

I propose to amend this section by putting in the following words :

That all freight originating on the line of the said railway or its branches, not specifically 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 want this to apply for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturer or the Canadian shipper. Suppose a Canadian shipper has a carload of cattle, or a carload of hogs or a carload of butter or cheese, that he wishes to send to Montreal, this clause makes no provision for his case. Suppose a miller in Manitoba has sold a carload of flour in Prince Edward Island. That is not export trade, and there is no provision that this road shall serve him as cheaply as the road that runs partly over American territory. There is nothing to prevent the Manitoba miller from shipping over the Canadian Northern and Northern Pacific to Boston, and so to Prince Edward Island, and he may get a much cheaper rate than on this proposed route under this agreement. I wish to make provision so that the Canadian shipper, whether in the east or in the west, shall be able to ship over this line at as cheap a rate as over a partly American route. There is not a member of the government, there is not an hon. member supporting the government, particularly among those who come from the west or from the manufacturing towns in eastern Canada, but will see the necessity of the condition I here propose.

Before I formally place this resolution in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a matter that was up for discussion yesterday. The right hon. Prime Minister, just before the House rose, took occasion to refer to a debate which took place in the afternoon in which I criticised some remarks of his with reference to the route proposed by the hon. leader of the opposition. Here is the statement the right hon. gentleman made :

"I come now to the main proposition of my hon. friend. He proposes to acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway as it exists to-day. But though the government may acquire the Canada Atlantic Railway, it certainly could not operate it.

And he goes on to explain why :

How could you expect that a Canadian government could possibly, with any advantage to the country, operate the Canada Atlantic Railway. It is within the knowledge of everybody that at this moment three-fourths at least of the business of the Canadian Pacific Railway

Mr. TAYLOR.

and three-fourths the business of the Canada Atlantic Railway is American business. It is business connected with the western states and carried to its destination in the eastern states. The Canadian government could not compete for that business if we were to acquire that railway.

He does not explain why. Why would not the government be in a position, if the scheme of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition was carried out, and this road operated by a commission entirely apart from politics, to operate that railway the same as any company would operate a railway? But the right hon. gentleman goes on :

At present the manager of the Canada Atlantic Railway has connections and agents in Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago and other points in the west, and in New York, Boston and other cities in the east, collecting freight in the east for the western states and in the west for the eastern states. Now, would it be possible for the Canadian government to maintain those agents in American cities and keep connections there in order to collect that trade now passing over our territory?

Why not? Has not this government a horde of immigration agents in the United States trying to collect immigrants in that country, and does it not pay these agents large sums of money? Wherein would it be inconsistent in this government, operating this railway through a commission, to have its freight agents in every city of the United States bidding and competing for the trade of that country? But the right hon. gentleman went further, and I presume he has had a number of telegrams from the marine interest of this Dominion this morning telling him that the statements he made yesterday in the House were not in accordance with the facts. Remember this, that I am about to quote the statement of the right hon. Prime Minister to the people of this country :

There is something more. The fleet maintained on the lakes for the purpose of supplying traffic to the Canada Atlantic Railway is composed in part of American bottoms. It would be impossible to have the trade we have to-day unless it was carried in American bottoms. We can carry Canadian freight in Canadian bottoms, but you cannot take freight at Duluth, Chicago or Milwaukee or any of the western ports and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms.

There is the statement of the Prime Minister that we cannot take freight in Chicago, Duluth or Milwaukee and bring it to Depot Harbour except in American bottoms.

The PRIME MINISTER. If destined to American harbours, certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is where the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is wrong again. It is being done every day. Since this discussion took place I have had a conversation with a prominent officer of the Canada Atlantic Railway, and