

the Bill pledging yourself to do it and why do you take any credit to yourselves for that? The clause has no meaning; it is merely clap-trap, if what the hon. gentleman now says is true, so you had better quit blowing this horn about buying everything in Canada. There is nothing in it.

I do not care which horn of the dilemma the hon. gentleman takes. He is welcome to it. It will not hurt the horn, but I do not know what would become of him. There ought to be no doubt at all on this point, and it is an easy matter to fix it in such a way that there would be no doubt. I think we have a perfect right to deal with Canadian interests and to deal with them in a permanent way. This report to which I have already referred advocates the building of roads not from east to west, but from north to south, for the purpose of opening up the country. That is what ought to be done. I want to say before I sit down that this road, if it is built, will not solve the problem that is before this country. Every man knows that if you add anything to the transportation charges of a country it is virtually a direct tax upon the producers of the country. If there is one factor more important than another in the settlement of our North-west, and in the opening up of these vast regions that we all anticipate will be opened up, it is the question of transportation, and there is no question that will affect the interests of the people who are there and the people who will eventually go there so much as the solution of this question in the interest of the people, and in the direction of securing cheaper rates from the west to the east. This road will not give the people cheaper rates. You are putting the road away outside of the region of competition to commence with. The question to be solved is how the grain or the produce of the west shall be put into the eastern markets at as low a rate as possible. This road which is proposed will not solve that question. This road, as the right hon. gentleman said in introducing the Bill, is not a purely commercial road. It has, according to the right hon. gentleman, its national features, which he took so much pride in speaking of before the House and the country. He laid great stress upon the national features of the road, but he failed to show that it will in any sense solve the problem that ought to be solved by parliament in the interest of the people generally.

Mr. GEORGE. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Mr. Speaker, just one word. The right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in referring to the leader of the opposition this afternoon, made the statement that if he purchased the Canada Atlantic Railway and its steamships, those steamships, in order to carry grain from Duluth to Depot Harbour, will have to sail under the American flag. I was surprised that the hon. Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr.

Paterson), who ought to know better, and probably does know better, did not get up in his place, call the right hon. leader of the government down, and say: You are making a mistake. He does know better. I have been shipping grain from Canada to the United States for the last three years, and I can ship in a Canadian bottom or in an American bottom. A Canadian vessel can go to a United States port, load with coal or grain, and deliver its cargo in any port in Canada, and for the right hon. gentleman to get up and try to mislead the House in respect to this as he did before in reference to the bonding privilege—

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) is all wrong. If grain is carried from an American port to a Canadian port it can be carried in an American or a Canadian ship, but if bonded freight is taken from Duluth to Boston it has to be carried in an American bottom.

Mr. TAYLOR. The right hon. gentleman is wrong again, and the hon. Minister of Customs will certainly contradict him, because American grain can come in an American or Canadian bottom to a Canadian port in bond. It is immaterial what boat it is carried in, whether an American or a Canadian boat. If it comes in bond it is loaded in a Canadian or American car, and it is sent through in bond. The hon. Minister of Customs will verify the statement I am making. The right hon. Prime Minister ought to know better and any hon. gentleman occupying his position ought to know what the laws governing the bonding privilege are. The hon. Minister of Customs will verify my statement, and I call upon him to verify or contradict the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister. I shall wait for the hon. Minister of Customs to answer my question.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was not listening to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. May a Canadian vessel go into an American port, load with grain, bring it to a Canadian port in bond, put it in an elevator and have it shipped out in Canadian or American cars in bond to Boston or to another American point of destination?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It can do whatever is allowed to be done under the coasting laws of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is simply contradicting the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister. I could not possibly have a better answer when I call upon one of the business men in this business government to contradict another member of the government. But it is the same story from beginning to end. When the Bill was introduced the people were led to believe that we were at the mercy of the United States