

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that was the same hon. gentleman who made the same offensive remark to me in the committee.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I want the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to withdraw that and withdraw it instantly.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order, I want the hon. member to withdraw that observation.

Mr. SPROULE. What is there to withdraw?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is the point of order?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The point of order is that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says that I am the person—

Mr. FOSTER. No, no, he did not.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes you did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He denies it.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the reference of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) it should be withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but it was not. The statement I made was that I supposed that was the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. GALLIHER. You said that you believed it was.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say I believed; I said I supposed. It came so pat from the hon. gentleman that I supposed he had broken out before.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am not quite satisfied with the statement of the hon. gentleman, and I only desire to say to him that if I had made that observation in the committee the other day, I would have been prepared to have stood behind it. I want him to withdraw the statement absolutely.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a circumstance which would lead me to deal kindly with the hon. gentleman. The gentleman who did say that, I denominated as a coward because he would not stand up and show himself openly. This hon. gentleman states that he would have been bold enough to have done it and under these circumstances, if the hon. gentleman says he did not say that, I withdraw all my remarks.

Mr. LENNOX. I regret that I cannot please both sides of the House, but I think

we might conduct this business, which is certainly of very great importance, without trying to interrupt hon. members. I admit that I have not that fluency of speech and that command of argument that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have, but I am convinced that I have a good sound case to argue and I am convinced that in standing up for the interests not of the people of the United States, but for those of Canada and for those of British Columbia particularly, I am discharging my duty, and whether it is pleasing to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House or not I shall claim that privilege. Now, it has been said that nobody is interested in this Bill except the people of British Columbia. I submit that is not the position of this matter. British Columbia may be said, perhaps upon a narrow view of the case, to have been the only party interested in it, so long as it was the subject of a provincial charter, but it has since become a matter of greater magnitude than concerns merely British Columbia, because this company has come to the Dominion parliament and the Dominion parliament, not only recently, but long ago declared this to be a work in the general interest of Canada.

Perhaps on some occasions this parliament has been too quick to declare that works are for the general advantage of Canada, but as that declaration has been solemnly made by parliament in this case, we must assume it is true; and that being so, it is the duty of this parliament to see that all necessary investigations should be made—even if there is a temporary delay—into the conditions which would prevent the construction of this railway upon all Canadian territory. Is there a gentleman in this House so ignorant of the conditions that exist to the south of the international line—even the hon. gentleman who first interrupted me—who does not know that when we allow the deviation of our smelting trade from Canada to the United States, not only do we give to the United States the profit on the labour which should accrue to Canada, but we also afford an inducement to our young Canadians to go into the United States to seek that labour which they should have at home. Having regard to the fact that two prominent members of the administration are not in sympathy with this measure, it behooves us to consider it well. The Finance Minister pledged himself to the committee that this Bill should be carefully considered by the government and their policy announced on it; it is a significant and unfortunate fact that the Minister of Finance, who is supposed to be best versed in financial matters, is not here to-night to give the House the benefit of his judgment. I see signs which convince me that the pledge given by the Minister of Finance has not been satisfactorily redeemed; I have evidence that the government has given this matter only very casual consideration, be-