

*Ocean Shipping Rates*

think if I sit silent that I agree with what he says. By specifying the commodities on which the low rates are to be given, and with the rates fixed by the government, I think the matter would be settled as to carrying Canadian commodities.

Mr. CLARK: Is there a difference between Canadian wheat and American wheat?

Mr. MACKENZIE KING: A very distinct difference. The government will fix a rate for Canadian wheat, and Canadian wheat and no other wheat will get the benefit of that lower rate.

Mr. CLARK: How can the Prime Minister distinguish between Canadian and American wheat? Will he have American wheat come into one elevator and Canadian wheat into another? Must they be kept separate, or is he going to prohibit American wheat from coming into Montreal at all? That is what will happen if he attempts any such thing.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): Why does the hon. member pick out wheat alone? We are practically all aware that wheat is not included in the conference rates.

Mr. CLARK: I chose wheat only for the purpose of illustration, and because it is the commodity that probably fifty members to my left are more interested in than any other. I might just as well take half a dozen other commodities.

Mr. LEADER: Take cattle.

Mr. CLARK: I will take cattle, but if my hon. friend will bear with me, I will take cattle when I come to the Preston report.

There is one other paragraph in the contract to which I would like to refer. It is paragraph 1 (f), by which the contractor agrees to:

Carry emigrants from Great Britain or the continent of Europe at rates to be fixed by the government and carry all Canadian mails free if and when the parties hereto agree upon the establishment of a passenger service or other steamers suitable for the carriage of emigrants in conjunction with and under the control of the shipping company.

Now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in introducing this resolution, stated repeatedly that there was nothing retarding immigration to this country more to-day than the action of this gigantic combine. The tragedy of this covenant is that there is no provision in these ten ships which the subsidy covers for the carriage of one single immigrant; no provision whatever, and yet the minister as his main point in favour of this subsidy says that nothing is retarding

[Mr. Mackenzie King.]

immigration to this country to-day more than the action of this gigantic combine. That is the reason he advances why we should adopt this agreement. There is a real tragedy in this covenant. We have to-day space in the ships which are coming to New York and Montreal for well over a million immigrants a year for Canada. We have space in the ships which call at Canadian ports alone for over 350,000 immigrants to Canada annually; and that space is not being utilized. In the United States, until they introduced their quota law they were securing upwards of one million immigrants a year on these same ships which are still travelling the same routes; but when the quota law came into effect, immigration to the United States was cut down to about 360,000 annually. The United States have now a waiting list of would-be immigrants, probably the pick of the immigrants from the whole of the Mother Country and Europe, sufficient to fill their quota for many years to come, showing full well that there are immigrants who are ready and willing to come to Canada, and to pay the rates at present existing if we have anything here to offer them. The tragedy, Mr. Speaker, is that we have no attractions to offer immigrants to-day; we have the immigrants ready and willing to come, but we have no work for them. The minister says that nothing is retarding immigration to this country more than the action of this gigantic combine. He might just as well say that the exodus annually to the United States of 200,000 of our best young men, upon whom we have spent millions of dollars to rear and educate, the very life blood of this country—he might just as well say that that exodus is due to the action of this gigantic combine. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that until this country has attractions to offer, we cannot hope to have a free flow of immigrants to this country, and I want to say this to my friends particularly to my left: Until this country has a general tariff equal to that of the United States—and some time my hon. friends to my left will be believers in that—we cannot hope to make this country attractive to immigrants, because we shall have no work to offer them. If we do not encourage industry, and if we do not stop the flow of manufactured goods from the United States to this country, we cannot hope to offer opportunities to immigrants.

Mr. SPENCER: Does the hon. member not realize that in the year 1913, when we had a tariff, conditions were just as bad as they are to-day?