

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, that is so. Now let me come back for one brief moment to the question of reciprocity. The First Minister and the Minister of Finance, and, so far as I have heard, every other Minister of the Government, express themselves in a spirit of undisguised and bitter hostility to the only form of reciprocity obtainable with the United States. I may do my hon. friend the Finance Minister an injustice, but I take it from his speech the other night that he still proposes to stigmatize the advocacy of unrestricted reciprocity as treason, and that he had not the slightest idea of accepting a treaty upon the basis of unrestricted reciprocity. Let me tell him that if he proceeds upon any other lines than those of unrestricted reciprocity he will, in my opinion, inevitably fail, and I shall regret, in the interest of this country, if the opinions expressed by the Minister of Finance represent the opinions upon which the Government propose to act. I shall regret if the Government refuse to modify in any degree the position which the Finance Minister states they occupy.

I will give the hon. gentleman the credit of having made an effort to provide us with a substitute for this great boon which the Liberal party of Canada seeks to obtain for this country. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman may have supposed that this substitute he sought to obtain would answer the purpose of an actual substitute for the American trade, but he did get last fall to the West Indies, and the result of his mission can hardly be called very brilliant. We find that the desire for reciprocity with the United States is so potent that Guiana and other dependencies of the Crown will have nothing to do with our proposal for reciprocity, as they wish to get admitted to the American market under the provisions of the McKinley Bill. I suppose this West Indian trade must be considered important; far more important than it would seem to be from any statistics which I have been able to obtain. I am rather surprised indeed at the slender amount of our business relations with these countries. The Minister of Finance is perhaps aware—although he might have been before he went on his mission to the West Indies—that the average mulatto or black of the West Indies is a being whose wants are few and easily supplied. I understand that about five yards of cotton is all the clothing he requires in a year, and that a quarter acre patch of bananas, which only requires renewing once in five years will support a family, while during the interval the darky can swing in his hammock. These individuals do not want our barley, they do not want our horses, or cattle, or sheep, or potatoes, or wool, or hides, or eggs, and they have no money to buy them if they did want them.

Mr. FOSTER. They eat cotton down there.

Mr. CHARLTON. They do not have a great deal of it to eat after having supplied themselves with five yards for clothing, if the returns for their labour are as small as represented. I thought I would look up the records to see how much the trade was with these countries, and what the probability was as to the capacity for developing that trade, and I find that last year we sent to the West Indies, including the British, Danish, French and Spanish Islands, and Hayti, agricultural exports to the value of \$229,882 and to South America \$27,452 worth.

Our exports of agricultural products to all other countries, except to the United States, Great Britain and Newfoundland, amounted to \$236,919. With the exceptions I have referred to the export of our agricultural products to all the rest of the world amounted to \$494,193, while to the United States alone we sent \$7,519,000 worth of agricultural products, or over fifteen-fold more than we sent to all the rest of the world excepting Great Britain and Newfoundland. I find that in animals and their products, we exported to all the West Indies \$23,382 worth, to South America \$843 worth, and to all other countries except the United States, Great Britain and Newfoundland, \$260,920. This gives us a total export in animals and their products of \$285,145 to all the world with the exceptions of the countries I have named, while we exported to the United States animals and their products to the value of \$5,966,000, or twenty-one-fold as much as we sent to all the world with the exception of Great Britain and Newfoundland. Even in manufactured goods we exported to the United States \$2,667,282, or nearly 47 per cent. of all the manufactured goods we exported to all the world. Our export of manufactures to the United States exceeded our export to all the world except Great Britain by the sum of \$686,000. How are you going to provide a substitute for that trade? It cannot be done. Even with the restrictions existing at present, by which every effort is being made by the Governments of both countries to kill the trade between Canada and the United States stone dead, the United States furnishes us with a market which we cannot dispense with.

There is a great deal of talk about discriminating against England, but what troubles me is the danger of discriminating against ourselves. We have carefully avoided submitting to the imposition of taxes in this country for the benefit of England. We pay nothing except the salary of the Governor General, and we would not allow England to impose upon us tribute in any shape, either stamp duty, customs duty or income tax. We would not pay a dollar of such taxation. We would revolt before we would submit to give England power to tax us in any way, and yet we talk about discriminating against England. We talk about depriving ourselves of advantageous markets, we talk about adopting a policy which injures ourselves, injures our growth and our prosperity. We talk about doing this because it is going to injure somebody else. We are charged with the duty of taking care of Canadian interests: it is our duty to promote the prosperity of Canada, and England can take care of herself. We must take care of ourselves, and if we can secure vast advantages by a trade treaty with the United States, it is our duty and our privilege to do so.

We have a political Jeremiah in the person of my hon. friend the First Minister, who gives us lugubrious predictions as to revolutions in the United States, and so forth, and we have a political Phari-see in the person of my hon. friend the Finance Minister. A great many years ago there was a man who thanked God he was not as other men were: and the hon. Finance Minister, the other night, in effect, took to himself great credit for not being as bad as these Grits. He said he would advise the gentlemen on this side of the House to cultivate some faith in Canada, some faith in things Cana-