

speech I have always been called to order. I notice that in this eighteenth parliament any hon. member can rise in his place and read his speech for forty minutes. I should like to have the privilege of preparing a speech and reading it in the house, and I ask for a ruling on this.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the right hon. gentleman desire to speak on the point of order?

Mr. BENNETT: I have just this observation to make. We had a discussion the other day about amending the rules of the house and on that occasion an admirable speech was read.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rule is that speeches shall not be read, but it has not always been observed. Hon. members do read speeches even though it is against the rule.

Mr. BENNETT: He can use notes.

Mr. SPEAKER: An hon. member may refer to his notes.

Mr. HANSON: If that is to be the practice, I should like to have the same privilege.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Is it something that they must have from us to compete with us in our own markets? Let us sell them the goods they need; let us not try to build up an artificial relationship. That is a quack remedy. We are a nation. We built our own plant, our own canals, our own railways, and are now building our own airways along national lines. We must use these nationally. We began by building our prosperity on national lines, and history shows that every time we got away from our own national economy we had a depression. We have been grasping for artificial foreign trade.

This government has adopted a laissez-faire policy with respect to the west and has scrapped the constructive policy of the former government. The first step was in connection with the wheat board. The wheat economy of the west has failed and it will fail again. The west must have a change. It will never be continuously prosperous until industries are established. The west has the assets most needed for manufacturing. It has oil, coal and gas in abundance, and there is plenty of labour available. Protection is necessary for the development of industries. The west is dependent upon the east for its support; the east must help the west. In the meantime, the east must have adequate protection and, if necessary, the west will have to be compensated.

We are one of a commonwealth of nations. From 1932 until October, 1937, we progressed steadily in prosperity as a result of our empire

relationships. We are a nation of the commonwealth of nations. Let us have protection that protects nationally and within the commonwealth of nations, mutual protection that is mutually satisfactory. We are bound together by ties that are stronger than trade, but that are helped by trade—sentiment and mutual defence and common laws. This is not the case as between ourselves and the United States. No such ties exist.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

After Recess

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT

JURISDICTION OF RAILWAY COMMISSION OVER TELEPHONE TOLLS AND SERVICES

Mr. WILFRID LACROIX (Quebec-Montmorency) moved the second reading of Bill No. 14, to amend the Railway Act (telephone tolls).

He said: During the session of 1937 I had the privilege of introducing a bill to amend the Railway Act, the purport of which was to extend and clarify the jurisdiction of the board of railway commissioners with regard to telephone companies. The bill went through the first and second readings, and was then referred, according to the rules, to the railway committee, where it was defeated on a division taken at my own request.

Since the prorogation of parliament I have received so many communications asking me to follow up the measure, and have gathered such useful data, that I could not lose heart. I know that where trusts are concerned one must fight every inch of the way. When people are acquainted with the actual conditions, the Bell Telephone Company will have to make concessions. We are dealing with a public utility. Every telephone subscriber is entitled to fair treatment. In the present case did the trust ever think of anything but collecting revenues?

In Loretteville, nine miles from Quebec, there are many subscribers who have to call Quebec once, twice or even several times a day. Is it fair to charge them each time for a long distance call? It might have been reasonable when the telephone was first established in Quebec, but surely not now. It seems as though the company did not know or did not wish to know that our town, like Montreal, Three Rivers and other towns in our province, had considerably increased. Important centres have sprung up a few miles away, and conditions are not what they were