

Perhaps I might refer again to the speech delivered by the hon. member from Athabaska (Mr. Davies). That speech, though it might not have been more eloquent, would certainly have been more effective had the hon. gentleman spoken as one representing the majority of the electorate in his constituency. As a matter of fact, the hon. member represents only thirty-two per cent of the voters of that constituency; he does not speak for the majority. When he spoke this afternoon he spoke as one of a very distinct minority. That is not being a member of a representative assembly in the broadest and truest meaning of the term.

I say, therefore, that the time has come for the introduction of these electoral measures, and I trust that my right hon. friend will consider favourably having them enacted before another general election. There is a special additional reason why this should be done at once. It is this. Under the redistribution measure, representation in the cities will in all probability be somewhat enlarged. I am sure that we should get a truer reflection of popular opinion if in the cities proportional representation were adopted in preference to the method that now prevails.

I come now to the next subject mentioned in the speech from the throne, namely, the St. Lawrence waterway. Let me read what the speech from the throne has to say on this subject:

Since the last session of parliament, my ministers have entered into a treaty with the government of the United States of America for the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway. Upon its ratification by the duly constituted authority of the United States, this treaty will be submitted to you for approval.

The first comment I have to make on that particular paragraph of the speech from the throne is that it offers no definite statement on the part of the government that the St. Lawrence waterway treaty will be submitted to parliament at all at this session or, for that matter, at any other session; it makes no statement of the government's own policy on the matter. It simply directs attention to the fact that when something is done in the United States then our government will say what shall be done in the parliament of Canada. I wish to ask my right hon. friend this question: Does the treaty as at present drafted represent the policy of the Conservative party in Canada. And, if it does, does it represent the policy of that party as it was enunciated at the great convention held in Winnipeg at the time my right hon. friend was chosen leader of his party? That convention laid down a statement of policy of the Conservative party with respect to the St. Lawrence

waterway, and that statement was couched in no uncertain terms. Here is the clause with respect to this matter:

Whereas the improvement of the Welland canal system by the Canadian people is nearing completion, this convention is of the opinion that the St. Lawrence canal system, as an all-Canadian project, should be developed in the national interest, and as and when conditions warrant. In such undertaking, the sovereign rights of the respective provinces in the development of power should be protected.

"An all-Canadian project to be developed in the national interest": that certainly is not what we have before us in the treaty presented at this time. Is it another case of the government throwing to the winds the policies by which it got into office, and adopting, when in power, a course wholly different from that to which they pledged themselves when seeking office, and which they declared would be adopted if they were returned? At the time the Conservative convention in Winnipeg made this statement of policy with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway there was some criticism by a section of the press of this country of an all-Canadian waterway route. Among the journals that discussed the matter was the *Toronto Globe*. The representative organ of the Conservative party in Toronto soon came into the arena of discussion and began pressing the Conservative point of view in opposition to the point of view which was taken by the *Toronto Globe*. I wish to read to hon. gentlemen opposite just what appeared at that time in the editorial columns of this Conservative journal, because it bears pretty pertinently upon the situation that exists at the moment. The *Mail and Empire* published an editorial on October 19, 1927, under the title "Canada Mistress in her own House", and commenting on the *Globe's* criticism of the project being regarded as an all-Canadian, a national system, that newspaper said:

Does the *Globe* object to the condition that the St. Lawrence canal system should be developed as "an all-Canadian project" and as a national system? Why should that newspaper prefer to have the improvement carried out in pursuance of a transportation policy framed by the United States government to figure as the principal issue in the coming presidential election campaign? Has the *Globe* no confidence in the national spirit and resourcefulness of the Canadian people? Up to the present the Canadian people have done their own canal building.

That was in 1927. In 1928 there was a presidential election campaign coming on in the United States and the *Mail and Empire*, which I presume knows the Conservative mind as well as any journal in this country, not excepting the *Montreal Gazette*, made the