

The full charge of the case was given to the Canadian authorities. Part of the communication of the imperial authorities is now down and they stated in the communication that it might be impossible to agree upon the question, but that there might be such a threshing out of the question as would lead to a settlement at some future time. What fault was to be found with the imperial government in reference to the matter? The whole case was under the jurisdiction and control of the government of this country; yet they seem to find fault with the imperial government and make the result of this case a reason for demanding further treaty making powers. When the right hon. leader of the government was discussing the question of treaty making powers what was it that he wanted?—the initiation of commercial arrangements with foreign countries. Every one of us knows that we have the power already. It is not that we have the power *per se*, but it is given to us at any time that the request for it is made. When an agent is asked for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with the Americans the request is granted at once. When an agent is requested for the purpose of negotiating a treaty with Spain authority is immediately given to the people of this country. When power is asked to negotiate a treaty with France an agent is appointed by the imperial government and we have all the power necessary for negotiation of such a treaty. That being so what is it that the right hon. gentleman wants? There is nothing further that he possibly could require. We could not receive the power which he has asked because it would mean the separation of this country from Great Britain. We could not without separation have the full power of making treaties, of alienating territory if necessary and of doing what we pleased in making an arrangement with a foreign country.

I must say that the Bill presented to us at the present time for consideration is one of the most meagre I ever saw presented to parliament. The only question to be considered is that of authorizing some amendments to be made to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway agreement and to consider a Militia Bill to be introduced containing—

Several important amendments to the present law rendered necessary by the growth of the force and calculated to promote its efficiency.

I see that the right hon. gentleman and the government have put into the mouth of His Excellency the Governor General a statement in regard to a subject that I thought we had thoroughly threshed out in the debate of last session. This statement is that:

Long before the transcontinental railway, authorized by parliament at its last session, can possibly be completed its urgent necessity as a medium for carrying the products of the west to our own Atlantic ports will have

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

become apparent independently of the many benefits that will follow from the opening up of colonization and for various enterprises of the northern parts of Quebec and Ontario.

Does the right hon. gentleman still stick to the idea that the bulk, or any portion of the products of the Northwest Territories, will be carried by this railway from that country to the sea coast? Has he read the speeches on transportation made by several gentlemen lately? Has he read one in particular by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company delivered before the Canadian Club in Toronto? Has he read Sir William Van Horne's remarks upon the same subject? Does he know at what rate grain was carried during last season from Port Arthur and Duluth to Montreal? During the whole season contracts were made for carrying grain from Duluth and Port Arthur to Montreal for 3½ cents per bushel, and in some cases they carried it for 2½ cents per bushel. Does the right hon. gentleman pretend that any railway that is constructed from Winnipeg to Quebec will be able to carry grain in competition with that route? The fact of the matter is that the railways which have been built for the purpose of carrying that grain a portion of the way complementary to the water route from Port Arthur down to Montreal will find out that next season they will have very little to carry. The managers of these roads are becoming frightened about it. They cannot carry it profitably for three and a half cents or two and a half cents a bushel. The right hon. gentleman proposes some amendment to his scheme. The contract, as my hon. friend says, was too favourable. The right hon. gentleman found fault with my honoured leader because, in addressing the House he said that he was not going into the details of the scheme and that afterwards he did discuss the details of the scheme. My hon. friend did not discuss the details of the scheme at all. He asked why it was, that, after making an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and after the right hon. gentleman's statement to the people of this country that a million pounds of the stock of the company had been deposited for the purpose of carrying out that arrangement, we should be asked to alter the terms of that contract and make them more favourable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. That was the whole of the argument of my hon. friend because he said that he would wait until the whole of the scheme had been brought down as the right hon. leader of the government has given notice of a motion upon which the discussion of the whole question can take place. I stated in my remarks last year that the road from Quebec to Moncton would never be built. I see a plan proposed under this Bill which may enable the government to abandon not only that section of the road but the section north of Lake Superior. Why is it that the right