EDMONTON BULLETIN.

Semi-WEEKLY

Published every Monday and Thursday by the Bulletin Company, Ltd., at the office, Bulletin Building, 318 Jasper Avenue East.

SUBSCRIPTION

One year to Canadian or British post office address $1.00
Six months to Canadian or British post office address ..... .50
One year United States post office address $2.00
Six months United States post office address $1.00
All subscriptions are payable in advance.

Classified advertising one cent per word; four insertions for price of three, and six insertions for price of four.

Notice of Estray Cattle for insertion, $1.00.

JOHN HOWEY, Managing Editor
F. C. HAYES, Business Manager.

THE HUDSON BAY RY. STOPPED.

If there was one promise that was made more definitely and prominently, and upon which more stress was laid than upon another, during the western tour of the present Premier, it was the promise to push forward the completion of the Hudson Bay railway without delay. Indeed, the promise was generally accompanied by adverse comment upon the alleged delay that had already occurred. This policy of pushing the Hudson Bay railway was put forward with the express intent of offsetting in the public mind, so far as possible, the demand for reciprocity. No one could suspect that in the case of this enterprise, championed so persistently in Parliament and in the west by the then leader of the Opposition, and now the Premier, that any other course would or could be taken than to implement in the fullest degree the promises of early construction so definitely made.

When it was announced immediately after the selection of the new cabinet that the work on the contract, already let for the construction of 185 miles of the Hudson Bay railway, had been suspended, it was assumed that the suspension was only temporary and that beyond question work would be resumed very shortly. Indeed, an announcement was circulated in the press to the effect that the order suspending work had been cancelled, and no doubt a large proportion of western people are under the impression that this is the fact.

On Monday, Dr. Neely, member for Humboldt, in connection with the suspension of work, made his motion for papers the subject of remarks protesting against the delay that had occurred, and urging that there should be no further delay. The Minister of Railways astonished the House by stating that shortly after having taken office, it was represented to him that the first one hundred miles of the line as proposed, was not satisfactory as a railway route, and that it might be in the public interest to change the starting point of the railway on the Saskatchewan. A discussion at once arose upon this new feature of the case. Clearly, if the two years' survey work that had been done on the present line was to be thrown away, that in reason could only be done after equally elaborate surveys had been made of one or more other lines, which meant, if it meant anything, a readjustment of the whole scheme; with no assurance as to when the readjustment scheme would be begun, much less when it would be completed. Hon. Mr. Foster and the Premier both came to the assistance of the Minister of Railways with explanations, but their explanations left the matter exactly as it had been stated by the Minister himself.

It will be remembered that very shortly after the Government took office, the Premier of Manitoba made an announcement as to the construction of a railway to Hudson Bay direct from Winnipeg. It would seem as though there was more than a coincidence between the announcement of Premier Roblin of the Manitoba-Hudson Bay Railway and the stoppage of construction work on a line from The Pas. This announcement of the Government in regard to the rejection of the present proposal of building the Hudson Bay Railway is second only in importance to the announcement of their rejection of the navy scheme of the late Government; and indeed, to western people is of even greater importance. The present route from The Pas gives the shortest possible connection between the existing railway systems of the Prairie West and the Bay, and gives that connection at a point which is most conveniently reached from seven-eighths of the grain growing area of the West. To delay construction for an indefinite period and to shift the starting point to one or two hundred miles further east, would be so detrimental to the interests of the West as to imperil the ultimate economic access of the project.

It is quite evident that there are forces at work in the present patchwork Government distinctly against the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway, and there are other forces who are anxious to construct the railway, but are much more anxious to have it constructed so as to be to the advantage of special interests. This does not tend to early construction, while the airy manner in which the Premier waved aside the responsibility to implement the promises which he had so definitely made, is anything but favorable to the securing for the Prairie West that shortest outlet to the sea, which its present and still more its future condition, so urgently demands.

A Liberal came within 500 odd of getting elected in Toronto. Wonders will never cease.

—

The Sifton Government was sustained on the first division in the Legislature by a vote of 32 to 6, every Liberal member being present, and every one voting with the Government. The occasion was most favorable for any Libera who intended breaking with the Government, to announce himself and join with their enemies. The dream of the Opposition papers that there was to be a cleavage in the ranks of the Liberals and that the disaffected ones would combine with the Conservative members against the Liberal Government has therefore gone by the board. The Government has the undivided support of the Liberal members of the Legislature, as they will have the solid support of the Liberals in the country when the elections come around.

—

Nobody will be surprised that the Whitney Government won the Ontario elections, nor that the Ministers will have a majority in the new House only ten less than the majority they had in the old one. Nobody expected that the Government would be defeated, and there was little enough ground to think their majority would be reduced to any large extent. According to its limited light the Whitney Government has been a good government, and it was to be supposed that those who voted for them three years ago on their merits would, in the majority of cases, vote for them again on their merits. Nor had the Opposition in the meantime succeeded in striking out any line of policy sufficiently aggressive to attract in large numbers the votes liable to change. The election was signally devoid of large issues, and was determined mainly by the fact that the Whitney Government has practised the negative virtues sufficiently to not arouse widespread animosity, and to gain considerable approval. The Government had too, the advantage that the party organization was in the best of condition and fresh from a victory in Federal affairs, while the Opposition were handicapped by the corresponding demoralization of defeat, and by the fact that a change of leaders was found necessary on the eve of the campaign. All things considered, the Liberals did well to win five seats.

—

The disclaimer of Hon. Duncan Marshall in the Legislature on Monday is one such as no public man should ever be called upon to make, and such as public men would not have to make if the code of honor which prevails in secret matters and the moral law which holds in business affairs were recognized in the field of politics. That a man should have to defend himself against slanderous stories circulated by those who should have known them to be slanders—and who probably did know them to be such—is an incident which ought not only to be counted entirely to his own credit but ought to be also marked down as an offence in the record of his opponents. It is a fact however that under the debased moral code which allows a laxity of tongue in matters political that would not be tolerated anywhere else, it is considered by some to be a triumph rather than a crime to have injured the reputation of an honorable man in this way, and to have forced him to defend himself. Elsewhere the onus of proof rests upon the accuser; in politics it is held by some to rest upon the accused. That those of this stamp will accept the disclaimer of Mr. Marshall as other than a victory won by their lying stories, and as an encouragement to continue the circulation of these is not to be expected. Of these and their view of the matter, however, the Minister can afford to be indifferent. They are the lineal descendants of the father of lies and perhaps cannot restrain the hereditary instincts. But they are not in the majority in this Province, and do not constitute a number sufficiently large or sufficiently influential to be seriously reckoned with. The vast majority of the people of Alberta are clean-minded and fair-minded, people who prefer to believe a man honorable than otherwise, and who will take the word of a man as to his innocence in the absence of proof that he is guilty. Among such the protest of the Minister against the underground campaign that has been directed against him will be counted altogether to his credit and to the corresponding shame of his detractors.

THE PRICE OF PLOWS

On Tuesday, December 5th, the ministers of finance moved the House of Commons into committee of supply in order to enable F. W. Cockshutt, M.P. for Brantford, to ventilate his objections to reference that had been made in the debate on the address by Mr. Oliver, to the Cockshutt Plow company After Mr. Cockshutt had made his statement Mr. Oliver replied as follows As reported in hansard of 7th December:

Mr. Oliver:—I am sure that the House is more than indebted to my hon. friend for the information he has given us with regard to the Cockshutt gang ploughs. But if he is under the impression that I, at any time, wished to say anything derogatory to the quality of that plough or the business ability of the men who make it, he is labouring under an entirely wrong impression. The very statement I objects to so much is the best evidence that the plough is a good one. It must be a good one since the firm are able to sell it in the United States in competition with the best ploughs made there and pay the duty as well. I would not accuse my hon. friend for a moment of taking advantage of his presence in this House for the purpose of giving a business advertisement, but I would point out to him that if he did so his method of advertising the Cockshutt gang plough is very expensive to this country, and further, that he has no warrant whatever for the suggestion that I made any attack on that implement. I only used the name of the Cockshutt Plough company and the instance in which that company sold its ploughs in the United States in competition with American ploughs because that statement is in general circulation throughout the west, and not because he happens to bear the same name as the company which makes it, and therefore, he had no right to suggest that I had in any way made an improper personal reference to him. I was not dealing with the policy of my hon. friends opposite which prevents the western farmer from selling his goods across the line where he will get a better price, while at the same time the manufacturers were selling their goods across the same line at a less price. That was the point I was trying to make. I say again that it is most creditable that the Cockshutt Plough company or any other manufacturing industry in Ontario, should find a market wherever it can and sell its goods across the line against American competition. That they have a perfect right to do but not to line up their employees before their doors a day or two before the election and tell them that if reciprocity carries their works are going to shut down. I say that when such tyrannical methods as that are used, my hon. friend can only expect some kind of a protest from the people who are so injuriously affected by the results of those methods.

Mr. Cockshutt—Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that was done by the Cockshutt Plough company?

Mr. Oliver—Not at all. I want my hon. friend to dissociate the personal element from anything that I say. I said at the beginning of my remarks that I did not wish to make any particular reference to the Cockshutt Plough Company or to the fact that my hon. friend bore the same name as that company. I used an incident which my hon. friend knows was circulated through the public Press of the west.

Mr. Hazen—The same thing was done in New Brunswick.

Mr. Cockshutt—I understood the hon. gentleman to say just now that he knew of a firm that had lined up its men in front of its works, and I understood him to say that it was ours.

Mr. Oliver—I want my hon. friend to understand that I did not refer to the Cockshutt Plough company, and if it is necessary further to emphasize it, so far as my knowledge and information goes the Cockshutt Plough company is in all respects a reputable institution, that is a credit to Canada, and is doing good work as a manufacturing industry. But I read in the columns of the "Ottawa Free Press" that the E. B. Eddy Company, and the J. R. Booth Company right within it did so line up their employees and did so address them, and it is a simple matter of fact that they were not the only manufacturers who did so. I am quite willing to believe that the Cockshutt Plough company did not do so, and I repeat that it is a most reputable company. But a very large number of the manufacturing enterprises of eastern Canada did that very thing, and if so many of my hon. friend's friends are sitting in this House today it is actually because of such acts of outrageous tyranny in what is supposed to be a free country.

Mr. Meighen—Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company did exactly the same thing in both the last election and the previous election?

Mr. Oliver—No. I am aware that there were more Grand Trunk Pacific men working in my constituency during the election than in any other constituency in the Dominion of Canada, and I am absolutely aware that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company did not do any such thing or anything approaching it.

Mr. Meighen—It was done in Portage la Prairie in both elections.

Mr. Oliver—Then I will say to my hon. friend that there is a legend current in the politics of Manitoba that when my hon. friend had the privilege of coming to this House first, it was as the result of the Grand Trunk Pacific company lining up their men on his behalf in Portage la Prairie.

That has nothing to do with the case however. My argument was that the men who thus exercise their undoubted and proper right to sell their products across the line in the face of a low tariff are not dealing fairly by their fellow citizens in preventing them from selling their surplus products across the same line without any tariff; and to emphasize my point I pointed out that whereas in the case of the farmer, by selling his products across the line he got a better price, they sold their products across the line at a less price. I did not challenge them in the exercise of their right. Every time a Canadian manufacturer can sell a Canadian product in a foreign market, I am ready to hold up my hands for the energy, enterprise and business ability of the man who can do it, so long as it is done on fair terms. But I say, live and let live, and if the manufacturer has special privileges and tariffs in his favour, if he has rebates and drawbacks to assist him to enter a foreign market, which he has, then it is unfair on his part to line up his employees to vote against the western farmer being allowed the same privilege. Today the western farmer has to face a tariff framed absolutely to prevent and prohibit access of his product to the United States market whereas the Canadian manufacturer has the advantage of a low tariff, a 15 per cent tariff, a revenue tariff, in sending his products across the line.

Mr. Beattie—Why did the hon. gentleman's government arrange these matters during the 15 years that they were in power?

Mr. Oliver—The late government was not vested with authority to do away with the United States tariff, but as soon as the opportunity came to secure the doing away with the United States tariff and at the same time to reduce the Canadian tariff, that government seized the opportunity, and went down to defeat—went down, Mr. Speaker, proudly to defeat—in the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. Beattie—I would like to know what the United States tariff has to do with the tariff of Canada or with the lining up of men at our workshops?

Mr. Oliver—I am astonished that a gentleman who has occupied the position of a member of this House for so many years, and is honored with the representation of one of our leading cities, should ask such a question. Does he not know that the late government was defeated because—

Mr. Beattie—That is all nonsense. The government of which the hon. gentleman was a member was in power for 15 years, and they never reduced the tariff, though they had promised many times to do so, and they were kicked out of office because they had not kept their promises.

Mr. Oliver—The late government had made an arrangement whereby the United States tariff was to be taken off, and it was because it had made that arrangement that it was defeated by my hon. friend and his friends and the friends of my hon. friend from Brantford, who, as I say again, and it has not been denied, lined up their employees, and by an act of tyranny which should be abhorrent to a free country, secured the control which these hon. gentlemen boast of so greatly today.

Mr. Sexsmith—I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the late government was not pressed, during the last parliament, by resolutions offered in this House, to take the duty entirely off farming implements

Some Hon. Members—No, they were not.

Mr. Sexsmith—Or even to reduce it. If my memory serves me, there was a motion on the order paper by one of their own members to that effect in order to prevent any one else making such a motion and he left it there without taking action.

Mr. Oliver—The late government is today defeated because it undertook to reduce the duties on agricultural implements as a means of securing the free entry of our farm products into the markets of the United States. I do not wish to bring into question the business arrangements, or methods of the Cockshutt Plough Company. I have nothing to say against that company except to use it as a sample of the kind of business that is being done by our manufacturers. I do not find any fault with their actions, but I do find fault with their arguments. When they are able to do business in the United States in competition with their competitors there and still demand protection at the hands of the people of Canada on the plea that it is necessary in order to enable them to do business at all. I am entitled, in all fairness, to show that the manufacturers are using arguments that are not justified. If they can pay a 15 per cent. duty to enter the United States and compete in the United States with the manufacturers of that country there is no reason why they cannot compete with the United States manufacturers in this country with a duty of 15 per cent. in their favor.

I want to say that the appeal which my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) made for a united Canada, for a Canada in which the interests of the east and the west would be consulted—for a policy under which the east and west would find a common interest, is a principle that I entirely agree with, and I beg to assure this House, on behalf of the western country, that that principle is one they have always stood for, and will continue to stand for, as long as they are permitted to do so. But I must again say, Mr. Speaker, that the policy which refuses to the western farmer that privilege which the eastern manufacturer claims for himself, and from which he is able to profit by reason of special legislation, and special administrative acts, is not the way to build up a united Canada. Let the manufacturers of Eastern Canada play fair, let them give to other parts of Canada what they themselves claim, and there will be no trouble about a united Canada. But if they, by reason of having the bulk of votes in their locality, are able to produce economic conditions at their pleasure whereby other sections of Canada are penalized, as the prairie west of Canada today is penalized, to the extent of $12,000,000 on the crop of this year, I beg to assure them that there are serious difficulties in the way of building up a Canadian national sentiment, or a united Canada under these circumstances.

Mr. Lancaster—Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question? I do not quite understand his argument, I want information. What is the law that the manufacturers have succeeded in getting passed by which they are depriving the farmers of a similar law, and want to prevent the farmers shipping their stuff to the United States with a tariff against them, any more than the farmers wish to prevent the manufacturers from shipping their stuff into the United States? What is the unfairness?

Mr. Oliver—The manufacturer has access to the United States market under a minimum tariff with special advantages.

Mr. Lancaster—What special advantages?

Mr. Oliver—Special legislation in the matter of drawbacks and rebates on the duties on his raw material, on manufactured articles which he exports. And it is the boast of my hon. friends on the other side of the House that the manufacturing interests of the province of Ontario have been able, by their votes, and by the votes they controlled during the recent elections, to prevent the going into effect of an arrangement whereby the prohibitive tariff now existing against farm products going into the States would be removed, thereby preventing the western farmer from getting the benefit which the eastern manufacturer today enjoys, and which I want to say, the western farmer has no objection to his enjoying, and is willing to support him in that enjoyment.

Mr. Lancaster—What is all the row about?

Mr. Oliver—The row is because the western farmer, the prairie west today, is penalized to the extent of $12,000,000 on the crop of this year, by the result of the action of those interests.

Mr. Lancaster—What is the nature of the penalty?

Mr. Currie—What is the proof?

Mr. Oliver—The proof has already been given to the House, and my hon. friend, who has already objected to my repeating what I said on the previous occasion, has only to read "Hansard" and he can get the proof. I want to say again that the statement put on "Hansard" has not been denied and cannot be denied.

Mr. Lancaster—What statement is it the hon. gentleman means? I am here to deny the statement. If the hon. gentleman means that the farmers of this country are penalized, he is talking absolute nonsense.

Mr. Oliver—The hon. gentleman is not able to make an intelligent denial, because he does not know the facts.

Mr. Lancaster—There is no penalty on the farmers of this country; never has been.

Mr. Oliver—The facts are on "Hansard," and they have never been denied, and cannot be denied.

Mr. Lancaster—They have been denied.

Mr. Speaker—Order.

Mr. Oliver—My hon. friend denies without knowledge which is not an effective denial. My hon. friend from Banrtford (Mr. Cockshutt) challenged the figures I gave the House on a previous occasion. I did not give them as authoritative, I said I got them on what I believed to be good authority. I said that this particular variety of plough was sold in Brantford at $600, and was sold in Minneapolis at $502, after paying 15 per cent. duty and freight. My hon. friend or his company have sent a commissioner to Minneapolis, and they have found out the figures I gave to the House are absolutely correct.

But he says that the Minneapolis figure was a wholesale figure, and the Brantford figure a retail figure, and that that accounted for the difference. Accepting the hon. member's statement that the figure of $502 at Minneapolis is a wholesale and not a retail figure, I still submit that the spread is entirely too great to allow the Brantford factory to remain in a position to claim the need of protection in order to enable it to compete with American manufacturers. In order to land their plough at Minneapolis the Brantford manufacturers have to pay an American duty of 15 per cent. If they have put in their plough at a fair valuation that duty will be not less than $60; therefore, if Brantford, but against $680 at Winnipeg, the point to which the same freight rate will prevail ought to prevail as to Minneapolis, so that there is a spread as between the retail price at Winnipeg and the wholesale price at Minneapolis of the difference between $442 and $680. $238 on an article that sells in Minneapolis nets them $442. The conclusion is irresistible, taking the hon. member's own figures, that the Canadian company must in all fairness be able to compete within Canada against United States manufacturers at a lower rate of duty than that by which they are protected at present, and that when they say they cannot compete in Canada against United States manufacturers, the figures are here on record, the figures that my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) himself has agreed to as correct, as showing that there is absolutely no warrant for the statement.

My hon. friend made the statement that if I thought there was money in the manufacture of ploughs I had better go into the business myself in order to compete. I am not a plough manufacturer and I have not the capital, and I do not know that if I had the capital I would put it into plough making, but I shall tell you what I did, what I tried to do, what the party with which I am allied tried to do: We tried to secure effective competition with the Canadian plough factories from institutions and organizations that could efficiently compete.

Mr. Currie—When?

Mr. Oliver—By the agreement for reciprocity.

Mr. Currie—May I ask my hon. friend a question?

Mr. Oliver—No, I think the hon. gentleman is through asking questions. We did not ask them to compete free of duty, we did not say that the duty should be taken off agricultural implements. All that we asked was that the duty should be made equal on both sides of the line.

That was all we asked and they refused that request they brought into play every argument of passion or prejudice—lying, disloyal arguments—and then lined up the men who were under their control, who depended on them for their daily bread and told them if reciprocity carries you will be out of work.

Some hon. members—No.

Mr. Oliver—And these men talk about Canadian national sentiment and the unity of east and west! I have before me a statement that may bring into a vivid light the condition as respects the western farmer and the eastern implement manufacturer at this moment. I find it in the Winnipeg "Tribune" of Wednesday, November 29. It is headed: The Purchasing Power of Barley. In that Mr. R. Mackenzie writes as follows:

"While in St. John, a small town in Dakota, three or four miles from the Canadian border, inquiring into the prices paid for grain, I saw a farmer being paid 92 cents per bushel for barley in the grain elevator there.

If that barley was brought to a grain elevator in Brandon, Manitoba, it would realize forty cents a bushel.

An eight-foot McCormick binder sells at St. John for $150.

In Brandon, the same machine costs $175.

A little figuring will show that in St. John, 163 bushels will pay for an eight-foot McCormick binder.

In Brandon 437 bushels of the same class of barley would be required.

Eighty-one bushels of barley will buy a farmers' wagon in Dakota.

It takes 212 bushels to buy the same kind of a wagon in Brandon.

The Dakota farmer gets eight gallons of coal oil in exchange for one bushel of barley.

A Manitoban must be satisfied with slightly over one gallon for the same quantity.

Had reciprocity carried, the price of barley would be the same in Brandon and St. John, freight rates to terminals being the same from both places.

It is said that the Cockshutt Plough Company of Brantford, Ont., sell their eight-bottom power gang ploughs in Minneapolis around $500, where barley sells from $1 to $1.15.

In Manitoba they charge $680.

In other words, the Minnesota farmer can draw 500 bushels of barley to an elevator and bring home a Cockshutt plough fully paid for.

But the Manitoba farmer would have to haul 1,700 bushels to an elevator in this province to get the same plough.

The Minnesota farmer can get a Cockshutt two-furrow plough for 81 bushels of barley.

The Manitoba farmer exchanges 212 bushels for the same article.

Truly the Manitoba farmer pays dearly for that brand of loyalty and patriotism which is represented by the Canadian manufacturer."

These facts and this condition are known only too well through western Canada by the people who are affected by them, and I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the people of eastern Canada and the representatives of the people of Eastern Canada and, if you like, the representatives of the manufacturing interests of Eastern Canada, to those conditions which prevail in the west, and to ask them in the name of Canadian patriotism, in the name of loyalty to our country, to raise the heavy hand they have laid on this country and to allow the western farmer fair and equal opportunity to secure the advantage proper to the conditions which surround him.

I ask that as a means of establishing in this country a Canadian patriotism; and I say to these gentlemen that it is not the way to establish patriotism to tell the population of by far the larger area of this country that they must submit to conditions that are essentially unfair, even though they are exhorted to do it in the name of loyalty and patriotism. If there are to be sacrifices for loyalty and patriotism—and every one should be willing to make these sacrifices—let the sacrifices be on both sides; let them be in the east as well as in the west. We are willing to bear our share of the burden of the nation or of the burden of the Empire, but we do not like to have to bear the burden of the nation and of the Empire and the burden of the tyranny of the Manufacturers' Association—that association of mergers, trusts, combines and monopolies—in addition to the proper and reasonable burdens of the state and of the Empire.

—

The action of the United States Government in trying to wind up the Shoe Machinery company has an interest for Canadians because this gigantic corporation operates in Canada also, and because a commission appointed to investigate its methods of operation in this country was held up by the Minister of Justice a few days after the Borden Government got control of the reins. If the Taft Government supports a tariff policy which breeds trusts, it at least tries to overcome the evil by restrictive legislation and vigorous prosecution. The Borden Government is wedded to the same kind of a tariff policy, but shows no similarly desirable intent to restrain the depredations of the combines which come into existence under its shelter.

—

The Provincial Government proposes to establish agricultural schools at the demonstration farms. The idea is a good one. What is needed in this province in the way of agricultural education is not a college which would turn out professors of agriculture, but schools where at small expense the boys from the farms of the neighboring districts may get a grounding in scientific agriculture, which will enable them to go back to the farms and make a better living than they would be able to make without the training.

—

The Ottawa Citizen corrects the notion that it was decided at the recent military conference to increase the pay of the militiaman. What was decided it says, was to adopt a flat rate of pay which will net the militiaman about $1 per year more than he has been getting. This will do about as much to round up recruits for the militia as Col. Sam Hughes did to round up recruits for the prison camps in South Africa.

PARLIAMENT

Ottawa, Dec. 2nd.

The result of the week's work in Parliament has been to clear up any doubt as to the position of the Government on the Naval question, and has brought out the fact that the victory of the Government at the polls was attained by the combination of many interests naturally diverse, but brought together with the common object of the attainment of power. How far a Government so constituted will be able to give good service to the country is the question of public interest. Generally speaking, the country stands to gain by having a strong Government; that is, a Government that has sufficient support to enable it to carry through an aggressive constructive policy. Judged by the majority behind it the Borden Government is fortunately situated for giving an aggressive and successful administration, but when the factions which make up the support of the Government are considered, the element of strength is essentially lacking. Between such diverse elements there must necessarily be continual compromise in order that they may hold together, and compromise is necessarily weakness.

This feature has been brought out most prominently in regard to the Naval policy. With one wing of the party pledged to an essentially aggressive policy, and the other wing absolutely pledged to a negative policy, the result has been not that a moderate policy, or policy of compromise between the two extremes, has been followed, but no policy at all has been agreed upon, which leaves the victory with those holding the negative view. This condition has been arrived at by the absolute sacrifice of a fundamental principle by what should, according to numbers, have been the dominant wing of the party.

The question itself is of the greatest importance, concerned as it is with the maintenance of the integrity of Canada itself, and even more so with the relationship between Canada and the Empire at large. It is not less important as an indication of what may be expected to occur in regard to other great issues as they come up for consideration. The present instance of the sacrifice of principle to political expediency and party exigency can only be expected to be the predominant condition in a Government constituted of men of not only diverse, but of violently opposing principles, and upheld by a combination of the various factions which support those principles. One great reason for the stupendous success of the late Government in securing the material advancement of Canada was that it represented a united party standing for definite principles and having sufficient support to enable it to give practical effect to its principles. The constructive policy of the Laurier Government beyond any doubt gave inspiration and direction to the energy of the people, and thereby secured the improvement of conditions which makes the period of Liberal control of her affairs the most notable and brightest chapter in Canada's history.

If the change of Government only meant a change of men, or if it only meant the substitution of one aggressive policy of advancement for another, there would be no cause for the people of Canada to look with doubt upon the immediate future of the country. But under the conditions which the debate on the address developed, with a Government in power whose only reply when confronted with their own declarations of principle made within recent months was, that they had not yet had time to make up their minds, and when the reason for that condition was made evident as being because of radical differences of opinion between the several factions in the Government, it must be conceded that the outlook for the future welfare of the country is not bright. It is to be feared that the attitude of the Government in regard to the material welfare of the country will follow the lead of the campaign cry, "Let well enough alone"—that their policy will be to hold back rather than to push forward, and to parcel out amongst the various interests to whose influence they owe their accession to office the advantages in regard to which sound economics would require that every citizen should have equal opportunity. From the expressions of the leader of the Government, and of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it would seem to be their idea that the country achieved success by a process of evolution and not as a result of capable direction. There is too much danger, judging by the records of the later years during which the present Minister of Trade and Commerce held office in a previous government, that the policy of leaving well enough alone, so far as the country at large is concerned, while taking care of the special interests, will be the policy to be pursued. This was the policy which stagnated Canada during the years preceding the accession of the Liberal Government to office, and notwithstanding the high pitch of prosperity which Canada has since attained, there is great reason to fear that even now a like policy will produce like results.

—

Mr. Haultain denies any knowledge of his impending elevation to the Supreme court bench. That does not of course mean that he is not to be elevated, but only that he has not yet been officially informed as to what the party bosses and backers have decided to do with him for bolting on the reciprocity question.

You will find that druggists everywhere speak well of Chamberlain's Cough Remedy. They know from long experience in the sale of it that in cases of coughs and colds it can always be depended upon, and that it is pleasant and safe to take. For sale by all dealers.

SOLID LIBERAL PRESENTED IN

(From Tuesday's

Shortly before Monday a vote in the debate on in reply to the speech fr The amendment of E. M was a want of confiden in the Government fo freely stated the details policy in the speech fr was defeated by a straig 32 to 6. Harold Riley O'Brien were absent fr The vote stood as follow

Against

Hon. A. L. Sifton. E.
Hon. C. R. Mitchell. T.
Hon. D. Marshall. Rob
Hon. A. J. McLean. Dr.
Hon. C. W. Cross. Joh
J. A. McDougall. Geo
A. Bramley Moore.
H. W. McKenny.
J. R. Boyle.
J. K. Cornwall.
J. L. Cote
P. E. Lessard.
Hon. W. H. Cushing.
L. Boudreau.
J. A. McPherson.
J. B. Holden.
C. H. Olin.
Dr. Campbell.
R. L. Shaw
Geo. P. Smith.
J. A. Simpson.
J. E. Stauffer.
L. M. Roberts.
J. M. Glendenning.
M. McKenzie.
J. W. Woolf.
Peter Gunn.
F. A. Walker.
R. T. Telford.
W. F. Puffer.
Chas. Stewart.
Hon. A. C. Rutherford.
Total 32.

Standing in their place eral member of the Le night voted confidence i ment. The motion on th reply to the speech fro was reached shortly bef Thirty-two Liberals vote opposition amendment t censuring the Governme laying before the House speech fuller particulars way policy. The amendm ported by six Conser seventh, Harold Riley, from the House. C. M. Socialist member for R tain, was the only other a vote on the address, mo Cote and seconded by D was the same as the amendment.

Other Business Side-

Business was side-trac altogether at the sitting bly yesterday in order t bate on the address in r speech from the throne m cluded. The house met a quarter of an hour lat art or Lethbridge had t was continuing the deba incidentally his maide so doing, Dr. Stewart wa the Hon. Duncan Marsh livered one of his speeches, vigorous but el convincing. Mr. Marshall his reply gave some time ment with regard to cer tions made by western respecting his political c tario. Mr. Marshall gave isfactory answer to t charges which had been him and concluded by s great applause: "You ha to the library and look nals of the Legislature a find reports of the elec and there are all the nam men who are reported f rupt practices or me judges. And if you can fi in any of these reports tainly should like to se anybody can prove that in an election where the were tampered with there to quit this government this House.

The Minister of Agricul lowed by Geo. Headley, Okotoks, who was the la speaker. J.W.Woolf follo Rutherford spoke next. spoke Peter Gunn, mem Ste Anne; Lucien Boudre for St. Albert; R. T. Telf for Ledue, was the next the debate was closed by Moore, member for Lloy

Dr. Stewart's Sp

Dr. Stewart, in openin magnanimously congra Minister of Agriculture cess of the efforts of hi in conjunction with th trade of Lethbridge, in 1912 session of the Farming Congress to th the speaker had the ho sent in the legislature. tion from a member of of the work of the Ge received with general a

Premier Sifton's railw not meet with the app Stewart. Why had Le overlooked in the plotti ferent lines? Was it be servative candidate had in Lethbridge constituen that was the reason L been unfairly treated cial Government in railways. Lines that ha ised, and should now had not yet been begu

Alberta had been h time of the granting of tonomy. Dr. Stewart d cussing the question control of natural r birthright of the prov bartered to satisfy the the Liberal members

Dr. Stewart found th special committee on outlined by the Ministe very good, but criticiz ment of education for t the preparation of th report. The delay i organization took plac die of the school year upon the regular work.