

its own affairs. The second remedy is the one indicated by me and my friends here in our places last year. That remedy is to seek for trade relations where alone really valuable enlarged trade relations can be found. It is to seek for them within our reach and at our door, not 10,000 miles away—not in the Antipodes, not to go to South America for what we can get ten times better in North America and at one-twentieth of the cost and trouble; but let me say that if ever official returns spoke in trumpet tones in confirmation of the policy advocated on this side and of the line we took last year, they are the identical trade returns I have in my hand. What are the facts? I have mentioned them before, but they will bear reciting again. What do these returns tell us? They tell us that last year, out of a total trade of \$193,050,000, we had a trade with the United States alone of \$91,053,913; they tell us that out of a total volume of exports of our own produce of \$81,382,000, not mentioning goods we do not produce, the United States has bought from us \$40,407,483 worth, Great Britain, \$33,648,000, and the whole of the rest of the world, excepting the United States, \$40,974,000—just \$500,000 worth more than the United States did; and yet we are to turn our back on the United States and are to go 10,000 miles away to see if somebody will buy a few dollars worth of goods from us. Now, is it not a thing which he that runs may read, a thing which ought to open, if anything can open, the eyes of gentlemen opposite, that at the very moment when they were occupied in this House belittling our trade with the United States last year—they are learning more wisdom now, I am happy to say—talking grandiloquently of how well Canada could do without the trade of the United States, the United States trade with us was growing by leaps and bounds. Could there be a better proof of the immense possibilities that that trade would afford to us, under proper development, than the fact that, fettered and handcuffed as it is, with all the impediments that two hostile tariffs can throw in its way, nevertheless last year, while we were deliberately refusing to consider the question, that trade increased by well nigh \$10,000,000; and those returns hardly indicate the true extent of that trade. In the first place, it is well known that our exports to the United States are systematically under-valued. It is well known that what are called short returns are probably a good deal too small. I have here the United States returns for 1887, and likewise our own returns for 1887, and I call the attention of the House to a few notable facts. According to the United States returns, in 1887 we sent to the United States, paying duty, 58,071 cattle. Our own returns only showed 45,981. We sent to the United States, by their returns, 20,695 horses; our returns only showed 18,527. We sent to the United States 477,753 sheep, according to their returns, while our returns only showed 363,000, besides a large number of all these kinds of animals entered as not paying duty. I cannot say how much may be involved in that item, but it does appear to me that a very considerable amount ought to be added on both sides, exports and imports, to the volume of our trade with the United States, and the more so as it is known to me, and I dare say to the Minister of Customs, that in spite of all the restrictions which he has placed on that trade, and in spite of all the vigilance of his officers, a great many goods do find their way into Canada without the formality of going through the Custom house.

An hon. MEMBER. Do you call that a formality.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will not say that going through the Custom house is often a mere formality, but I will say without paying tribute to our Canadian Cæsar. I am not going at this hour to repeat many of the arguments which I used last year. Those arguments, have not yet been met or answered, and therefore I will refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the speech which I then

delivered for the further arguments I could very easily advance in regard to this matter. I have no doubt that, if any hon. gentlemen on that side desire to take up our challenge, they will find many of my hon. friends here ready to make our views plain to their understanding, if they are not now. What is wanted just now is rather to understand exactly the obstacles which are in our way, and I contend that the chief obstacle to the carrying out of the well understood and well ascertained wishes of the people of Canada is the conduct and the past attitude of the Government of Canada. Their fault in that respect is very much the same as their fault in the matter of the fisheries. They have managed, in some way or other, to convince the people of the United States, and to convince the Government of the United States, that the Government of Canada, whatever the people of Canada may be, are not at all desirous of cultivating friendly relations with the United States. I cannot stop to discuss how much of that feeling may be due to the downright stupidity of the Government, as shown in the case of the export duty on sawlogs, how much of it may be due to mere selfishness, how much may be due to a desire on their part to promote their own interests and the interests of the combines and manufacturers which they represent, but there is too much reason to fear that these men are to-day the secret opponents of the wishes of the people of Canada. They hardly dare openly to avow the hostility to the United States which they manifested last year, because they had several lessons which must have opened their eyes to the fact that a very large number of the people of Canada desire full and free and unrestricted trade with the United States; but there is danger that privately they will do everything they can to make a fair treaty impossible. It cannot well be otherwise. Reciprocity between the United States and Canada means wealth and freedom to a very large proportion of our people—freedom particularly from unjust taxation, and from the power which is put in the hands of the monopolists who are grinding the people of Canada to pieces to-day. Therefore, the Government to-day cannot earnestly seek to promote reciprocity, though it may be in their interests to so pretend. Unless the people of Canada convince them that it is at their peril if they push their negligence any further they will conduct these negotiations in such a way as to lead to foreseen and predestined failure. I do not think they will dare to provoke the United States, but I believe they will privately interpose obstacles between what we desire and its accomplishment. This is a case in which you must judge these men not by their words but by their acts, and it is by their acts in the past that we have to judge them; it is by noting such paltry quibbles as that in regard to packages of fruit, it is by such mistakes as that in regard to the export duty on logs, it is by such acts as these that I judge that, if they dared, they would be openly hostile to the United States. I have shown what I believed, and I have given reasons for my belief, to be in the true interest of this country at present. I am very far from saying that the position in which we now find ourselves was the inevitable result of Confederation. I believe, on the contrary, that with reasonable prudence, our position might be very much better than it is. But it is idle to discuss that now. We are not concerned with what might have been, but with what is at this day and this hour. I contend that our position is one of arrested development, and I say that, all things considered, this is the best way out of it. I say that not only is the project we advocate eminently calculated to benefit us materially, but I claim for it this great benefit, this indirect result, that, if it were carried out, it would necessarily curb the extravagance we deplore, and would, to a great extent, though perhaps not altogether, because that mainly depends on the people themselves, ensure honest government in this country. The moment is op-