

As a matter of fact one of the reasons given for the refusal of the United States to recognize Canadian certificates is that in Canada there are various certificates, and the American authorities could not undertake to examine into the different associations which issue them. The natural answer was: If you will recognize Canadian national certificates, we will make our certificates national. That is one of the reasons why this movement has attained such force.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman communicated with the United States government regarding this matter of certificates and regarding also the admission of Canadian thoroughbreds free of duty?

Mr. FISHER. The first point is with regard to the recognition of our certificates to entitle an animal to exhibition as a thoroughbred. I think that that would follow the recognition of our certificates by the customs authorities. I may say however that the United States exhibition authorities have recognized our certificates. At the St. Louis exhibition last year, animals that were registered in the herd books were accepted as thoroughbreds and allowed to compete. We could not however get free entry of those animals for sale. That is a question of customs over which the exhibition authorities have no control. They referred the matter to the customs authorities, and these authorities applied their ordinary rule which does not recognize Canadian certificates of registration. The consequence was that any animal exhibited at St. Louis had to pay the customs duty before it could be sold.

Mr. INGRAM. Am I to understand that the hon. minister made no representations to the authorities at Washington at all?

Mr. FISHER. We made representations to the exhibition authorities and they told us that we would have to deal with the custom authorities, but we had been already dealing with the customs authorities many years and knew exactly what they would say. They always told us they could make no change in their rules so that there was no object in appealing to them again.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

PROVINCIAL AUTONOMY IN THE NORTHWEST.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the second reading of Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta, and the amendment of Mr. R. L. Borden thereto.

Mr. T. MARTIN (North Wellington). As a new member, I feel that I should apologize for taking up the time of the House after the lengthy discussion we have had on this

Mr. FISHER.

Bill. The question however is so important, more especially as the Bill before us is not only one of the very first measures that has to be considered by myself as well as other new members, but extends our confederation by the admission of new provinces, great in area and rich in future possibilities, that I think I may fairly claim the indulgence of the House while I take up its attention for a short time. I listened last night with pleasure to the speech from another young member of the House (Mr. Lalor), and while I congratulate him on the excellent address he made as his maiden effort, I was very much astonished at some of his remarks. Indeed I thought that he skated around the question very carefully; and I noticed in the past few days an inclination among members opposite to sail all around the subject and not face it as it should be faced. I would refer, in the first place, to the speech of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) in which he challenged the government to open up a constituency in the west and appeal to the people to elect its Minister of the Interior. You will notice in that speech that he almost tells us that if the government had courage enough to place this matter before the country he would have very little objection to the Bill afterwards; that is, if any member from the west was appointed Minister of the Interior and was elected by his constituents. I am sorry he is not in his place to-day, and I am sorry to say that that good looking young man has not been in his place since the 25th day of this month. He seems to have already commenced to think that it is time to go back on what he has said.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the hon. member for Calgary had not been in his place?

Mr. T. MARTIN. I only said that I had not seen him and I have not seen him here in the House. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has made several speeches, one particularly, challenging the government to appoint a Minister of the Interior and to go to the country, to open any constituency in the west and elect a minister there. We find that since the 25th of this month that courageous gentleman's chair has also been vacant. I call attention to the fact that even the shepherd of the flock, the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has made some statements in this House that I think are worth calling the attention of the House to. He said:

I wish to make a proposition to the Minister of Justice which I shall ask the Minister of Finance to convey to him as he is not in his place. I suggest to the Minister of Justice that if the statements of the Minister of Finance and the ex-Minister of the Interior are true, he should let the lawyers on both sides of the House get together and frame an amendment in accordance with the statements of these two gentlemen, an amendment which shall contain