

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. I answer—and if the hon. gentleman did not know it, it is a marvelous thing that one in his position did not know it, and I must be permitted to doubt whether he did not know it,—that this arrangement does not in any way touch the rights which we have in any countries in the world. I repeat that every country makes its own tariff arrangements, that the United States has no power to determine on what terms and conditions Canadian products will enter Austria-Hungary. Every nation makes its own tariff.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Except Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. Canada makes its own tariff. I would have thought that after our little interview of yesterday, never again would we have heard that very foolish statement. I have a better opinion of hon. gentlemen than to suppose they do not know the principles of favoured-nation treatment. Favoured nation, simply means that in every one of these countries, we have a guarantee that no other country will ever be allowed to get any advantage over us. That is what favoured-nation treatment means, and I rather suspect that the hon. gentleman knows it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course I do.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg pardon, I only spoke once, and I was called to order, when I was entirely within my rights, and here is an hon. gentleman making four speeches.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I yielded on every occasion in order that the Minister of Finance might ask a question.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know that you have an absolute right to ask a question, and demand three or four answers to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have allowed a great many questions to be put, because I have felt it was the sense of the House that they should be put. Of course the minister having been called on more than once, cannot be called on to make a speech on each occasion, and therefore, it is irregular to put these questions, because they cannot be put without there being a right to answer them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not calling in question the right of a minister to answer my question, that would be an utter lack of courtesy. I asked the minister a question, and I yielded the floor in order he might have an opportunity to answer. I could not compel him to answer, but I yielded the floor to him to answer if he saw fit.

Mr. PATERSON. No, because you spoke three or four times.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have never understood that a gentleman who sits down in this House in order that some one else may answer a question thereby yields his right to the floor. The Minister of Customs does not seem to know any more about the rules of the House, than he does about this reciprocity treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. I take the point of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I knew perfectly well what the answer of the Minister of Finance ought to be, but I sought to let him give a plain statement to the House of what the facts were, and with a good deal of skill he has in some sort of half-hearted way, endeavoured to make a plausible answer, and at the same time to avoid giving a direct answer.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you understand it now?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. PATERSON. I raise the point of order.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the point of order?

Mr. PATERSON. The point is that the hon. gentleman has spoken half a dozen times and he has not the right to do that. I was called to order when I was speaking perfectly within my rights, I had not spoken before or anything, and the hon. gentleman has taken the floor four or five times, occupying all the afternoon, after having all his questions answered.

Mr. SPEAKER. I consider that the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), is within his right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think I am entirely right in the conjecture which I ventured a moment ago, that the hon. Minister of Customs knows just about as much about the rules of the House as he does about the reciprocity arrangement. That has been made absolutely manifest by the result of the point of order which he raised just now. I understood perfectly what the situation was, but we desired to have the understanding of the government upon the same point. The question was really not open to argument. We in Canada, under these reciprocity proposals, will be obliged to open our markets to all the countries that have been named upon the same terms as are contained in these proposals with reference to importations from the United States of America. There is no doubt at all about that, but on the other hand, when our products go from Canada to these countries, they do not go on the same terms as those on which products of Canada enter the United States. In other words, to sum it all up, by these reciprocity proposals,