

routed otherwise by the shipper, if destined for points in Canada, shall be carried entirely on Canadian territory or between Canadian inland ports, and that the rate for such carriage shall not be greater than the rate charged between the same points by any route not wholly Canadian; and if such freight be for export, it shall, unless otherwise specifically routed by the shipper, be carried to Canadian ports, and that the through-rate on such export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater by way of Canadian ports than by way of any other ports.

I may say this whole clause provides, in case of freight carried from the west or elsewhere, if it is for export, that they must comply with the requirements and not charge a greater rate; but if the grain, or cattle, or cheese, or butter is shipped from any point in the west to any point in eastern Canada, they can charge whatever they please for it. We want to say this to them: You have received aid from the government of Canada, and you shall carry these goods as cheaply as they can be carried over any competing line, whether partly in Canada and partly in the United States or not.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. One word about a subject not directly concerned in the amendment, and that is with reference to the misunderstanding that seems to exist between the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the Prime Minister with reference to the law of the United States. He asked me last night what I had to say, and being busily engaged at the moment in conversation, I did not hear what he said, and gave the answer that they could do whatever was permitted by their law. Now, the law of the United States that was passed in 1898 is this:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in congress assembled, that no merchandise shall be transported by water, under penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port of the United States to another port of the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the voyage, in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States.

Then the hon. gentleman argues that if merchandise is shipped from Duluth destined, we will say, to Boston—

Mr. TAYLOR. For export.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It has to take that voyage from Duluth to Boston, we will say. This section reads that if on any part of the voyage it is carried in any other vessel than a vessel of the United States it is subject to forfeiture.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he say that the United States have construed the word 'voyage' as including transmission by railway trains?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is reciprocity in the bonding arrangements as

Mr. TAYLOR.

far as railways are concerned but not with reference to coasting.

Mr. TAYLOR. No one denies that.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. But I have read the law which says these consequences may arise out of this and if they did not arise I do not think it would be our desire or duty to call attention to it. I understood the hon. gentleman to say it is done now, that it is perfectly legal to do it and that he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for stating that it is possible for a merchant to ship goods say from Boston by way of the Canada Atlantic Railway destined for Chicago, that they may be put on a Canadian vessel at Parry Sound and landed from a Canadian vessel in Chicago. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) say that the Canada Atlantic Railway can do that?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister is quoting me, I said nothing of the kind.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said: that what we are doing in Canada to-day is shipping goods via the Grand Trunk Railway by rail to Collingwood or Owen Sound; that they are there placed in a Canadian or American vessel and are landed in Duluth; that they are there taken by the Northern Pacific, carried through the United States, handed over to the Canadian Northern Railway, and taken again through Canadian territory. Will my hon. friend admit that this can be done under the United States law?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The question was one of United States law and we do not here interpret United States law. If the United States law is more liberal than we thought we are delighted to know that, because we would like to have all the advantage we may have, and therefore I would be pleased if I correctly understood the hon. gentleman to say that he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for saying that merchandise may be shipped from Boston over a Canadian line of railway, say to Parry Sound, and there be placed on a Canadian vessel and be delivered from that vessel at its destination in Chicago. I again ask the hon. gentleman if he has the authority of the Canada Atlantic Railway for saying that?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not say that the Canada Atlantic Railway made any such statement. The statement I made about the Canada Atlantic Railway was that they are to-day carrying grain from Chicago and Duluth by both Canadian and American vessels to Depot Harbour, then putting it in cars and shipping it out from there; that there is no difference between Canadian and American bottoms.