

Hon. Mr. POWER—There were test cases in former years, and there have been various tests during the present season, and in every case it has been found that the mails carried by Halifax got to Montreal in at least ten hours less time from Liverpool, than those which went via St. John. Now it seems to me that the Government are not doing the right thing by the people of this country. I leave Halifax and St. John out of the question, but the people of this country have a right to get their mails in the shortest possible time.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. POWER—And they are not doing it, and the interference of the Government with the Canadian Northern railway has had the effect, at any rate with respect to a large proportion of the mails, of lengthening the time taken in transportation. I end as I began with the hope that the harmony and good feeling which have generally characterized our relations in this House will continue to characterize them in the future.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—I had not intended to take any part in this debate, but a few statements have been made during the course of it which induce me to think that probably it would be advisable for me not to pass the debate over in absolute silence. I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—Will the hon. gentleman allow me. I may not be here to-morrow when the debate is continued, so if the hon. gentleman will allow me only a few minutes.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—Certainly.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—I wish to call attention to an argument used by the hon. gentleman who moved the adoption of the Address. I thought it was one which had been abandoned, and should not be taken seriously. Of course, he quoted a great authority, Sir George Paish, in support of it and tried to make out that the people of England like us so much that they are willing to lend us money at 4 per cent when they can get 5 per cent for it elsewhere. The hon. gentleman went on further to show that this difference in the rate of interest enables us to effect a saving which, in two years, would pay the cost of the dreadnoughts Canada was asked to contribute to the British fleet. For my part, I do not believe that the English people like

Hon. Mr. DANIEL.

us quite so much as that. I should like to have the name of one Englishman whose income from investments we will say is £500 a year and who would voluntarily, for love of the people of Canada that he never saw, would be willing to lend his money at a rate which would reduce his income to four hundred pounds a year, and perhaps when his wife asked for a new bonnet would have to say 'My dear, I cannot afford it this year, I love the people of Canada so much that I have given up one hundred pounds of my income in order that they may pay only four per cent on my investment.' I cannot believe that such an argument is made seriously. The hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Mason) is president of a bank, lives in the imperialist city of Toronto. What did that city do lately? It required to borrow money lately and where did it go? Not to England but to the awful Yankees, to the city of New York, and the Americans must have liked the people of Toronto better than the English do, because they loaned the city money on better terms than it could be borrowed for in England. What a debt of gratitude the imperialists of Toronto must owe the people of New York who are willing to lend them money at a lower rate than they could borrow it for in England. I do not think it is necessary to dwell further on that argument. Although it was the first speech the hon. gentleman delivered in this House, we must remember that his speech was written and he must have used that argument for a purpose.

As to the Branch Lines Bill, I do not want to dwell on the old story of the rejection of that measure. I was in favour of it, but the majority of the Senate rejected it. The rejection of that measure, far from proving partisanship on the part of the Senate, simply proved the independence of this Chamber. The Bill, which passed unanimously in the House of Commons, had been framed at the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Graham, the Railway critic of the Opposition, because, as originally introduced, it was similar to a Bill of the same character that had been introduced by the former Administration, and Mr. Graham told the present Minister of Railways that it was no good because it did not go far enough. He said if you want to buy a branch railway you must have authority to do it even during the recess of Parliament. I stated that last year, but the majority of this House though aware of the fact, refused in its wisdom to pass the