

ment. I have under my hand here—if it is desired to raise economic considerations on a question which was thrashed out in very great detail—an address which I issued to the people of Canada during the course of that campaign, and in paragraph after paragraph of which—as the right hon. gentleman would know if he had ever done me the honour to read it, as I believe he could not have done—I dealt with the economic considerations connected with the adoption of this agreement. I said:

It is a direct and serious menace to our internal lines of water communication and to our ocean shipping, as well as to our Canadian Atlantic ports that have been constructed and equipped at such enormous cost to the country.

It opens to the United States our home market, which consumes 80 per cent of our animal and agricultural products. It also has the effect of opening that same market to twelve foreign countries and to all the British possessions for which we obtain no reciprocal or compensating advantage.

It makes an absurd pretence of bringing relief to the farmer by exposing him to the competition of the world in everything that he sells and by continuing the existing burden of taxation on everything that he buys.

I can read to the right hon. gentleman many more extracts from this address which touch the economic feature of this question and the economic feature alone.

Now my right hon. friend says that the result of the elections of the 21st September was obtained by an appeal to prejudice. I take issue with him upon that and I say, Mr. Speaker, that he cast a distinct reflection upon the capacity and the judgment of the Canadian people when he ventured to say that their action on that occasion was the result of prejudice. I say that their verdict was the result of well reasoned consideration of the arguments placed before them on the one hand by himself and his colleagues, and on the other hand the arguments both from the economic and from the national standpoint which were placed before them by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

The right hon. gentleman declares that trusts are flourishing in Canada, and he draws an alarming picture in that regard. Might I venture to ask him what he and his administration have been doing during the past two or three years? Does he mean to suggest that these trusts have sprung up since the 21st of September last? I venture to remark that when the right hon. gentleman made that suggestion he cast no reflection on hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who have not been responsible for legislation during the past fifteen years, but he cast very serious reflection upon his own administration, and his own policy in respect to the matters which are alluded to. But, Sir, how did

he propose to remedy the state of affairs of which he complained? By submitting to the parliament of Canada a measure not to control and regulate Canadian trusts, but by opening up the Dominion of Canada, the markets and the resources of this country to the depredations of the enormous trusts of the United States. Well, if that be the method which commends itself to the right hon. gentleman I for one am not surprised that sometimes his reason and his eyes do not see alike.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was dealing with the observations of my right hon. friend with respect to what is known as the reciprocity pact which he submitted to parliament in the last session and which was passed upon by the country. I had been dealing with his assertion that the economic question had not entered into the discussion so far as we were concerned. I challenged that statement, and I still challenge it. The fact that it is absolutely unfounded can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of any hon. gentleman who desires to go over again the discussion which took place in the late campaign. But I will point out to the right hon. gentleman one thing—one thing which he has overlooked or forgotten—that on one side in that controversy there was not only one economic argument, there were two wholly inconsistent economic arguments; and that side was the one that he represented. For every one who recalls what took place will remember that, up to about two weeks before the 21st of September last, the argument of these gentlemen was that this proposal should be accepted by the country because it would bring higher prices to the farmer; but, about two weeks before polling day, they absolutely changed their position and placed before the people, not only in the east but in the towns of the west, the argument that the proposal ought to be accepted because it would give lower prices to the farmer and therefore lower prices to the consumer. So, if my right hon. friend is disposed still to contend that we did not stand upon any economic argument, I can pay him the compliment of saying that he and his friends stood during the campaign upon two absolutely inconsistent economic arguments.

My right hon. friend says that the people are suffering to-day from the results of the rejection of this pact. The conditions of Canada at the present time do not appeal to me in that way. But I was not very