

But, worse than that, our friends will surely not deny that it was a leading part of their policy to prevent the carrying of trade north and south by railways. They surely will not deny that that was proclaimed on every platform from which they addressed the electors. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. White) will not deny that at the last session of this Parliament he declared that to be part of the policy of the Government of the day, and to-day when the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggests for a moment to the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. R. L. Borden) that there may be something to be asked in regard to the effort made successfully by the Government to have Canadian grain carried to United States ports across the line he replies: Why should it not be so? Certainly why should it not be so. We say by all means it should be when the conditions demand it. It was our friends on the other side who said it should not be so and yet they are helping to make it so and they ask us to give them credit for the fulfilment of their promises. It is true that circumstances required that they should reverse their policy, the policy upon which they were elected, that they should belie the promises made to the electors by which they secured election. It was necessary that they should adopt measurably the policy of their opponents. But having done so it strikes me that the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. R. L. Borden) was asking too much of this House when he asked us to give his Government credit for having fulfilled their promises.

Reference was made to the retirement of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) from the Government and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) spoke of him as he should speak of a late colleague, in terms of the highest commendation. He said that Mr. Monk in his retirement was actuated by the highest motives. It struck me at the time that it was a fair subject of inquiry what motives actuated those members of his Cabinet who entered that Cabinet on the same terms and under the same conditions and advocating the same principles as the Hon. Mr. Monk and who still remained in the Cabinet. If Mr. Monk in retiring from the Government showed himself to be a high-minded gentleman I forebear to suggest in what position that leaves his colleagues who still remain in the Cabinet. I shall leave that to my right hon. friend the Premier.

I was somewhat astonished to hear the right hon. the Premier dwell at some length on the fact that the right hon. leader of the Opposition had not made a western visit this summer. I could not see the connection between this fact and

Mr. OLIVER.

the subjects under discussion before the House, the subject matter of the Address, or the remarks that have been made on the reply to the Address. This the right hon. the Prime Minister made a matter of importance, and he went beyond that and gave what he asserted was suggested to be an account of a stormy meeting that took place amongst the friends of the leader of the Opposition in connection with this visit. Let me say one word in regard to that. There never was any foundation whatever in any way, shape, manner or circumstance, for any of the suggestions made by the right hon. Prime Minister in that connection. I can only suppose that he arrived at that conclusion by having depended too much upon information derived from the special detective service of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and that, upon that occasion, I can only presume that the chief of the special detective service had had an attack of the jim-jams and had reported matters which had appeared to his inner consciousness and not matters that had reached him through ordinary sources of information. I would respectfully further suggest that, while this special detective service of the Minister of Public Works may have some usefulness in some regards, its usefulness ceases absolutely when it is required to do detective work.

The Prime Minister was good enough to ask my opinion of what the leader of the Opposition had said with regard to the removal, or partial removal, of the cement duty. I have no difficulty in giving him exactly what I think. I think exactly as the leader of the Opposition expressed himself, namely, that if the duty upon cement should be reduced, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe it should, it should be reduced by Act of this Parliament at the proper time, in the proper place and in the proper way; and that it would not be a proper action by the Government of the day to make that reduction having a view to the effect that it might be expected to have upon a provincial election rather than upon the welfare of the country. I am against the cement duty. I am for a reduction, and if the duty had been reduced at the last session of Parliament the duty would be reduced to-day and it would have remained reduced. It would not have been juggled with to be off to-day and on to-morrow. We had freedom from half of the cement duty during the summer but we are paying the whole of the cement duty now, and I say again that, while there may be emergent circumstances such as occurred in the case of the removal of the coal duties by the late Government, there are no such emergent circumstances in the case of