

selfishness, and bad men and bad measures have to disappear. From 1896 to the present day, the appeal of my right hon. friend to the country has largely been an appeal to the selfishness of the individual. Reciprocity with the United States was an appeal to the selfishness and cupidity of the elector. I am glad, Sir, that the people having listened to that appeal, felt, that underneath this proposed measure there lay the seeds of harm to this young country in its national ideas and national development. I am glad that the electors did forego the extra few cents a bushel on their grain, that they did forego the appeal to their selfishness, and that they looked to the better and stronger and higher interests of the country and gave their verdict in accordance with their judgment in that respect. And Sir, to my mind, nothing has ever sent through this country a more purifying flame than the canvass that resulted in the elections of the 21st of September, 1911. I hope that ever and anon in the history of this young nation there will come times when on large issues sentiment may be appealed to, a sentiment which is proper and honourable and just, and which may purge us from selfish and unworthy ideas.

Mr. DEVLIN. What about your own trips to Washington?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) shows that he has not lost one of those small interrogation points that always stuck out on him when he was supporting the government in this House. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) also said, and to this I call the attention of the House and country that the conditions in Canada with respect to reciprocity with the United States were the same now as they were at confederation. No more misleading statement was ever made in this House, but I believe now that my right hon. friend himself did believe it and of course it led to his complete undoing. You have all read the remarkable personal allusion made by Mr. Balfour in taking leave of his leadership of the Unionist party, where he describes a peculiar disease insidious and powerful which creeps upon a man although he does not know it, and though he seems to be in the plenitude of his powers yet has really become impervious to new ideas. That more than anything else, Mr. Balfour said, led him to the captious course of laying down the leadership before he braved the risk of entering such a period. Well, such a period seems to have taken hold of my right hon. friend and his two principal colleagues. They believed in their hearts—my right hon. friend has said so to-night—that the conditions in 1911 were exactly the same as the conditions before confederation. In that belief he proposed recipro-

city, and though from every side came hints of the changes that these years had made, of the springing hopes of the new and aroused and growing national life of Canada and of the higher ideals of her people, none of these seemed to find access to the minds of my right hon. friend and his two colleagues; they wrapped themselves around with the conditions of 1867 and rushed to their fate and ruin. One of the right hon. gentleman's arguments was that reciprocity was necessary because Canada produces more than she needs for her own consumption and therefore requires markets. That is just the point. Canada needs markets but what she needs especially is home markets. That is the cardinal difference between the two parties on the issue which has just been decided. My right hon. friend looked at the published figures of foreign markets, and he forgot that home markets and the interchanges which make home markets are infinitely of more importance to us than our interchange with foreign countries. We believe that it is better to have an interchange of products raised in Ontario with an interchange of products raised in the prairies, both requiring in their production Canadian labour and both building up homes in Canada. Our whole policy was to make production greater in our own provinces and then to interchange these products the one province with the other and so build up a trade within the country. We said to the Liberal party: it is because we see that your policy threatens these provincial productions, threatens these provincial interchanges, threatens our means of interprovincial communication, which will be built up by these interchanges and thus sap the life of the country, that we prefer to stand by the policy which we have announced and which we believe is best for the country.

My right hon. friend, in referring to the monopolies, and the speculations, and the unemployment in the United States of America, asked, what caused them? He was ready with the cause, and his one and only cause was a hard and fast tariff. Then in the United States of America it is a hard and fast tariff which causes monopolies and unemployment; in Canada it is a half-and-half hard and fast tariff which causes monopolies and unemployment, if they exist here; in Great Britain it is no tariff at all which causes monopolies and unemployment, for there are both of them in Great Britain to-day. My right hon. friend is evidently not a philosopher, he catches at the straw of a hard and fast tariff in the United States as being the cause of monopolies and unemployment. Graded down, what about the tariff which he maintained in this country for 15 years—was that productive of non-