

crossing or some other interest before the board, can come and effectively plead his case and that the rules of procedure shall be so plain and so free from technicality that there will be no difficulty in that respect. Parliament had that in view when it framed section 56 which provides that if it shall happen that the rules and regulations of the board are for any reason undesirable, the Governor in Council can annul or modify these rules and regulations as he sees fit. As a matter of fact, at the present time, I do not think any great difficulty has arisen in that respect. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who are not lawyers have appeared before that board and presented their case. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) did so, I know, very effectively and with great success and other hon. gentlemen have appeared as well. There is no reason why, in the majority of cases, the Solicitor General should not be the person to appear on behalf of the public in prosecuting the interests of the party who is affected by the matter pending. If the Solicitor General devoted himself to a considerable extent to the practice of advancing the interests of the public in that way he would become a specialist himself. But, I have confidence in the Solicitor General's ability and I feel there is no difficulty in that regard. I feel very strongly that there is an opportunity for the Solicitor General to take on himself a greater part of the duties than he now discharges. It would be an advantage to the public that he should do so and it would be a justification for having a Solicitor General.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On the 22nd of May I called the attention of the minister to the fact that the trade for Prince Rupert and the Grand Trunk Pacific was done through the port of Seattle to the detriment of the Canadian port of Vancouver. The minister treated my remarks on that occasion in a rather discourteous manner and he blamed it on the Conservatives because they would not allow the Yukon Railway to be built. I do not suppose the minister wants to open up that discussion nor does he want me to show the absurdity of the proposition of the government to give away millions of acres of land in that western country for the building of that road. Perhaps the hon. members from British Columbia would now stand up for the trade of their city and urge on the government the necessity of doing something to prevent it going to American ports. I should think it is the duty of the Minister of Railways to bring this question before the Railway Commission so that they may take steps to remedy the evil. The minister knows that not only the Vancouver Board of Trade petitioned him with respect to this matter, but that the Canadian Pacific Railway has also brought it to his attention.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would point out to the hon. member that his remarks are not relevant to the item before the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is a vote for the Railway Commission and I have urged the minister to bring the matter to the attention of that commission, but he has treated my representations in a very light manner indeed. I cannot help thinking that he is neglecting his duty in this respect. On a former occasion I read articles from newspapers published in Vancouver referring to this question, and only to-day I received another Vancouver newspaper stating that it was the duty of the representatives from the province of British Columbia to stand by the rights of that province, and to see that the trade for the north went out of the port of Vancouver rather than out of Seattle. It is a question of vital importance not only to western Canada but to eastern Canada as well. The money of the people is going into the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and instead of that money being spent in Canada it is going to the United States.

Mr. MACPHERSON. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has spread his covering wings around this great country; every down trodden part of the Dominion has been gathered by him under his special care, and of course he has not forgotten the province of British Columbia. It is amusing to hear the hon. gentleman cry out for the port of Vancouver when the party with which he is allied acted as destroying angels to that port and as benefactors to the cities of Seattle and Tacoma when they killed the Bill to construct the Teslin Lake and Telegraph Creek Railway. But the hon. gentleman should read a little of the history of the province of British Columbia before he engages in his self-imposed task; he should cast the beam out of his own eye before he regards the mote in his brother's eye.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the hon. gentleman object to my urging on the government the necessity of trying to get the freight and passenger traffic for the city of Vancouver?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Not at all. I am delighted to have the splendid help of the hon. member (Mr. Armstrong) for without his valuable aid we would be poor indeed. With his assistance there is no danger that we will not make port, because if the wind does not carry us we have got the hon. gentleman as an auxiliary steam engine to come to our rescue. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is very wide of the mark when he says that large supplies for Prince Rupert are being bought in Seattle and Tacoma and other American cities. Stewart & Larsen have the contract for the Grand Trunk Pacific for two hundred miles from the coast, and Mr. Stewart is a