

that. The purchaser of an article for importation into the United States, if that article is for sale, and he expects to make a profit upon it, will add his profit to the amount of the duty, as it is a part of the cost. Then the existence of trade restrictions all operates to prevent competition and to keep out a certain class of buyers. Whenever a purchase is made for importation to the United States, the purchaser must take out a consul's certificate; he makes the entry at the Customs and runs the risk of seizure. There is a large class of purchasers who do not care to embark in trade under these conditions, and we are suffering from these disadvantages in the duties. First of all, we lose the amount of the duties; then we lose the profit that the dealer importing these articles to the United States receives upon this duty, which is part of the cost; then we lose the benefit of that active competition which will exist in this country if the purchaser is free to trade without any restrictions or any customs regulations to deter him. I believe it is a fair calculation that there is a loss in these three respects of not less than \$10,000,000 a year on the importations from this country to the United States. That is the amount that would be realised under the present system of importations from the United States as measured by the returns of last year, to say nothing of the increase of trade that would ensue if the duties were removed. The rate of duty paid upon our various exports to the United States are, on coal and iron ore, 75 cents per ton; canned fish, about 20 per cent.; lumber, \$1 to \$2; shingles, 35 per cent.; horses, cattle, swine and sheep, 20 per cent.; wool, 10 cents per pound; barley and wheat, 10 cents per bushel; malt and flax seed, 20 cents per bushel; peas, 10 cents per bushel; hops, 8 cents per pound; butter, 4 cents per pound; hay, \$2 per ton; potatoes, 15 cents per bushel, &c.

Let us see what we buy from the people of the United States. Among other things we bought last year, in large quantities, coal, iron and steel manufacturings, tools, pianos and musical instruments, paper, coal oil, printing presses, watches, clocks, furniture, books, cotton goods, cordage, glassware, plated ware, boots and shoes, India-rubber goods, castings, hardware, iron, sewing machines, straw goods, hats, jewelry, &c. We paid in duty last year \$7,131,000 on dutiable goods of the value of \$27,076,680, imported from the United States, and imported from the same country free goods amounting to \$21,384,168. We paid in addition profits upon duty as part of cost amounting to \$3,000,000 more, and between the loss to this country on importations from Canada into the United States and on importations from the United States into Canada on dutiable goods, we were \$20,000,000 worse off than we would have been under free trade. So much for the advantages which would be derived from the removal of the present restrictions between the two countries.

I am occupying the time of the House longer than I had intended, but I wish before resuming my seat to refer briefly to the objections raised to this policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I desire to meet, as well as I can, any and all the objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite or by their friends in the country with respect to it. First, they tell us—and I have met this objection in a measure before—what is the use of this agitation; in what respect is your position different from our own? We are in favor of reciprocity with the United States, you have not a monopoly of that principle, we are in favor of it. I deny it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not in favor of it, because they persistently refuse to make advances to secure it on terms which they know are the only admissible terms, and if they will not accept admissible terms but insist on seeking to secure impracticable terms, it is no use of their talking about being in favor of this policy. It cannot be secured on the terms they propose. Reciprocity in natural products the United States will never grant. Why?

Because the former treaty did not work to their advantage or satisfaction. What was the volume of free importations each way during the 12 years from 1855 to 1866? The free importations from the United States to Canada amounted during that period to \$124,872,233. The free imports to the United States from Canada amounted to \$239,792,234, or almost double. The treaty did not work satisfactorily to the United States. Everything we wanted to sell to the Americans we sold to them, but we did not allow them the privilege of sending to us the products and manufactures they could exchange for our natural products, and it was not a fair reciprocity treaty. And, Sir, if we wish to have a fair reciprocity treaty now, it must be unrestricted reciprocity, a treaty permitting unrestricted interchange of commodities of every nature and character between the two countries, and that is the kind of reciprocity treaty the United States are willing to grant and it is not the kind of reciprocity which our friends on the Government benches are willing to accept.

The next objection is, that we cannot get unrestricted reciprocity, that it is no use agitating about the matter or talking about it or holding out inducements to lead the people to believe that it is a feasible project. I deny it. I think we have abundant reason for saying that this is not so. We have as a reason the resolution of Congress passed the other day by a nearly unanimous vote, and which only failed to be taken up by the Senate by a technical objection being raised by a single member to its immediate consideration, although it had been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. But for that circumstance we would have had the resolution of the House passed by the Senate.

Mr. McNEILL. What was the resolution?

Mr. CHARLTON. It was a resolution of Mr. Hitt in favor of commercial union. It indicates, on the part of the United States, a willingness to treat, for unrestricted reciprocity is one of the outcomes of commercial union, and commercial union is one way of arriving at unrestricted reciprocity, and another way is that which we prefer, and we are warranted in the belief from the passing of this resolution, that a good opportunity is presented to enter into negotiations for the attainment of our object, and that they would be willing to grant us terms somewhat different to those which they now propose. At all events it is worth trying. This objection that we cannot get unrestricted reciprocity is negatived by the passage of this resolution, and at least we are warranted by its passage in attempting negotiations to secure unrestricted reciprocity in a different way from that in which it is presented to us by the resolution passed by the House of Representatives. The feeling in the United States, and I saw it evinced in Washington when I was there lately, is an unmistakable desire on the part of American public men to cultivate friendly relations with Canada, to impress upon Canadians who visit their capital, their desire to treat us fairly and in a friendly spirit, and to show that they are ready to enter into a reciprocity treaty on a fair and equitable basis. There can be no doubt we can get it if we desire it, and the assertion that we cannot get it is not borne out by the facts.

The next objection is, that it is disloyal. To whom is it disloyal? If a policy is calculated to benefit the great mass of the people of this country it is not disloyal to them, because the highest requirement of loyalty is to be loyal to your own people and to promote their best interests. It may be a disloyal policy if you take into consideration exclusively the benefits accruing to a small ring of manufacturers in this country. It may be disloyal if you take into consideration the interests of another ring of manufacturers in Great Britain. Our imports from Great Britain last year amounted to the value of \$39,000,000. We will assume they were all