

of liquor. He said to me: "Sir, I have not eaten since yesterday." Here, in Ottawa, from the Parliament Buildings to my residence, every day I meet young men and old asking for charity. I hope that some day the present depression will give place to some degree of prosperity, but these years of acute adversity will, I fear, create in the minds of hundreds, indeed of thousands, of people the idea that they can rely on the public for food and clothing, and with the progressive mechanization of industry I am wondering what will become of them.

Now, what is the Government doing to solve the problem of unemployment? I know the Government is composed of men who, in common with us, have the deepest sympathy for our poverty-stricken unemployed; but is the Government formulating any constructive measures to take care of these unfortunate people? The winter will soon be upon us; indeed, we feel the pinch of winter every morning. Yesterday I brought to the attention of the House the question of the price of coal. Many people who are still wage-earners have said to me: "It is impossible for us at its present price to use coal in our houses." Only this morning a gentleman told me that he was going to burn wood this winter. Well, it is not a bad substitute for coal;—I like to hear the crackle of a wood fire. But the price of coal to-day terrifies me. Not many years ago coal was sold at \$6, \$7, and at most \$8 a ton. To-day, by virtue of the agreement with Great Britain, we are assured of an ample supply of Welsh coal. I am told that that coal delivered on the wharf at Montreal does not cost more than \$8, or at most \$9 a ton; but here it is selling at \$17. Now, what becomes of the spread between Montreal and Ottawa prices? I ask my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen)—whose wonderful ability is admitted by all—to endeavour to get the Labour Department to institute at once an investigation of this matter in order to dispel or confirm the suspicion that the public are the victims of a combine. I make no accusation that there is such a combine; I have no evidence to that effect; but this is being repeatedly said on the street and in the home. Remember that riots and indeed revolutions are brought about by suspicions.

As regards unemployment, I say it is the paramount issue of the day. Let us not lose sight of that fact. There convened in Ottawa this summer a great Conference, and at that Conference Canada did her part magnificently. The delegates were entertained royally—and deservedly so, because they were our guests.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX.

But let us not labour under the illusion that the agreements reached at that Conference constitute the paramount issue in Canada to-day. No. There is but one problem to which the Government is expected to find a solution, and that is the problem presented by unemployment and the prevailing acute adversity. My right honourable friend will say—I think he has it in his mind now—that the agreements were drafted with a view to bringing back prosperity to Canada. Well, I beg to differ with him on that. Like Cato of old, who kept repeating, "Delenda est Carthago," I keep repeating, "Delenda est adversitas." That is the first duty of the Government.

As regards tariff making for the future, let me say in all sincerity to my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Mr. Meighen) and to my colleagues of the Senate that I have been brought up in a school which believes that the name of Canada is writ large on the map of the world. The tariff of Canada, therefore, should be made by Canada and not by the various Dominions which constitute the British Empire.

When the Conference was summoned, I read in one of the British newspapers that a family gathering very often meant a family quarrel. At the conclusion of the Conference, Mr. Baldwin, whom everybody trusts because he is a great statesman, as much as said that there had been storms and tempests, but that happily calm had finally prevailed. Family gatherings mean family quarrels, especially when material interests are at stake. How can you expect Rhodesia, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and Great Britain, not to mention Ireland, to agree for ever, or even for a number of years, on a common tariff? How can those countries which are free and independent, situated as they are in various climes and having divergent interests at stake, be expected to agree for long on complicated tariff policies?

Preferences from England to her colonies are as old as the hills, but history teaches us a lesson that we ought not to forget. In the middle of the last century, say from 1825 until 1849, when Canada was a colony—a large and ancient colony—our fathers received preferences from Great Britain on grain, flour, timber and meat. It was during those days that the old city of Quebec became so famous for her trains of timber. Those who pass the city of Quebec by daylight can see the various coves to which the trains came from the Ottawa River and other parts of Canada through the St. Lawrence. Our logs were exported to Britain and to various other parts of the Empire, which benefited by the preference given us by Britain. If you