

aires have been created in this land, too, and the money they have got has been taken from the great body of the people, where it fairly and properly belonged. I desire to call the attention of the House, as illustrating in some degree the line of action we have adopted towards the United States, to the question of wrecking. As far back as 1878, at the time of the change of government in this country, Congress placed on record a statute in which they offered to Canadian tugs the right to give assistance to American as well as Canadian vessels in United States waters, provided Canada did the same. Here was a very fair offer. Of all questions for reciprocity, surely that of rendering assistance to vessels in distress was the most reasonable and natural one, which ought to be first taken up by an intelligent and friendly people, yet year by year went by, and one cause or another has prevented the Canadian Government from acquiescing in the proposals from the United States. The pressure became so great, that in 1888 a leading gentleman belonging to the Conservative party—it was useless for anybody else to propose such a thing—the member for Frontenac, now Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, brought in a bill authorizing the Government to issue a proclamation placing the wrecking question on both sides on a reciprocal basis. The Opposition, with one or two exceptions, supported the measure. However, the hon. gentleman who had charge of the bill was unable to divorce from the Government following a sufficient number to carry the bill with the assistance of the Opposition. The following year the bill was introduced again, and the next year as well. In 1891 they did succeed in getting it through the House of Commons and it came to this Chamber. I am sorry to say that the Senate failed to respond to the advanced public opinion of this country, which considered the subject of wrecking was one that should be put on a reciprocal basis. I will not go now into the object lessons which were given on that occasion, pointing out the serious injury and difficulty caused by the absence of such a law, but I again express my regret, as I did when the bill was before this chamber, that this House did not respond to the advance of public opinion on this question. And for whom, pray, were we keeping up these laws that were certainly not in harmony with the spirit of this age? Not probably more than five persons

were interested in tugs, but for the sake of less than half a dozen persons, Canada had to be placed year after year at this great disadvantage of refusing the olive branch held out by the people of the United States. In 1892 the Government did take it up. My hon. friend, the leader of this House, gave it his assistance, and with that aid it went through without any difficulty. I do not think there was a vote on it. The measure came to this chamber and although this is purely a non-political House, when it was supported by the Government, its chances, as the sequel proved, were very much better than when it was an independent measure. The moment the Government lent its aid the bill went through. We were in hopes that a joint proclamation would issue on both sides and that wrecking would be made mutual. In the issuing of the proclamation on the other side, however, the President named in connection with the waters open to the tugs of both countries the various canals. Very naturally he regarded the canals as part of the waterways. Although there would seem to be very little probability of accidents happening to vessels on them, yet our Government, with the short-sighted policy they seem to pursue, carped at the language of the proclamation and declined to accept it, saying it was a departure from what was intended and they did not propose that there should be any reciprocal aid given to vessels in distress on the canals. They did not say that it was improbable that there would be many cases of that kind and for that reason the matter should have been passed by. It is unlikely that vessels will be wrecked in the canals, but if they should be, surely if we are acting in a spirit of friendliness to an adjoining nation, we ought not to carp at so insignificant a point as that the wrecking privileges in question were not contemplated on our side to apply to the canals. There the matter stands to-day. I suppose there is influence at work somewhere or other to keep it back in order that one or two Canadian tugs may enjoy for another season an advantage, and that Canadian vessel owners shall be obliged to seek our favoured tugs for assistance. It is just of a piece with the whole policy of this country. The next paragraph in the Address asks us to respectfully thank His Excellency "for informing us that measures will be laid before us for the improvement of the Franchise Act." Well, I am glad to find that the