

contributions. In other words, the amendment, which nearly carried, interpreting clause 10, allowed the geographical situation of a country to enter into consideration and recognized the supremacy of each Parliament. This amendment did not carry, but my honourable friends, when reading the Protocol, will find that these safeguards are to be found in it. Of course, it may be found that the economic and financial sanctions have been made more stringent towards the adherent to the Protocol, and the question raised by the Japanese towards the end of the session may call for some explanation and discussion.

I will not enter more fully into the details of the Protocol, but will simply say that these are amendments to the Covenant which already binds us to give the Council of the League of Nations the support of Canada in the economic, financial, and military fields. I will await another occasion, perhaps when the right honourable gentleman's motion comes up, to lay the documents before the Senate and to explain the working of the Protocol under the Covenant.

Hon. J. P. B. CASGRAIN: If no one wishes to speak from the other side of the House, I am quite prepared to say now what I have to say. It is not at all controversial.

I suppose, since we are discussing the Speech from the Throne, the first thing according to ancient usage is to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address. It was not my good fortune to be here this afternoon to hear them, but I am sure that the ex-Prime Minister of the province of New Brunswick, a man who has been a long time in public life, must have acquitted himself with great credit. As far as the seconder of the motion is concerned, he has been 39 years in public life. Since 1886 he has never been one day out of public life, so I am sure he acquitted himself very well of the task assigned to him.

After all, there are not very many questions in the Speech from the Throne to discuss. The first thing I see is that it is the intention of the Government to regulate the high cost of living, and that this matter is engaging their very serious attention. We all say amen to that. No doubt we would all like to see the cost of living go down, but with wheat selling at \$2 a bushel—

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: No. no.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: When wheat is selling at \$2 a bushel, the price of bread, the staff of life, will go up. The high cost of living has its good side too, but my honourable friend from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Mc-

Hon. Mr. DANDURAND.

Means) says oh, no. It depends on whose ox is gored.

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: It is not \$2 a bushel.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: Is it not? \$2.08? \$2.10?

Hon. Mr. McMEANS: The last quotation I heard was about \$1.92.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: That is a very good price, f.o.b. Winnipeg or Fort William. It does not look as though the high cost of living was going down with wheat at \$1.92—and a few days ago it was \$2.

I regret that the ex-Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Robertson) is not in his seat. The cost of living cannot very well go down unless wages go down too, and I am sure the ex-Minister of Labour would be opposed to wages going down, as my honourable friend from Winnipeg is opposed to the price of wheat going down. Between the two, the poor consumer is going to be mulcted anyway.

The next thing is the regulation of railway rates. Well, regulating railway rates is a very serious matter, and it is again our friends from the West who are always asking for lower rates, and they are not the people who are paying for it. We will take a concrete case with regard to railway rates. Take for instance the Province of Saskatchewan. It is a large province, the banner province of the prairies, and it has a population almost equal to that of the city of Montreal. Saskatchewan wants a reduction of railway rates. But when there is such a reduction it must be remembered that the deficit of the Canadian National Railways is increased and somebody must pay. Who is going to pay? It will not be Saskatchewan; for when you look at the amounts paid in income tax you find that Saskatchewan pays \$2 per head, whereas we, in the Province of Quebec, pay \$10 and Ontario pays \$9.25. Ontario and Quebec are the two provinces who would have to pay for these reductions.

And who has the railways? It is not the province of Quebec. They have four times more railways, according to population, than we have in the province of Quebec. Saskatchewan, with a population nearly equal to that of Montreal, has one and a half times more railways than the entire province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Do not the Saskatchewan railways all pay?

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN: The Saskatchewan railways do not all pay. I would like my honourable friend not to say that, because Mr. Beatty, the President of the C.P.R., gave