

we might have reciprocal trade with the United States, as we once had before, for the advantage of both countries. That we admit—everybody admits that. But the hon. member from Ottawa says it would be for our advantage to have universal reciprocity with the United States.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Because we cannot get any other.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Can my hon. friend tell me any way in which we can get that except by annexation?

HON. MR. SCOTT—Nothing of the kind.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend has not proved that there is any chance of getting unrestricted reciprocity with the United States any more than there is of getting such reciprocity as would be advantageous to our country. But what is the difference between the two? What does unrestricted reciprocity with the United States mean? That means differential legislation against the whole of the rest of the world. My hon. friend objects to differential legislation in favor of the mother country, but he is quite willing that we should legislate differentially in favor of the United States and against the whole of the rest of the world, including the mother country. I could understand such an argument from people in the United States, but not from anyone else. I do not see how any Canadian could maintain a proposition like that. My hon. friend, of course, is sincere, and believes he is right. He may be more right than I, but I give my view—I cannot see how any Canadian can advocate differential legislation against the whole world except the United States. And what does unrestricted reciprocity with the United States mean? The United States has twice as large a duty as ours. In order to have unrestricted reciprocity we must have the same tariff as the United States to begin with.

HON. MR. SCOTT—No.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I confess I cannot see how we could have unrestricted reciprocity with the United States if we admitted goods into this country at a lower rate than their tariff. Would the United States allow us to import goods from the mother country at 20 per cent. while

the same goods paid 60 per cent. in the United States? The consequences of that would be that the whole of these importations would be through Canada. If we can imagine that such a result as that could be arrived at I would join with my hon. friend.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The same thing occurs now.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—We have Customs houses now.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Goods may come into our country at a lower duty than prevails in the United States, and from this country be transported to the United States.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—Although my hon. friend did not say there were to be no Customs houses along the line, I have read a good many articles on this—I will not call it “fad”—but this idea of unrestricted reciprocity, and one great argument urged by its advocates was that there would be no Customs houses along the line.

HON. MR. POWER—My hon. friend is confounding commercial union with unrestricted reciprocity.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—I confess I cannot distinguish between them. Unrestricted reciprocity, I understand, is to admit all goods from this country into the United States without paying duty.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Only the products of the country.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—And all goods shall come from the United States into this country free of duty.

HON. MR. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman does not state it fairly at all. The products of Canada, whether natural or manufactured, should be interchanged with those of the United States, but the products of other countries could not be imported and sent to the United States in the same way. The Customs houses between the two countries would still have to be kept up. It would simply be an enlargement of the old Reciprocity Treaty.

HON. MR. ABBOTT—My hon. friend is not in accord with the hon. member from Halifax.