

know it has been the fashion for Government organs and Government speakers on various platforms to denounce the Opposition as being despondent and given to crying down the country because they give true illustrations of Canada and the United States. I acquit my hon. friend entirely of any such intention and I did not have him in view when commenting on the course of other gentlemen. Now we are asked to congratulate ourselves upon an increase in trade. I desire simply to call attention to the fact that as far back as 1873, 1874 and also 1883 we were rich enough to buy a very much larger amount abroad than we were able to buy last year. The value of our imports during the last year was 127 millions in round numbers. In 1873 our imports amounted to 128 millions. Again in 1874 they amounted also to 128 millions, and in 1883 we brought as much as 132 millions worth, five millions more than last year. The export last year was no doubt large and gratifying. I wish, however, that it had been much larger and I think that if a different policy had been pursued it would have been much larger. To what was that large export due? It was due entirely to the farmers of the North-west. It was largely due to the great crops with which Manitoba and the North-west were blest last year. It is due also to the increase of two millions in the products of the forest; it is due also to the cheese industry of Ontario and Quebec, one of the great industries of this country. That is what it is due to, and although very gratifying, and I am glad to recognize that it is so, I think under other conditions it might have been very much greater than it is. I notice that our exports of manufactures have increased. I was rather curious to know in what way the exports of manufactures had increased, and on turning up the page I was surprised to find that over one million of our exports of manufactures was due to the exportation of the household effects of settlers. Over one million of the total exports was made up of the effects of settlers going to the United States. That branch of it was not a subject for congratulation. I find that during the year preceding the household effects of settlers who went to the United States was about the same figure. I do not think we can take very much credit to ourselves for having exported as manufactures the household effects of the people of Canada who have had to fly to another land.

We are asked to thank His Excellency for informing us that measures have been taken to carry into effect an agreement between the United States and this country in regard to the boundary of Alaska. This boundary of Alaska is a very old subject. It crops up periodically. It was up some fifteen or twenty years ago, and at several periods since. Alaska, as hon. gentlemen probably know, is that part of the country ceded by Russia to the United States on this continent. By the treaty between Great Britain and Russia in 1825, a boundary line was established between British territory and Russian territory on the western side of this continent, and I am sorry to say that, as in the case of a great many other treaties where the lands of Canada were made the subject of treaties by plenipotentiaries from the mother country, Canada got the worst of it. If any one looks at the map he will see how very illogical it is to give away, or to consent to a foreign country occupying so much of the coast line of this continent as Russia then insisted upon occupying of our Canadian territory on the north-west. But the boundary line between the two countries was made rather a puzzle: Prince of Wales Islands (strange to say, one would have thought the very name would have saved it as a possession of the British Crown) was freely given away to Russia, and the line was then run to the head of Portland channel and by a devious crooked line to Mount Elias. It is that very devious crooked line that is now engaging the attention of the two Governments. If I had any advice to offer to the two Governments, I should say adopt a true line running straight north, wholly irrespective of the height of land mentioned in the treaty. Under the treaty the line was to follow the height of land. Where the height of land was more than ten marine leagues distant from the shore, then a line running parallel to the shore and ten leagues from it was to be followed. The mountains of course do not follow the coast in a direct line, they bend towards the shore, and they bend inland, and so the line is an exceedingly difficult one to draw. I think, therefore, that the two Governments ought to agree upon a degree of longitude, a straight line which would run north to Mount Elias.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B.C.)—That has been proposed.