

as a youth and worked in Ontario. After he had been here for some time he thought he would come to the west. He told me he was in Great Britain last winter and he saw all kinds of placards saying to the people of Great Britain, "Come to Canada and secure \$5 to \$7 a day for every day you care to work." I maintain that is misleading and if it is within the power of the Immigration department to stop that kind of propaganda, it is the duty of that department to stop it as quickly as possible. We know there is no possibility, unless the circumstances are exceptional, of people coming from Great Britain and securing \$5 to \$7 per day. The average man is not worth that much because nobody can afford to pay it; they have not got the money.

Mr. DONNELLY: Was it not paid all over the west last fall, \$5 to \$7 per day; it was in my district.

Mr. GARDINER: You speak for your own district and I will speak for mine.

Mr. DONNELLY: That is not answering my question.

Mr. GARDINER: I said that this propaganda was spread about in Great Britain, that if they came to Canada they would receive from \$5 to \$7 per day for every day they cared to work; that was my statement. It is this propaganda in Great Britain that I object to.

These miners were brought out long before the harvest was ready. In our particular district the crops were coming in a little earlier but they were there even before our crops were ready. If you went down and said to these fellows, "Look here, our crops will not be ready to harvest for ten days. We will give you a job and pay you \$2 or \$2.50, give you your board and room and washing and everything," what was the reply? They said, "Before we left Great Britain we were promised \$5 to \$7 per day for every day we worked, and we are not going to work for any less." We were merely trying to help them out of their trouble. I am complaining about the propaganda which was carried on in Great Britain, and I trust the minister, if he possibly can, will see that that is rectified at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FORKE: I do not like to interrupt, but I think the hon. member will excuse me when I state that no such statements were ever given out by the Immigration department, nor do I think they were given out by the British government. You cannot prevent people

[Mr. Gardiner.]

putting up statements of that kind, but I do not think any of the governments responsible had anything to do with them.

Mr. GARDINER: I do not blame the department as I feel it was probably the transportation companies that were responsible. But that being the case I would suggest to the minister that his department publish the actual truth and let people in Great Britain know that statements such as I have alluded to are untrue. Then, when they come to this country, they will be better satisfied because they will know what they are up against.

I would like to take a few moments to deal with the railway situation. We expect this year a branch line program from probably both railways. I would like to draw to the attention of this house, the different methods of dealing with the two railway systems, the Canadian Pacific and the Canadian National. When the Canadian Pacific desire to project a branch line, they bring their bill before this house and the house grants them a charter. They state in that bill where they are going, and they secure two years' time in which to start that branch and five years in which to finish the work. If the work has not been completed the charters are renewed from time to time.

But the Canadian National system has not the same privileges as the Canadian Pacific. They cannot come to this house except when they make an actual proposal to build, and they receive the consent of parliament and the sum of money necessary to build that particular branch line. I maintain that under these circumstances the Canadian National is not being treated fairly by this house; that the time has come when these two railways, in so far as charters are concerned, should be placed on the same plane. It should then be left to the house to determine, where the two companies are competing for the same territory, which company should go into that particular territory. I know of several cases in western Canada where branch line programs were turned down by another chamber years ago and where the other railway has gone in and secured a charter and preempted the territory which, to all intents and purposes, the Canadian National was building into. I merely make the suggestion that the two lines be given equal opportunities in that regard.

Branch lines are badly needed in the west, and I believe they are badly needed in other parts of Canada as well, but I can only speak for the territory with which I am familiar. I merely say that the time has come, in my