

fidence on the part of the public and there was a great deal better feeling toward the National roads as a result.

The cheerful view which the Prime Minister took of the situation at that time led one to analyze somewhat the statements contained in the few sentences I have read, and they seem to constitute an appropriation of clothes stolen from the political party to which we on this side of the House have the honour to belong. They indicate also a number of hallucinations which seem very seriously to affect the mind of the Prime Minister as to what had been accomplished. Inasmuch as many of those subjects have to do with the Speech from the Throne, we might analyse a little more closely some observations made by the Prime Minister, which have been re-echoed in the Speech of yesterday:

Treaties have been arranged with France and Australia for the betterment of trade conditions between the Dominion and those countries.

One would fancy that this Government had initiated all the negotiations which have taken place between this country and France. The French Treaty, which is at present upon the statute book—placed there by Parliament, I think, about two years ago—was preliminary to the Treaty which the present Finance Minister, seemingly, has negotiated within the last few months. The preliminary negotiations for that Treaty originated with and were conducted by the late government, and when it is brought down, if it possesses advantageous features, I fancy it will not be unfair for this side of the House to claim as much credit for it as my honourable friends opposite.

The Prime Minister seems to be under a hallucination as to a trade treaty having been negotiated with Australia. This is the first intimation I have had that an Australian treaty has really been entered into. Only a few ago a public statement was made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who had just arrived from Australia, to the effect that unfortunately he was not able to negotiate a treaty with that country. How it happened that the Prime Minister was under the impression that that treaty had been negotiated raises a question as to how he concluded that it had been entered into.

We are told also that a treaty has been inaugurated with the United States looking to the settlement of the Great Lakes disarmament question. It certainly is news to Parliament and to the people of Canada that a treaty has been negotiated with the United States to supersede the Rush-Bagot treaty, with regard to war vessels on the Great Lakes. One fine summer day, some few months ago, the Prime Minister and the Minister of

Militia, suffering probably from monotony, left for Washington. They had an interview with the President and some of the executive officers in the capital of the United States, and the press of Canada rang out the news that a new treaty had been entered into and that the Rush-Bagot treaty was to be entirely superseded.

Well, those of us who have followed public affairs for some years know that there is no truth in the statement that such a treaty has been concluded. I fail to understand why claims of this kind are made and the people of Canada deluded into the belief that treaties are concluded when such is not the case. Those of us who have followed public affairs know—and my honourable friends opposite know as well as I—that to conclude a treaty with the United States involves not only the negotiation of that treaty with the Executive, but also its approval by the Senate of the United States. The experience not only of Canada but of Great Britain as well has been that to succeed in negotiating a treaty with the United States means the expenditure of very considerable time and the lapse of several years. Why the Dominion of Canada should take the initiative to supersede a Treaty which has been in effect for over a century I fail to understand.

Of all the treaties between Great Britain and the United States there has been none so satisfactory in the friendly relations which have obtained under its operation as the Rush-Bagot treaty. True, great changes have taken place since the negotiation of that treaty over a century ago. The battleship of that time was an insignificant affair compared with the enormous leviathan that sails the deep to-day, but that treaty is just as effective to-day in the security it affords to both nations against war vessels being placed on the Great Lakes as it was on the day it was signed; and I am satisfied that no Treaty has given the people of the United States and Canada greater satisfaction. Before the declaration of war in 1914 both countries had entered into most satisfactory arrangements to celebrate a century of peace, of which this Treaty was the foundation. Why should it be disturbed at the present time? Why should the Prime Minister, upon his own responsibility, proceed to Washington without any sentiment having been expressed in Parliament, or in Canada, for the purpose of abrogating that Treaty and throwing another treaty into the cockpit of the United States Senate, where it would be opposed by all the elements antagonistic to Britain in that country arrayed against it? And why

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.