

new requirements resulting from the development of our country. What form we should adopt, whether the government should participate or not, whether the government should help or not, or what should be the form of assistance, are questions which present themselves and as to which we have taken no pledge, and as to which we shall have not only to consult our friends but have the advice of parliament at large. That is not all. There is another sentence in that paragraph to which I would call attention :

The whole question of transportation and terminal facilities continues to occupy much attention, and my government will immediately appoint a commission of experienced men to report on the subject.

What is the meaning of this ? The House knows that we have expended a great deal of money in order to remove the congestion which is every year taking place at the head of Lake Superior, and provide terminal facilities at the different ports of the country. We have expended at Port Colborne a great deal and also at Montreal, Quebec and at St. John, N.B. We are asked to spend more money in these and other places. Parliament will be called upon to make new sacrifices. But before we spend any money, whether at Port Arthur, Port Colborne or Montreal, Three Rivers, Quebec or St. John, we think it of the highest possible moment that we should have a committee of experts, the most experienced men the country can furnish, in order to obtain from them a full report as to what is required, so that, before another dollar is asked from parliament, parliament should know exactly what amount is required and how it shall be expended. I think that this is an idea which will commend itself to the judgment of members of both sides.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will we likely have that report this session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is more than I can say. The commission will be announced probably on Monday, but whether we shall have a report this session I cannot say.

My hon. friend devoted a great part of his time to the conference which took place in London last summer. He said that this conference had been barren of results. I do not share that opinion. I do not share the opinion that the conference which sat in London, and at which the representatives of all the self-governing colonies took part, was barren of results. True it was void of such results as were anticipated by those short-sighted men who would cause England to revert to the fatal policy of the eighteenth century, whose aim was to saddle the colonies with burdens which do not belong to them, a policy which carried to extreme limits in that age, brought about the violent separation of the American colonies from the motherland. That conference settled

the principle upon which the British empire alone can rest, the principle that the British empire is composed of a galaxy of free nations all owing the same allegiance to the same sovereign, but all owing paramount allegiance also to their respective peoples.

We were invited to discuss three subjects—the commercial relations, the political relations and the military relations which ought to exist between Great Britain and her colonies. As to the question of commercial relations, I do not propose to say much at this time, because I do not believe it can be discussed so well now as later. When my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) brings down his budget—and I hope to be able to say that that will be at an early day—we shall better be able to take up the question which has been referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). In the meantime, I can satisfy him on one or two subjects as to which, perhaps, he has not all the information he might have possessed. The hon. gentleman says that the Canadian representatives do not appear to have made any propositions to the conference. Sir, we went to the conference without any propositions whatever ; we went to receive and entertain suggestions from the others. But, when we came before that conference we had suggestions to offer and propositions to make. The trade resolution passed by the conference was the work of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) introduced a resolution to reduce the postage on newspapers and periodicals between different parts of the empire, and I am glad to say that that proposal has already been acted upon, and my hon. friend has taken steps to give effect to the suggestion he then offered. The Postmaster General also introduced the resolution, which was carried, to have the metric system adopted throughout the British empire. These, of course, were minor points. Upon the main question at issue, I have only this to say in anticipation of the debate which will take place later on—that the conditions in 1902-3 in Great Britain are not the same as were the conditions of 1897. In 1897 Great Britain had nothing as to which she could make—if I may so say it—a reciprocity treaty ; but now the conditions are changed ; Great Britain has imposed a duty on cereals and is now in a position to meet our views, and, perhaps have a reciprocity of trade between Canada and Great Britain. That is the reason why we have spoken differently in 1902-3 from the way we spoke in 1897. We are not flies on the wheel—we move with the times, and, the times having changed, we were ready to take advantage of the opportunity and place our views before the British parliament. Whether they will fructify or not remains to be seen. The new budget has not been presented by the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.