

Mr. KYTE. There is no such reference as that in the speech I have read.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what it was; it was an alternative.

Mr. KYTE. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong), also spoke of the annexation sentiment that existed in the United States, and he referred to Senator Cummings as an annexationist. True, Senator Cummings is an annexationist, but like his friend, Speaker Cannon, he is opposed to the reciprocity arrangement, and therefore, it may be assumed that if there was any trend towards annexation in this reciprocity arrangement, Senator Cummings, annexationist as he is, instead of opposing it, would have been anxious to have facilitated its passage through the Senate. Let me remind hon. gentlemen opposite that Mr. Bennett, who moved the annexation resolution in Congress, is also opposed to the reciprocal arrangement, and Senator Fordray, of Michigan, speaking on the question a few days ago, in the American Senate said:

We have been buncoed by the Canadian representatives into a free trade treaty from which we receive no benefit. I do criticise our representatives for having surrendered body, soul and breeches to Canada.

Evidently, the people of the United States, like the people of Canada, are not unanimous as to the real meaning or consequences of this trade arrangement. We have in this House hon. gentlemen opposite censuring this government and its representatives, for yielding everything to the United States, and we have a member of the United States Senate censuring the representatives of that country, because they negotiated an arrangement, which gave everything to Canada. Amidst these conflicting opinions, it is difficult for one to come to a conclusion, as to how much sincerity or earnestness there exists in one party or the other, but, taking the extremists in the United States, who say Canada gets everything, and taking the extremists in Canada, who say the United States gets everything, and drawing an average between them, we may possibly come to the correct conclusion that this treaty is a fair treaty, and one that ought to receive the approval of the people of both countries. I do not know whether our hon. friends opposite are serious, when they say that the interchange of business promoted by reason of this agreement, will lead to annexation. I can scarcely believe that these hon. gentlemen one after another would reiterate so solemn a statement, unless they had some real conviction upon the matter. But, I would call attention to the fact that a reciprocity treaty existed between Canada and the United States from

1855 to 1866, and before that treaty actually terminated, the people of Canada, for the first time in 100 years, were called upon to show their loyalty to the mother land and their disposition towards the people of the United States. In 1866 there was a raid by United States subjects across the Canadian border. True, it did not amount to much, but whether the invasion was great or small the people of Canada did not hesitate to take up arms to repel the invaders from Canadian soil. Had that reciprocal arrangement between the two countries, had the effect which hon. gentlemen opposite say a reciprocal trade arrangement will now have, then the people of Canada might have betrayed their annexation sentiment and rested on their arms, while their country was overrun by invaders. Happily but few opportunities have been given to the people of Canada to defend their country, and I trust it may be many a long year before another opportunity will arise, but I venture to say, tracing the whole history of this country from its earliest beginning to the present there is to be found no time when the people of Canada expressed annexation sentiments, except it be on a historic occasion when certain men of the political stripe of gentlemen opposite, desired for the time being, to make political capital out of a great question in this country.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman does not include the Hon. Edward Blake, does he?

Mr. KYTE. I do not include the Hon. Edward Blake, but I do include the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott and other distinguished Tories.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why does the hon. gentleman exclude the Hon. Edward Blake, when he did the same thing as the Hon. Mr. Abbott?

Some hon. MEMBERS. He never did.

Mr. KYTE. Another statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that this reciprocal trade arrangement will have the effect of diverting all the grain carrying trade from Canadian ports to United States ports. I have before me a statement of the amount of foreign exports from Canada in 1910, and I find that from the port of Montreal there were shipped in that year, \$15,037,958 worth of United States goods. I find also, that at the present time, when no reciprocal trade arrangement is in effect, 27 per cent of the foreign exports of Canada, (other than to the United States), was shipped from United States ports during the same year, 1910.

When I point out that millions of dollars worth of American goods for export are shipped from the ports of Montreal and St. John and that millions of dollars worth