

of New York are proclaiming to their government and to the world that Montreal has captured the export grain business from New York. They point out that 74 per cent of the shipments of the west are now going through Montreal. In 1903 New York exported 14,000,000 bushels of wheat, while Montreal exported 8,000,000. In 1908 New York exported 16,000,000 while Montreal exported 30,000,000. In 1910 New York figures showed 6,000,000 and those from Montreal 20,000,000. They claim that Montreal is bound in time to capture practically all of the export grain trade, not only from the Canadian west, but a large amount of grain from the northwestern states.

All students of economics, or even the man who knows absolutely nothing of economics, knows that business will naturally follow along the cheapest lines. If grain can be carried cheaper to Montreal than to New York it will naturally go by the former port. As a matter of fact, such is the case, and with the developments going on in connection with our canals, our terminal facilities, and the deepened St. Lawrence route, Montreal will continue to receive more and more of the export grain trade. The bogie which the protectionists' interest have raised is not even a real one. Canada is developing at such a rate that no treaty or combination of treaties could retard her development.

I, for one, should be very sorry to see any policy adopted by this parliament that would result injuriously to the manufacturing industries of this country. I recognize the part that the manufacturers and the capitalists of this country have taken in building up this great Canadian nationality. I recognize that by their enterprise and capital, they have made it possible for men to receive remunerative employment, and they have added enormously to the population in our industrial centres; but having regard to the record of the government and to the patriotism of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), it is idle folly to assume for a moment that anything will be done by this government or this Finance Minister that will jeopardize the manufacturing interests of Canada.

This question of loyalty is so beside the question under discussion, that one almost loses patience in discussing it, but it comes up so frequently and with such insistence, that it seems necessary for every one taking part in this debate, to put himself on record as respects his loyalty, ambitions and inspirations, as regards our connection with the mother country. The question of loyalty was not permitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, when in power, to in any way interfere with the carrying out of any question of public policy. It is well known that on one occasion, when Sir John Macdonald proposed a policy which was criticised as being likely to be injurious to British connection, he answered: 'So much the worse for British connection.' That sentiment has never been stated or

repeated by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House, or so far as I know, by any member of the Liberal party in Canada since 1896, when this government was called on to take office. But their loyalty is of such an ephemeral character that it is difficult to say what hon. gentlemen opposite, regard as loyalty to-day, and what they will call loyalty to-morrow. It was loyalty last year to proclaim that Germany was a nightmare disturbing the dreams of the people of Canada; that the people of Canada should put up money to help to build a navy in England, to assist in repelling a threatened German invasion. We hear nothing now about a German invasion or a German peril, that has passed away into the oblivion of forgotten things. A year ago an election was progressing in Great Britain, in which gentlemen, who were trying hard to get into office, were endeavouring to secure some support by conjuring up to the minds of the people of England, that the responsible ministers did not show a sufficiently anxious disposition to keep up the armaments of Great Britain. But that election passed away. The Liberal party were returned to power. Since then, but a few weeks ago, another election took place, and the same party has been returned again to power. We have had strident and hysterical demands for imperial preferential trade between Canada and the empire. It would be a very good thing, and I can assure you, that if Great Britain declared for imperial preferential trade within the empire, I should hold up both hands for it. But, is it not idle for the hon. member for North Toronto, to tell the people of the maritime provinces, 'you had better keep your fish, keep your lambs, keep your apples and keep everything else you have to sell until we obtain preferential trade with Great Britain, and then we will send our goods over there.' There is not much prospect of our getting imperial preferential trade within the empire while the dominant partner, the people of Great Britain, repudiate it, as they have on three several occasions within the last five years. It is loyalty to-day as far as hon. gentlemen opposite are concerned, to proclaim imperial preferential trade within the empire, but who knows what will be their policy next year? I am reminded of lines written by a poet whose name we all venerate and revere, referring to a distinctly similar situation which existed in England at a time when a party out of power was endeavouring to get back to power. He wrote:

Loyalty, sooth, we're on dangerous ground;
Who knows how the fashions may alter,
The doctrine to-day that is loyally, sound,
To-morrow may bring us the halter.

I have one more observation to make, and I am through. During the course of