

you expect to have the benefit of our market." I am one of those Canadians who have lived in Canada a long time—perhaps longer than some of those present here to-day who were born in the country. I have watched the progress of Canada and have come to the conclusion that Canadians are not inferior intellectually, industrially, or in perseverance, to any other people in the world, and that while we are prepared to deal fairly and honestly with our neighbours, we never should consent to any arrangement with a foreign country that will not be equitable in its character, or which would prove injurious to the empire of which we form a part. These are my views, and I deprecate in the strongest possible language this constant appeal to the United States, and the declaration that we have been unfriendly to our neighbours. It is not true. There is nothing on record in the statute-book, or in the correspondence between the United States and Canada since confederation that can establish a charge of unfriendliness. Talking about the bonding system, I am surprised that a man, with the genius and eloquence of the premier of this country, should refer to the subject as he has done. We all know that the bonding system is guaranteed by treaty, and that if the United States were to denounce that treaty it would affect them quite as much as it would affect us. We are not so dependent on the United States carrying trade as we were twenty-five or thirty years ago, and as we are deepening our canals and extending our railway system, we are becoming more independent every day. Look at the traffic through the United States of Canadian products, amounting to sixty or seventy million dollars annually. Does any one suppose that our neighbours will denounce a treaty which gives them the benefit of that carrying trade? The whole thing is so nonsensical that I wonder that the leader of a great party should give utterance to such sentiments. Then there was a remark made about the coasting trade. Everyone knows that we have been trying to induce the United States government to concede the coasting trade to Canada in the inland waters. If you refer back to 1869, the first despatch which I had the honour of drafting and sending to the United States on the trade question, when I was Minister of Customs, laid down the broad principle that if the United States

was prepared to repeal its navigation laws, so far as they affected the coasting trade in the inland waters of Canada, although we were only four millions of people as against their sixty millions, we were prepared to meet them on equal terms and fight the battle with them. That proposition was made by me to Mr. Blaine, and he said: "Oh, no. Do you propose your scheme for the inland waters and also for the sea?" I replied: "No; our proposition is for the inland waters only; but if you are willing to negotiate the broader question, we are prepared to discuss that question too. Our statutes give us power to declare the coasting trade free to any nation, and the moment you adopt that course we will follow you to the fullest possible extent. Surely you are not afraid of the four or five millions of people in Canada when you have sixty millions of people in the United States." Mr. Blaine, with that characteristic of all United States citizens—and I admired him for it—turned to Mr. Forster and said, "How will that affect the United States?" The conclusion they came to was, as expressed in Mr. Blaine's own language, "Great Britain has the carrying trade of the world now, and we will not permit them to come into our waters." That is the spirit in which, I venture to say, you will be met when you come to ask the United States government for concessions. If you take my advice you will not accede to anything of the kind. If they give you free coasting trade—wrecking we did concede to them in the interests of humanity, though some of the Liberal party objected because it affected their personal interest—let us reciprocate, but I hope beyond that the government of Canada will not go. I have to apologize for having spoken at such length, but so many points were raised by the mover of the address, affecting the administration of which I was a leader for a short time, that I deemed it necessary to put in this defence.

Hon. Sir OLIVER MOWAT moved the adjournment of the debate.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate then adjourned.