

of putting the notice on the paper. Since then, at the instance of the opposition in the House of Commons, the inquiry in that branch of parliament has been enlarged to a certain extent. Whether it will go far enough can only be ascertained after they have proceeded with their investigation. The hon. senator from Halifax put the matter very clearly and fairly—there are a number of documents now being laid before the House of Commons committee which it would be necessary for us to place upon our records in case we go on with the investigation, and if at the time mentioned in my motion, a week from next Monday, we come to the conclusion that the Commons committee is not making a thorough and exhaustive investigation into this whole question, my hon. friend will find that I shall be quite prepared to move for the appointment of the committee and go on with the investigation as vigorously as possible. I had no idea that the general question of the rights of the Senate was to be discussed on this motion, and I shall refrain from citing precedents until I move for the appointment of the committee. Then, if it should be necessary, we can have a thorough discussion on the subject. I have given this explanation in order that the Senate may distinctly understand that the postponement of the motion is not indicative of a desire on my part to drop this question or to place the Senate in a false position before the country. The Senate has a duty to perform in relation to this as to other matters. There is another important matter before the country now, and it is a grave question whether a committee of the Senate should not be appointed to ascertain whether the course pursued by the government in reference to that matter is a justifiable one.

The motion was agreed to.

#### INTERNATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AT THE ALASKA BOUNDARY.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON rose to—

Ask the government if it is the intention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to go to Washington to facilitate international arrangements that may be mutually beneficial to the citizens of both countries in crossing their respective national boundaries to the mining regions of Alaska and the Canadian Yukon?

He said: This motion has been standing upon the paper for some time, and if I had not been slightly indisposed before the

Senate adjourned, I should have asked the question some time ago before the recess. However, I do not know that the time was more opportune then than it is now, in consequence of the recent action of the United States Senate with regard to the very subject that I desire to deal with in reference to this matter. The time is opportune to ask this question, and for the government to consider the advisability of ascertaining upon what grounds the common interests which exist in the north-western part of this country, on both sides of the international boundary, can be best promoted. I do not know that it is necessary for us to look upon our neighbours as natural enemies. They are rivals in trade and commerce, and they compete with us in various ways, but beyond that I do not know that we should regard them other than friends. But what I wish to point out is this: Our neighbours, in their legislation, take advantage of the leniency of our laws in order that, by their legislation, they may direct the trade and commerce of this country to their advantage in a manner quite different from that in which our legislation designed to place it. Take for instance first of all the question of our lumber trade. We have two classes of limit holders in this country, the limit holders of the United States who take the logs across free into the United States territory and manufacture them there and distribute the products in their own country. We have on the other hand the limit holders of Canada who manufacture the logs into lumber in Canada and distribute it in Canada and the markets of the world. The logs that are cut by the United States limit holders in the Canadian woods go to the United States free, while the United States government impose a duty of \$2 per thousand on boards manufactured in this country. The consequence is that the United States limit holders are benefited by a discrimination of \$2 per thousand, while the Canadian limit holder is placed at that disadvantage as far as the United States market is concerned. The tendency of that legislation is to give a monopoly of Canadian timber limits to American holders, and gradually drive the Canadian lumberman out of his own country. That is one instance in which the United States legislation has been turned to the detriment of Canadian interests in consequence of the concessions that we give to our neighbours. The only