

they were to be taxed if coming from Canada or England. These discriminations were in favour of the United States, and the British Government were a party to the transaction. It will be found in the same papers that when a protest was entered by the Canadian Government against the completion of this treaty the Secretary of State for the Colonies wrote that they had induced the Island of Newfoundland to promise similar legislation in favour of Canada, and he asked Canada not to stand in the way of Newfoundland, she having carried out their wishes in this respect. Thus, the British Government have expressed their readiness in the interests of one of her colonies to admit manufactures as well as other articles to a certain extent from the United States duty free, while duties were to be maintained against Canada and against the rest of the empire. Complaint had been made that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) did not refer to the loss of revenue. If the hon. gentleman who made the complaint had read the speech of my hon. friend he would have found that he dealt with the question, and dealt with it in a satisfactory manner. Certainly my hon. friend did not shirk it. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) also noted that if we had reciprocity with the United States the Americans would take possession of our markets and ruin our manufactures. How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the conclusion that under free trade between the two countries, with the barriers of each country let down, and the manufacturers in Canada having the same opportunity to buy raw material at the same prices, to employ the same labour, and having a market of 65,000,000 equally with the American manufacturers, American manufacturers would wipe out Canadian manufacturers? Is it not pouring contempt on our people to adopt that line of argument? If we maintain that contention we must admit that the workmen of Canada are inferior in skill to the artisans of the United States, or that employers there look after their business more efficiently. One or other proposition must be maintained, and to hold either one is to throw discredit on this country. For my part, I submit that reciprocity on this basis has not been tried, and we can only argue from data, and cannot tell the result from actual experience. What data have we to proceed upon? Unfortunately, there are tens of thousands of our fellow Canadians in the United States. In that country, which was to them a new and foreign country, what is their position? Are they in an inferior position? No, Sir. The hon. gentleman knows it, and as Canadians our cheeks should glow with honest pride as we recognize and bear testimony to it. Canadian artisans, Canadian-born, Canadian-educated, have gone to the United States by the thousands and tens of thousands, and these artisans in the busy hives of American industry are holding their own, man for man, with those who have been trained in that country. I ask, Sir, if these artisans go into that which is to them practically a foreign country, and under that disadvantage hold their own with a native-born artisan or an artisan from any other country, why should not these Canadian artisans hold their own in the Dominion of Canada when the products of their labour find a free and open market in the United States—as free as the market for the products which he is manufacturing in the

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

United States at the present time. Do they tell me it is because our manufacturers have not the enterprise, the business capacity and the brain to compete with the men on the other side? Look at what has been done by Canadians in the United States; look at their boards of railway directors; go into their exchanges, go into the business marts of commerce, and there you will find Canadians holding their own with any native-born Americans or with the people from any other country. Why, then, does the hon. gentleman lay it down as a matter settled by himself that if you have reciprocity with the United States in manufactured articles all your Canadian manufactures will be destroyed? The contention will not bear investigation, and therefore it is urged, as my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has urged it in his resolution, that in the securing of this reciprocity you should give instructions to your representatives who go to Washington in October next to treat with the Government of the United States on a broad, expansive, liberal platform, not confined to reciprocity in natural products, which will not be entertained and which hon. gentlemen opposite know will not be entertained, but that you should include manufactures as well. Giving to them that mandate, I ask the hon. gentleman what he fears, and why he does not believe, if it be good for the farmers of this country that they should be brought into free and open competition with the farmers of the United States, it should not also be good that the manufacturers of this country should be brought into free and open competition with their manufacturers to receive the benefit of their market, and giving them in reciprocity the benefit of our market, and letting those who best can prosper under the circumstances. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon) refers to letters which he said were written by Mr. Laurier with reference to the finances of the Province of Quebec. He did not know whether these letters were written or not, but if it was true they were written he said that it meant there would be some \$2,000,000 added to the burdens of the people of this country in giving additional aid to the various provinces of this Dominion. I do not know whether or not the letters were written either, but I ask the hon. gentleman this: He stands appalled at the very thought of it, but suppose the Dominion Government gave this money, they would be giving it for the benefit of the whole people of these provinces. But the hon. gentleman cannot view this present tariff legislation in the light it ought to be viewed in, namely, that instead of \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 of taxation being scattered over all the provinces for the benefit of all the people in all the provinces a far larger sum is by this tariff legislation placed in the pockets of four or five wealthy monopolists in this country. My friend is perfectly satisfied with that, but, oh! how his righteous soul was indignant as he thought about \$2,000,000 additional burden being added to the people of this country, which, even according to his own declaration, would be taken out of the pockets of the people of the country, not to benefit the sugar refiners, but to benefit the whole people. The hon. gentleman could contemplate a tariff sustained and maintained for the purpose of giving to some favoured individuals in this country vast sums of money, and not feel in the least degree shocked about it; but he cannot understand taxation to benefit the people at large. The hon. gentleman