

and will be presented in the line of the tariff incidence of the United States Congress when it finished its work. Now these are things which actually exist and with the large trade which is involved between us and the United States and the small trade which is in question as between us and some favoured nation countries it is these things which make the gravity of the situation and, to my mind, it is a very serious matter. Now, when does the Finance Minister propose to find out what the attitude of the United States will be in reference to it? I do not know. He may have sources of information that I do not know anything of, but, it seems to me, that he will not know until after the 31st March. When the 31st March comes and these duties of 25 per cent go on over and above the rates then established, action will be taken sooner or later by the President upon the facts presented to him and we will not know what will be the mind of the United States or what will be the incidences of this tariff until that date has passed, until these facts have been presented, and until the President issues his proclamation in accordance with these facts.

I refer to this matter because I think it is necessary that the members of the House shall have the whole of these facts before them. This is a most grave and serious juncture to which we have come, and it needs very careful treatment. There are some other clauses in the tariff to which I will only refer. One is a discriminating clause providing for ten per cent additional duty on imports in other than United States vessels. This has a bearing upon Canada. If a country outside of Canada desires to export into the United States through Canada the non-contiguous country is shut off from doing that without the payment of this ten per cent additional. How will that strike some of our Canadian commerce? For instance, if articles meant for the United States start from the far East, come to Canada and approach the American border there is an importation from a non-contiguous country through a contiguous country, and it seems to me under that tariff item that it is bound to pay the ten per cent additional. More than that, there is a tonnage tax. For 25 years there has been no tonnage tax upon Canadian vessels on the great lakes going into the ports of the United States and none, of course, on our side—an arrangement agreed to long ago. This tariff enacts that a tonnage tax shall be put on absolutely of a certain amount; I think it runs at two cents per pound, but not greater than ten cents in any year, from a country contiguous to the great lakes and from some other countries. Otherwise it is larger. All these are indications which show that the purpose of the United States tariff was to make

all the advantage possible for the United States and as little as possible for Canada, and, in the light of that, we must make up our minds that the facts will be very carefully looked into and that the President will issue his proclamation in accordance with the facts. The ground work, which is the last thing I wish to call the attention of the government to, is a mighty broad one:

That whenever, after the 31st day of March, 1910, and so long thereafter as the president shall be satisfied, in view of the character of the concessions granted by the minimum tariff of the United States, that the government of any foreign country imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural manufactured, or other product of the United States, which unduly discriminate against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country pays no export bounty or imposes no export duty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, thereupon and thereafter a proclamation may issue, &c., &c.

That is broad. Unduly discriminates against the United States. Discriminates in what way? Gives a greater advantage to an article coming from another country than from the United States. It may be held that this discriminates. You have a resolution of parliament that we, sometimes by proclamation shall call into effect an enactment that upon goods coming into Canada there shall be a less duty if they come in by Canadian ports than if they come in through United States ports. Could we carry that out and not be within the conditions which would bring the results of discrimination if we thereby gave a preference to St. John, Halifax and Quebec as against Baltimore, New York, Boston and other American cities? The extraordinary width of it, the inclusiveness of it, and the evident intention which is beyond contingency and already in force make a very serious problem for us to consider as to what is to be done in face of the possibility of a tremendous dislocation of trade. I am not one who believes that, our position being right, we should recede one inch because another country legislates in its tariff for its own advantage. We legislate for our own advantage and that is the only ground that we can take. But, at the same time, when such an immense amount of commerce is at stake, it becomes very important we should know where we are before we go any farther. Now, just one moment more,