

Mr. EDWARDS: Where did the farmers formerly get that potash from?

Mr. PUGSLEY: From Germany, but there are other fertilizers which should be secured.

Mr. LALOR: Is this Government to blame for the German potash not coming here?

Mr. PUGSLEY: This Government is to blame for not getting other fertilizer into this country to take its place.

Mr. STEELE: Does my hon. friend say that there is no potash purchaseable in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Practically none.

Mr. STEELE: I think I can give him the names of firms that can supply all the potash he wants.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If he will send it down to New Brunswick he will find a market at a good price for every pound of it. Contrast the conduct of this Government with regard to farm tractors with the conduct of the British Government. The British Government wants to increase production just as this Government professes to do. The British Government, however, is in earnest. It is a working Government. Within the last two months the British Government has given an order to American manufacturers for two thousand tractors to be sent to England for the purpose of assisting the farmers in increasing production. This Government, instead of doing that, says to-day, through the Minister of Finance, the farmer is doing mighty well in this country, and here is a chance to take 27½ per cent out of their pockets, and while we cry with one voice: produce, produce, produce, with another voice we say: put your hands in your pockets if you want the farm tractors and pay into the treasury of this country all we demand for the purpose of revenue. Let me ask the Minister of Labour really to do something; let me ask his colleagues really to do something. We have in this Government the most splendid set of talkers that one could gather together. They go to New York and with their eloquence thrill the audiences which gather to meet them. We next hear of them at Boston, where they thrill the people with a beautiful story of Canada, its splendid present and its glorious future, and they hold a high reputation for oratory in that city. They are the greatest aggregation of talkers that one could gather together, but

I doubt if one could scrape together a bunch of gentlemen with less desire than the present Government for real solid productive work.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What strikes me in connection with this Order in Council is the roundabout method of prosecution. I do not wish to deal with this matter as a party question, because the constituents of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as of hon. gentlemen on this side are both confronted with the high cost of living. I think it was Charles Dickens who exposed the circumlocution office in London some years ago, but to my mind the circumlocution office is not to be compared with the Department of Labour in its methods of prosecutions under this Act. I read a description of the method in a speech by the Hon. Mr. Lucas in the Legislature of Ontario some time ago. One of the members had asked him how offenders would be proceeded against and, if I remember correctly, this was the method: If a citizen of my constituency wishes to complain about the price he has to pay for flour, sugar, or any other commodity, he complains to the municipal council of his county, and here I might say that the municipal council in my county meets only twice a year, and their next meeting will not be till January, 1918.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is that place on the map?

Mr. SINCLAIR: So if a citizen in my county wishes to complain he will have to wait till early next year. The complaint comes up before the municipal council, and they appoint a commission to investigate; evidence is taken, and they have a case, we will suppose. But they cannot prosecute; my hon. friend from Pictou was mistaken about that; they have no power to prosecute under these regulations. What they do is to refer the matter back to the Minister of Labour. Then he looks at the papers that have been sent on from the municipal council, and makes up his mind whether the case shall go any further. If he thinks he has a good case he appoints another commission to go over the very same matter, call the very same witnesses, and hear the very same evidence. When the commission make out their report to the minister, even then he does not prosecute, but turns the matter over to the Attorney General of the province in which the offence took place, and the Attorney General decides whether there shall be a prosecution or