

I notice that the closing paragraph of the interview rather dashes to the ground the extravagant statement that has been dinned into our ears for many years about this great market of 60,000,000. Mr. Davies, speaking in the county of Wright about that market, put it at 75,000,000, but talking to the Americans he said "the Canadian trade will only be felt in the very fringe of your American border," so this large market for Canadians of 75,000,000 has no existence except in that gentleman's imagination. But not only Mr. Davies, but another prominent gentleman was in Washington last summer and was interviewed, and his interview was published in the press. I refer to Mr. John Charlton, and I will read a paragraph from the published report of that interview :

Mr. Charlton states he is not here in an official capacity. In an interview to-day with a reporter of the United Associated presses Mr. Charlton in discussing the question of the desirability of more liberal trade relations between the United States and Canada, stated that the recent change of government in Canada had brought the question of reciprocity to the front. The Liberal party of Canada had always favoured more intimate trade relations with the United States. The Conservative party, on the contrary, had uniformly been adverse to reciprocity except upon unattainable conditions. Now Canada was governed by broader-minded and more liberal men. Hon. Wilfred Laurier, the premier of Canada, is a man of broad views. He is a Liberal of Liberals. His knowledge of American affairs is accurate and extended, and he ardently hopes for intimate and friendly business and social relations between the two countries.

"Canada," said Mr. Charlton, "will unquestionably attempt in the near future to obtain a treaty of reciprocity in trade with the United States; a treaty that will admit to freedom of mutual interchange all natural products, and will cover, in addition, as wide a list of manufactured articles as the establishment of a just equilibrium of mutual interests shall require. When the conditions of trade between the two countries are carefully analyzed," said Mr. Charlton, "it will be found that the advantages to be arrived from a free interchange of natural products are not entirely upon the side of Canada. The removal of the Canadian duty on Indian corn would lead to an enormous consumption of that grain in Canada for stock feeding and other purposes. American pork would be largely used by Canadian lumbermen if admitted free, and the repeal of the Canadian duty on flour and meal would enable the United States to supply Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island with breadstuffs, to the exclusion of the Ontario and Manitoba wheat. Fresh beef from Chicago packing houses would find extensive sale in Canadian cities and towns and the repeal of the duty of sixty cents on bituminous coal would crowd out the use of Nova Scotia coal in all of Canada west of and including Montreal."

## PARTING OF THE WAYS.

One statement, which Mr. Charlton emphasized, seems to possess significance. He represents Canada as now standing at the parting of the ways. On the one hand, are friendly business and social relations with the United States and the gradual closing of the gap which has been widened since 1886. On the other hand, are Imperial confederation, Empire consolidation, a distinctive British system, embracing the Motherland and all her colonies, improved steamships and cable services; differential duties in England in favour of the colonies and in the colonies in favour of England, colonial representation in the Imperial parliament, and a movement all along the line for the consolidation and unification of all the scattered outposts of Britain's Imperial world-wide domain. When Canada shall present her overtures to the government of the United States for more extended trade relations, the latter will decide upon which of these ways she will enter.

Here Mr. Charlton distinctly states to the people of the United States that they have the destiny of Canada in their hands and that whenever Mr. Laurier presented his proposition, it was for the United States to decide whether Canada should be allowed to go on and work a consolidation within the lines of this great empire of ours, or whether he should fall commercially into the hands of the great republic to the south of us. I have always felt that this course of conduct pursued by Liberal leaders when the Conservative party were in power, of going to Washington and interviewing the government at Washington behind the backs of the government of Canada, has been most reprehensible. I would like to know when any such course was known to be pursued in any European country—a member of the opposition going to a government, a friendly government, perhaps, and dinning into their ears that the ruling party were unfriendly to them, but that when the other party came into power, they would do what was fair and right with them. That course has been followed by several members of the present government when they were in opposition. They stepped between the government of the day and the government of the United States, and barred the government of Canada from settling some of the difficulties that existed between Canada and the United States by saying that the Canadian government were unfriendly to the United States. It was unpatriotic and disloyal to Canada, and borders, in some instances, on the limits of treason. I refer to the conduct of Mr. Charlton when the Wilson Bill