

on the naval question. I saw reports of his speeches from time to time, and unless I am very much misinformed, my hon. friend took the view that the ships should be built in Canada.

Mr. TURRIFF: What is wrong with that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: What does the hon. gentleman himself think of it?

Mr. WHITE: The hon. gentleman will find out what I think about it a little later, when I will have something to say to my hon. friend. I have not the slightest objection to anything being done in Canada that can be done in Canada. When I speak upon the naval question, I shall endeavour to demonstrate that in this particular instance it is against the interests of the Empire that we should waste precious time in experimenting in the attempt to build dreadnoughts in this Canada of ours, in time to serve the needs of the Empire as they exist at present.

Mr. MACDONALD: Might I ask the hon. minister whether he is going to argue that it is against the interests of Canada that these ships should be built in Canada?

Mr. WHITE: I like to be courteous to my hon. friend. Let me say this to him. When I come to deal with this question, I think I shall be able to deal with any arguments advanced by my hon. friend.

Now, in regard to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), to whom I say I always listen with the greatest pleasure, during recess my hon. friend took part in a campaign in the West and, as I have said, took the view that these ships should be built in Canada. My hon. friend is an apostle of free trade; the motto of free trade is, 'Buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest.' Does my hon. friend claim for a moment that ships can be built in Canada within thirty-five or forty per cent of the cost of building them in Glasgow, where labourers and artisans receive nothing like the remuneration or wages that they do here, to say nothing of the extra time that would be required?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I say yes.

Mr. WHITE: I will answer my hon. friend later. As regards my hon. friend from Red Deer, I think that is an apostacy from the tenets of free trade of which he is an apostle. When I read the reports of his speeches in the West, I thought it was the greatest case of apostacy since the days of Daniel Webster. I do not know what we will have to call my hon. friend if he persists in the protectionist heresy according to Adam Smith and Cobden. In view of his previous record, it

seems to me that his name shall always be Ichabod, because his free trade glory has departed. With regard to reciprocity, so much has been said about reciprocity in this House that I for my part do not propose to take it up here. To be frank with my hon. friend, I do not discuss reciprocity because I think it is disrespectful to speak lightly of the dead, and I believe that reciprocity is dead.

Mr. TURRIFF: Preferential trade is dead.

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend from Red Deer has had a great deal to say about reciprocity, and has blamed this Government for their rejection of it. This Government did not reject reciprocity. Reciprocity was rejected by the people of this country. I have very great respect for hon. gentlemen opposite, but I think that reciprocity has got on their nerves and on their minds; they have become obsessed with the idea of reciprocity. Why do they not admit that they have 'got in wrong,' to use a common expression, and have made a mistake and say: 'We have made a mistake; we are going to make a fresh start.' That is what they ought to do politically and in every other way. They made a mistake; the country said so, and the country would say so again.

Mr. TURRIFF: Give it a chance.

Mr. WHITE: There is no sentiment in the country in favour of reciprocity. You may find it in certain localities, but you will not find it generally. My hon. friends made a serious political mistake, and they will not admit it. The sooner they admit it the better for them as a party, although they do not want any advice from me. The people of this country believe that their fiscal independence would be jeopardized by concluding a trade arrangement with their great neighbour to the south. There they have a hundred million people; here you have eight million people. In 1866, when Messrs. Hay and Howland went to Washington, as I said in the last debate on this subject in which I took part, the Hon. George Brown, the founder of the Globe, said that he was against any reciprocal agreement such as was recently proposed, terminable on six months or a year's notice.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about 1874, when he went down?

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend sometimes is curiously impatient. In 1866 George Brown took that view. He said: 'We should not be kept dangling upon the legislation of Washington.'

The people of Canada are quite willing that the people of the United States should