

then I say to him that the statement he ventured to make—it was in an after-dinner speech, and, no doubt, some allowance must be made, particularly as the enthusiasm of his followers had, perhaps, carried him away a little—that this was due to his policy, is not well founded.

I turn to another evidence, which, I think, the right hon. gentleman will admit is conclusive on this point. Let me read from the report of Mr. Gage, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States :

The foreign commerce of the fiscal year 1898 in many respects has been phenomenal. The exportation of the products of both field and factory exceeded in value those of any preceding year, and the grand total of exports was the largest ever recorded. For the first time in the history of our foreign commerce the year's exportation averaged more than \$100,000,000 a month, the total being \$1,231,482,330, against \$1,050,993,556 in 1897, and \$1,030,278,148 in 1892, no other year having reached the billion dollar line.

Was this due to the policy of the hon. gentleman? Is it to this Government that the United States owe this that they declare to be a phenomenal condition of progress and prosperity? No, Sir; it is due to those causes to which I have adverted: it is a question of crops—yes, and of prices. The crops may not have exceeded by so very much those of previous years, but when you come to send a hundred millions to Great Britain alone, as the United States did, and at double prices to the farmer that they have been able to obtain before, the hon. gentleman will see that the causes of the prosperity are entirely beyond anything that he has been able to do. But I am wrong, perhaps, in saying that the hon. gentlemen had nothing to do with this prosperity. They had, a little. They ran up the imports into Canada of the products of the United States some nineteen or twenty millions beyond what they had been before, and to that extent their policy may be fairly claimed to have contributed to the increase of the United States exports to which Secretary Gage refers.

Now, let me give my right hon. friend another evidence to show that this idea that it is in proportion to what you receive from a country that you send to that country, is an entire delusion. I have already shown that, while we were increasing by millions the exports of Canada's products to Great Britain, we were actually taking half a million dollars less from Great Britain than had been taken before. And what about the United States? Why, Sir, the United States took from the United Kingdom, in 1889, \$179,566,373 worth, and in 1898 only \$111,361,617, a decrease of \$68,204,758. Now, if there was anything in the hon. gentleman's theory, how could these figures arise? In 1889 the United States exported to the United Kingdom \$650,616,283 worth, and in 1893, having taken \$68,000,000 worth less

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

from England than they did before, they exported \$981,134,110 to England, or an increase of \$331,517,827. That, I trust, will prevent my right hon. friend from on any occasion venturing again to claim that the question of how much the products of Canada may be sent to any country depends upon what is received from that country. Now, Sir, I approach the subject that was so fully and so very ably dealt with by the hon. gentleman who moved the Address, and that is the Anglo-American rapprochement, as it was termed. The question is one of the greatest possible gravity, there can be no doubt about that; and I think I may venture to claim at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite that I fully appreciated that gravity in the course I felt it my duty to take in regard to that matter. I felt that if there was anything in the shape of gratitude in the heart of man, it was simply impossible that the United States of America could fail to recognize the deep obligation under which they stood to Great Britain. When all the leading powers of Europe approached Great Britain at the time of the Spanish war with a proposal to intervene on the ground that there was no sufficient cause for war between the United States and Spain, no intelligent person in this or any other country requires to be told that if England had adopted that policy, if she had joined the other powers of Europe in interfering between the United States and Spain, it was impossible that the arms of the former could have accomplished what they did, or that the results could have been what they were. There is no doubt that in the press and among public men in a great many quarters of the United States there was a warm and strong expression of gratitude for England's course in that matter. I confess that although I had had some reason to take a somewhat contrary view, from observations I had an opportunity of making, I was greatly impressed with the opportunity that was thus presented for a closer rapprochement between the members of the great English-speaking family. My right hon. friend will remember that I was obliged to treat a proposal of one of my friends behind me with a little discourtesy, advising him not to persist at this time in urging action on the part of this House that would be calculated to interfere in the slightest degree with what I looked upon as a very great and important movement.

An hon. MEMBER. And you were wrong.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. It really looks as though I had been. But as I say, I felt that there never had been such an opportunity for Canada to obtain a fair and just settlement of the various questions in dispute that existed between the United States of America and our own country: and so strongly impressed was I with that