

notice should be given, and, therefore, the question is out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With your consent, Mr. Speaker, I would say that I was following what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said with respect to the proper question of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean), and I was simply following the practice pursued ever since I have been in parliament, under which the member acting as leader of the opposition for the time being has been permitted to ask a question on some matter of great public importance, as the question of the boundaries of Manitoba and the financial terms certainly is.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 29, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE SPEECH OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Bennett (Calgary). For an address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N. B.). Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night I was expressing my regret that a matter of such great importance as the proposed trade agreement with the United States should have been defeated at the polls on extraneous issues. I substantiated that fact by referring to the statement made by the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) in which he emphatically said that side issues caused the defeat of the government candidate in his riding, and as I understand it, the same applies to practically all the ridings in the province of Ontario.

I shall now make a few brief references to the statements made by the Minister of Finance whom I take pleasure in cordially welcoming to the high position he occupies. In considering this question from the economic standpoint he said that both parties have adopted a policy of protection, and that protection is the settled policy of this country. I take issue with the hon. gentleman on that broad statement unless it be that he means that a moderate tariff is protection, and incidentally it is, but it is framed with a view of securing the necessary revenues to carry on the great public works of this country, and not with a view of protecting any specific industry. When the Liberal party came into power in 1896 they did very materially alter the

Mr. SPEAKER.

tariff then in force. At that date nineteen dollars on every hundred dollars was being collected from the people of Canada who used imported goods, and last year that nineteen was reduced to sixteen dollars, so that the Liberal party had reduced the rate of taxation by about 14 per cent. By the reciprocity agreement proposed it was expected the tariff would be still further reduced by three per cent or a total reduction of seventeen per cent on the tariff in force under the Conservative regime. Then the Minister of Finance told us that because of the United States tariff wall we had taken our own line of development. That may be true. If our tariff has incidental protection in it, and we use the textiles, &c., that are made by our own manufacturers then of course the trade must be interprovincial because we have no other customers except our own people. But it does not seem to me that the proposed trade arrangement in any way interfered with that line of development or with that distribution of our industries, and when the Minister of Finance speaks of industries I presume he means manufactures as distinguished from the products of the sea, the land and the forest. Then the Minister of Finance assumes that we had attempted to make a change in our economic conditions and he used these words:

Now, under the circumstances was it wise to negotiate an agreement, the purport or intent of which was to introduce so sudden and so radical a change in our economic system.

I fail to realize what is meant by that statement inasmuch as we in no way proposed to interfere with our industrial development, and that our home industries would not be in any way adversely affected. Another reason given by the Minister of Finance as to why this reciprocity arrangement was rejected was that we had no assurance of the continuance of the agreement, and he went on to say that it was admitted the United States could withdraw from the agreement if that great country saw fit, but that it was a grave question whether Canada could do the same. The Minister of Finance made that statement in view of the fact that it is plainly set forth in the wording of the agreement that the power to withdraw applied to each country alike, and that being so I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman meant. As a further reason why the Liberals were defeated, the Finance Minister said that the people of this country were afraid of the entanglement which might result. Well, the trade arrangement was that we could send our natural products to the United States market without paying into their treasury, and that in return we should allow the natural products of the United States to come into the Canadian market without their paying into the Can-