

cial and social union, to the great advantage of both.

How long afterwards will they be kept apart politically? I say that commercial and social union inevitably ripens into something more—ultimately into political union. Then, I take Mr. Wilson, the United States Secretary of Agriculture. He is equally frank as in his addressed letters to the farmers of the republic, he assures them that:

The removal of the duties on Canadian products will do them no harm, and that the great feature of the compact is that under it our relations with Canada will be more intimate and we will become more and more one people.

One people commercially, one people socially, one people politically, if that is not leading us away from our ties of loyalty to the mother country, I do not know what English language means. The Detroit 'Free Press' says:

That the principal merit of the agreement is political and social. It will, it is hoped, and confidently expected, be the beginning of the end of the stupid separation of two halves of a continent which is inhabited by substantially one people.

If I know what the English language means, I say that there is but one interpretation to be placed on this, and it is that it means ultimate political union. Then, the 'Free Press' of Milwaukee, says:

The terms of the agreement will be viewed by some people from the standpoint of the pocket book, but the man of larger vision will regard it not only in the light of its present effect but in the light of its future fruitage. Thus viewed, a reciprocity agreement with Canada assumes a significance far transcending even its great promise of benefaction to the living people of these neighbouring nations.

It means a union of the two countries in the future. I said that it will tend inevitably to weaken the tie that binds us to the mother country. I have here a speech made by Mr. Austen Chamberlain, at Birmingham, a short time ago, and I wish to quote from it briefly, to show how the subject is viewed over there. To my mind, he has voiced the situation very correctly. He says:

What is going to be the effect upon the trade of our city of such an arrangement as this? I cannot doubt that it will be serious. I cannot doubt that, whilst depriving us of advantages which Canadian imperial patriotism has hitherto afforded us, whilst depriving us of those, it will expose us to a new and an additional and a more eager competition from the United States of America. In the first place, the purchase from Canada of its grain and raw material, creating a new trade route, will bring back the trade route a

stream of manufactured articles; and I cannot help saying that, as I think of this agreement, I come more and more to the conclusion that the American policy of conservation of its natural resources is turning into a policy for the exploitation by American capitalists and American manufacturers of the national resources of Canada. It must increase enormously the competitive power of America in the world's trade, and its export power as well as its domestic production. And as its new ties become more firmly established, as new interests grow up under them, I feel that the independent national growth of Canada, within the British Empire, will be seriously menaced by the overwhelming strength and the overwhelming wealth of its great neighbour. As the years roll by, as the north and south trade develops, as the transport interests become greater and ever greater, the hold of the American upon the Canadian market will become closer; his grip upon Canada will be firmer, and the national development in which we all rejoice, the material development to which we have looked forward, will be hampered, if it be not jeopardized, by the growing competition of continental ties.

I take up the speech of Mr. Asquith when answering in the English House of Commons the speech of Mr. Balfour, and in that speech we find illustrated the callous indifference of our government to the great policy of inter-imperial preferential trade to which we ought to look forward knowing what it would do for us. What does Mr. Asquith say:

I come to the main point in the debate. The charge against the government is that during all these years the Dominion has been knocking at our door, that we have turned a deaf ear to her appeal, and that the first-fruits of our indifference and neglect are to be found in this agreement between Canada and the United States of America, which the leader of the opposition tells us, if ratified, will be a disaster to the empire. Well, but have they been knocking at our door? What do they themselves say? Sir W. Laurier, speaking at Nelson on August 30 last, said:

'It is not the policy of the Canadian government to ask Great Britain to change her fiscal policy one iota. (Ministerial cheers.) We make our arrangements to suit our own interests, and so it is with Great Britain.'

Mr. Asquith gave that statement of our Prime Minister as an answer to the contention of the leader of the opposition in the British House of Commons that Canada had been knocking at its door for imperial preferential trade, that she had been knocking in vain and was now about to make a tie which would alienate her affections from the mother country and seriously cripple every chance of bringing about that inter-imperial trade. Am I not justified therefore, in saying that this proposed reciprocal arrangement with the United States will operate to our disadvantage? It will give American manufacturers command of the timber resources of Canada, it