

grievous crimes, and the grievous errors my hon. friend has to answer for. But there is worse behind. Why, Sir, my hon. friend is so lost to all sense of propriety and shame that he dared to suggest that in other times hon. gentlemen opposite had not always been overfriendly towards the Government and people of the United States; and the leader of the Opposition charged him, with great emphasis, with having dared—I took down his words—to charge a great party with hostility to the United States, which he intimated was an extremely grave offence. Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that I have heard an hon. gentleman, who may be nameless now, charge a still greater party than the party which he leads, with a still worse crime, with that of disloyalty to the Empire of which we form a part. I think that charge was made and repeated by him, and his organs, and his followers, from one end of the country to the other; and I have grave reason to know that he abused his place as High Commissioner in England to the detriment of the party which now controls the destinies of Canada. Sir, were it my disposition, it would be an extremely easy task for me—because I am tolerably well acquainted with the history of this country, with the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, and with the negotiations which have taken place between Canada and the United States for this many a day—it would be an easy task for me to substantiate, and much more than substantiate, all that my hon. friend hinted as to the very dubious relations which prevailed between them and the people of the United States for a good many years past. Sir, did I choose to recall the history of the negotiations at Washington, did I choose to recall the reception which was given to the propositions made thrice over in this House in 1888 and 1889 and 1890 by members of the Liberal party tending to the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty with the United States, did I choose to ransack their press as hon. gentlemen opposite have ransacked ours, did I choose to collect together all the language of their leaders with respect to the institutions and people of the United States, I could present an array of evidence which would go extremely far to show how very mild and gentle was the statement made by my hon. friend. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not choose to do that. I am willing to let bygones be bygones in that respect. I do not think I would advance the interests of Canada at the present moment if I were to recall all the language that political exigencies induced those hon. gentlemen, and in particular induced the leader of the Opposition to use towards the Liberal party of Canada with respect to our desire to cultivate amity and good-will with the United States. Sir, I am going to point out to the hon. gentleman, I hope not altogether in vain, because I am aware that in his better days and in his better mood he himself has

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

appreciated the situation, to some extent at least, the enormous importance and the enormous desirability of cultivating friendly relations with the United States. I have not forgotten, any more than has the hon. gentleman, the language which he used in this House when advocating the passage of the Fisheries Act, in 1888. I remember right well, as does the hon. gentleman, how, on that occasion, he pointed out in somewhat strong language, that the indiscretion of his colleagues had brought about a state of things between Canada and the United States, which, as he said himself, meant commercial war within twenty-four hours, and he went on to add, that from commercial war to actual war, the distance is but a step. Sir, I say there is a more excellent way. The friendship of the United States is most valuable to Canada, it is a thing to be striven for and cultivated by all fair and honourable means. I say more. I have said long and I have said it often, I have said it on the hustings, I have said it in this House, I have said it to English Cabinet ministers, I have said it in English public assemblies, and I shall not hesitate to repeat it wherever and in whatever situation I find myself, that the friendship of the United States is not only most valuable to Canada, but most valuable to the British Empire at large. I say the truest statesmanship which any Canadian statesman can show is, I repeat, to cultivate by all possible fair and honourable means, the friendship of our kinsmen, the people of the United States. No nobler task lies before us, and if that is all the charge that can be preferred against my hon. friend, it is one in which he may well glory, and his friends may glory too. The hon. gentleman denounces my hon. friend because his utterances seem to show a great desire to cultivate the good-will of the people of the United States. Pray, has the hon. gentleman read the recent utterances of a man who, I suppose, he will admit to be in titular rank higher than himself, the Prime Minister of England, Lord Salisbury, with respect to this same vexed and disputed Venezuelan question? Has he still more had his attention called to the very recent utterance of a very distinguished English visitor to America, the Chief Justice of England, Lord Russell? Why, Sir, the language used by Lord Russell is almost exactly in spirit, if not in letter, an echo of the words used by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier), and I shall not hesitate to give the House an exact transcript of what Lord Russell said, speaking with authority, speaking practically as an envoy from the people of Great Britain to the people of the United States. Here is what Lord Russell thought fit to say:

Mr. President, I began by speaking of the two great divisions—American and British—of that English-speaking world which you and I represent to-day, and with one more reference to them I end.