

1

duty to the Empire, like all of you, during the dark days in South Africa, and that, whatever our views on fiscal policy, we have all the same object in view, the prosperity and aggrandisement of the glorious British Empire.

I feel that I have a good excuse for taking part in this discussion. My Chamber is the commercial mouth-piece of a large and important tract of the Indian Empire with twelve times the population of Canada. I have travelled twelve thousand miles to attend these meetings. My Chamber draws its members from a territory having a population of 70,000,000. I am here to represent the commercial interests of a population of citizens of the British Empire nearly twice as large as the combined total of Great Britain and the self-governing Colonies, and larger than the total population of your neighbours to the south—the United States of America.

The terms of the amendment now proposed are plainly and intentionally designed with the view of endeavouring to reconcile conflicting interests—the interests of frankly Protectionist countries like Canada and New Zealand, with those of free-Trade countries like Britain and India. The underlying idea appears to be to establish between the various constituent parts of our great Empire trade relations similar to those that have subsisted for generations between India and the Mother-Country. It must be taken for granted that the Mother-Country has always desired to buy as much as possible of what India has to sell, and that India has honestly wished to confine her purchases to England. Now, what has been the result? The foreign trade of India amounts to nearly \$700,000,000 yearly, made up of imports \$270,000,000, exports over \$100,000,000. Of India's total exports the Mother-Country takes 25 per cent., the Colonies 20 per cent., and the proportion finding its way to foreign countries is 55 per cent. Looking at the imports in the same way, we shall find that the Mother-Country supplied 66 per cent. (two-thirds), the Colonies 10 per cent., and foreign countries only 24 per cent. Now they argue, if they prove anything at all, prove that India has been consistently loyal to the Mother-Country, but they do not prove that the loyalty has been reciprocal. They seem to me to show that the Mother-Country, as a shopkeeper, is not swayed by sentimental considerations, but that she buys where it suits her pocket, which is the most sensitive part of a man's anatomy, as was very effectively said by the eloquent mover of the Resolution, who kept us spell-bound by his impassioned address. There is an old saying that the leopard does not change his spots. If we expected such a miracle, we would be irresistibly reminded of the old lady who thought to keep back the tide with a broom. Gentlemen, whatever Resolutions you may pass, or whatever the result of the "Inquiry" now in progress, trade will continue to flow in the channels determined for it by economic conditions.

In India, even more than in Canada, a large proportion of the population are dependent on agriculture, and in that great Empire, with its 300,000,000 inhabitants, the margin of reserve resources at the command of the cultivator is so small that, when the annual rains fail over any considerable tract, dire distress and famine are inevitable. And, gentlemen, how many of you fully and clearly realise what famine in India means? In that country, the normal standard of comfort of many millions of the inhabitants is such that they have to be content with one meal a day. Can you picture to yourselves the condition when the wherewithal for that one meal is non-existent? If we were obliged to forego one of our three or four meals a day,