

matter of this kind, it is the duty of the Canadian Government to retaliate in some way or other in order to obtain justice and fair-play for our workingmen. It may be that the smoother course would be better than retaliation, but we have in so many other instances found that, when that was tried, it was of no earthly use, that they paid no attention to it, that I have come to the conclusion that the only thing to do is to pay them back in their own coin. But, though I am individually of the opinion that this Bill is a good one and would have the effect that is wished for, still, when gentlemen of the experience of the hon. the First Minister (Mr. Laurier) and the hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Charles Tupper) state that it is far better to try other methods, I must bow to that superior knowledge and experience. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) stated that the Bill that was passed by Congress was not aimed alone at Canada, but at the whole world. That does not, to my mind, do away with the necessity that exists for Canada to look after herself. However, I sincerely hope that the Government will think it its duty to look into this matter most carefully, and, if possible, allow a committee to be formed to look into the question, and I sincerely trust the hon. member for South Leeds will not allow the matter to drop, as it is one of the very greatest importance to a large number of the citizens of Canada.

Mr. CLANCY. I fully recognize, Mr. Speaker, the difficulties attending a Bill of this kind. The proposition of the hon. the First Minister was, in a sense, reasonable; but I think that perhaps my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) also has a large measure of reason on his side. I am sure that the House will recognize fully the difficulties of retaliatory legislation. We must all recognize also that a measure of that kind is of the nature of a last resort, and I am sure that both sides of the House, on a question of this kind, can afford to lay aside all party squabbles and all consideration of party advantage. Now, the question the hon. gentleman is pressing is not one of a purely sentimental character, of real hardships that have been suffered under the operation of the very illiberal and very harsh and unfriendly law of the United States. I might refer to cases of hardship that have come under my own knowledge. Living close to the boundary line and not far from the city of Detroit, some cases of special hardship have come under my notice. I have known vessels to go there loaded with lumber, and not a single Canadian workman was allowed to take part in unloading the cargo. The moment the vessels reached the docks, American workmen take hold and discharge the cargo. I hope the First Minister will see to it that this Bill gets its second reading and that a committee is appointed to draft a Bill that may be brought before the House next session. This will in no sense interfere with the proposition

made by the First Minister and the leader of the Opposition. It will in no sense show an unfriendly feeling on the part of Canada to allow this Bill to take one stage and afterwards to be put into the form that will be given it by a committee. If the negotiations referred to by the First Minister should fail, nothing is lost; if they should not fail, but if the most desirable result should be brought about by friendly negotiation, so much the better. In the meantime I feel disposed to assist my hon. friend in pressing the Bill this session, in so far as having a committee appointed, and deal with it, with the understanding, at least, that it shall be subject to the approval of the House and that it shall take no stage that will in any sense interfere with the negotiations which have been undertaken by the Government.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am glad that the Bill has been introduced, and glad also to hear from the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition that the matter will be taken up. I live in a border city, and I am free to say, so far as negotiations between the labour on the Canadian side and labour on the American side, it is reciprocal. We send from our side six or seven hundred persons across to Detroit to work. They board and sleep on our side, and are Canadians. The Americans send about 150 to 200, who work in Canada. So far, as I have said, the trade has been reciprocal, and I hope and trust that, when the Prime Minister has had time to look into this matter carefully, negotiations may be brought about, with the result of putting on the statute-book a law that would be more satisfactory to both parties. Not only is there this reciprocity in the city I live in, but there are other cases. A mile and a half above is the town of Walkerville, which has the same advantages. A ferry boat leaves every ten minutes, and the traffic goes backward and forward, some of the people even taking their dinners on the opposite side from that on which they work. We have also a town of about 1,700 or 1,800, the town of Sandwich. People cross from there also, and are not molested in any way. Once in a while we have a difficulty because of some stranger coming in from a distance, but so far as our own people are concerned, we have reciprocity in trade relations between the two sides. But if the Americans should interfere with our people, as it is said they have done in other places, I will gladly favour the Bill, with some modifications made in it before it passes.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the First Minister if his intention is to have the Bill dropped entirely this session, or merely to ask for an adjournment for a few days.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the principles involved in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). I wish to say that I am, on general principles, heartily in favour of introducing legislation on the