

thing starts to slide down the hill if we move in the direction of commercial union. I have spoken from the constitutional and national point of view and later on I purpose telling how this arrangement affects my own riding, my own city and my own province, and how it destroys the industry of the market gardeners around the city of Toronto, who are constituents of mine; an industry laboriously built up by these industrious people. Already the land they cultivate has fallen in value, for fear of this arrangement. The same thing happens with regard to the fruit growers in the Niagara district. Even to-day the future of Toronto is changed by this proposal, and Canadian manufacturers, with annexation in view, are not going to increase their capital and their industries. But the greatest danger of all is to our transportation industry. The transportation of Canada moves east and west and capital moves east and west, and the great source of our capital to-day, is in the mother land, and if we have the policy and commercial institutions of the United States, we soon will see the last of British capital coming to Canada.

Mr. AMES. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), is now discussing the merits of the proposal.

Mr. FIELDING. He has been doing that for a considerable time past.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). And I have a perfect right to do it, and the great mistake has been that the Bill has not been discussed on the proposal to go into supply. I was quite willing that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames), should go on to-day, and I told him so, but inasmuch as the question came up in this way, I exercise my right to speak on the motion. Again I warn the government that this is an unpatriotic proposal, that it should not go through, that it has a tendency in the direction of annexation, and that no action should be taken until the people of Canada have had an opportunity to pass on this great organic change in our system, which this proposal brings about.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I desire to offer my sympathies to my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who, according to the programme was scheduled to speak this afternoon and who finds that three gentlemen on his own side have cut in to deprive him of the opportunity which belongs to him.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has stated that I 'cut in' for the purpose of depriving my hon. friend (Mr. Ames), of his right to speak.

An hon. MEMBER. He said 'butt' in.

Mr. MONK. Whether it is 'cut in' or 'butt in' I do not think the expression should be used.

Mr. FIELDING. I would not charge my hon. friend with 'butting in', because it is rather a clumsy way, but I did say that he cut in, which is a more gentlemanly method.

Mr. MONK. I object to the insinuation of my hon. friend that I had a motive.

Mr. FIELDING. I have not ascribed any motive to the hon. gentleman, I merely mentioned the result, namely, that he has kept the hon. gentleman from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), from delivering his address, until at last in sheer desperation, the hon. member (Mr. Ames), had to protest against the hon. member from York (Mr. Maclean), discussing the merits of the question.

Mr. MONK. I have raised my point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not see that any point lies there, unless the hon. gentleman may further explain it.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no point except in what I have stated. We are not favoured in this House with the continuous presence of my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. gentleman is now making an unfair statement. I have been sick quite a number of days, and I have had a lot of sickness in my family, and I would be here long before this, if it were possible.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I withdraw what I have said on that point. I would not charge my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) with improper motives, but he is a busy man, and we know that every once in a while, when he turns up here, we may look out for squalls. It does appear to me that to-day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean), finding it convenient to be here, and perhaps being obliged to go away soon, thought it would be a nice thing to cut in on a side issue and thus get in his speech, which he would not have got in for several days, had he waited the usual routine. I do not think I am doing any injustice to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), when I say that that seems to be the purpose of his address this afternoon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) seems to be labouring under the delusion that this agreement does not require the approval of the parliament of Canada. He has talked again and again and again of this parliament having no voice in the matter. Well, this agreement is submitted to this parliament and every member of this parliament is as free to vote for or against this agree-