

the market was open we could do some business, and there was some outlet for our farmers even although they could not make very much money out of it. Now, with the embargo on, these men are in a very much worse position than they were before. I am pointing this out to the minister to show the calamity which threatens the people of the Maritime provinces and the national necessity that everything possible should be done that can be done to get us access to that market so that our people may go there, do business and grow up and prosper as they ought to be allowed to do.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) began his remarks by quoting the words 'fools rush in'—leaving the rest to be inferred, and immediately proceeded to give us a demonstration of the truth of that in so far as he was concerned. If the hon. member for Carleton had addressed himself to this subject in a non-partisan way, if he had not been actuated by any other motive than the desire to obtain for his province what he believes would be in its interest, I think he might very well have left unsaid many of the remarks which he made. I did not see that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Wright) had, in his remarks, said anything which warranted the hon. member for Carleton in addressing him in the disrespectful manner in which he did address him. Neither was he justified in speaking as he did of the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best). In his Chesterfieldian way he spoke of that hon. gentleman's mental and business capacity and he asked: What kind of people must they be who will send a man like that to represent them in Parliament? I do not believe that even the worst Grit in the county of Dufferin would send a man to Parliament like the hon. member for Carleton. Even in their wildest moments I do not believe they would make such a selection as that. What call was there for referring to my hon. friend from Muskoka in the way in which my hon. friend did refer to him, and for saying that they had talked of these things in the lodges on the back concessions? What had that to do with the motion before the Chair? Could anybody imagine the hon. member for Carleton being a member of any lodge? I could not. I do not think the hon. member for Carleton could become a member of any lodge or any association of men which was

[Mr. Carvell.]

gathered together as a lodge, council, court or anything of the kind. If the hon. member for Carleton ever occupies any position at all in a lodge of any kind, it will be a position, I fancy, in which he will not require much decoration; that is to say, that of the goat.

It is idle for the hon. gentleman to say that he is not actuated by any political motives in his remarks here to-night. Fancy the hon. gentleman for Carleton addressing himself to any subject in this House in which he was not actuated by political motives! In referring, as he did refer, to different members from the province of Ontario he spoke in very discourteous tones of the class of people who inhabit the province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman forgets what the figures show in regard to his own province. If the hon. gentleman has the influence in the province of New Brunswick that one would suppose from his talk we would have expected very different results in the last election. I presume he talked potatoes in the election of 1911 and no doubt it was small potatoes too that he talked. His majority was reduced from 151 in 1908 to a very doubtful 11 in 1911. If the hon. gentleman had not made use of his fine legal knowledge and taken advantage of technicalities it is said that he would not have a seat in this House at all. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie), who also, I suppose, talked his potato ideas down in his county, had his majority reduced from 981 to 392. The hon. member for St. John city (Mr. Pugsley) had his majority reduced from 496 to 65. I suppose that he talked potatoes too. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) had his majority reduced from 1,385 to 64 and I presume he also talked about potatoes and the advantage it would be to the farmers of New Brunswick if potatoes were on the free list. I can only infer then that the people in different parts of New Brunswick—in these constituencies at least to which I have referred—had given this matter more thought and attention than their representatives had given it and had showed that they had given it more attention by the vote they gave in the election. The hon. member for Kings, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) stated there were only ten states on the other side of the line which grew potatoes to any extent, that really only one of these states, namely, the state of Maine, could be called a potato-growing state and that the United States was not adapted to the growing of