

he explained to me that they have part of their fleet American bottoms and part Canadian bottoms. The Canadian vessels go to Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee, take a cargo and bring it to Depot Harbour. The reason for having part American bottoms is so that if they have no business for Depot Harbour they can load at Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee for Buffalo or any other point on the American side, which a Canadian bottom cannot do. But the Canadian bottom can load at an American point and carry to Depot Harbour exactly the same as an American bottom. Then, to contradict my statement, the right hon. gentleman read the law. I challenged the Minister of Customs to deny my statement last night, and he said that the Canadian boats could do just what the law allowed them to do. The law is the same on the Canadian side as on the American side. Will the Minister of Customs tell me that I cannot do what I am doing every day, shipping goods to Winnipeg routed by the Grand Trunk Railway to Collingwood or to Sarnia, loading them there on American boats, taking them to Duluth and shipping them over the Northern Pacific and the Canadian Northern into Winnipeg? Is there anything in the laws or bonding privileges of the United States to prevent that being done? Nothing. We are doing it every day, so is every manufacturer in eastern Ontario shipping by the Grand Trunk and by the water route, going partly through American territory in bond; and the Americans are doing the same in our country. The law passed in the United States is for this special purpose. It was passed in February, 1898, and the Prime Minister read it last night:

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—

‘By water’ this Act applies to—by water all the way.

—under a penalty of forfeiture thereof, from one port in the United States to another port in the United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any other part of the voyage, in any other than a vessel of the United States.

Now, that applies this way: I cannot go to Chicago and order a load of grain shipped from Chicago via Port Colborne to Ogdensburg by a Canadian boat; that is, I cannot go into Chicago and load grain on a Canadian boat and carry it to Port Colborne, unload it in an elevator there, get it reloaded into another Canadian boat and carry it to a Canadian port. But they say: Grain going from Chicago, for instance, to Ogdensburg must be carried all the way in an American bottom. It cannot be transhipped at Port Colborne by a Canadian vessel or by an American vessel and then put into an American vessel and carried back, the same bulk, to an American port. But there is nothing in that law, and I

defy any lawyer in this House to contradict the statement, there is nothing in the bonding privileges of the United States, which are the same as they are in Canada, to prevent us shipping every day in bond through the United States and back into Canadian territory, from Collingwood or Sarnia to Duluth. There is nothing to prevent it being carried in an American bottom, neither is there anything in their law to prevent me from shipping a load of grain in bond at Chicago to Depot Harbour, because that is the water route, shipping it partly through Canada and partly through the United States, for export to the old country. Every bushel of grain in bond for export goes through Depot Harbour and goes through our Canadian elevators and over our Canadian railways. The Prime Minister tried to belittle the proposition made by the leader of the opposition, saying that he could not acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway and operate it; and could not operate the boats, because they are sailing under the American flag. That is in accordance with the statement made by the Postmaster General when he tried to make the people believe that by the proposition of the leader of the opposition you could not acquire 57 miles of the Canada Atlantic Railway, all of which were in the United States, whereas there are only three miles in the United States to make a connection. Although the Postmaster General made that statement and I showed he was wrong, he has not risen in this House and apologized for it. Neither has the Prime Minister apologized for the statement he made in introducing this Bill, saying that it was wanted altogether for the purpose of making Canada independent of bonding privileges that might be withdrawn. He has never withdrawn that statement. He made the same statement yesterday, which I am sure he will withdraw when he looks into the matter, otherwise he will raise the marine interests of Canada against him; he said that we cannot carry grain from an American port and land it in an American port when it is carried through in bond for export. Therefore, in order to settle this question, I am going to move an amendment, which I hope the government will accept, because it is in the interest of the manufacturers of eastern Canada and of the purchasers in the west, who may want to ship goods through Canada. I want to assure them that they will be sure of the same rates on this road on goods transported from the west as they can get when they are carried partly over Canadian and partly over American territory. I therefore move:

That all the words after the word ‘that’ to the end of the question be left out and the following substituted therefor:—‘the Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with power to amend the same as follows:—

That all freight originating on the line of the said railway or its branches, not specifically