

rings have been formed amongst Canadian manufacturers, only more effectually, because the manufacturers have only high protection in their favour, while the contractors would have a prohibitory law in their favour. That combination would exclude all competition, except such as the Canadian contractors' ring would be inclined to permit. The Canadian contractors' ring would have all the contracts among themselves and all the extras and all the boodle. It is absurd to contend in this House that the Canadian contractor has not a good chance for making money out of Canadian public works as things stand. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McLennan) is a proof, in his own person, of the fact that Canadian contractors can, and do, make a good thing out of Canadian public contracts. The hon. gentleman has certainly made a good thing out of more than one public contract. He has shown his enterprise, ability and management in making very handsome profits out of these contracts. He is himself a striking proof that the Canadian contractor has a chance, and the allegation that he has not any show in comparison with foreign competitors, would be the only possible reason which could be urged for adopting a Bill of this kind. Therefore, I say that the suggestion of the Minister of Railways that this Bill should go into committee, and be changed in some mysterious way in committee, is one consistent with the public interest, and with the tone of the hon. Minister's own speech. If we were to give this Bill a second reading, we would be adopting a principle which the hon. Minister himself declares is not capable of adoption by this House, namely, that we have the right to exclude aliens from taking contracts in this country, or that it would be advisable to exclude them. He intimated that the principle of the Bill was bad and impracticable, and yet he proposes that we should give it a second reading and go into committee on it.

Mr. HAGGART. I did not propose that.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly heard him say that it might be as well to go into committee.

Mr. CURRAN. He said that the hon. mover of the Bill might suggest that.

Mr. CASEY. I did not mean to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, and certainly thought he used the words I quoted. I am satisfied that the hon. Minister will agree with me, judging from the tone of the rest of his speech, that we would be doing a very unwise and improper thing if we gave this Bill a second reading at all.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have a great deal of sympathy with the hon. member for Glengarry. He has ably stated a grievance which Canadians feel in this country. He speaks from experience, and also for a large number of contractors who have gone from the county of Glengarry, which he has the hon-

our to represent in this House. The men of Glengarry, without much capital, but with unbounded energy and industry, have gone from that county and spread all over this continent, especially the United States, where they have built millions of dollars' worth of public works. Now, however, they find themselves so harassed by laws and restrictions that they are no longer able to carry on such works in the United States, and they think that the law of retaliation should be put in force in this country. The Americans ought, at least, to treat us as we treat them, but they are not disposed to do that. They are not disposed to treat us generously or fairly with regard to the fisheries, wrecking laws, quarantine regulations, and hundreds of other things; and if we sit quietly down and allow them to smite us on the one cheek, they will expect us to turn the other and will harass us in every way. The time has come, or will soon come, when we, as Canadians, ought to insist on a reciprocity of treatment. As they treat us we should treat them. I would not like to see the measure made as strict as the hon. member for Glengarry proposes, but I would like to see something carried out in the line suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals, namely, that if the Americans insist on treating us as they have been doing, and if they intend making these harassing acts of theirs still more stringent, we ought to adopt some scheme for treating them as they treat us, and in that way, at least, protect our people. Especially should that be done by a Government or party who say that their policy is a national policy. It is because the Americans are so strongly national, so patriotic, that they have passed all this legislation, and the result has been that they have built up their own industries and contractors, and kept their work for their own people. As Canadians, we ought to do the same; and in standing up for that principle, I have a great deal of sympathy for the hon. member for Glengarry, and hope there will be such an expression of opinion from the House that the Government will be strengthened in following some such line as the Minister of Railways and Canals has indicated.

Mr. TISDALE. I must say that, like the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), I have a great deal of sympathy in the line of the Bill which the hon. member for Glengarry has introduced. I am very sorry that the hon. gentleman did not speak loud enough for all of us to hear what he said, because he gave a very interesting and lengthy account, not only of the legislation of the general government of the United States, but of the still stronger laws of the different states on the line of his Bill. Now, I deprecate such legislation by any country. Of course, I concede the right of the general government