

Near the Tobique river where the same was rendered reasonably necessary by the physical features of the country a grading of 1:1 is allowed.

I would ask the minister if that is one of the pusher grades in New Brunswick?

Mr. GRAHAM. 1:1 we call a pusher grade, I think that is one of the pusher grades in New Brunswick.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the minister sure about it?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is my impression.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MONK. Before you leave the Chair I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of some importance. It seems to me that in the discussion of the question with which the House is now seized, the members require the fullest possible information, and at the stage at which this discussion has arrived, I think that perhaps what will throw most light upon the subject of this trade agreement, and will, perhaps more powerfully sway the members of this House in their decision, is the production of all the correspondence had before and during the negotiations. In this, as in many other matters, the government, I think, shows an unwillingness to deal fairly with this House, and upon this point particularly, to give us without niggardliness, whatever correspondence we require. Let me illustrate this point. Yesterday I asked the government for the production of all the correspondence had since the last letters were laid upon the table, and let me recall the answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance:

Mr. MONK. I desire to ask the government if they will table any correspondence had with the American government since the last batch of correspondence was laid upon the table. I understand there has been an exchange of letters, and that notably since what is known as the Champ Clark utterance, there has been some correspondence, letters addressed, I believe, to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), or it may be, to the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). I think that all this correspondence up to the present moment should be tabled.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) refers to some correspondence which the Minister of Finance has had in relation to the Champ Clark utterance?

Mr. MONK. I said that amongst other things it was said that there had been an exchange of letters in regard to that question between the Secretary of State of the United States and my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. DANIEL.

Mr. FIELDING. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

Mr. MONK. Has there been any correspondence?

Mr. FIELDING.

Note this sibylline answer:

If there is any correspondence in relation to this matter with the United States authorities, properly the subject of consideration by this House, it will always be brought down.

Well, does my hon. friend not think—because he knew it—that when he gave that answer, he might have told the House that there had been correspondence? 'If there is any correspondence.' But he adds another qualification. He assumes to himself and to his colleagues, the right of saying whether that correspondence should be brought down; he and his colleagues will be the sole judges as to what should be given of that correspondence, and what should not. 'If there is any.' I submit to you that that is not a tenable attitude. All correspondence of any nature whatever bearing upon this question, we, who are called upon to ratify this treaty, have a right to see. Now, let me add another word, and I speak in the judgment of the members of this House. This question has already passed through quite a range of discussion and deliberation. When my hon. friends returned from the United States, and when we had the first news of their negotiations issued, not only here but in the United States, the discussions and opinions freely given were as to the value of these schedules, what were the concessions made on each side, and nothing else. Then there came a second phase, and we were invited by the public press of both countries, and by those who spoke upon this subject, to give our opinion in regard to the broader question raised by this agreement, that is its effect on trade generally between the two countries, and more particularly on the transportation question. Then it entered upon another phase, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that to-day the discussion has assumed much larger proportions. We are treated in the newspapers of the neighbouring republic, and of our own to a consideration almost exclusively of the ultimate effect of this agreement upon our political relations. Open these newspapers and see what our public men have to say: the utterances which they make turn upon this point. Is this going to lead to annexation, yes or no? I do not insist on that point, but I say that is what it has come to. Look at the trend of discussion in the United States, open their newspapers, and in every part of that country, it is not the schedules, it is not the particular bearing of this treaty upon the interchange of the natural products of both countries, it is annexation, and nothing