

That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;....

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would promote those kindly relations between the empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

Since 1896, when we took office, the Liberal party has striven to open negotiations with the United States on this question of reciprocity. In 1898 or 1899 a high joint commission under the presidency of Lord Herschell proceeded to Washington and there and then discussed the question with the American statesmen. We all know why this commission did not meet again after the sittings held in the summer of 1898. We all know, it is a matter of history that it is on the question of the Alaskan boundary that it came to grief. But strange to say, in the document which I quoted a moment ago, the letter of Governor Stanley of Preston to James G. Blaine, then Secretary of State in the United States, the first question to be debated is that of a renewal of the reciprocity treaty with the United States. The Alaskan boundary question has since been settled, alas! against the best interests of Canada. The question of the fisheries has been settled in the interests of Canada by the Hague Tribunal. The other questions pending between the United States and Canada concerning our boundaries on the lakes and rivers adjoining the United States have also been settled and now, as the crowning event, it is the first question in the letter of Governor Stanley of Preston which is settled last. We have ceased to make pilgrimages to Washington. Washington has come to Canada, and the result is the policy which is now offered to the consideration of the Canadian parliament. Mr. Chairman, I stated a moment ago that the two policies of 1891 and of 1911 are quite different. As I stated, in 1891 we were advocating unrestricted reciprocity; in 1911, we are presenting to parliament a restricted reciprocity agreement. In 1891 we were opposed by Sir John A. Macdonald and the Hon. Edward Blake, because both were opposed to the free interchange of all commodities including manufactures as well as natural products. But, Sir John Macdonald

Mr. LEMIEUX.

favoured the free interchange of natural products. That is mentioned in the statute of 1879, and in his last address to the electors of Canada. The Hon. Edward Blake—and by the way, I may say his distinguished brother, in a letter published in this morning's 'Globe' stands by the present policy of the Liberal government—the Hon. Edward Blake in his Durham address of 1891 opposed the policy of the Liberal party, first, because in his mind it was discriminating against British manufactures, second because Canada would become dependent on the United States for the adequacy of the Dominion revenue and third because in his mind commercial union or continental union might mean political absorption or annexation. How different from the present situation! In the first place, there is not in this agreement a discrimination against Canadian manufacturers. There is in our fiscal policy, however, a discrimination in favour of English manufacturers. Our revenue has never been larger and it will become larger and larger as the years roll by. We are discriminating in favour of Great Britain's manufacturers.

Let me quote from a pamphlet issued by the Tariff Reform Association in England. In this pamphlet, Tariff Reform, by Mr. J. Ellis Parker, the effects of the Canadian preference in favour of British manufactures are pointed out. It says:

Before the Canadian preference, British imports into Canada constantly declined. The effect of the Canadian preferential tariff, which was introduced in 1897, upon the British export trade as a whole, and upon the individual manufacturing industries, may be seen at a glance from the following table which is taken from the report on Conditions and Prospects of British Trade in Canada, published in 1908.

Then he gives the three columns of British imports. These figures are in round numbers:

1888..	\$30,848,000
1897..	20,217,000
1906..	52,615,000

Proceeding with the advantages that must inure to Canada let me mention in as few words as possible what the farmers will draw from the present agreement. The benefits from the opening of the markets of the United States to the products of Canada are so obvious and have been set forth with so much ability by those especially qualified to deal with the subject that it would be idle to again recite a catalogue of these benefits. Last year Canada exported rather more than \$90,000,000 worth of agricultural products. This is nearly one-third of the total exports from this country which totalled \$279,000,000. These agricultural products consisted mainly of wheat, oats and flour, and of the \$90,000,000,