

matter by the United States government until comparatively recently, whereas the Canadian ruling was made months ago.

There is no question about it that, in the building of international bridges and tunnels within the last few years, the American government has allowed Canadian material only to go as far as the waters edge, and then an inventory was taken of every article that passed that point, and every article had to be accounted for or duty paid upon it into the United States treasury. Now, it seems to me that we have been taken advantage of long enough. While I have every regard for our American friends and admire them in many ways—one of the reasons for my admiration of them individually being that they look after their own interests—yet I say it is high time that the Canadian government should look after the interests of Canadians, the interest of our own labour and manufacturers rather than consider the interests of the Americans. So far as the construction of this tunnel is concerned, practically none of the advantages as in construction go to Canadians at all. It is simply an advantage to themselves to get a short cut through the western peninsula of the province of Ontario. I have on previous occasions called the attention of the House to the advantage which that large corporation has been taking of the leading interests of this country. It seems to be their constant aim, from an American standpoint, to get every advantage they can for themselves and to avoid giving any advantage which ought to accrue to this Dominion and to Canadian interests. I have quoted letters and correspondence enough to impress this on the attention of the minister and I trust he will consider it sufficiently serious to make a searching investigation. These contractors, Messrs. Butler Brothers and Hoff, are simply individual contractors; it is not a question of international courtesy at all, it is simply a courtesy which has been farmed out to these gentlemen, and if anything can be done to deprive them of the advantage they now enjoy over Canadians, so that our manufacturing concerns and our labour may be protected, it is the minister's duty to do his utmost, without losing a moment.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BERGERON. With the permission of my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) who, I understand, has the floor, I wish to rise to a question of privilege. I noticed in this morning's 'Citizen' a report of something I said yesterday which is not correct. I would not have drawn the attention of the House to it had I not found that the same report has appeared

in some other papers, and as it might convey a wrong impression I desire to make the correction. Yesterday, speaking with regard to a certain pamphlet, I said that it purported to be written by one of the Jesuit fathers in New York, and the papers make me say that it was written by one of the Jesuit fathers. I want to state to the House that what I said was that it purports to be written by a priest, not that it was, because, as a matter of fact, it was not written by a Jesuit father or any other priest.

THE DEPARTMENT OF CUSTOMS.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this opportunity of making a few observations in connection with the Customs Department. Some ten days or two weeks ago, before the Customs estimates came up, I requested the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to allow one item to stand over in order that I might take part in the discussion of his estimates. The hon. gentleman could not see his way to permitting me that courtesy, and all the items in connection with his estimates were put through in two sittings of the House. It is, therefore, necessary for me to take this, the earliest opportunity I have had, to draw the attention of you, Sir, and the House to some matters in connection with the Customs Department. I regret that it is necessary to do it under this order, because I would have preferred that the matter should have been debated pro and con while we were in Committee of Supply so that questions might have been answered and replies might have been made to whatever observations were offered with respect to these matters. That opportunity was not accorded me, and so I must make the best of the present opportunity. In regard to the hon. Minister of Customs criticising my absence from the House, as he did on two or three occasions, all I have to say is that I do not think it was necessary. We have always been the best of friends and I hope that after this discussion we will be the same as we have always been. The hon. gentleman was himself going away when I met him in the corridor and made this request of him. I wrote him a line saying that it was my intention on the very day he went away to proceed with the discussion of matters in connection with the Department of Customs. But that did not make any difference; he went away to fill his engagement in the city of Brantford. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman going, but I do not think he should take to himself privileges as a minister that he would not accord to me as a member of the House. I had as good a right to go to South or North Brant to take part in the local election as he had himself, and I do not think his criticism of my action in that respect was justified. Further, I am not so

Mr. CLEMENTS.