857
Principle of, 2281
Property, 2443
Provincial, payment to British Columbia govt., 1714
Receipts, 2270, 2853-7
Riordon Company, qu., 372; qu., 607
Sales tax, 2220, 2843. *See also* Special War Revenue bill
Ale, beer, etc., 2117, 2567, 2852, 2857
Automobiles, 2116, 2186, 2206, 2260. *See also* Automobiles; Budget
Collections, qu., 375
Confectionery, 2117, 2641, 2676
Exempted goods, 2126
Beet pulp dried, 2852
Fertilizers, 2852
Goods on which tax was collected, 1921-22, 1212
Increase, 2393
Mineral waters, 2117
Soldier settlement, municipal taxes, 1257
Special War Revenue Act. *See that title*
Stocks and bonds, 2856
Stock transfers, 2117, 2853
Telegrams and cables, 2117, 2178, 2856
Transient aliens, 2155

Taylor, Dr., qu., 1211

Technical Education. *See* Labour

Telegraphs. *See also* Wireless

Telegraphs and Telephones
British Columbia, 2008, 2012
Canadian National lines, qu., 3360
Humboldt-Fort Pitt telegraph line, 2007
Lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, 2012
Prince Edward Island, 2012
Public buildings, Ottawa, 1757
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2007, 2012

Telegraphs and Telephones — *Con.*
Telegrams and cables, tax on, 2117, 2178, 2856
Yukon, cost of, 1275, 2012

Telephones. *See* Telegraphs and Telephones

Temperance. *See* Canada Temperance Act

Ten Eyck, Congressman, 1396

Terminal Elevators. *See* Grain and Grain Trade

Terminal Facilities. *See* St. John

Territorial Waters, Fishing beyond. *See* Fisheries Act Amdt.

Territories, Unorganized. *See* Royal Canadian Mounted Police

Textile Industry, 2882. *See* Speeches on Budget
Foreigners engaged in, 2518
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Profits, 2632

Thompson, Colonel Andrew, soldiers' bonus, 403, 432

Thompson, Colonel J. T. C. *See* Pensions Board

Thompson, Mr. T. H. (East Hastings)
Dairy inspection, 1009
Dairy produce, grading of, 655-6
Stamp tax on cheques, 3261

Three Rivers Clerk of the Peace. *See* Criminal Code

Threshing Machines. *See* Agricultural Implements

Thunder Bay, icebreaking, 1677

Thurston, Mr. John J. (Victoria, Ont.)
Immigration, travelling expenses, 757
Militia and Defence, Lindsay arsenal, 2085
River-gauging and metering, 2011
Trent canal, Nassau dam, qu., 2457

Tidal Fisheries. *See* Quebec Fisheries

Tidal Survey. *See* Naval Service

Timber. *See also* Lumber
Acquisition of British Columbia areas by Japanese, 2311
Gaspé, in, 625
Illegal cutting on Tobique reserve, 1233
Lease of Ontario areas, 2805; qu., 2992
Protection of. *See* Forestry

Tobacco
American Tobacco Company, 2547
Bull Durham, comparative prices, 2546
Cigarettes, duties on, 2394, 2547, 2852-3
Cigars, duties on, 2115, 2853, 2857
Duties, 2115, 2394, 2546, 2891
Experimental station at L'Assomption, 1776
Imperial Tobacco Company, 2546
Industry, protection, 2891
Raw leaf, 2115, 2673, 2853

Tobin, Mr. E. W. (Richmond and Wolfe)
Canadian National railways, purchase of ties, qu., 1659
Oleomargarine, importation and manufacture, qu., 1506
Richmond and Wolfe
Post offices, qu., 1507
Postmasters, qu., 1508
Rural mail routes, qu., 1505

Tobin, Lieut. Col., Vancouver, letter of, 1975

Tobique Reserve. *See* Indians

Todd, Mr. W. F., election promises in Charlotte, N.B., 1994

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. (Victoria City)
Accredited herd system, 2738
Agricultural exhibitions, 650
Agriculture
Cattle embargo, 973-4
Dept., Mr. T. N. Lynton, 588
Live stock industry, 971
Livestock trade with South America, 648
Salaries, 656
Animal Contagious Diseases bill, 2734-43
Bovine tuberculosis, 2738
Budget, 2591. Duration of previous Parliament; congratulations to Finance Minister, 2591; tariff and agricultural implements; trade relations with Australia; agricultural conditions; mixed farming, 2592; wool and sheep raising; dumping clause; British Columbia fruit industry; United States competition, 2593; tax on temperance beverages; fruit juices; grading hogs for the British market; extermination of hog cholera, 2594; United States system of dealing with disease; eradication of bovine tuberculosis, 2595; horse racing, Federal control of and revenue from, 2596; cattle export; embargo; new taxes; amendment, 2597;
Cold storage, 818
Entomology, orchard protection, 816

Tolmie, Hon. S. F. — *Con.*
Esquimalt and Nanaimo railway bill, 1156, 1161, 1353, 1355, 1604
Esquimalt dry dock, 597
Experimental farms, British Columbia, 796
Fisheries dept., 2166
Fishing schooner race, 3512
Fruit growers, protection, 2593, 3424
Health of Animals
Diseases, 968, 2594, 2738
Tuberculosis, 2594, 3521
Hog cholera, 2594, 2738
Horse-racing, federal control, 2596
Immigration of Japanese, 1289, qu., 1459
Marine and Fisheries
Examination of masters and mates, 1491
Lightkeepers' salaries and allowances, 1497
Ministers' secretaries, 413
Oleomargarine, M. (Mr. Neill) 1785
Opium and Narcotic Drug Act Amdt. bill, 2825, 3017
Oriental Aliens, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 1567
Oriental immigration
Japanese, 1289, qu., 1399, qu., 1459
Patronage, civil service, 3083
Victoria post office building, repairs, 1255-8

Topographic Maps, qu., 1631

Topographic Survey, 1043

Tormentine Reef, buoy, 1499

Toronto
Campaign advertisement, 198-199
Cheque tax, 2395, 2329
Customs house, 198-9, 1246-51
Harbour improvements, qu., 365, 1187, 1467, 1471, 1474, 3541
Imperial convention of teachers, 1673
International yacht race, 3513
Post Office, qu., 108-9, 368
Building, 1246-51
Revenue, 1250
Power plant, public ownership, 123
Prison reform, municipal farms, 1277
Railway facilities, 66
Viaduct, qu., 1660
Railway grades, reduction of, 74
Rate increases, 131
Representation of, 1365
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment staff, 1343
Steam railway freight, qu., 936
Street railway
Public ownership, 1937
Service, 63
Toronto Suburban railway, qu., 2457
Transportation commission, 130
Unemployment, 86

Toronto Electric Light Company, 123

Tourist Traffic
Banff-Windermere highway, 1681
Highways, 1681. *See also that title*
Visitors to Canadian National parks, 1052

Town Planning, Banff, 1052

Townsend, United States Senator, 1206

Tracadie Lazaretto, 1240, 2021

Tractors, 769, 2354, 3123. *See also* Agricultural Implements
Value $1,400 and less to be free, 2115

Trade and Commerce, 2108. *See also* Customs and Excise; Exports; Imports; Speeches on Budget; Tariff
Agreements and negotiations, 2110, 2172
Agricultural implements, in, 2620-1. *See also that title*
Australia, with, 9, 174-5. *See also* Steamship Services
Austria, with, 2535
Bills to be preceded by resolution, 1283
British Preference and Canadian seaports. *See* British Preference
Canada-Mexico, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Canadian ports by, 104. *See also* British Preference
Channels of, 336-7
Competition, 223. *See* Speeches on Budget
Consular agents, repeal of Act of 1921, 3222, 3477
Consular certificates, 2114, 3222, 3477
Department
Canada Grain Act, administration, 2834
Estimates, 1361, 2834, 2978, 3026, 3541
Salaries, etc., 699
Elevators, terminal, maintenance and equipment, 2978
Exchange value of commodities, 2868
Expansion, 2021
Export. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities
Exports and imports, 1876-77 and 1921-22, qu., 1376. *See also* Imports
Foreign. *See also* Germany
France-Belgium, 3223
Freight rates, effect on, 276
Germany, with, 138, 2203, 2279, 2535, 2859. *See also* Customs; Germany; Speeches on Budget
Great Britain, 2540. *See also* British Preference
And United States, 2369
International, 2862
Interprovincial, 2284

Trade and Commerce — *Con.*
Italian, effect of currency valuation on, 2849
Mexico, with, qu., 606, 699-700, 2989
Necessity for revival, 105. *See also* Budget; Industrial Depression; Speeches on Address
Potatoes. *See that title*
Russian, consortium to re-establish, 1463
Southern Pacific dominions, 2990
Steamships Services. *See that title*
Total
1876-77 and 1921-22, statement, 1376
1900-1921, qu., 1633
Statement, 1376
Trade commissioners and commercial agents, 1373, 2114, 2581, 2989
United States with, 2223, 2449-50. *See also that title*
West Indies. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities; Steamship Services

Trades and Labour Congress
Oriental immigration, 1514
Unemployment insurance, 1081

Transatlantic Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Transcontinental. *See* Canadian National Railways

Transportation, 2580, 2611. *See also* Crowsnest Pass Agreement; Freight Rates; Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Cattle, free carriage of, 1029
Commodity and freight rates, 234
Costs. *See* Freight Rates
Farm products of, 231
Fish, 2166
Loss of, 175
Maritime provinces in, 106-111, 2687-8
Nationalization, 2325. *See also* Canadian National railways
Problems. *See* Budget; Speeches on Address. *See also that title*
St. Lawrence River Waterway, 269
M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1203-8
Tonnage rates, 234
Water, 1939

Trawlers. *See* Naval Service

Treaties. *See also* Conferences
Anglo-Japanese, 168
Chinese Customs Tariff Treaty, 3161
Far Eastern, 3160
Four Power. *See* Limitation of Armaments

Treaties — *Con.*
France-Belgium, 3223
Hungary and Turkey, 3490, 3547
Tabled, 3359
International Opium Convention, qu., 1066
Japan, with, 1511
Lemieux treaty with, 1459
Limitation of Armaments, 3158
Peace treaty with Germany, Lusitania claims, 3599
Pelagic Sealing, 1844
Prevention of use of noxious gases and chemicals, 3159
Protection of neutrals and non-combatants at sea, 3159
Quadruple Pacific, 3160
Versailles, 2848

Treaty of Peace with Hungary and Turkey bill
1r., 3490; 2r., com., 3r., 3547

Tree Planting. *See also* Forestry
Provincial highways, qu., 2039

Tremblay, General, Quebec Harbour Commission, 1477

Trent Canal. *See* Canals

Trenton Harbour bill
Res., 3436, 3493; 1r., 2r., com., 3494; 3r., 3495

Trépanier, Alderman, of Montreal, 1392

Trial by Jury, 1388. *See also* Criminal Code Amdt.

Trusts and Combines, 2395, 2414. *See also* Address; Budget
Minister of Labour and, 200

Trust Companies Act Amdt. bill
1r., 1210; 2r., ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1464; com., 3r., 3142; Senate amdts., 3607

Tsur, Dr., Chinese-Consul General, 1776

Tuberculosis. *See also* Health; Hospitals
Bloc areas, 3521
Bovine, 2556, 2595, 3521. *See also* Animal Contagious Diseases bill
Indians, 1225, 1228
Returned Soldiers. *See* Pensions; Returned Soldiers' Insurance; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment hospitals, 1344

Tupper, Sir Charles, and maritime union, 107-108

Turgeon, Mr. Onésiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply, 273. Congratulations; maritime provinces and the Intercolonial, 274-276; government ownership of railways, 277; tariff questions, 278; natural resources of western provinces, 279
Budget, 2188. Mr. Fielding's visit to Washington; Fordney tariff; relations with the United States, 2189; public debt; income and business profits taxes; economy; British preference; duties on farm implements, 2190; fishing industry; lumber; alcohol for medicinal purposes; sales tax; taxation of land values, 2191; Liberal platform of 1919; capital and labour; immigration, 2192; railways; Transcontinental; opposition of C.P.R., 2193; board of directors; grain shipments, 2194; public ownership; Intercolonial, 2195; regional control of Canadian National railways, 2196
Canadian National railways
Board of directors, 2194
Hanna and Mitchell, Messrs., salaries, qu., 471
Public ownership, 2193
Transcontinental
Grain shipments, 2194
Opposition of Canadian Pacific to, 2194
Canadian Pacific railway, cost, 2193
Civil Service patronage, 3082
Immigration, agricultural workers, 2193
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Single tax, 2191

Turkey, Peace Treaty with, 3359, 3547

Turtle Mountain Forest reserve, qu., 615

Ukrainians. *See* Immigration

Ultra Vires, Canada Grain Act, 1132

Undesirables, deportation of. *See* Criminal Code; Immigration; Opium and Narcotic Drugs

Unemployment, 1290, 2331, 2627. *See also* Address; Budget; Canadian Patriotic Fund bill; Housing; Immigration; Labour; Returned Soldiers
Agricultural conditions and, 2158
Banff-Windermere road, 1052, 1682
Canada, number in, qu., 3362
Cities, in, 86

Unemployment — *Con.*
Continuance of, 237
Credit system, 219
Economic causes, 1081, 3526
Employment offices, Co-ordination Act, 1058, 2022
German competition and, 2178. *See also* Germany
Farm labourers, 2331. *See also that title*
Housing, 219. *See also* Housing
Immigration and, 225, 2143
Importations and, 210
Insurance, 88, 218, 1070, 1081
Land settlement and, 182-3
Military expenditures, 1144
National conference proposed, 1082
Nova Scotia miners, 1759. *See also* Labour
Occupational diseases. *See* Labour
Policy of Government, inquiry, 3491
Proposed order steel rails to relieve, 1691
Rail and car repair contracts, 1690, 1912
Relief, 1061, 1719, 1970, 2022; qu., 3152
Camps, 86
Expenditure for, 86, 2023
Report of Ontario Government commission, 218
Returned soldiers, 2458, 3311, 3329-30. *See also that title*
Hikers, qu., 3153
Riley's army, qu., 3364. *See also* "General" Macdonald's Army
Seasonal, 87-88
Soldiers, 3524. *See also* Returned Soldiers
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, relief, 1347, 1352
Standing Committee, proposed, 1082
Toronto, aid to, 121, 199
Unemployment Service Council, recommendations, 2803
Unemployment situation, 1069-84
Welland canal, 2750

Unimproved Land Values, tax. *See* Taxation

Union of Canadian Municipalities
Foreigners, immigration of, 1392
Immigration, 2155

Unions. *See* Labour

United Farmers of Alberta
Loan system, resolution, 220

United Farmers of British Columbia, 1354
Oriental immigration, 1514

United Farmers of Ontario, 63
Platform, 2393
Protection and, 2440

United Grain Growers' Limited, 2489, 2653
Agricultural implements, 304, 2693, 3119
Crerar, Mr., and, 2489
Political organizations, contribution to, 2488
Report, 2654

United Mine Workers. *See* Nova Scotia miners

United Shoe Machinery Co. of Canada, 1902

United States. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Air Service, 1726
American Bankers' Association, resolution, 2189
Amicable relations with, 91
Bonds held in, non-taxable, 1133
Canadian exports to, 209. *See also* Exports
Canadian-owned railways in, 312
Canadian representation in, 2990
Coal and steel industries, 2419
Coal, importations from, 124, 1759. *See also* Coal
Con Rein, sinking of, 1382
Duty on Canadian apples, 164. *See also* Fruit
Duty on Canadian potatoes and wheat, 239. *See also* Root Vegetables
Emigration to, 2516. *See also* Immigration
Factories in Canada, 2413-14, 2467
Farmers, competition with, 2527
Farmers' bloc, 69, 210, 988, 2323. *See also under this title,* Fordney
Flag, 1265
Fordney tariff, 53, 93-94, 209, 272, 343, 2112, 2178, 2189, 2219, 2336, 2367, 2409, 2527, 2580
Effect of, 2454
Grand Trunk mileage in, 191
Immigration from, 236, 2147. *See also that title*
Comparison, 3056
Figures, 758
Years' residence in Canada, 236
Imperial pensioners in, 1347
Importations, duty on, 208-209
Importations of British goods through, qu., 375
Income tax, non-resident aliens, 1304
Industries developing Canadian resources, 2667
Insurance companies, tax. *See* Special War Revenue Act
Investment in Canadian industries, 2368, 2546
Iron and steel industry, 2412-13
Magazines, imports, 3109

United States — *Con.*
Medical inspection of immigrants for Canada, 2022
Military expenditure, 1622
Oriental immigration, 1515
Pecuniary claims convention with, 1276
Pelagic Sealing Treaty, 1844
Railway difficulties, 67-70, 129, 1917-18
Railways
Lines in Canada, 204
Purchase of, 2611
Reciprocity, 77, 102, 2111, 2201, 2285, 2368, 2463, 2485, 2511, 2527, 2616, 2694, 2846. *See also* Address; Budget
St. Lawrence and Welland canals, 2749
St. Lawrence river waterway, 1184, 1315 1396. *See also that title*
Treaty, consideration of proposed, 2207
Steel prices, 2412
Tariff discrimination, 2466
Tariff legislation, 113, 988, 2487, 2620-1, 2864. *See also under this title* Fordney
Trade, 2111, 2178, 2610,. *See also under this title,* Reciprocity
Cattle, 2695
Relations, 2908
War operations, 1336
Washington
Hon. Mr. Fielding's trip to, 2112, 2189, 2300
Wrangel Island, 1751
Russian claim to, 2208

Unopposed Motions for Papers
Algoma Indian lands, timber leases (Mr. Simpson) 942
Appraisers, Paris and London, (Mr. Parent) 1068
Avignon, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Bonaventure
Mail contract (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Caisse, Mr. J. J., Montreal post office (Mr. Marcil) 828
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 112th Battalion band instruments (Mr. Martell) 372
Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk insurance (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) 828
Canadian Northern bonds (Mr. Stevens) 2458
Canadian ships, damage during war (Mr. Bristol) 1183
Caraquet and Gulf shore railway (Mr. Hanson) 1183
Carleton, Que., post office (Mr. Marcil) 829
Cattle embargo, Hon. Manning Doherty (Mr. White) 616

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Civil Service bonus, (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 828
Dauphinee, Mr. Charles, dismissal (Mr. Baxter) 2584
Dominion Iron and Steel Co., contract (Mr. Caldwell) 616
Extra-territorial rights (Mr. Meighen) 1068
Fisheries
Establishment of independent department (Mr. Martell) 372
Transfer to British Columbia (Mr. McQuarrie) 2042
Fort Edward lands (Mr. Martell) 372
Genoa conference (Mr. Boys) 1905
Grand Trunk Railway Company 1921 loan, (Mr. Putnam) 828
Griffenhagen and Associates report (Mr. Séguin) 1633
Holland, Lee, deportation (Mr. Meighen) 372
Hudson Bay, St. John parish patents (Mr. Garland, Carleton) 829
Hudson, Govt. cutter (Mr. Baxter) 3600
Immigration
Foreigners admitted as farmers (Mr. Stevens) 1068
Western lands, on, 616 (Mr. Stevens)
Indian agency, Bear river, N.S., (Mr. Lovett) 828
Inverness Railway and Coal Co., (Mr. Chisholm) 372
Kootenay flats (Mr. Humphrey) 286
Legal costs, payments (Mr. Martell) 2971
McQuarrie, John C., dismissal of, 377
Mail contract, Rigaud-St. Rédempteur (Mr. Ouimet) 1776
Migratory Birds Convention, infraction, (Mr. Martell), 377
Nanaimo County judge (Mr. Neill) 2042
Nautical assessors (Mr. Church) 1633
Newspaper censors (Mr. Archambault) 1068
Nova Scotia
Barristers, payments (Mr. Martell) 707
Miners, McLachlan correspondence (Mr. Stewart, Leeds) 616
Order of Grain-Baggers (Mr. Stevens) 2806
Page, Mr. H. W. A. claim (Mr. Neill) 2042
Palais station, Que. (Mr. Parent) 1068
Parc St. Charles Company (Mr. Marcil) 372
Paspebiac post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Post Office department (Mr. Séguin) 3600
Purchasing Commission, origin of goods (Mr. Raymond) 2042
Quebec
Bridge (Mr. Parent) 1068

Unopposed Motions for Papers — *Con.*
Fisheries (Mr. Marcil) 616
Harbour Commission (Mr. Meighen) 372
Sardines for export (Mr. Grimmer) 1183
Shigawake post office, (Mr. Marcil) 829
Sorel shipyards, dismissals, (Mr. Hanson) 377
Tobacco experimental station L'Assomption (Mr. Séguin) 1776
Tug Pekin (Mr. Maclean, Prince) 1289
Victory bonds, (Mr. Putnam) 942
Winnipeg strike (Mr. McMurray) 1068
Yukon territory
Royalty on minerals (Mr. Black) 616
Transfer of mineral claims, (Mr. Black) 616

Universal Postal Union, 3173

Universities, Physical drill and military training, 1615

Unrestricted Reciprocity, Hon. Edward Blake on, 2677

Urban Population, loss of. *See* Immigration; Population

Vancouver
Anti-Japanese riots, 1511-16
Assay office, 1236
Ballantyne pier, wages of workmen, 1465, 1469
Board of Trade drydock, 2009
Customs aerial patrol, 1730
Drydock, 1255, 1484, 2005, 2009, 3542
Board of Trade telegram, 2009
Expenditure in, 2309
Free port, proposal, 2470
Harbour, 1473. *See also* Vancouver Harbour Commission bill
Mounted Police barracks, Fairmont, 1255
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building repairs, 1255
Railway duplication at, 74-75
Shipment of grain from, 235
Sun, criticism of Hon. John Oliver, 2237
Unemployment conference, 1069
Unemployment relief camps, 86

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company, 798

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Act Amdt. bill (Port Warden and Shipping Master) 1r., 1929; 2r., com., 2821; 3r., 2996

Vancouver Island coal mines, 178

Vancouver Sun, criticism of Hon. John Aliver, 2236-7

Vegetables. *See also* Root Vegetables
Dumping clause, 2372. *See also* Speeches on Budget
Production of near Montreal, 1019

Versailles, Treaty of, 2848

Vessels. *See also* Canadian Government Merchant Marine; Shipbuilding
Aurora. *See* Naval Service
Britisher, 3514
Canadian Exporter, wreck of, qu., 1210
Canadian Farmer, 2311
Canadian Freighter, qu., 963, 2311
Canadian Inventor, 2312
Canadian Prospector, 2311
Canadian Winner, 2311
Champlain, qu., 1400
Con Rein, 1382
Foreign ships of war, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Hudson, Government cutter, qu., 3598
James Whalen, 1677
Lambton, wreck of, 1492, 3507
Mildred McColl, 3598
Niobe, sale of. *See* Naval Service
Ocean-going, 1471. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Patrician. *See* Naval Service
Patriot. *See* Naval Service
Pekin, 1289
Phalarope, patrol boat, 1503
Plamonder, dredge, 2006
Quebec, in and out of, 1471
Scottish, 3514

Vickers Company, 320, qu., 936
Claim, 2975
Elevator dredge, 1494

Victoria, B.C.
Drydock, 2009. *See also* Quebec Harbour Commission bill
Govt. expenditure in, 2309
Lightkeepers' salaries, 1497
Ocean tonnage, 2008
Post office building, 1255
Wooden ships constructed at, qu., 364

Victoria Bridge. *See* Bridges

Victoria Memorial Museum
Geological specimens, 1237
Potlach institution, 1377. *See also* Indians

Victorian Order of Nurses, 772
Unemployment, relief of, 86

Victory Bonds. *See also* Finance
Exempt from taxation, 263
Five year maturities, qu., 2993

Vidal's Point Park, 1052

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lotbinière)
Daylight saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 948
Dominion lands, cancellation of leases bill, 3467
Senate amdts., 3615
Duty on apples, 164
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company bill, 1161
Judges' Act Amdt. bill, 426
Military expenditure and policy, 1145
National Defence bill, 661
Mounted police, 675
Pension Act Amdt. bill, 3451
Point of order, Rule 18, tedious repetition, 1360
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Royal Canadian Navy, 1868-89
Soldiers' bonus, 440
War, advances to Imperial Government, 1288
Wheat Board, 2969

Vimy Memorial, 2098

Vitamines, 1781

Voters, qualification of. *See* Dominion Election Act; Euler; Rinfret

Wabana Ore, 2412-13

Waddington, Mr., 398

Wage Cuts. *See* Nova Scotia Miners

Wage Investigators. *See* Labour

Wages. *See* Labour; Unemployment

Wallace, Mr. J. A. (Norfolk)
Tuberculous cattle, 2742

Wallace Shipbuilding Company, 3542

War. *See also* Militia and Defence
Battlefields memorials, 2098
Canadian and United States armies, operations, 1336
Claims, adjustment of, 1155, 1672, 1677, 2098, 2977
British Admiralty, 1752
Details of estimates, qu., 1288
Hospital ship, claim for loss, 1082, 2975
Militia and defence, 2974
Naval service, 1752
Repatriation, dependents of soldiers, 1711

War — *Con.*
Conscription and, 2570. *See also that title*
Conscription of wealth, 2725
Debts, 90, 174. *See also* Address; Budget; Public Debt
Demobilization, expenditure for, 1155, 1163, 1171
Equipment, 2616
Expenditures, 2228
First Canadian Contingent, qu., 1376
Foreign ships, exemption from pilotage dues. *See* Canada Shipping Act
Imperial War Graves Commission, 2099
Indebtedness, 2294
Kemp, Sir Edward, 1169
Laws of. *See* Limitation of Armaments
Medals, 1752, 2975
Mewburn, Hon. S. C., 1169
Mobilization of unfit men, 2608
Munitions, shipment of from Great Britain, 1154-63
Newspaper censors, 1068
Overseas ministry, 1169
Pensions. *See that title*
Preparation for, 1335. *See also* Militia and Defence; National Defence; Naval Service
Profiteering, 2221, 2247, 2395, 2440, 2455. *See also* speeches on Budget
Reparation claims, Lusitania, 3599
Results, 91, 2588, 2861-2, 2895
Scandals, 90
Taxation and, 2567. *See also that title*
War memorials Commission, 2098

War Finance Corporation, 54

War Graves Commission, 774, 2098

War Measures Act, 662, 663, 1362

War Purchasing Commission, sale of warlike stores, 1171

Ward, Mr. W. J. (Dauphin)
Animal Contagious Diseases Act Amdt. bill, 2738
Apple-growing industry, 3419
Boy Scouts, 773
British Columbia fisheries, M. (Mr. McQuarrie) 863
Budget, 2400. Congratulations to Finance Minister; reactionary and mysterious budget, 2400; the tariff; protection and indirect taxation; drydock on Pacific coast; purpose and principle of protection; invisible government; Canadian manufacturers a Bourbon; free trader when purchasing; pro-

Ward, Mr. W. J. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
tectionist when selling; raw material and finished product, 2401; subsidizing of one industry means penalizing of another; immense wealth and dire need; results of indirect taxation; cumulative effect of tariff taxation, 2402; agricultural conditions in western Canada; rural depopulation, 2403; railway situation; land speculation; expenditures on agriculture contrasted with amounts paid to manufacturers; exports the source of wealth, 2404; Professor Ely on taxation; national debt; speculators and unearned increment; tariff from cradle to grave; land tax; payment of war costs; binder twine industry, 2405; basic industries, 2406
Canadian National railways
Directors, employees, represented, 2794
Yorkton branch line, 2139
Experimental farms, 811
Fisheries
Fish culture, 2169
Fishways, 2168
Generals Burstall and Gwatkin, retirement, qu., 1211
Income tax, cost of collection, 2025
Rail and car repair contracts, 1695
Rideau canal, 2767
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, estimates, 2130
St. John terminal facilities, 848
Soldier land settlement, 2136
Soldier Settlement Act Amdt. bill, 3406
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, employees, 3602
Supply, opportunity for members to speak, 1985
Welland ship canal, 2764

Warlike Stores. *See* Ammunition; Militia and Defence

Warships and Torpedo Boats, qu., 827

Wartime Elections Act, 14, 258, 350, 352, 473, 2229, 2289, 2488. *See also* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Warner, Mr. D. W. (Strathcona)
Address in reply, 349. Progressive point of view; farmers not asking for special privileges, 349; excessive freight rates; immigration problem, 350; protective tariff and the manu-

Warner, Mr. D. W. — *Con.*
Address — *Con.*
facturers, 351; banking system, 352; Wartime Elections Act, 350, 352
Agricultural fairs, 651
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2204. Tariff, disappointment at proposals of Finance Minister, 2204; small reductions; oleomargarine; dairying industry; protective duties on woollen goods and shoes; income tax; lack of purchasing power, 2205; british preference; agricultural implements; sales taxes; automobiles and the tariff, 2206
Canadian representation in United States, 2025
Crowsnest pass agreement, M. (Mr. Kennedy, Essex) for Special Com., 1429
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 952
Exhibition grants, 983
Experimental farms, 809
Forestry, aerial patrol at High River, 1050
Hudson Bay railway, completion of, 2797
Indian education, Edmonton school, 1231
Northwest rebellion pensions, 3523
Oleomargarine, Manufacture, etc., M. (Mr. Neill) 1829
Pensions Com. final report, 3338

Washington
Canadian representation in. *See* Canadian Representation in United States
Conference. *See* International Labour Conference; Limitation of Armaments
Visit of Finance Minister to, 2112, 2181, 2189, 2300

Water-Borne Traffic. *See* St. Lawrence River Waterway

Water Powers, 71, 124, 2182. *See also* Hydro Electric; Lake of the Woods; St. Lawrence River Waterway
Aluminum Company of America, Cedar Rapids, 71; qu., 728; qu., 1375
Canals, on, 2747
Development of, 223
Electric energy, 133. *See also* Electrification
Exportation from Niagara district, 137, 1188
Lake of the Woods Control Board, 2025
Joint board, 2805; qu., 2970
Regulation Act, 1921 Repeal bill, 2991, 3199, 3435
Niagara river power development, 137, 1188
Railway electrification, 1940. *See also* Electrification

Water Powers — *Con.*
St. Lawrence and Ottawa rivers, on, 629
St. Lawrence river, M. (Mr. Church) 1183, 1205, 1314. *See also that title*
Surveys, 1051
Welland canal, 2747

Water Transportation, 70, 73-74. *See also* St. Lawrence River Waterway
Canals in United States, 68

Waterways. *See* Canals; International Joint Commission
St. Lawrence river, 1183. *See also that title*

Watson, Major General Sir David, 1477

Ways and Means, Committe of, 362, 599, 1842, 2104, 2854, 3104, 3246, 3409, 3476, 3604, 3607
Amended resolutions, 2854
Interim Supply bill, 599
M. for (Mr. Fielding) 2104
Resolutions, 2118; amended, 2854
Supply bill, 3607

Wednesday Sittings. *See* House of Commons

Welland Ship Canal. *See* Canals

West Indies
Canada-West Indies trade agreement, 2110
Subsidized steamship services and freight rates, 3026, 3032
Trade with. *See* St. John Terminal Facilities

Western Provinces. *See* Budget; Natural Resources; Speeches on Address
Agricultural depression, 1475
Flags on public schools, 1265
Marketing of grain, 114. *See* Wheat Board
Natural resources, 7, 12, 22, 41, 148, 279, 328, 1017. *See also that title*
Interest of other provinces in, 23, 340, 355, 1017
Public buildings, alleged discrimination against, 1254

Weston post office, 1259

Westport Railway. *See* Brockville and Westport

Wharves. *See also* Harbours and Rivers; Public Works
Baddeck, 1269
L'Orignal, qu., 1212
Provincial, New Brunswick, transfer, qu., 2305

Wharves — *Con.*
Provincial wharves and tidal waters, 1991
Sault Ste. Marie, 2006
Selkirk, 2004
Tidal waters in, 1991, qu., 2209

Wheat. *See also* Agriculture; Grain and Grain Trade; Wheat Board
Competition with Russia, 2157
Cost of production, 114
Dumping of. *See* Customs, dumping clause
Duty on, 239
Early seeding in West, 115
Exports to United States, 209
Fordney tariff and, 210. *See that title under* United States
Free trade in, 2528
Freight rates on, 300. *See also* Freight Rates
Kubanka, 2454
Marketing, 46-47, 53, 115, 151, 231, 2453. *See also* Budget; Speeches on Address; Wheat Board
Prices of, 152
Shipments through Vancouver, 235
Transportation, 233. *See also* Railways; St. Lawrence River Waterway
United States demand for, 333

Wheat Board, 31, 283, 338; qu., 472, 1118-20. *See also* Agriculture and Colonization Com.; Budget; Grain and Grain Trade; Grain Commission; speeches on Address
Agriculture Com. report of:
Amdt. (Mr. Sutherland) to M. for concurrence in, 2951; neg., 2969
Concurrence in report, delay, 2306
Canadian Council of Agriculture memo, 377
Constitutionality of, opinion of Law Officers, 940
Fixation of prices, 2588
Kay, Mr. privilege, 872
Participation certificates, qu., 2304
Re-establishment of, demand for, 72, 115, 146, 152, 158, 232

Wheat Board Bill. *See* Canadian Wheat Board Bill

White, Mr. James
Newfoundland-Labrador boundary, 1276, 3495

White, Mr. J. F. (London)
Budget, 2352. Congratulations to Finance Minister; election pledges, promises and arguments; tariff proposals; proposed permanent tariff commission,

White, Mr. J. F. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
2352; western agriculture; freight rates; climatic conditions; Wheat board; agriculture and protection; importation of farm produce; wider markets; free trade; farm tractors; tariff and manufacturers' profits; trade with Germany; unemployment, 2354
Experimental farms, 810
Lake Huron, marine allowance, qu., 1930
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, salary increases, 406

White, Sir Thomas, resignation of directorships, 1089, 1102

White Lead, duty on, 2297

White Slave Traffic, Suppression of, 3497

Whitley Councils, 1061

Widowed Mothers, Pensions. *See* Pensions' Committee

Wife Disertions. *See* Pension Act Amdt. bill

Wilson, Mr. G. C. (Wentworth)
Highways, approved, qu., 2040

Windermere Road, 1051, 1682

Windsor, N.S. removal of derelict in channel, 1493

Windsor, Ont., Canadian Transit bill. *See* Private Bills Discussed

Wines and Spirits. *See* Customs Act Amdt. bill

Winnipeg
Strike, 1068
Andrews, Mr. Alfred J., 1068
Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 671-9
Trials, cost of, qu., 1182
Unemployment, 86

Winnipeg River. *See* Lake of the Woods

Winnepegosis Wharf, 3545

Winter Ports in Canada. *See* Intercolonial Railway

Wireless Telegraphy. *See also* Radio
Lighthouses and, qu., 370
Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co., qu., 1063

Wives, Foreign-born, of British Subjects. *See* Dominion Elections Act, M. (Mr. Euler)

Wolves, destruction of livestock by, 990, 998-999

Women
Alien born. *See* Dominion Elections Act
Representation in Parliament. *See* Macphail, Miss
Voting in last election, 185

Wooden Ships, qu., 364

Woodmen of the World, 1905

Woods, Mr. R. J. (Dufferin)
Address in reply, 92. Congratulations to Miss Macphail, 92; changes in political parties; attitude of Progressive party; greater markets for farm products, 93; tariff revision; farmers not concerned with politics, 94
Budget, 2183. Tariff; history; classification; reductions; sales tax; added burden to consumer; dumping clause, 2184; free raw materials and high duties on finished products, protection on farm implements, 2185; duty on clothing, woollens, etc.; automobiles; Ford car; effect of 25 per cent duty; drawback system; farmers and protection, 2186; speeches of the Prime Minister in 1920; manufacturers free traders in raw materials; protection as it affects the consumer, 2187; agricultural implements, 2188
Canada Temperance Act Amdt. bill, 3004
Daylight Saving, M. (Mr. Kay) 953
Militia and Defence
Annual training, 1582
Expenditure and policy, 1582
Sales tax, 3264

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. (Centre Winnipeg)
Address in reply, 84. Economic disturbance, 84-85; demand for markets; home market; unemployment, 85; unemployment insurance, 88; production, factors of; equipment; transportation question, 89; tariff revision; national debt and taxation; war fortunes and war scandals, 90; Defence department; relations with United States; war legacies, 91; reconstruction, 92
Blankets, duty on, 3132
Budget, 2242. Conservatives and Liberals, origin and policy; extension af franchise to ordinary people; agriculture and business interests not identical; labour view; sales tax unduly burdensome to family man, 2242; civil service pay;

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Budget — *Con.*
immigrants to pay taxes and feed the railways; an administration bankrupt in ideas; no economic changes proposed; drifting and borrowing; "mortgaging the homestead"; foreign ownership of natural resources, 2243; concentration of wealth; railway exploitations; alieniation of lands and resources, 2245; mergers and watered stock; consolidation of financial organizations; grain trade and, 2246; the Great War and profiteering; financing, 2247; burden of taxation; repudiation; capital levy; income tax, 2448; profits and property rights vs. human welfare; labour and capital, 2250
Cadet camps, 1973
Canadian Government Merchant Marine, employees' wages, qu., 3598
Canadian National railways
Directors, representation of employees, 2798
Steel cars, qu., 2213
Civil Service, 3075
Bonus, 3533
Industrial councils, 1061
Patronage, 3097
Salaries, 2243
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sedition and Criminal Conspiracies) 364, 865, 1395, 3104
Debates, inaudibility of, 1755
Disarmament, 1143
Fishing schooner race, 3510
Immigration Act Amdt. (Bill 16) 364, 864, 1388, 3104
Immigration, British artisans, 2208
Immigration-Criminal Code bills
Report of Special Committee, 3281
M. to refer back, 3282
Income tax, taxpayers, qu., 1399-1400
International Labour Conference, 3601
Joint industrial councils, 1060
Labour
Industrial engineer, 494
Mounted Police and, 670-1
Military policy and expenditures, 1143
Military Service Act repeal bill, 424, 639
Ministers and Directorships, 1127
Mounted Police in unorganized territories, M., 829, 841
National Defence bill, 670
Naval Service, Royal Canadian navy, 1854
Nova Scotia miners, M. (Mr. Irvine) 516; qu., 605

Woodsworth, Mr. J. S. — *Con.*
Oriental labour on British ships, 2042
Post Office employees' salaries, 2801
Quebec Harbour Commission bill, fair wage clause, 1486
Railway Commission, representation of labour, 2776
Russian relief, 3516
Save the Children Fund, 3516
Unemployment
Relief, 3526
Returned soldiers, 2458
Situation, 1069-84
Unemployment Service Council, 2803
Winnipeg strike, Andrews correspondence, 2042

Wool. *See also* Agriculture; Livestock
Blankets, duty on, 3128
Duty on, 2415
Prices of, 985, 997
Woollen clothing, prices and labour cost, 2205, 2350, 2632. *See also* Speeches on Budget

Workmen. *See* Labour

Workmen's Compensation Act, 88, 1381

Wrangel Island, 1750, 1751
Russian title to, 2208

Wrecks. *See* Marine and Fisheries; Ships and Shipbuilding

Yacht Racing. *See* International Deep Sea Racing

York County, Ont., representation, 1365

Yorkton, Sask., Speech of Prime Minister at, 2730

Young, Arthur and Company, qu., 365, 1490

Yukon Territory
Administration of
Cost, 1681
Justice, 1275
Expenditure, 1275
Expenses, population, qu., 2456
Government of, 1034
Mineral discoveries, 1276
Parcel post, 2802
Radiotelegraph service, 1749
Telegraph line, 1749
Union for judicial purposes with British Columbia, 1275

Zaneth, Corporal, 671