

SUPPLY—TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*

tion of the Intercolonial railway, the government should certainly provide the facilities necessary to handle business pressing on the road, 5047.

*McKenzie, D. D.* (Cape Breton North and Victoria)—5071.

Transportation of fish referred to, 5071.

*Oliver, Hon. Frank* (Edmonton)—5065.

I could understand our paying \$400,000 a year more if we were getting a quicker and better service; than we were getting before, 5065. This is an important matter, and one that, I think, we ought to thresh out until we get to a conclusion. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce said he thought I was in wrong in my statement of the case, 5067-9.

*Pelletier, Hon. L. P.* (Postmaster General)—5058.

I would like to explain, and I hope this will be given as wide publicity as possible, because if this kind of thing continues we will have to think very seriously whether we shall continue the Canadian subsidy at all—that we had four steamers on the Canadian mail service before 1913. We now have twelve in summer and eight in winter. For this very great and very marked difference we pay \$400,000 in addition to the \$600,000 that we used to pay. An impression has gained ground that our new Canadian service is bad, and I want to dispel that belief if it is at all possible. What are the facts, 5059-61. Although these patriotic words have been pronounced by his leader, the hon. member for Rouville characterizes the service as rotten. That is the hon. member for Rouville, from beginning to end, 5064-5.

*Pugsley, Hon. Wm.* (St. John City)—5050.

The sooner the government recognize that those two ports have merits and settle this difference of the mail service between the two ports by dividing the fast mail steamers equally between them the better it will be for both ports, 5050-1. What we in St. John complain of bitterly is that the Canadian Pacific ought to have been told that they would have the same rates which were prevailing over all the steamship lines which come to Halifax, 5053. But under this Gutelius-Bosworth agreement, a lower rate was given to the Canadian Pacific in order to induce them to abandon St. John and stop at Halifax, 5055.

*Sinclair, J. H.* (Guysborough)—5070.

Fishing industry of Nova Scotia referred to, 5070-1.

## TARIFF AMENDMENT.

## Motion:

That in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that manufactured goods and natural products coming into Canada from any other country where the rate of wages of those employed in the mak-

TARIFF AMENDMENT—*Con.*

ing or raising of the same is below that prevailing in Canada, be subjected to a tariff duty sufficient to preserve the standard or rate of wages of those in Canada employed in making or producing like goods and products.—*Mr. Burnham*, 1358.

*Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L.* (Prime Minister)—1359.

Might stand until Speaker considers it, 1359.

*Burnham, J. H.* (Peterborough, West)—1358.

In my opinion this resolution involves one of most important facts relating to Canadian national and industrial life, 1358.

*Speaker, His Honour the*—1359.

Think this resolution is out of order, 1359.

## TAXATION OF UNPATENTED LANDS.

Attention directed to newspaper article in regard to taxation of homesteads in Saskatchewan.—*Mr. McCraney*, 1918.

*Knowles, W. E.* (Moosejaw)—1923.

A new entrant is not liable for the taxes imposed on a former entrant, and the letter written by the secretary of the Department of the Interior, was absolutely uncalled for in its substance as well as in its tone, 1923. Letters quoted, 1924-5.

*McCraney, G. E.* (Saskatoon)—1918.

Article from Saskatchewan Daily Star, March 5, quoted. In Saskatchewan our understanding has always been that lands vested in the Crown are not taxable nor are lands in which the Crown is interested as a beneficiary owner, 1909. My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the minister is to obtain a statement as to whether or not the department repudiates the letter which I have quoted, 1920.

*Oliver, Hon. Frank* (Edmonton)—1921.

There seems to be in the answer of the minister the elements of a great many difficulties for the municipalities without probability of any good result, 1921. There is no doubt as to the necessity of the taxation; there is no doubt that the man who occupies and uses the land should pay his share in the way of taxes. It would be most unfortunate if the homesteader should be relieved from taxation, 1922.

*Roche, Hon. W. J.* (Minister of the Interior)—1920.

Complaints have been received from homesteaders that they are charged taxes prior to receiving patents. Memo. from deputy minister quoted. A protest was entered with proper authorities at Regina and a satisfactory answer received, 1920. If they are taxing the land as they would tax it if it had been patented and the title vested in the individual, that is not legal, 1921.

## THESSALON AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill No. 39.—*Mr. Smith*, 993.