

friendly to a reciprocal trade agreement between Canada and the United States; and in pointing to the public opinion of the motherland on this matter, I take it that that opinion is represented by the party now in power, the great Liberal party of the United Kingdom. Well, what did the people of the United Kingdom say about this proposed trade arrangement? Did not Mr. Asquith himself say that the United States were in a position to offer Canada reciprocal trade advantages which it was impossible for the United Kingdom to give Canada because of geographical and other reasons. Mr. Asquith went on to say that he believed in having the dominions over the seas make the best trade arrangements they could in their own interests. He believed in the principle of the fullest autonomy for the overseas dominions, and he added that anything which could make these dominions more prosperous would favourably affect the textile manufacturers of the United Kingdom. In like manner, when we make our fishermen, our farmers and our lumbermen more prosperous we incidentally favourably affect the textile manufacturers of the motherland and our own home industries.

I want to revert to one or two remarks made in the speeches of the hon. member for Kings (Mr. A. De Witt Foster) and the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Webster) to the effect that under the reciprocity agreement United States citizens could come over into this country and take our forests and our fish. These statements are absolutely without foundation. I challenge any hon. gentleman in this House to show me one sentence in the reciprocity agreement that would give an American citizen a right to put an axe into a Canadian tree that he has not to-day, or a sentence that would give United States fishermen a right to put a hook or a net into Canadian waters. It is not fair for hon. members to make speeches of this kind that are not borne out by the facts and that go broadcast throughout this country.

The Minister of Finance stated that the discussion of the situation from a national standpoint was the scheme for the first portion of the campaign. I verily believe the hon. gentleman, for that was the case. They aroused the people of this country with a false alarm from a national standpoint. Listen to what the Montreal 'Star' said to our Conservative friends on the 18th of July:

The members ought to know more accurately what the electors think than they did before adjournment. The mistaken tendency of the opposition to discuss reciprocity largely as an economic question—precisely the ground on which the government prefer to discuss it—has deprived the electors of a clear lead on the national phases of the proposal; but it is not too late yet for that lead to be given, and there is abundant evidence that the peo-

Mr. LOGGIE.

ple are looking in that direction very suspiciously, without much serious inspiration outside of the press.

The inspiration from the national standpoint came from the press, led by the 'Star' of Montreal and the moneyed interests of Toronto, forming themselves into a league. The 'Star' says further:

To the plain man who loves Canada and wants above all things to see her keep her name, position and independence, this Greek gift, from a source whence we are more accustomed to receive blows, has a significance far deeper than its tabulated schedules.

The editor of the 'Star' wants to see Canada keep her good name, forsooth! Here we have the national aspect of the question propounded by the Montreal 'Star', and then taken up by the press, and advertised in all the local papers from one end of the Dominion to the other. So I say the Liberal government was defeated ostensibly on reciprocity, but from the evidence of my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), as well as from the statements of the Montreal 'Star,' there were imported into the agreement matters entirely foreign to it. To say that because the citizens of Canada trade freely with those of the United States we shall be any the less loyal or less likely to stand by our Canadian rights and Canadian interests seems to me to be beyond conception.

Now, I want to say one word in support of the amendment moved by the right hon. gentleman who leads the opposition. There are men in the present cabinet who were diametrically opposed to each other on the naval policy represented by the resolution adopted unanimously by this House on the 29th of March, 1909. As I understand responsible government, the advisers of the King should be at one on such grave matters as the defence of our shores, our commerce and our empire. Let me read to you a Canadian press despatch found in the Moncton 'Transcript' of November 27, as follows:

Montreal, Que., Nov. 27.—That Canada would be almost defenceless in the event of a war with the United States, that the Atlantic ports should be defended, was the theme of C. H. Cahan, K.C., before the Canadian Club to-day. 'The possibility of war is omnipresent, despite the one hundred years of peace,' he declared. 'The authorities who are responsible for the defence of Canada, cannot longer ignore the military and naval preparedness of our neighbours to the south. They must sooner or later take adequate measures for the protection of our naval internal waterways, and great transcontinental lines of railway. Despite the 100 years of peace, there are obvious questions between Great Britain and the United States that would make war inevitable.'

At such a time we have the government of the day coming before parliament with