

upon the suffrage, and in this column he wrote the one word: 'Manhood'. In my Liberal creed, it is a greater thing to be a man than to be a farmer, it is a greater thing to be a man than to be a cabinet minister. Manhood is the test of citizenship, with me, it is the true test in making any appointments. Following this line, what are you going to look for in a railroad commissioner? Capacity for work, qualifications for the position, ability to examine into, not only the needs of the farmer, but the needs of the whole community. You want judicial qualities in a man, you want a man who can procure and appreciate evidence from all classes. I feel perfectly sure that the government, in making an appointment, will look for those broader tests, and look away from the narrower tests called for in the resolution.

My second reason is this, that I do not believe it is right to restrict the choice of the government to any particular class in making this nomination. If I may venture to mention one thing that has struck me with surprise in this House, and I do so with great modesty, it has been the amount of sectionalism, the amount of provincialism, the amount of class thinking which has characterized the debates that I have had the honour of listening to in the short time I have been a member of this House. We want, if I understand the needs of my adopted country which I have learned to love, we want to develop in this country a sense of nationhood, and if that be our aim, we must place no restriction upon the government that they shall make their nominations from any particular class of people. If you are animated by the spirit of nationhood, in selecting a man for any position, I do not care whether it be deputy speaker of the Senate, or speaker of the House of Commons, or a member of this House, or a member of the cabinet, you will not look to any class, even though it be the great class to which I am proud to belong, but you will look in every case for a Canadian and a man.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). It is with great pleasure that I rise to say a few words in favour of the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples). I do so, not only from a sense of loyalty to him, but from a sense of the duty I owe to the farmers whom I am here to represent. I do it moreover because I am also a farmer, and I have the honour to represent in this House over 9,000 farmers in the Northwest. I say, therefore, it is a pleasure for me to speak on this question, because it affords me an opportunity of advocating their interests. But while I rise with pleasure to support this motion, my pleasure is tinged with a very sincere regret when I remember that the cause of this debate is the demise of a gentleman who stood high in the records of

Mr. M. CLARK.

Canadian history. It is the demise of the Hon. Thomas Greenway which has furnished the occasion for this discussion. For twenty-five years Mr. Greenway took an active part in the politics of Manitoba. Although he made some political mistakes, from my point of view, still he was a man who did much to build up the great Northwest. He was a man of many parts, a lovable man in many ways, a man who was a strong personal friend of mine, though a political adversary. Many of the laws which he was instrumental in placing upon the statute book of Manitoba were, I believe, in the best interests of the people of that province. He was the leader of the great Liberal party in Manitoba, and might yet have been the leader, had he not been misled by the same influences that I told the First Minister had misled him with regard to the late elections in Manitoba.

I regret that this discussion has drifted into party politics, whereas we are, or should be, discussing the advisability of placing a representative of the farmers on the Railway Board in succession to the late Mr. Greenway, who was himself one of the most trusted and representative farmers in all Canada. Sir, we who advocate this resolution are not here representing only a fraction of the people of Manitoba, we are here representing over 140,000 farmers. It is their dictum we are asking this House to follow and it is their interest we are asking this government to consider. This House, through the Minister of Railways, has been asked by the farmers of the west to appoint a man whom they can trust, a man who sympathizes with their interests, to a position on the Board of Railway Commissioners. This is not a matter to be laughed at, as was done by my hon. friend who has just spoken, and by the Minister of Agriculture, it is a matter for the serious consideration of the members of this House, a matter to be discussed on common sense lines. Now let me point out the importance of these 140,000 farmers to Canada as wealth producers. Take my own province of Manitoba. The farmers of Manitoba last year raised farm produce to the value of sixty-six and a half million dollars, the result of the toil of their hands and the sweat of their brows. In Saskatchewan they produced thirty-seven and a half million dollars worth. They did not find this wealth by chance, they had to toil for it, and have they not a right to be listened to? In Alberta they produced fourteen and a half million dollars worth, a total for the three provinces of \$118,500,000. Surely these people ought to be recognized as a factor in governing the appointment of members of the Board of Railway Commissioners. Looking east, we find that from the eastern boundary of Manitoba to the Atlantic ocean, agricultural products last year amounted to no less a sum than \$236,000,000. And yet the Minister of Agricul-