

sisted upon putting in the words "regularly and habitually," which caused the Bill to directly apply to Windsor people, and made a law which no one could enforce against aliens who come to this country for a season and then go home, because they may only come once.

I never meant to make this direct attack upon people who live in Canada adjacent to the American border, and I tried to devise an exception for them, but found it could not be fairly done. I have since considered the advisability of excepting all Canadians who now live within two miles of the American line, and if I find such a provision will be legal and constitutional, I will make an amendment to my own Bill in Congress to that effect. You will remember that President Cleveland, in his veto, referred to no portion of my part of the Bill, except the words "regularly and habitually," and he very justly asked what they meant. In reintroducing my measure this time, I left out those words, and I shall fight all attempts of the Senate reinserting them. I have nothing against the people who live across our northern borders. I have no desire, for instance, to interfere with a man whose farm may lie partly in this country and partly out of it; but I do believe we should give our labourers as much protection as we give our producers.

Such was the provisions of the Corliss Bill. It must be borne in mind that this Bill was not passed by a moribund Congress, but by a Congress fresh from the people, and by an overwhelming majority; so that if there is any possibility of ascertaining the sentiments of the American people upon an Alien Labour Law, that Bill expresses those sentiments. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know that some members of the Government have been down to Washington for the purpose of interviewing members of Congress with regard to this matter, and of ascertaining the feeling of the Government and Congress upon it. It is true that they were preceded by a great forerunner from the wilderness of Canadian pine; but notwithstanding all this, they have come back with results not very encouraging to us. Now, Sir, without underrating the ability of the Government, I cannot think they were wise in choosing their deputation to Washington. They might expect to be confronted with some of their own statements made here at home derogatory to their own country. These statements were of a character to induce the American press and members of Congress to believe that Canada was getting nearer and nearer to the parting of the ways. The purpose of the Corliss Bill, without any doubt, are antagonistic to Canada. Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the present Bill, but not because I have any desire to create a cause of friction with or annoyance to our neighbours to the south of us, who themselves have been so unneighbourly. I will not support it either as a retaliatory measure, because I believe that this country cannot be coerced by the adverse legislation of any foreign state. But standing on our rights and the dignity of our position as one of the arbiters of this North American continent we should take this means of resenting legisla-

Mr. GANONG.

tion which is evidently directed against us. In so far as reciprocity is concerned, I am in favour of it; but when it comes to a reciprocity that involves that the American eagle shall perch on the North Pole, I decidedly object to it in this year of grace 1897.

Mr. INGRAM. As one of those who has supported this proposed legislation every year it has been submitted to this House, I wish to say a few words in regard to it. I think we should approach this question from a non-party standpoint. It seems to me that as two political parties we have ample to divide us and to discuss without discussing a question of this character, from a party standpoint. I do not, therefore, intend to approach it in that spirit, but I hope to straighten out a few of the assertions unjustly made for what I believe to be party purposes. The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has certainly introduced this Bill session after session. He has not been successful, it is true; but he has been charged by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan) with having voted against this Bill in 1892. I ask any hon. gentleman whether, taking into consideration the spirit in which this Bill was received in that year, when he found the Prime Minister of that time moving the six months' hoist, backed up by the then leader of the Opposition, as well as that prominent member, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is it to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman, finding so many opposed to the Bill, did not divide the House upon it? These are the facts. I therefore say it is unfair to accuse the hon. gentleman of having voted against his Bill. The hon. member for North Essex I remember at the time, was heartily opposed to the Bill, and he has given a very forced explanation of the reason why he changed his opinion. He says that circumstances have changed. Certainly they have changed sufficiently to justify the hon. gentleman in changing his opinion. But there is one thing I cannot understand, and it seems to be very inconsistent. The mover of the Bill we are discussing represents South Essex. In South Essex there are very few manufacturing industries, very little labour is employed, but North Essex, which is represented by the hon. member for Windsor, employs a large amount of labour, and it is chiefly Windsor and Walkerville that this Bill, if it becomes law, will benefit. How the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. McGregor) should ask, request or even suggest that the operation of this Bill should be postponed to a late period, I cannot understand. Instead of taking that step, we should do something of this kind. Section 12 says:

Sections eight to twelve of this Act, both inclusive, shall not have force or effect until a day to be named by the Governor General by his proclamation.