

our trade with the United States. Take for instance the exports to that country from Canada. They amount to \$92,000,000 last year while the United States sent into the Dominion of Canada \$192,000,000, one hundred millions of dollars of trade against us. Let us examine the kind of products we are sending into the United States and then consider whether it would not be wise for us to say that as far as raw material is concerned, it should to a great extent be taken care of in our own country. Canada exports to the United States of raw material, the following amounts:—

Coal and charcoal.	\$ 4,048,000
Furs and skins, not dressed.	1,393,000
Copper of all kinds.	6,212,000
Gold and silver, gold-bearing quartz, dust, &c.	7,388,000
Silver ore.	9,937,000
Chromic iron ore, iron ore and pig iron.	154,000
Scrap iron.	109,000
Lead and tin ore, asbestos, nickel, &c.	3,875,000
Settlers' effects.	1,665,000
Wood, logs, lumber, piles, pulp-wood, &c.	26,377,000
Wood pulp, chemically prepared and mechanically prepared.	3,217,000
Wool and manufactures thereof.	3,280,000
Coin and bullion (which last year were over \$16,000,000)	1,581,000
Rags.	211,891
Total.	\$69,454,000

Practically in round figures that makes \$70,000,000 of raw material out of the \$92,000,000 of exports from Canada to the United States, so that the manufacturers of Canada receive small consideration at the hands of this government. While, on the other hand, the manufacturers of the United States are sending into this country the bulk of the \$192,000,000 of American exports to Canada.

The minister says that Ottawa went to Washington years ago and now Washington comes to Ottawa. It does not seem to matter much whether Washington comes to Ottawa or not, Washington goes back, generally speaking, with the very best terms that can be obtained and terms very much to the advantage of the United States. We are certainly in this case giving something for nothing. Let us see whether or not the United States used a club in this instance. In the Sunday Herald of Boston, under date of March 27, I find:

Using the maximum schedule as a club, just as the framers of the provision intended it should be used, the president has been able to obtain lower rates of duty for numerous exports to several countries than could otherwise have been obtained.

The Journal of Commerce of New York says:

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG.

Every tariff since 1890, except the Wilson Act (and even that in certain particulars), has made it harder for Canada to do any business in the United States. The trade in barley was slaughtered, the wheat business was cut to the lowest level, the tariff on paper was kept at tremendous height. Whenever Canada thought she saw a chance to build up a trade in the United States, the next tariff Act regularly cut off the possibility.

I could go on reading paper after paper of the United States going to show that they are more than delighted with the outcome of the treaty arrangement with Canada. They emphatically state that it would be impossible for the President of the United States to force through such a measure as our Finance Minister seems to think he would. Canada has certainly suffered humiliation at the hands of this government, especially when we consider the fact that the government was backed up in a firm stand against any concessions by practically every newspaper in the Dominion, Liberal and Conservative, outside of perhaps the Toronto 'Globe.' On the 17th of March, the Toronto 'Globe' made this statement:

The Liberals are firm. Prepared to face tariff war if necessary.

But on March 28, it took back practically all it had said. Would the hon. minister consider this fact, that we are buying from the United States \$25 worth of goods for every man, woman and child in Canada, whereas the people of the United States buy from us only one dollar of goods for every man, woman, and child, in the United States. Then look at the message which President Taft sent to Congress when he said that the results of the meeting with the Canadian statesmen were satisfactory. The opposition voted against the French treaty. Are we as Canadians going to make a present of our trade advantages to every country which asks for it? You can depend upon it that if we continue the policy that we have laid down with regard to our trade relations, that, as years go by, we will have more and more complications in our tariff arrangements with other countries, and can expect to be placed in just such a humiliating position as we are placed in to-day; and I sincerely hope that whenever the opportunity comes the Finance Minister will arrive at some definite tariff arrangement whereby we shall have one maximum and one minimum rate for all countries. I merely rose to utter my protest against the present arrangement forced upon the Finance Minister, and I trust that in future, if he should take into consideration the tariff, and treaty arrangements of other foreign countries with Canada, he will also get closer to the question of how these arrangements