

the last nine months of 1923 the immigration was one hundred and twenty-four thousand odd and for the corresponding nine months of last year it was one hundred thousand odd. The multiplication of policies does not result in the multiplication of immigrants.

Then a reference is made to the tariff reductions of last year which are said to have resulted in a lessening of the cost of production of raw materials and of the necessities of life, and the intimation is that because of that legislation we are enjoying a lower cost of living in Canada. As a matter of fact, as all are aware, the cost of living has increased. There may have been reductions in the cost of production of certain articles, but the public gets the benefit when the reduction reaches the public and, as official statistics of the Minister of Trade and Commerce disclose, the public is paying higher than ever.

Coming to the next paragraph in the Speech we are advised that something must now be done in the way of control of transportation by land and sea. This it is stated is "obviously essential to the promotion of interimperial trade, the expansion of export trade generally, and the development of Canadian trade via Canadian ports." The procedure that is to be followed with respect to railway freight rates, we are told, will depend upon the decision of the Supreme court in the case of the present lawsuits which are under consideration there on the question of the Crowsnest pass agreement. But as to ocean freight rates "action is being taken to overcome the restraints on export trade due to the exactions of the powerful steamship combine known as the North Atlantic Steamship Conference." The address continues:

Your approval will be asked of a measure aimed at affording the government of Canada a control of ocean rates.

Obviously the government is determined to get away as far as possible from tariff discussions this session. To-day some new subject has to be hoisted to the fore. They have chosen transportation for the purpose. As to land rates, their policy cannot be disclosed till they know the decision of the Supreme court on the Crowsnest pass agreement. Well, may I ask, why not? I thought their policy had been disclosed, not only disclosed but proclaimed all through the length and breadth of half of Canada—not widely emphasized in the eastern portion, but boasted of with unlimited adulation in the west. Why wait for the decision of the Supreme court before deciding to continue the policy so long proclaimed? Did the Prime Minister not go through western Canada turning handsprings on plat-

form after platform, telling the people that he had restored the Crowsnest pass agreement and was entitled to their everlasting gratitude? This was the policy of the government last summer, why is it not their policy to-day? The Supreme court may decide whether or not the government actually did restore the Crowsnest pass agreement—whether or not the legislation, or the absence of legislation, the course they pursued legislatively, resulted legally in the restoration of the agreement. This they can decide and this only; but whether the agreement stays or does not stay, the Parliament of Canada can decide, and the Parliament of Canada alone. No one has ever called in question the power of parliament to legislate yes or no as to the Crowsnest pass agreement. It is not a question of powers that is before the Supreme court at all—not in relation to parliament. Whatever the Supreme court may decide, this parliament alone controls the destiny of the Crowsnest pass agreement. Therefore, if it is still the policy of the administration to do what the Prime Minister proclaimed—and, I have not the slightest doubt, believed—that he had done, why is it not revealed in the Speech from the Throne? Why are we waiting for a decision, on the result of which nothing depends at all in so far as the policy of parliament is concerned? But the fact of the matter is, as everybody knows, and as the government was warned, that by the course they have pursued they have precipitated transportation anarchy and chaos in this country. They have shifted their ground month after month. We have had various sets of rates one month and other sets of rates another month, and the result of it all is to put the government in a position where it either has to reverse its own action or to compel chaos again. But when they come to the water they have no doubts. Both on the Great Lakes and on the ocean their policy is clear. A year ago we were told that there had to be "equalization" of transportation rates on the lakes, and the government brought in legislation amending what it had done the year before. Now they are going to proceed from the Great Lakes to the ocean and control the rates there. Is it worth while inquiring what their success has been on the lakes? Will any member of the government suggest that within the past year there has been one atom of control of one rate on the lakes? The Acting Minister of Finance (Mr. Robb) knows there has not. He knows the legislation was precipitate and abortive. He knows it was hastily computed. He never had any faith in it; in fact I am informed he warned his colleagues against it. But what-