

and his statement was a correct one—that not all the British imports that were dutiable were given a discrimination of 33 per cent, but that this applied to only about \$28,000,000, upon which the duty amounted to about 19 per cent. This is correct. I have only to say, in connection with that, that the reduction of duties under the operation of the thirty-three and one third per cent discrimination to 19 per cent, is about 8 per cent lower than it ought to be. If the discrimination were abolished the duty would go up 8 per cent and the cry we have from our woollen interests of insufficient protection would be ended. We have developed in our argument about this matter the fact that Canada is an excellent customer for the United States. The truth is she is the third largest customer for the general line of exports from the United States, and the largest customer for manufactured goods exported from that country. If we compare our standing in this respect with that of Latin America with its 60,000,000 inhabitants, we shall be somewhat surprised with the result of the scrutiny. Last year the United States exported to Mexico and Central America, with a population of 14,000,000, goods to the amount of \$45,924,000. These are countries almost as closely allied to the United States by geography and nature as Canada is. Last year the United States exported to all South America \$38,074,000 worth of goods; and to all the West India Islands, Spanish, Danish, Dutch, British, French—this excludes Cuba and Porto Rico—goods to the value of \$17,020,000. That is to say, to all this enormous region from the northern boundary line of Mexico to Cape Horn, embracing every island in the West India group, excepting Cuba and Porto Rico, the United States exported less than she exported to Canada, by no less than \$19,796,000. And, excluding the West Indies and including all of Mexico and Central and South America, her exports to these countries were less by \$36,814,000 than her exports to Canada. It is beginning to dawn upon the American mind that Canada is a market worth looking after, that it would be well to take into consideration whether they should not examine a little more closely into trade matters between the United States and this most excellent customer to the north of them. We have had a full generation in the life of man of repression, of bad feeling, of hostile tariff legislation—all upon one side nearly. We are now rounding out that period, and we have to see what the culmination of these conditions is.

If these conditions are to continue, what are we to do? First of all, as I imagine, we have to find out whether they are to continue. That is a question of so much importance that we need to make no mistake about it. We want to ascertain what we may settle down upon and rely upon as likely to be permanent conditions; and when we have ascertained that, then our line of conduct, so far as my opinion goes,

would be clearly defined. We are either to get fair play from nations now treating us unfairly, or we are to meet them with their own weapons. That may not be profitable for the time being, it may inflict upon us a little inconvenience, it may raise the price of some things a little higher, but in my opinion that is the true policy to pursue. We want to look to ulterior results, and we want to apply ourselves to a line of conduct with something in view that we are aiming for, and that we can only get by asserting our rights.

Again I refer to the significant utterance of the Finance Minister where he states that notwithstanding and whatever his abstract principles may be, we have got to take note of what our customers and surrounding nations do, and have got to be governed to some extent by the course they pursue. Now, as I have said, we have dealt with Germany already. That question was closed up, we knew where we stood, we knew that we had received the most unfair and overbearing treatment from the overlord of that empire. We knew we had to assert ourselves, we have done it, and we have done it like men; and if the overlord wants to adopt a retaliatory policy and exclude our imports from Germany, I would look upon it with serene indifference; we would simply exclude his goods from Canada and inflict eight times as much injury upon that country as we receive in return.

Now, it is necessary to inquire in a discussion of reciprocity: Is reciprocity desirable? Why, if it is not desirable, we do not want to waste any time on it. If it is not desirable we would simply say to the United States when they make us overtures: We don't want to meet you, we don't want any reciprocity. We have decided what we want to do, you go your road and we will go ours; we don't care anything about reciprocity. Would that be a wise course to pursue? Mr. Speaker, this continent, with its seven odd million square miles under the domain of English speaking people, inhabited by 85,000,000 of people speaking the English tongue, this continent has before it vast, almost inconceivable resources of power and possibilities of development. This continent inhabited by English speaking people, will inevitably exercise a potent, if not a controlling, influence upon the affairs of the world. This great region is now in the possession of two branches of that great stock, with an interesting experiment in one branch of it in the fact that one state of its domain is inhabited by people of French extraction. We have most interesting problems before us. There is one thing that we can rely upon, and that is that in the interest the world at large, in the interest of every man, woman and child, that lives upon this continent to-day, or will live upon this continent in the future, in the interest of all this, it is in the highest degree desirable that the relations between these two states should be amicable, friendly and intimate, and that the seeds of dis-