

Mr. BROWN: Good stuff perhaps, but very different from what the Prime Minister gave us the other day. Well, the campaign was fought out along those lines. I remember the Manitoba campaign organized by the present member for Winnipeg South (Mr. Rogers), who then had the reputation of being one of the greatest election winners in Canada. At any rate, the campaign was organized by that hon. gentleman, and he brought with him Mr., afterwards Sir Robert Borden and another gentleman who afterwards became a cabinet minister, to the town of Morden in my constituency. I travelled from my own town to hear them, and I remember the dire picture they painted of what would happen to Canada if we entered into that arrangement. I remember hearing of the 90,000,000 head of cattle that would come from the United States and graze in our pastures, and of the disastrous consequences that would follow if we yielded to the solicitations that were being put forward. I remember the Conservative candidate at that time, a gentleman who now sits in the other house, telling us after it was over, "We saved Canada". That was the way the campaign was fought and it ended, as other campaigns have ended, by the people responding to the absurd pleas that were made to them. It was another instance in which, in our judgment, democracy showed its weakness by counting the number of heads instead of taking the quality into consideration.

The house met in November and the right hon. the Prime Minister, then a man occupying a high position in the country, was given the honour of moving the address. Here is what he said, and we can see what resemblance it bears to what he said the other day:

To many of us, it seems but fitting that a member of the royal family should open a new parliament, with a new government with a clear mandate from the people on a great issue, indicating in no uncertain terms a settled conviction that the Canadian people would consider no trade proposals that menaced, even remotely, their fiscal and national independence, or threatened to lessen the strength of the ties that bind them to the British Empire,—

We remember what we heard a session or two ago about cutting the painter that binds us to those islands across the sea.

—or rendered for a moment more difficult the realization of the hope that lives in all of us for the commercial and organic union of that empire.

Mr. Speaker, the risk was real and the danger imminent. I doubt not that when the proposals to which I have referred were first introduced, they were regarded merely as trade proposals; but when it was ascertained that in their ultimate results they involved the whole future

of Canada, then it was that the national spirit of our people was aroused. I venture to think that the right hon. gentleman who so successfully leads the opposition in this house would not have introduced those proposals if he could have foreseen that there would have arisen around them an agitation, the results of which were so vital to the imperial and national future of the country.

I shall stop there, for I am afraid that if I continue reading from it I may not have time to say all I want to. But that extract shows sufficiently that the opposition of the present Prime Minister to reciprocity in 1911 was not on the ground that the agreement was loose, as he now says; rather, the reason was as indicated in the quotation I have just given.

When I heard the confession of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) that the government's policies had now proved inadequate, I was reminded of another confession I once heard him make, and I was still more reminded of it as he proceeded with his speech. He once admitted in a burst of candor that when his case was weak he was unusually vigorous in presenting it; in other words, he made up in vigour what he lacked in logic. There were a number of illustrations of that truth in the speech to which we listened the other day. For instance, when he turned his guns against the hon. member for Shelburne-Yarmouth (Mr. Ralston) with regard to stabilization. He tried to prove that the hon. member was inconsistent because in the first place he had condemned the principle involved and then later, as the minister tried to make out, the hon. gentleman had urged the application of the same principle to all exports. But someone on this side pointed out that the minister was forgetting that little word "if"—if it was sound. The minister saw he had made a mistake and it was rather amusing to see him floundering about for a while. It reminded me of the only other time I have ever seen the minister completely floored, the time he undertook to defend the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Thompson) when the Vigilant matter was before the house. That was one of those cases where he could not even be vigorous when his argument was bad. After a while he got started again and soon found his feet, but it was not long before he again fell into the same error. He taunted us with opposing everything in the budget. He said we were opposed to the reductions in the tariff and to the reducing of the valuation for dumping duties from \$4.40 to \$4.25. He said we had nothing good to say for it. He adopted these same tactics last fall when we were discussing the question of trade through