

of the country. I have to repeat that the interest of the country is not served by the present resolutions, and as they stand it will become the duty of the opposition to oppose them from first to last."

Meighen in Defence

Hon. Arthur Meighen in an able speech replied to the contention of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and at great length endeavored to present to the House in lucid form the meaning of the resolutions under consideration. He said that while the government believed its proposals to be complete and that they safeguarded the public interest in every way, yet they were laid before the house not as a perfect document beyond all possibility of improvement, but as the proposal of the government to which was invited the criticism of members of the house. If the bill could be improved in the public interest it was open for improvement and the government would welcome any suggestion along that line. In the earlier portion of his speech Mr. Meighen maintained that the guarantees received for the proposed aid to the Canadian Northern were ample. The opposition, when in power, guaranteed three quarters of the cost of building the G.T.P., and for its guarantee and its \$100,000,000 of subsidy never got one dollar. Now the leader of the opposition said that the government was not justified in aiding Mackenzie, Mann and Company with a paltry forty millions of stock as compensation for this guarantee. "We have," he said, "a two-fifths proprietorship in the Canadian Northern absolutely, come what may. If it succeeds, as there is every anticipation it will, then the value of that stock enters the treasury of the country as compensation, and there is every reason to believe that before long there will be a par value for that stock and the government will have recouped the forty million dollars which Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government squandered on the N.T.R."

The Insurgent Speeches

The first severe criticism of the government proposal from within the ministerial ranks came on Wednesday evening when W. F. Nickle, Conservative member for Kingston made a strong speech in opposition to the terms of the resolution. Mr. Nickle, during the course of his remarks, took occasion to criticize the prime minister. He said that he was not a member of the house in 1904 or in 1908, but he was taking some little part in politics. "There rings in my ears yet," he said, "the statements of the Right Hon. leader of the government and his conferees, that, if Canada were to support the cost of building a railroad (the N.T.R.) we should own and operate it. In the debate that took place in this house in 1903 the right hon. leader of the government of today made the remark, 'I do not shrink from government ownership and government operation.' He went further and moved a resolution, in support of which he said that he regretted that the bill then going thru the house would put back government ownership fifty years. I am not going to discuss the advisability or expediency of government ownership; that is a matter that may be discussed at another time, but what I do say is that, if my leader turns sharp corners and sees new light and I do not see that light, I see no reason why I should be held up to the contempt and ridicule of the Conservative party because I go on my way unperturbed, holding my allegiance to the principle that he upheld in 1903."

Mr. Nickle gave as his reason for advocating that the government should take over the C.N.R. his belief that the problem for Canada is: can we not develop some transportation solution that will place in the western provinces the raw material of the East, so that we may have manufactures in the West? "What I would like to see," he said, "would be for the government to take over the National Transcontinental Railway and the Canadian Northern Railway."

Mackenzie's Threats

Mr. Nickle, towards the close of his speech, severely criticized Sir William Mackenzie on account of an alleged interview which appeared in the Kingston Whig, in which it was stated that the

railway knight was not favorably disposed towards Kingston because of the opposition of its representative in parliament to the C.N.R.; also because it had been stated that Sir William Mackenzie would give no contracts to the chief industry of Kingston, the Canadian Locomotive Works Company. He said: "What is democracy coming to when the plutocrats can so tyrannize over the representatives of the people? Does free speech amount to anything? First they tried coercion, then they tried other influences in their power. Are the representatives of the people to be throttled? Better a thousand times that I should go out of public life than that Mackenzie and Mann should put their hands on my throat and make the public think a man dare not stand up and express his conviction in this house. The day the government brought down this measure I met Sir William Mackenzie. What did he say?—'Why don't you go over to the opposition?' That is his idea of freedom within a party. He thinks there is no room for independence in Canadian politics either on one side or the other. I would sooner have honorable defeat than mean victory. I would sooner go down to defeat in Kingston than I would be in Mackenzie's shoes—and so far forget the order to which I belong as to adopt the tactics of the South African savage and blow a poison dart into the back of an unsuspecting enemy. Gentlemen may laugh. Some man behind me laughed. But he does not know what it is to suffer. Let him stand where I have stood for the last three weeks and see whether he will laugh. I do not profess any virtues, but when I accepted the nomination I reserved the right to think and speak for myself. If party government in this country has got to such a stage that within a party there is no room for independence then I say to this house that so far as the member for Kingston is concerned, give me the freedom of the elector rather than the fetters of the elected."

Mr. Nickle said he was opposed to going into partnership with Mackenzie and Mann just as he would be opposed to going into partnership commercially with people he could not trust. He believed that they would do the government in the long run.

Bennett and Meighen

Strong as were the statements of the member for Kingston they were comparatively mild when compared with the biting criticism hurled at Mackenzie and Mann by R. B. Bennett in the course of a four-hour speech delivered on Thursday and which was marked by frequent interchanges between the member for Calgary and Hon. Arthur Meighen, solicitor-general. Finally Mr. Bennett, becoming impatient of the interruptions, referred to Mr. Meighen as "an impertinent young man" and also as "the megaphone for Mackenzie and Mann." Earlier in the course of his speech he expressed his regret that the solicitor-general had constituted himself the apologist for the railway promoters. Mr. Bennett described Sir William and Sir Donald as "mendicants." He said that ever since he had been in public life they had been on their knees begging money from the federal and provincial governments. They had conceived the idea of building a transcontinental railway with government aid and of owning it themselves. In the railway history of the world, he said, there was no instance where a couple of men had endeavored to become the owners of a transcontinental system. Space limitations make it absolutely impossible to give an adequate idea of the ground covered by the member for Calgary. He was bitter and biting thruout and seemed to be quite regardless of how his criticisms of the government proposals were taken by the members of the cabinet or his conferees in the house.

Would Eliminate Bill and Dan

He insisted that the proper way to do with the C.N.R. situation was to eliminate Mackenzie and Mann entirely. They had made a botch of the job as contractors he argued, and knew no more about operating a railway than children. The people of the west, he said, would support him in this assertion. Mr. Bennett had some alternative proposals to make. He said that there should be the full-

est possible inquiry into the C.N.R. system and the operations of Mackenzie and Mann. There should be, he said, a physical valuation of the road. The people of the United States had found that freight rates must be based on physical valuation—that water in a creek has no value. A long ten years' struggle in the United States came to an end last year and the Interstate Commerce Commission commenced its labor of physically valuing every road in the country and on that valuation they will base the freight rates. Therefore we should begin right with the C.N.R.

Another suggestion made by Mr. Bennett was that the \$100,000,000 of common stock should be placed in trust and the operation of the road put in charge of some prominent railway man, such as Sir Thomas Tait. "Let us pause," he said, "before we go forward lest it be said of us that we have made progress too swift and have not considered the end from the beginning. It is for us to look at this enterprise in the right way and not be deterred from our duty because the action which that duty lays upon us seems temporarily unpopular."

Oliver Blames Government

Hon. Frank Oliver, who followed Mr. Bennett, advanced the view that the real cause of the trouble in connection with the C.N.R. was the premature construction of the line from Yellow Head Pass to the Pacific coast, for which the government of British Columbia and the present Dominion government were entirely responsible. This section of the road would cost \$60,000,000 and had it not been undertaken the company would not now be in need of forty-five million dollars.

THE CANADIAN WAY

Comparing the methods in the United States and Canada by which the state, or at least its parliamentary power has been used to transfer vast properties, powers and privileges into private ownership, the investigator is impressed by the evident superiority of the Canadian system.

In the United States most of the legislators have been small lawyers, merchants' farmers or nondescripts, few of whom aimed directly at becoming great capitalists themselves. They dared not openly use their parliamentary power to vest in themselves as beneficiaries charters, subsidies and land grants. They were willing to grant all of these to others, provided the granting was attended by certain tangible considerations, such as the promise of renomination, or of a higher political career or direct bribes in money or in stock. Bribery has been common in the United States legislative bodies for more than a century. The members have been mostly middlemen selling the law-making power of the state usually to the highest bidder. Of the thousands upon thousands of men who have sat in congress or in state legislatures, hardly more than one or two are remembered as the founders of great fortunes. In the United States senate there are, it is true, many multimillionaires, but they were able to get into that body only after they had accumulated enormous wealth.

But in Canada members of parliament have had no scruples in directly vesting in themselves by their own votes properties, powers and privileges of every description. They gave bank charters to themselves, railway charters, subsidies and land grants, coal and other mineral areas, timber and agricultural lands and other donations, all comprising the most extraordinarily valuable gifts estimated in billions of dollars. Having the power of doing this by their own votes and freely exercising that power, they of course had no need of middlemen. Consequently, also, there have been few legislative bribery scandals in Canada. "Slush funds" there have been in abundance, but they were funds applied not for the personal benefit of any set of legislators, but for partisan campaign purposes. An American legislator might often be bought for a few hundred or a few thousand dollars, but the Canadian legislator could not be purchased in so crude a way. He would not have to take money, a dangerous practice, at best, and always open

to the possibilities of detection and prosecution. The Canadian system has been a much more refined one, in which the vulgar business of passing money has been, not invariably, but usually absent. Each member would have his own "job," or combinations of members would have their "jobs," requiring simply an exchange of votes. Hence, in voting for one another's "jobs," the members could do so with what they could style "perfect propriety," at the same time expressing the most sanctimonious horror at the "Yankee system" of money corruption of legislators.

Most of the great Canadian fortunes can be directly traced to the activities of their founders as members of parliament or other legislative or governing bodies. Or to point it in another form, members of parliament in Canada have usually been the founders of the great fortunes. Lord Strathecona, for example, was a member of the Canadian parliament during the very years when millions began to roll in upon him by means of the possessions that he and his associates obtained thru the laws of one kind or another. The same is true of many other railroad and land, coal and timber and manufacturing and banking magnates. One notable exception to this rule is the case of those eminent railway magnates, Sir William Mackenzie and Sir Donald Mann, of the firm of Mackenzie and Mann, owning the Canadian Northern Railway system. Neither has ever sat in any legislative body, but they are exceedingly perspicacious men, and have learned the art of hypnotizing cabinet ministers and other members of parliament, and getting all they want—Gustavus Myers, in the New Review.

SEED COMMISSIONER'S REPORT

It is interesting to note in the following extract from the report of the Seed Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture for Canada for the period from March, 1911, to August 31, 1913, that so few samples of alfalfa seed tested were of Canadian origin. Since it is recognized that varieties giving the most satisfactory results in any locality are those which have been obtained from plants growing in that special locality or at any rate under similar conditions to those prevailing in the district it is evident that there is a wide field open to the farmers of the West in the production of acclimatized alfalfa seed. Try a small patch this year.

In regard to Alfalfa, the report says: "Of the 353 samples of seed tested at Ottawa last season, probably not more than half a dozen were of Canadian origin, while more than one-third of the total number contained weed seeds which occur only in Alfalfa produced in Europe. The remainder originated in the Western and Middle Western States, most of them probably in Montana and Utah. Very little Alfalfa seed is produced in Wisconsin and Minnesota, and practically none of it is to be had in Canada."

Referring to the influence of frost on immature oats, it is stated that two degrees when in the milk stage will, in most cases, ruin oats for seed, even tho the heads may fill and give a heavy bushel.

This report, which constitutes a concise summary of the work of the Seed Branch for the period indicated, is available to all who apply for it to the Publication Branch of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa.

SPRING RUSH OVER

Duluth, Minn., May 16—Eight hundred and fifty thousand bushels of grain have been shipped from here during the week ending today and lake men claim that the annual spring rush of grain shipments is over. Only some ten to twelve million bushels of all grain are now at the elevators here, considerably under the usual amount at this time of year, and the low rate offered, seven-eighths of a cent to Georgian Bay and one and one-eighth to Lake Erie ports, is not attractive to carriers. It is expected, therefore, that grain shipment from now until the next crop begins to arrive will be exceedingly light.