

is forsooth at the mercy of the United States because of the danger of having the bonding privilege abrogated. I believe that that bonding privilege is as valuable to the United States as it is to us. And for my part, I desire to disclaim, in language as emphatic as the usages of parliament will permit, the statement of the right hon. gentleman, the Prime Minister, that Canada now or at any time is or has been at the mercy of the United States, for that reason or any other.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I had expressed my disappointment, Mr. Speaker, that the right hon. gentleman, in introducing this measure, had seen fit to depart from parliamentary usage in springing his measure upon the House this afternoon without any previous notice of its terms, and in seeing fit, during two and a half hours, to make a controversial speech, instead of contenting himself, as is the practice, with intimating to the House the purport of the Bill. The intention was perfectly obvious. The opposition were to be taken unawares. No reply was to be made to the right hon. gentleman, and his speech was to go forth to the country without any answer whatever. Well, Sir, it will not go forth without some answer, although of course, one is taken very much at a disadvantage, with regard to a measure of this magnitude, in having the printed copy sent across, at the conclusion of the right hon. gentleman's speech, when it might have been placed in the hands of the leader of the opposition hours before. Nevertheless, I think there are some salient points in this measure which ought to be answered on the spot, and which I propose to answer on the spot.

The right hon. gentleman has covered a very wide range of ground. When we took recess at six o'clock, I was dealing with his remarks regarding the bonding privilege between this country and the United States. Before proceeding further, let me say that I do not know, to use the phraseology of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), who dry-nursed the right hon. gentleman for this speech which he has delivered to-day. There might be some question as to whether or not the gentleman who wrote that article in the New York 'Sun,' which was quoted by the Prime Minister to-day, had anything to do with the preparation of that speech. The right hon. gentleman declared at considerable length that Canada was at the mercy of the United States on account of this bonding privilege, and it may not be out of place, in passing, to point out the view which another Canadian statesman, who is not now in the House, took of this

situation some six years ago. Speaking in this House on the 24th of August, 1896, Sir Charles Tupper said :-

Occasionally some people in the United States, who are very anxious to create trouble with Canada, who do not hesitate to do everything in their power to hand us over to the United States, have been kind enough to suggest to the United States government to stop the bonding privilege as a means of bringing Canada to her knees, just as they have been kind enough to suggest that the United States have it in their power to adopt a course that would render the great railway lines of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, bankrupt in a very short time. That is the policy which I can understand emanating from the Farrars from the Wymanns and from the Glens; but I cannot understand the first minister committing himself to a declaration tantamount to saying that the bonding privilege is one we have yet to settle. Sir, it is a privilege that has been conceded after the most solemn declarations by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, and has been ratified by a treaty under which we now enjoy it.

That is in marked contrast to the position taken by the Prime Minister to-day. He tells the people of Canada that we are utterly at the mercy of the United States government, when, as a matter of fact, it has been demonstrated that the bonding privilege is of more value to the shippers of the United States to-day than it is to us, and that, if it were abolished to-morrow, the shippers and the people of the United States would have more to suffer than we. But whether that be so or not, it seems to me a remarkable position for a Prime Minister of this country on the eve of the resumption, as we are told, of negotiations with the United States concerning trade matters, to stand up and say that for a period of five or six years to come, until this road is completed, we shall be absolutely at the mercy of the United States, bound to go down on our knees and submit to anything they may dictate to us. The right hon. gentleman has indulged in efforts of this kind before. The first thing he did after coming into power in 1896 was to give an interview to a reporter in Chicago, in which he very kindly promised to give away almost everything Canada had to offer, provided we could have some better relations with the United States than we then enjoyed; and when the right hon. gentleman expresses his fear of commercial bondage to the United States, I am reminded that eleven or twelve years ago, in 1891, he went through this country advocating a policy which his leader, the hon. Mr. Blake, admitted afterwards, was bound to subject the people of this country, not only to commercial, but political bondage as well, to the United States.

The right hon. gentleman apparently forgets those days, he forgets his attitude of that time, and he is oppressed with the danger of the commercial bondage of Canada to the United States of America. Thanks to the policy of the Conservative