

satisfy hunger, unless they went to the galley and bought it. They had to supply their own utensils and keep them clean. Will any person who wants to be honest and fair make a comparison between what the rates were then and what they are now? Last Easter I was down at Halifax and I had the privilege of going through one of the passenger boats there. I took particular care to go through the steerage department. What did I find? Good clean mattresses in each compartment. Some of the compartments would contain two berths, some three, and some four to accommodate families, and in every one of them you would find every accommodation that you would get in a hotel. Their food is first-class, and is served at the table on clean tablecloths. Is there any comparison between the accommodation the people are getting now and what they got then? If the government would take five or six of their merchant marine ships and provide the accommodation that passengers used to get at the same rate, I venture to say they would not get twenty-five passengers a month. The trouble with the public at the present time is that they demand a certain standard of service, and those engaged in the business are willing to provide them with that service, but the public are not willing to pay for it; they want to let the other fellow pay. And why should the taxpayers of this country be assessed, to give accommodation to a certain class of people?

In conclusion, I can see no good point in this Preston report from start to finish. It says a whole lot about insurance and a combine on insurance. I have been insuring boats for the last twenty years, and I will say this for the insurance companies: I have always got a square deal. I have always found them wanting to give a square deal to their customers. They have to do this to get the business. There are different ways of insuring boats. In some cases an insurance

company will take off 33½ per cent, new for old; that is, if a boat goes on the rocks and loses her keel, and a new keel has to be put in, they will take a third off, new for old, considering the new keel is worth one-third more than the old. There are other ways of insuring. In some cases you will get no insurance unless damage is done to the extent of 10 per cent of the total value of the boat. Others will insure in this way; if you knock a blade off your propeller, they will replace it. Taking them as a whole I have found insurance companies willing every time to act fair and square with the people if the people are willing to act square with them. I have done shipping to Australia; some years ago I did quite a lot of shipping to Honolulu and the Old Country, and I have got considerable material from the Old Country in the days when it came round the Horn, and I found the shipping companies as a whole always wanting to do what was right. Their freights might be a little high sometimes, but they must have a profit, for their ships are often tied up and they require a profit that will allow for depreciation. When I came to this country first the Canadian Pacific had three of the finest ocean going steamers, I guess, that ever were launched—the Empress of Asia, the Empress of China, and the Empress of Japan. They were a credit to any port, but within the last six years the Canadian Pacific has had to scrap those steamers. Why? Because the public in general demands a better service. They want swimming pools aboard their boats; they want baths and gymnasiums and the like; but the trouble is they do not want to pay for the accommodation. I cannot support this resolution.

On motion of Mr. Duff the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Mackenzie King the House adjourned at 11.41 p.m.