

boundaries extending along ours for 4,000 miles — why, of course, it must exercise a most profound influence upon the future commercial destiny of this country. I might characterize it even more strongly than I have done. It has been said, that they can lower their tariff and change our trade routes. Perhaps they can accomplish something of that kind, but I want to ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not it is wise for us to combine with them for that purpose? Are we wise to make concessions to them for that purpose? Wider markets is the cry of the Minister of Finance. If the national issue is to be absolutely disregarded and you are to push the argument of wider markets to its logical, and, I believe, its inevitable conclusion, what will it lead you to? It will lead you to complete free trade and absolute commercial union with the United States.

“That Path Has Only One Termination.”

My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) smiles at that suggestion. I do not know whether he smiles at the argument or in approval of the suggested ultimate destiny. But I would like to say to him that if it is good to seek wider markets, from which the rest of the empire is excluded, in the United States of America, why not have still wider and wider markets in the United States of America from which the rest of the empire will be excluded? That path has only one termination, and that is absolute commercial union with the United States of America. There cannot be much doubt, I think, about what that would mean.

“The Parting of the Ways.”

The President of the United States, in his message, on page 6, used very significant words. Speaking of the people of the Dominion, he said: ‘They are at the parting of the ways.’ They are at the parting of the ways! I think the people of Canada have indeed come to the parting of the ways, and that the issue of infinite gravity which is presented to them at the present time is whether they will continue in the work of nation building, in which they have been engaged during the past forty years, whether they will maintain their own markets as they have maintained them during the past forty years, whether they will preserve the autonomy of this country as they have preserved it during the past forty years, or whether they will undo the work which the fathers of confederation began, and which their sons have been carrying out. Whether our provinces will continue to trade with each other and with the

mother country as in the past; or whether we will impel British Columbia to trade with the state of Washington, the prairie provinces to trade with the middle west, Ontario to trade with Ohio, New York and Pennsylvania, and Quebec and the maritime provinces to trade with the New England states. If that issue is not presented to the parliament of Canada by these proposals then I certainly have utterly mistaken their purport and meaning.

What a Zollverein Means.

A book came into my hands only a few days ago. It is written by a gentleman who visited Canada about seven years ago—Mr. Geoffrey Drage. I quote the opinion of a German authority and publicist from page 68 of this book. Mr. Drage refers to the opinion of Professor von Schulze-Gaevernitz, contained in a work which he has written on British imperialism and English free trade, and the quotation from this German professor is in these words:

As Professor von Schulze-Gaevernitz has pointed out, a zollverein between the United States and Canada would be both commercially and politically the death of British dominion in North America. Political union must follow commercial union.

Then Mr. Drage goes on to speak of commercial union in these words:

Such a union would also be the political suicide of Canada, who would lose the political identity which she has developed and of which she is so jealously proud.

Why Americans Desire Reciprocity.

I could give very many extracts, indeed, from the opinions of men in the United States. Mr. Beveridge, a very notable public man in the west, has given utterance to ideas, which, I am sure, have come to the attention of every hon. member of this House. Perhaps it might be well that I should quote one or two words from his opinion in this connection:

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbor. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade.

That capital should be kept at home to employ American workmen to supply Canadian demand. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

Canadian Trade for American Ports.

And so on. The result of that argument, and indeed, the scope of many of the schedules brought down to this parliament is, to hand Canadian natural products over to the United States producers with a mini-