

Court on the question whether waterpower falls under the jurisdiction of Federal or provincial authorities—that those governments, separately or together, should utilize some of our magnificent waterpowers for the purpose of supplying farmers with artificial fertilizer. It seems to me that that is the one and only thing which will keep the farmers' sons on the land. When they are able to cultivate intensively 100, 200, or 300 acres of land, they will remain on the land, and they will find employment, which is not now available, right on the ancestral farm. With the aid of fertilizer they will be able to cultivate with success the entire ancestral holdings.

We know that in France and many other countries of Europe farmers who have only ten or fifteen acres of land are able to make not only a decent living but to set money aside, simply because they carry on this intensive cultivation for which I am agitating, but which cannot be conducted without fertilizer.

We have given protection to all sorts of industries, but we have completely neglected the basic industry of this country, agriculture. If there was justification for imposing duties and granting bounties to other industrial enterprises, surely agriculture is of the first importance, and has the best right of all to protection. Here is a plan by which protection can be given to the farmer, and by which the farmers' sons may be permanently kept in this country.

Consider what that means for Canada and the world. Canada to-day is recognized as the granary of the world. If we could cultivate the whole of the farming lands of Canada, and make them produce to their capacity, we would be adopting the best method of making Canada greater and more prosperous, and it seems to me that the expenditure involved would be amply justified. I had a good deal to do some years ago with the beginning of the development, which is now about completed, of the water power on the Saguenay river at the outlet of lake St. John. The undertaking was prompted by Mr. Duke, of New York, whose money went almost exclusively into it. His plan at first was to establish a fleet of 60 steamers of 10,000 tons capacity, to take the phosphates from the rivers in Georgia and the Carolinas, and bring them up to Chicoutimi, for the purpose of turning them into fertilizer. The proposition involved this large carrying capacity. Other capitalists found it to their advantage to take up this power and use it for other purposes, else there would have been an excellent opportunity for putting

my suggestion into practice. But there are many water powers yet undeveloped, that could furnish millions of horse power, and I suggest that they be utilized for the object which we all desire, the increase of our population.

May I say a few words on the subject which engaged the attention of my right honourable friend (Right Hon. Sir George Foster) for the most of his speech, to which I listened with great interest and profit. I refer to the appointment of representatives of Canada to foreign countries. I cannot see how the carrying out of this policy is in any way inconsistent with our relations with the empire and the Government of Great Britain. Nothing in our constitution is opposed to such action being taken. Representatives or plenipotentiaries could have been appointed as early as the 1st of July, 1867. We are not to-day exercising, or attempting to exercise, any power or authority which could not have been exercised at any time since the Confederation Act was adopted.

However, I did not understand my right honourable friend to dispute the right or authority of Canada to do this, but he did not seem to think it wise or prudent to appoint those representatives. Well, that is an opinion which of course must be respected; however, it is one which I cannot adopt. The reasons upon which the right honourable gentleman relies, at least some of them, were not quite clear to me, or perhaps I should say not convincing. He seems to think that the diplomatic function has very greatly changed in our day from what it was in centuries past, or perhaps up to within a half-century of the present. I cannot see in what way it has changed. It is true that in the Middle Ages, and for some centuries after, the function of the diplomat was mainly concerned with war and peace. In those days with all diplomats the main or perhaps exclusive function was to try to secure the friendship of the neighbouring nations or sovereigns, but that was because of the conditions of the world at that time. Conditions have changed in many respects, and it is necessary to add to the functions that were performed in the Middle Ages; yet in the present age we still have to consider war and peace. In fact, peace is the thought with which my right honourable friend lives every day; it is peace which fills up the most of his life to-day. There is no change in that; there is as much reason to-day as there was four or five centuries ago to have diplomatic relations with regard to peace. What has changed, and what my right honourable friend seems to forget, is