

hailed down their flag and we are compelled to make this capitulation, for it is nothing else, and this surrender of our admitted legal rights. So it was, Sir, a week ago with respect to that statutory proposal which the Minister of Justice and the First Minister declared could not be granted without treason to the rights of the people of this country. A week after when a retaliatory Bill was put on the Table of Congress we found those gentlemen issuing a proclamation granting the very concessions which they declared could not be made without treason to the country. Sir, I venture to say that perhaps within twelve months, at all events within no very distant period, it will be found—if those hon. gentlemen remain where they are—that they will also deal with the proposal I had the duty to submit the other night. I have this one thing to say to them: I fear it will be found in that case, as it has been found in many others, and as is apt to be found in all such cases, that the longer they wait the worse the bargain will be. This is a simple repetition of the case of the Sybil's books. The longer you delay coming to a fair understanding the higher the price you will have to pay, and the worse your bargain will be. I am not going to detain the House any longer; I thank the hon. members for the patience with which they have listened to me, and I have only to say in conclusion that if any future difficulties of a similar character should again occur, I trust that the hon. gentlemen who have found themselves in such a position as this will in future bear in mind the humiliation they are now inflicting upon the people of Canada, and will conduct the controversy in such a manner that if they are finally obliged to recede, they may not be confronted with their own declarations that to recede as they now propose to do is treasonable and contrary to the best interests of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat with his usual style has varied the discussion by forgetting the subject before him and attacking those who sit opposite him. He describes the policy of the present Government as a policy of brag and bluster. Has he not described exactly his own attitude at the time he made that speech? Was his speech anything from beginning to end but an exhibition of brag and bluster? He says the Government have also been at sea with their policy—they have had no guiding line. Mr. Speaker, we have been at sea three times, and we came safely to land each time. The hon. gentleman was at sea too, but he suffered shipwreck; that is the difference between the policy of the Government and the policy of the Opposition. There is no pleasing hon. gentlemen opposite. We cannot know what their line of opposition is, because there are so many lines. The hon. gentleman who spoke last says that he does not think there was much humiliation in making the treaty, but the humiliation was in the pretences of the Government—in their various despatches of a year ago. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says it was one vast surrender, one vast humiliation. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) says that it was no humiliation—that those concessions ought to have been made two years ago. How are we to find out where we are wrong? We can justify ourselves by the views of any one member of the Opposition by quoting the speech of some other member of the Opposition. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) commenced his attack by repeating his statement, that he made a little while ago, that among the greatest blunder we had ever committed was having taken this inauspicious moment for attempting to make this treaty. But, Sir, the treaty is the consequence of the communication that passed a year ago between my hon. friend and Mr. Bayard. The hon. gentleman, after stating that it was the most inauspicious blunder that was ever committed by a government, com-

mends Mr. Wiman, and says he conferred a great benefit on Canada by asking my hon. friend to go down and commence the negotiations which ended in this treaty. After the negotiations commenced a year ago, were we to stop them? We were either right or wrong. In following up the lead or the hint which had been given by Mr. Wiman, which resulted first in this semi-official communication between those two gentlemen, which was followed up in England, and which after long correspondence and long diplomatic delays culminated in this treaty—after the negotiations were once commenced, we should have been guilty of a great rudeness in the first place, and a great diplomatic blunder in the second place, if we had taken any step either by laches or by positive refusal, to break off the negotiations which we had to a certain degree created under the wise instigation and advice of Mr. Wiman. But it is very singular, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman thinks it was a great blunder and stupidity for us to attempt to make a treaty in the immediate proximity of a presidential election; and yet, if you look at the hon. gentleman's own resolution, which we voted down the other day, you will find that he, in the immediate proximity of a presidential election, says:

"It is further expedient that the Government of the Dominion should take steps at an early date to ascertain on what terms and conditions arrangements can be effected with the United States for the purpose of securing full and unrestricted trade therewith."

The hon. gentleman actually lays it down as our duty to open negotiations at this moment, the most inauspicious time, just before the presidential election, when party strife and party rivalries would prevent any successful negotiations. It was all wrong in us to make any proposition a year ago and attempt to carry it out; it is all very right in the hon. gentleman to suggest that now we should commence *de novo* negotiations for a treaty. How does the hon. gentleman reconcile the position? I am sure he cannot.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He might try, but his success would be just as dubious as was the success of the whole resolution the moment before the vote was taken upon it. The hon. gentleman, wandering away from the subject, takes up the old cry that we should make our own treaties, and he says that England dare not back us—that England would support her colonies against any other nation, but would not venture to do so against the United States. The hon. gentleman has read very carefully the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and he knows everything that is contained in it. My hon. friend took the opportunity of stating that he had received full support from the representatives especially chosen by England—to use a phrase fashionable now-a-days, unrestricted support from Mr. Chamberlain, the British ambassador—aye, and from the British Government that stood behind all three; and if there is anything wrong in that treaty, if there is any humiliation concerned in it, that humiliation has not been forced upon Canada by the British Government, or the British plenipotentiaries associated with my hon. friend. My hon. friend takes the whole responsibility, or shares the responsibility, of having made that treaty. After my hon. friend made that statement, there was no appropriateness in the hon. gentleman bringing in the old cry that Canada should make her own treaties. In effect, Canada has made her own treaties of late years, and will in future make her own treaties—

Mr. MITCHELL. Not much.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And she will have this advantage, that when those treaties require to be enforced, she will have not only the moral, but the material support of the mother country at her back. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was exceedingly severe in his attack,