

## THE BALANCE OF TRADE.

Here are 51,000,000 of people to the south of us with whom, for the last forty years, we have a balance of trade against us of \$2,152,990,569, and yet we are seeking by every device known to diplomacy, aided by the strong arm of the Treasury, to further extend our trade with them, regardless of any revenues this trade may bring to the Treasury. Here are 5,000,000 of people to the north of us who, for the last forty years, have a balance in their favor of \$252,117,912, and yet, instead of using national effort to extend and increase our trade with them, we are sending out investigating committees to see if some injury, real or imaginary, can not be hunted up or sought out, by virtue of which we shall be enabled to frame some bill of indictment against them. Can any fair, broad-minded, reasonable man tell us why this is so?

The United States is a great nation; Canada is a small nation so far as numbers are concerned. Geography and destiny have decreed that the two people shall be one. Nothing but parsimonious statesmanship will enable them to continue as two countries.

Let us show by our acts to these people that we are willing to deal fairly and liberally with them; at least, as fairly as we are striving to deal with all the people between us and the south pole. This will make them feel that it is desirable to live not only on good terms with us, but to come in and be a part of us. Starving or coercive measures will never accomplish this end. Such policy wholly ignores the operations of human nature.

Mr. FLOWER. Right here let me ask you a question. Do these South American products, which come from these countries, compete with our American farmers in what they grow?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Some do and some do not. I will get to the question of competition in a moment.

Mr. FLOWER. Would not you get this? Our manufacturers send to Canada these \$51,000,000, and they send to these American States twenty odd millions of dollars. In one instance you are getting the benefit of the manufactures at a point south, and in another instance you are getting the benefit at a point north. How does that affect the farmer?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It would have the same effect upon the farmer as the admission of Texas or Kansas into the Union.

Mr. FLOWER. In opening 3,000,000 square acres of land with only one to the square mile put in competition with him.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. There is nothing in this bugbear of destructive competition on this continent. I speak of the country north of the Rio Grand, as my bill relates immediately to that. If there is anything in it so destructive, as some gentlemen seem to think, the system of economy which nature ordained, which is of divine origin, is not worthy of respect.

Mr. CARLISLE. Suppose you annex Canada.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Exactly. I am coming to that in a moment. In this statement here I show the condition of trade with the 51,000,000 of people to the south of us. Now, we all agree that it is desirable to extend our territory and multiply the facilities of our people, to fight the battle of life successfully and have the opportunity to do it, and that is what this bill proposes.

## CONDITIONS WHEN A PROTECTIVE TARIFF HAS NO OFFICE.

Now, what are the objections? In the first place, it is well known to this committee that I am an earnest Republican, that I am a protectionist with somewhat ultra tendencies, and as such I lay down the proposition on which I stand, and on which I have stood since I have known anything of political economy, that in the presence of equal opportunity, equal conditions, a protective tariff has no proper or honest office to perform and never had, and the fathers of this Republic, and those who in an early day advocated protection, never believed it had and never so said.

As between Canada and the United States there is not a gentleman present who does not know that from every stand-point in the field of industrial competition we hold the reign of vantage. Now, what would result from this competitive trade? Across the border and near by you may obtain iron ore which you need in New England, and also coal which you need. In fact, there are various supplies of raw material just at hand, but across the line, that could be utilized in that great hive of industry, New England.

What is the objection to permitting you to exchange that which you want to sell for what they have and which you need? Why, it is said that Canada will come in competition with us in every field of industrial effort. So say some of the manufacturers. So say some of the farmers. Why, gentlemen, that can be no valid objection. If it is the object of Government merely to restrict competition, will you tell me