

friend will be anxious to have these people counted in when it comes to deciding what proportion of representation the west shall have. I did not expect to hear this from a western member. It might have sounded better from some of the representatives of eastern Canada, who are not so well aware of what is going on in the west. Notwithstanding my respect for the hon. gentleman's opinion, I still believe that the western land is being largely filled by people of the Anglo-Saxon race, by people from the motherland, who will carry out the ideal we have for the west, and will in time become a great source of strength to the empire, perhaps one of the greatest defences it could have.

The hon. member who preceded me (Mr. A. Broder), in his very excellent though brief speech, called attention to the curious fact that out of 50,000,000 bushels of wheat going out of Baltimore and grown in the United States, only 10,000 were shipped under the American flag, and that out of 1,200 ships leaving New York every year laden with American commerce for all parts of the world, only seven carried the American flag. He continued:

No wonder that one of the American senators said: Just think of it, ten cruisers, eight Dreadnoughts, and nineteen battleships, guarding eight merchant ships in the Pacific.

I agree that it is curious to see that, and it is a wonder that something has not been said, not about the commerce, but about the lack of commerce of the United States. It might have occurred to my hon. friend to give some reasons why the commerce of the United States, a people naturally given to commerce and whose flag at one time almost, if not quite, rivalled the flag of the old country upon the seas, is non-existent so far as sea-going commerce is concerned. He might have told us that the great navy that the United States is building up is perhaps a good sign of better times, and that the commerce of the United States, having been driven off the seas under a mad and unwise fiscal policy, there are now indications in the United States that that policy will, in the not far distant future, be to some extent reversed, and possibly then the commerce of the United States will be seen on the seas and there will be some use for the United States navy in guarding it.

During the early part of this discussion the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) spoke and his address, as all his addresses are, was exceedingly eloquent. At the same time it contained some things that seemed strange. I would say that the state of mind in which my hon. friend must have been in from the time that the resolution was introduced by the Prime Minister until he made the speech, would

Mr. WARBURTON.

be a subject of most interesting investigation on the part of a student of psychology. The hon. gentleman referred—and I suppose he referred to it in order to render more pronounced his expression of loyalty—to a report that had been made of a little incident that took place, in this Chamber when, upon the conclusion of the speech of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), and when you, Mr. Speaker, had put on your hat and declared it six o'clock, there was what to my mind appeared to be a pre-arranged spontaneous outburst of loyal songs. This incident has been reported as occurring at the close of the speech of the right hon. the leader of the House, and my hon. friend asked the Prime Minister what he was going to do about it. The reply of the Prime Minister was: What have I to do with that? My hon. friend after referring to this incident, went on to say:

But, we do claim from the right hon. gentleman and his party, as this matter was given such extraordinary prominence in the papers throughout the country, he should have used his undoubted influence to have got, in an equally prominent position, a correction of the report and a true statement of what took place in this House. When I put that question to the Prime Minister this afternoon what was his answer. His answer was! What have I got to do with it? Well, let me show that the right hon. gentleman had far more to do with that question than he had with another question on which he expended a great deal of power and energy last session. Everybody remembers the occasion last session when British Columbia affairs came up, that there was introduced a garbled telegram, and the Prime Minister waxed indignant upon the immorality of publishing a telegram of that character, though it had not half as much to do with the right hon. gentleman as this particular episode has to do with him at the present time.

I would not have gone into this subject, and I do not see much use in my hon. friend bringing it in, because it recalls perhaps a somewhat unsavoury episode. What surprises me is that the hon. gentleman should speak of it as a garbled telegram; it was not a garbled telegram, it was a forgery, it was a crime. To call it 'garbled' is taking a very extraordinary view of a very base crime. I would like to ask my hon. friend, who seems to think that the Prime Minister of Canada has nothing to do but to go round and correct newspaper reports, whether, when he knew of that crime, and knew that a minister of the Crown had been robbed of his seat by means of that crime, he ever took any means to have the criminal punished. Why did he not say: The Conservative party will not be in receipt of a seat in that way, and insist on having the Minister of Inland Revenue given the seat of