

manufactured goods. I do not believe unrestricted reciprocity would diminish that trade; it would increase our prosperity and our purchasing power, and the tendency would be to increase rather than diminish the trade with Great Britain. But we will suppose that trade was obliterated, that we blotted out the entire importations to the value of \$39,000,000, what interests would be affected? How much capital is invested to produce those goods? Not more than \$20,000,000. How many operatives are employed? Not over 26,000; at least not over 100,000 are directly or indirectly employed in connection with our importations from Great Britain last year. Is our policy disloyal which would benefit five millions of Canadians at the expense of the owners of \$20,000,000 of capital, and at the expense of 100,000 people in England employed in manufacturing the goods we import? My sense of the requirements of loyalty would lead me to prefer the interests of 5,000,000 here to 100,000 people in England. My sense of loyalty would lead me to prefer the interests of English capitalists who have invested \$600,000,000 in Canada to the interests of British capitalists who have invested \$20,000,000 in manufacturing English goods imported into this country. The true loyalty is such as promotes the interests of our own people at home, and that is the object of the policy we advocate.

Then we are told that England would not sanction such an arrangement. I do not know about that. England did sanction a treaty called the Brown Draft Treaty, which amounted almost to unrestricted free trade, which put a very large number of articles on the free list. Here is an incident which has a bearing on this case:

"In 1874, when the Reciprocity Treaty was being negotiated by Minister Thornton, the English Government instructed him to modify it at the suggestion of the Canadian Ministry and make such additions to the list of American goods to be admitted free into Canada as the Canadians desired."

He did so and made out a long list of American articles to be admitted free of duty, so long that it was almost free trade. Not one of these articles coming from England was to be admitted free of duty. This draft of a treaty was sent to Lord Derby, who answered that the whole proceeding was approved, and the English Government assented to the arrangement admitting American goods free to a British colony, where a tariff of 20 or 40 per cent. was to be laid upon the same kind of goods coming from England or any other country than the United States. That was done by Lord Thornton and Lord Derby in 1874, and in view of that precedent, I do not think we have any reason for saying that if we desire unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and arrange the basis of a treaty, that England would refuse assent to that treaty any more than she refused assent to the Brown draft treaty of 1874.

The next objection raised against this treaty is that it would lead to annexation and it strikes me that the Government party are a little inconsistent in this matter, when they state that this policy will lead to annexation, that the Americans want annexation and that the Americans will not give us a treaty. There is an apparent contradiction there. The charge that this treaty will lead to annexation implies a good deal. It implies that the treaty will work so well and that the prosperity of the country under this treaty will be so great that Canadians will want more of it, that they will want to go the whole figure and not only have commercial union with the United States but political union as well. Now, I think, Sir, that the fact is that unrestricted reciprocity would give us just exactly what those who want annexation would desire, that is free trade relations with the United States. I do not believe there is one man in a hundred in this country who is an annexationist because he is dissatisfied with our political institutions or because he believes that American political institutions are superior to ours, but he is an annexa-

Mr. CHARLTON.

tionist because he desires to see this tariff wall broken down and he sees no other mode of obtaining that object than annexation. Give to that man the advantages that follow from the obliteration of those tariff restrictions and you give him all he wants and he ceases to be an annexationist. Just as in 1854, following the manifesto of 1849 which was signed by many of the friends of the party opposite, the existence of the annexation party ceased when the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was agreed upon, and we heard no more of annexation during the continuance of that treaty. We would not hear of annexation now if we had unrestricted reciprocity with the States. In any event I am disposed to take the prosperity that will result from this arrangement and run the risk. The future will take care of itself. Nature has decreed these two countries to live on intimate terms, nature has decreed that we should be geographically and commercially very closely allied with each other, and the endeavors of our friends on the opposite side to prevent the consummation of this decree of nature reminds me of the reported efforts of Mrs. Partington who one morning went down to the Atlantic beach and attempted to keep out the tide with her broom. You cannot keep back this tide of commercial free relations between the two countries. You cannot prevent these two peoples from securing free intercourse with each other. Your efforts in this direction will be surely unavailing. The people are bound to have this continent open to free play and interchange of these mighty agencies that have vivified the United States and made it the great nation which it is to-day. The population of this Dominion will be satisfied with nothing less than this and those paltry objections that are raised by the party in power will be swept away by the people as cobwebs disappear before the brush of the sweeper, and the tide will roll in as it did that morning down at Long Branch when Mrs. Partington stood on the beach and tried to keep it out with her broom.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a fable.

Mr. CHARLTON. Not so much a fable as it is an illustration of the puny efforts of man to counteract the forces and oppose the decrees of nature.

The next objection that is raised to unrestricted reciprocity is that it will lead to direct taxation. Well, this was a serious difficulty, and although as I have shown we will save in this arrangement twenty millions a year to the people of this country besides the prospective profits resulting from greatly increased trade, yet the people would not hesitate I presume if they thought that these twenty millions of dollars were to be purchases at the expense of direct taxation of two or three million dollars a year. But I do not believe that direct taxation would be the result, and I know that perhaps this is the only really plausible and strong objection to the consummation of this arrangement. Now, Sir, I wish to-night to indulge in a little theory in regard to this matter; a little theoretical speculation upon a branch of the argument that is not exactly pertinent to the subject. We have from the United States a proffer of commercial union, and it is something that is not expressed in the resolution before you. We expect if we make this arrangement to get it on a different basis, but as a mere matter of theory and to get into a region of speculation I wish to enquire for a moment what will be the probable result to us as regards this question of direct taxation if unrestricted reciprocity is secured upon the basis of commercial union—a basis be it observed which as I have said we do not propose to accept, a basis upon which we are not proposing a treaty, but it is only fair to give some degree of attention to this proposal so as to enquire what its effects would be. The United States customs last year amounted to \$219,091,173, their excise tax \$124,296,871 or a total of \$343,388,044. Our customs and excise amounted to \$28,177,412. Under com-