

never shown any disposition to embark on any policy that would unify the empire.

But we have had sprung upon us lately a new theory; we are told that we are to have an All-Red line which is to compass the British empire and is to solve the transportation problem for the whole empire. It promises to be a thin red line rather than an All-Red line. Even the seconder of these resolutions, one of the government's own supporters, distinctly opposed it, so far as I was able to gather from his speech. So that when we upon this side are twitted with want of unity on the tariff question, I would suggest that hon. gentlemen opposite had better unify their own followers on this All-Red line question.

The much-heralded French treaty has been brought down. I regret that I have not yet had an opportunity to look very fully into that treaty; but, so far as I have been able to examine it, I am not hopeful of any great results from it for Canada. There have been some concessions on light wines, which will strike at some Canadian industries, because in Ontario there are several companies that manufacture large quantities of light wines, and I fancy they will not be advantaged by the concessions granted to France in that treaty. In this connection there is one point to which my attention has been called, that is, that unless these goods from France come directly through a Canadian port they are not to receive the full advantage. I would ask the Finance Minister if I am correct in that?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they must come across the ocean to a Canadian port. They may start from a French port or a British port, Great Britain having the advantage of the minimum French tariff, but they must come across the ocean to a Canadian port.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Well, I think that is in advance of our time. It is unfair to the railways and to many merchants and importers. For instance, I understand that the Grand Trunk Railway will not be able to bring in these goods through Portland, and the lines in western Canada which depend on connections with New York or Philadelphia will be cut out of the carrying trade on these goods. I am opposed to that feature, and I think it is regrettable that the Finance Minister should have gone so far as to adopt a principle with regard to imports from France after refusing to apply the same principle to British goods, as was done last session on a resolution brought in by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan).

I wish to speak for a few moments on the question of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. That is a rather interesting question, and I do not know that the reference to it in the speech from the Throne is any more reassuring than the reference to other matters. It says, referring to the Transcontinental Railway—

Mr. COCKSHUTT.

Progress has been made both on the eastern and western divisions, but the difficulty of obtaining labour and material at a time of great business activity has somewhat retarded the construction of the Transcontinental Railway. Nevertheless some progress has been made.

It is to be regretted that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not in as forward a state as it might reasonably be expected to be. But whose fault is that? I am rather doubtful that it is due to the lack of labour. We have had an influx of Japanese and Chinese and a large number of Hindoos and Coolies into British Columbia last winter, whose advent was opposed by the British Columbia representatives. I scarcely think that these representatives will re-echo the sentiments expressed by the First Minister and the Minister of Finance in this debate. I doubt whether they will feel satisfied with regard to the position taken on this question by these two gentlemen. But if the construction was hampered at the outset by lack of labour, that is not the case now, because I find that the other day the Grand Trunk Pacific dismissed 8,000 men, on one section at Kenora, most of whom have returned to their native land.

But what I want to call particular attention to is the cost of the road, and I regret that the right hon. the First Minister is not in his place to-night. I am told that he is busily occupied attending to the business of the country in the Russell theatre. Whether that be the case I do not know, but I do not see why I should be restrained by his absence from pointing out a statement made by him which certainly requires some explanation on his part. I have been twitted on many platforms by Liberal speakers and by many Liberal newspapers with not going by the book when I say that the First Minister was guilty of misrepresentation when he introduced the Bill in parliament. Although I was not present in the House at the time, I understand that he stated in three different places in his speech on that occasion that this new transcontinental road would cost the country \$13,000,000 and not one cent more. Is that correct? The right hon. gentleman is not here to reply, but the Minister of Finance might reply for him.

Mr. FIELDING. So far as I know, the right hon. gentleman never made such a preposterous statement in any shape or form.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I am very glad to be able now to give the hon. minister and the House exactly what the right hon. gentleman did say. In Vol. 4 of 'Hansard' for the session of 1903, will be found the introductory speech of the right hon. gentleman when he submitted the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill to the House. I take it that he was then speaking with the view of making the people believe that his was the right policy and that it was a policy which would be carried out as he explained it. Let me read