

session. I called the attention of the Minister of Railways last session to this matter, and he told me that he had not yet had time to consider it, but that he would do so during the recess. The recess has been six long months, and I am still at a loss whether or not the hon. Minister of Railways has given any consideration to the subject. It is a subject of vital importance to the Maritime provinces, and I hope that the session will not be long protracted before we have some expression of policy upon this question. We are perhaps more interested in having the matter settled at once, because we often hear rumours that are disquieting to the people of the Maritime provinces. Some few years ago the Canadian Northern Railway company wished to have running rights over the Intercolonial and even to acquire possession by long lease of that road. We hear the same rumours again and, when coupled with the long silence of the Government, they are disquieting.

This afternoon I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Finance express some opinions in regard to the policy of the Liberal party in the past, more particularly in regard to the great question of reciprocity with the United States. My hon. friend asked the Liberal party if we had not decided to let reciprocity alone. If by reciprocity with the United States my hon. friend meant the arrangement concluded by Mr. Fielding and President Taft, which still stands for the acceptance of the people of Canada, an arrangement which is not a treaty, which is for the exchange of the natural products of Canada for the natural products of the United States, I wish to say that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has no more devoted supporter, no more sincere admirer than the modest member for Gloucester, and, if the leader of the Opposition were to say that we do not want the arrangement any more, even if we can get it; then I would have to take issue with my right hon. friend. The experience of the last year has only served to make that arrangement dearer to the minds and hearts of the Canadian people, because they have been in a position to study it; and, comparing this year's experience with that of previous years, they have come to the conclusion that it is one of the best possible arrangements that could be offered to the people of Canada. It was not a treaty binding the people of Canada for a number of years, as the Minister of Finance and the Conservative party at large are always so anxious to urge claiming that we would not be able to command our tariff, and that we would become an adjunct of the United States. The fact that it was only an arrangement which could be upset by the

Parliament of Canada or the Congress of the United States, gives us perfect assurance that nothing of the kind could happen. Therefore my great admiration was for the ex-Minister of Finance when he came back from the United States with such an arrangement, for I had never anticipated that he could have obtained for Canada an open market for our natural products without affecting the tariff on manufactured goods; and what do I find? I find that the manufacturers are always insisting that we would not be able to command our tariff in future, if such an arrangement had been made.

The opening of the markets of the United States to our agricultural products would have greatly benefited our farmers, and this in turn would have benefited those engaged in our manufacturing industries. For everybody knows that agriculture is the foundation of our prosperity and that the more prosperous our farmers are the greater will be their purchases from the manufacturer. Increase the quantity of farm products by opening wider, quicker and more profitable markets and you will necessarily increase, by that very fact, the quantity of farm implements and tools that have to be used. Thus the iron manufacturers first and more particularly would have found their interests advanced by this reciprocity arrangement more than they could be advanced by any tariff that we can make.

But one of the speakers to-day asked: Why should we consider this extension of commercial relations with the United States when it involves danger to our loyalty to the British Empire. Personally, I consider myself as loyal as any British subject that ever lived. I have been represented at times in the Nationalist press as being more British than the King. Well I do not expect to be more British than the King, but I am as British as any King who ever sat upon the Throne. Let us hear no more of these charges about disloyalty to British institutions. British institutions mean before the world civil, religious and political liberty. And they mean also intelligence. I should consider myself less than a true British subject if I had not sufficient intelligence to be able to go to a foreign country to buy or sell without affecting my loyalty. And if there is a nation in the world that, more than any other has proven to the world that economic matters have nothing to do with loyalty it is the British people. These solid business men of the Motherland have shown by their extensive relations with the German, Oriental and American people, that a true British subject does not sell his loyalty with his goods. And I would not be a true British subject if I could not trust my children or my