

glad to undo and revoke. I am not going to pursue that question. It would be worth pursuing, but at this late hour I must refrain, tempting as the subject is because it shows the utter carelessness, recklessness and imbecility with which the affairs of the country are administered, the utter folly with which the Government acts on questions of trade of the greatest possible moment. Here is a trade of ten million dollars absolutely put in peril for the sake of an export duty of ten thousand dollars additional, and that when the Government must have known that at the very moment they were raising this export duty, we were importing free from the United States probably six or seven times as many saw logs as we were sending to them. The object of the hon. gentleman, I am afraid, was only too apparent to those who choose to read between the lines and to look below the surface. Those hon. gentlemen when they commit those acts, when they challenge the United States—because these acts of theirs were a direct challenge to the United States to adopt retaliatory measures, a challenge which we have seen the Congress and people of the United States no way slow to accept—when they committed those acts, their object was altogether too apparent. They dreaded the rising tide of public opinion in favor of freer commercial relations with the people of the United States. They thought that we on this side might make political gain of it. They knew that if our contention was successful, it would interfere a great deal with certain interests from which they draw much comfort and assistance from time to time. They do not dare to say they dread reciprocity in open terms. They cannot say that, because they carried the elections in which the Mackenzie Government were defeated, to an enormous extent, and especially in the Maritime Provinces, by deluding the people into believing that, by imposing enormous duties on the goods which they imported, they would, in all probability, obtain reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. KIRK. And they were not to raise the duties.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; as my hon friend reminds me, they were not to raise the tariff, but only to readjust it. I believe, however, that there is a change coming rapidly over the spirit of their dream. I think they are gradually awakening to the fact that, by these unfriendly acts—and they were most unfriendly acts towards the people of the United States—they are provoking a feeling which is not encouraging for the policy they have pressed to pursue. Up to a recent time, it appeared to be their policy to provoke and chafe the people of the United States, and then turn around and say to us: the United States are hostile to you, they are going to put duties on your products and there is no chance of our making reciprocal trade relations with them. This day's work shows that the United States—to their credit and honor be it said—are not actuated by hostile feelings to the people of Canada. They have extended an olive branch to us; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite are wise, if they can rise for once to the level of the post they fill, they will even at this twelfth hour endeavor for their own sakes, if not for the sake of the country, to obtain some reasonable proposition from the United States, and to make reasonable propositions to them, by which in time, if not forthwith, the structure of fairer and fuller commercial relations between the two countries may be built up. I have said that the policy pursued up to this time was one which called in the highest degree for censure at the hands of the Opposition, and of the people of Canada. That policy contained a double fraud. These hon. gentlemen thought they were perfectly safe in vamping and blustering—I mean particularly in talking as they did about having the whole army and navy of England at their back. I tell those hon. gentlemen that neither the army nor the navy of England will ever be used for

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

the purpose of allowing us to embroil them with the United States, and well they know it. They talk about this matter, they vapor and they bluster, and, when serious peril is incurred, they back down as they have done before, and then they tell the people: We stood up for your rights until greater interests came into question, and we could not interpose against the interests of the Empire. At the same time, they will say to England: We have sacrificed the rights of Canada for the sake of the Empire, and we hope you will consider it, and give us your consideration. Being traitors both to Canada and to the Empire, they will probably, like some other traitors, succeed in obtaining rewards from both. But to Canada this means injury and degradation; it means that the United States will be more or less irritated; that, in the long run, we will have to make concessions and will receive no thanks for them, because concessions which are forced out of us, and are known to be forced out of us by the orders of the Imperial Government, will never conciliate the United States. That is not the way in which the United States ought to be approached. Our position is difficult enough. I admit that it must be always, in the nature of the case, a position requiring great caution when a small country of four or five millions of people has to deal with one of the greatest nations in the world. I agree with some things which have been stated on the other side of the House. I agree that it is eminently in the interests of Canada that our policy should be firm, dignified and prudent in dealing with the United States; but where I take issue with the hon. gentlemen opposite is that their policy is neither firm, prudent nor dignified; that what they do in one day they are in haste to reverse the next, that they are consistent only in one thing, which is to inspire the United States with a feeling of contempt for the conduct of the Canadian Government. Now, if these hon. gentlemen were prepared, having counted the cost, to stand firm to any policy they had adopted, although I might think rather lightly of their discretion, I would admire their valor in thinking that they were able to contend with a power like that to the south of us. I agree, however, with the Minister of Finance, who stated that we could not single-handed contend with the United States; and, under those circumstances, it is of no service to us to advance pretensions which the Government know at a later date, and probably at a shortly later date, they will be compelled to abandon. No greater calamity could befall the people of this country than for the United States to be hostile to us; and, if the policy of this Government has made them so hostile, this Government would have committed as great a treason as they well could against the welfare and good government of Canada. In any case, it is not the part of brave men, when confronted with such a situation, to indulge in bluster or to talk about the army and the navy we would have at our back. We might have to face such a contingency, and, if we had to do so, the situation should be faced manfully, but with a full knowledge of the gravity of the situation. This is a matter in which petty provocations and small annoyances on the part of the Government are calculated to do enormous injury to this country, and also to the friendly relations which should exist between the people of Great Britain and the people of the United States. We have to study not only to be right but to appear to be right, and to show that we desire to be good neighbors to the people of the United States and to cultivate good relations with them. In that way only could the people of Canada truly serve the Empire of which we form a part. That is of all things the greatest service we can render to the British Empire, and it is clear, if we are going to do that, that it is advisable for us, in the words of this resolution, under existing circumstances, to remove any causes of irritation, especially when there is a new Government coming into power in the United States. I thoroughly and cordially endorse the