

fore, that there is no wrong for Canada to right, and there is nothing that Canada has to excuse herself for. But the whole of this present issue is something brought about by a request on the part of certain sections of the American public for protection, aggravated and insisted upon in view of the present discount on our money.

The member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), asked about fish. This article at the present time, is free; it was made free in 1913.

Now, my hon. friend says that bad blood is being engendered. I sincerely hope that this is not the case. He complains of statements made by ministers.

Mr. FIELDING: No, I did not; I referred to the matter, but I did not complain.

Sir HENRY DRAYTON: Well, the hon. gentleman referred to these statements as something calculated to engender bad blood. Mr. Speaker, I for one would very much deprecate approaching this matter in any such spirit. I have no idea that any country ever got anywhere by retaliatory measures, and simply because our friends to the south pass a tariff, which they have every right to pass in connection with their own business, but which we do not like, I am not going to say that we should then and there adopt retaliatory measures. But I do believe in having a tariff for Canadians, and one that is in the best interests of the Canadian nation.

There is no thought of retaliation. We hope, indeed, that the occasion will never arise, but certainly there is no thought of retaliation. If there is one real complaint that the American has against us to-day it is that we have bought too much from them. That is his real complaint, and the advice that has been given to this country by American financial newspapers is that the best thing we can do is to stop some of our purchases in that market. It is not a good thing for the American that our dollar is at a discount there. If it had not been, as I said before, we would not have had very much of this present agitation to-day. But that, after all, is the only thing that can be done. There is one other way of curing the situation, but unfortunately our friends to the south do not seem to think that is a good way—we can effect a cure either by shipping them more or by buying less from them. I do not know any way by which we can compel them to take our goods but we can, and I think we ought to, reduce our purchases.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): On rising, at the request of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Crerar), to voice sentiments that I think are pretty prevalent in this corner of the House, as well as almost universally in the part of the country from which we largely come, I trust I shall not be unmindful of the fact that there seems to be a general desire that this debate should be brief and that I should comport myself accordingly. I support this resolution very heartily, Mr. Speaker, because, looking at it broadly, its effect will inevitably be to increase international trade in at least one direction. If the obstacle to the flow of a stream are removed to any extent water is certain to trickle through, so that if we interfere with the obstacles to trade, to any extent whatsoever, we shall increase international trade. Now I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that any man of human instincts and a world outlook, with a little economic knowledge added, will agree with Mr. Lloyd George that what the world wants in the economic sphere to-day more than anything else is the restoration of international trade. May I quote a single sentence from that great statesman, who has been fifteen years in power in some part of government or another in the United Kingdom and is at present Prime Minister of that country. I quoted these words in my remarks on the Address this session:

If international trade fails I do not care what you do, you will have nothing but starvation and ruin.

The words are very brief, very emphatic, and I should like to photograph them upon the brain of every thoughtful man not only in Canada but in the world. On that ground, therefore we hail this resolution and we shall support it.

Now my hon. friend the Minister of Finance began his remarks by stating that he would not quote long lists of duties. I do not know whether that was a little quip at the expense of my hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) but, whether it was meant as, it was almost as inaccurate a statement as his fiscal arguments were fallacious, because he went on—so rapidly did his arguments fail him, apparently—and quoted rather longer lists of duties than were quoted by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. Well, I shall avoid the example of both hon. gentlemen in that respect and not refer to specific duties at all.

Now the Minister of Finance asked us on this side of the House a very pointed