

IF WE ACCEPT THE TERMS WE MUST PAY THE PRICE.

It binds, but it binds the other way; it binds British Columbia to Oregon and to Washington and to California; it binds the provinces of the North West to the states immediately to the south of them; it binds Ontario and Quebec to the states south of us; and it binds the maritime provinces to the state of New England. And we are expected to believe that a policy of that kind is a broad national policy, one to promote a broad and strong nationality. What have been the main features of our transportation policy? We have spent scores of millions of dollars for what purpose? What has been in our mouths at all times, Liberals and Conservatives alike, on every platform? Send our goods through Canadian channels, from one province to another, and from the eastern provinces across the sea. What did Sir John A. Macdonald mean when he nailed his colours to the mast and said that the Canadian Pacific Railway must be built around the north shore of Lake Superior, and appealed to the people of Canada on that policy and got their support? My right hon. friend the leader of the present Government later came before this House and said: We shall build another line of railway from ocean to ocean, every foot of it on Canadian soil, and he appealed to the people of this country for their support, and they supported him in doing it. They said: Yes, we believe in that policy. Why should we turn from that policy now?

WHERE TRAFFIC GOES.

If it does not make any difference which way the traffic goes, why spend \$50,000 or \$60,000 or \$133,000 per mile to build a railway from Quebec through to Moncton and duplicate the Intercolonial, which we had before? Why do that, if it does not make any difference whether or not the traffic goes through on Canadian soil? For my part, I can see no reason. What is the reason for the right hon. gentleman's change of view? I could take the "Hansard" and read to you the strong words of the right hon. gentleman when he said, in this House, that of all things in connection with the policy of Canada as related to the United States, the one thing we must do was to be independent of the Americans. That is a policy, Sir, which I believe in. He never said a word in the whole course of my close association with him with which I agreed more fully than I did with that statement, but the difference is that I believed it then and I believe it now, and so long as I have the honour to have anything to say about the public affairs of Canada in the most humble capacity I shall continue to support what I believe to be the loyal policy that the people of Canada desire to have followed.

DRIVE OUR MILLERS OUT.

We know why the other policy is being supported. We know why the milling trust

of St. Paul and Minneapolis are in favour of this proposal; it is because they want to get the hard wheat of the Canadian North West without paying duty and drive our millers out of the export market. That is just as easy as adding two and two together. The North West miller of the United States gets \$2 or \$3 a ton more for his offal than the miller in Canada, and that makes the difference; the Canadian miller has no chance in the world in the competition which is brought about in this way. The North West miller of the United States would get the wheat free now if he could. The meat trust would get meat free if they could. We have often been told that they might take the duty off if they wanted to, but they cannot take the duty off, because they have a population of farmers who do not propose to permit these gentlemen to manipulate the duties to suit themselves.

IN POWER OF THE UNITED STATES.

We understand why the milling people would want this arrangement in regard to transportation, why the meat trust would want it and why the United States Steel Corporation want to get into our markets. We can understand why the Chamber of Commerce in New York, always in favour of reciprocity, should favour this arrangement, because in this last year they have been conducting an inquiry to ascertain why Montreal has been growing so rapidly and becoming a rival of theirs in connection with the export trade. We know why it is that the New England States, looking jealously upon the commercial development of our St. Lawrence route, should support this treaty to get the great trade which is building up Montreal and the St. Lawrence route down by their own channels. But can anybody in the world tell why a Canadian, devoted to the interests of Canada should support the arrangement which we have here?

What will be our future relations with the United States? I read the argument presented by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) upon that aspect of the case. I see no possible answer to it. It seems to be perfectly clear to me that every day in which we adapt ourselves to the markets of the United States, that every day in which we cater to those markets, that every day in which we adapt all our arrangements to catering to that market, strengthens the grip of the United States upon Canada.

SHOOK CLUB 30 YEARS.

And while everybody repudiates as absurd the idea of any conscious interference either with our political independence, or with our commercial independence, I do not believe that if this treaty goes into effect there will ever again, so long as it goes on,