

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: Each?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: \$800 for the work for the month.

Hon. Mr. BRADBURY: The two of them?

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF: Yes.

Another case brought to my attention was that of a mechanic. Something goes wrong with an engine. The engineer either cannot or does not want to fix it. He wires down to the divisional point or to one of the big shops, and a mechanic is sent up. He has to have a helper. They come up on the Pullman or in the parlour car. That is all right. But from the time they start out until they come back, they receive pay and a half after the first eight hours for twenty-four hours, day in and day out. Any one knows that under those circumstances if a man made a trip of two or three hundred miles in the West, the bill would be several hundred dollars. That sort of thing cannot go on. Wages have to come down to a proper basis. And remember, I am not in favour of reducing wages to the limit. I like to see a man make a good day's pay, but I want to see a fair day's work done for that pay. At present we are not getting a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. And if freight rates are to come down—and they have to come down if you want prosperity in Canada—then I say wages must come down also.

Why should these men be in any different position from the farmers, for instance? At the present time the farmer does not get one-third of what he did for his products, and still he has to pay an increased price for everything he purchases. At the present time in the West there are many products of the farm on which, if loaded on a car of either the Government railways or the Canadian Pacific railway, you have got to pay the freight in cash when the car is shipped—why? Because the railways are afraid that the carload of the product, whatever it is, will not sell for sufficient at Winnipeg or Fort William to pay the freight. There have been numbers of cases in which a man has shipped a carload of farm products, and has been billed back for a certain amount to pay the freight, the receipt from the sale of the goods not being sufficient to do so.

I ask you, how in the name of Heaven can a country prosper under such circumstances? I say it cannot prosper: there can be no revival of trade till conditions are remedied along the line of reducing freight

Hon. Mr. TURRIFF.

rates. This agreement giving the Board of Railway Commissioners power to increase the rates on the Crownsnest railroad over and above those fixed by Act of Parliament at the time of the granting of the charter and the giving of the subsidy to build the road should come to an end. We paid millions of dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the building of the Crownsnest road, and we got as a quid pro quo reduction on certain commodities, both east and west—grain, cattle, coal, implements, etc. Now, there is a campaign being carried on, not only in Canada but in the United States, to continue that sort of thing. The shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway have been drawing 10 per cent on their common stock for years, and I want to ask why should they any more than anybody else be bonused year in and year out? Is there a man here having investments who has not suffered losses or decreased dividends during the past few years? Why should the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a large majority of them outside of Canada, be put on a pinnacle and be permitted to say: "Oh, no, the Canadian Pacific railroad is sacred; the shareholders of that railroad, no matter whether they live in Europe, Africa, or the United States, must be paid 10 per cent on their common stock." Why cannot they eat thin soup as well as the rest of us? Are we going to be taxed day in and day out? The income tax will have to be increased still further in order that the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, living in affluence in many of the countries of the world may receive 10 per cent on their common stock irrespective of conditions here. I want to point out to my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) that if the Government extends the time under which the Railway Board can set aside the agreement that was made, or if they put up any private member to introduce some little clause that would hardly be noticed but which will have the same effect, there will be a strong reaction through the country, and they will have mighty good reason to regret their action. I think it is time for us to let the Canadian Pacific Railway know that they have got to live up to contracts they made years ago. When that matter was brought up in the House some three years ago, there was a proposal made that without limit on the time the Railway Board should have control irrespective of any Act of Parliament; and I think it was due to my honourable