

the American Government to establish wide commercial treaties with the different nations, he goes on to say :

"But, it may be asked, if this be true, why not extend it to our Canadian neighbours on the north? The first answer is that with our tropical neighbours, whose products are so dissimilar to ours, reciprocity is a simple matter, but when we come to deal with a country having thousands of miles of conterminous territory and with like products and industries, the question becomes more complex. But this is not the insuperable difficulty. The fact that Canada does not possess the right of negotiating her own treaties, but must have them negotiated for her by a distant power which is controlled by economic principles entirely different from those of both the United States and Canada, constitutes the chief barrier to any arrangement."

Sir, though I would not subscribe altogether to everything that is said here, I see, however, no insuperable difficulty, judging from the language of the American authorities, to securing complete reciprocity between Canada and the United States. The difficulty at this moment is that we have not the power to negotiate our own commercial treaties. The power to negotiate our own commercial treaties is one which has been long claimed by this House. As far back as 1882 Mr. Blake introduced a resolution in favour of asking the mother country to grant us that power. That motion was voted down. Some years afterwards my hon. friend to my left (Sir Richard Cartwright), in 1888, if I remember aright, or in 1889, introduced a similar motion, which was also voted down. But in view of the events that have taken place, in view of the fact that we are progressing as a nation, in view of the fact that it is becoming recognized on both sides of the House that the trade of Canada must be extended somehow, and that this country will no longer consent to be shut up within its own boundaries, it is more than ever opportune to debate and to discuss this question once more, and this question, I may say at once, must be debated at no distant day during the present session. A few days ago three Canadian Ministers paid a visit to Washington. This time their visit lasted longer than did their visit of last April. Their present visit, we are told in the speech, was the result of an intimation from the American Government. I was not prepared for that statement, but I accept it with a great deal of pleasure indeed. I am glad to hear from the advisers of His Excellency, that the visit which they paid to Washington was made upon an invitation from Washington. This, Sir, is of good omen, it shows friendship on the part of the United States; and for my part I deplore the fact that between Canada and the United States, between two countries of the same blood, of the same language, in a large measure, and of similar institutions, there should be any feeling other than one of the closest friendship. Patriotism does not mean hostility to any country; patriotism ought to be founded, not upon hostility to any country, but upon the broadest and most generous instincts of human nature. While we ought to profess ourselves friends to the Americans, on our side, I am sure, we do not wish to do so with any loss of dignity. The hon. gentleman said a moment ago that he was sure the Canadian Ministers at Washington had not done, and would not do, anything detrimental to the dignity of Canada. Sir, I have no doubt of it, but I can tell him that there is no party in the House who would negotiate a treaty with the States, if such a treaty were to imply any derogation to the dignity of Canada. We do not

MR. LACRIER.

admit on our side of the House the view which is often stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, that a treaty of unrestricted reciprocity would imply derogation to the dignity of Canada. Nothing of the kind. For my part, I am glad that the Canadian Ministers went to Washington some time ago. They did not, and could not, succeed, because the basis upon which they wanted to negotiate could not be accepted by the American Government. Some time or other, sooner or later, and sooner rather than later, if another Government were to send a deputation to Washington charged with negotiating the fullest treaty that it is possible to obtain from the American Government, I may tell hon. gentlemen opposite at once, that if on such an occasion the American authorities were disposed to be arrogant or unfriendly, or were disposed to make us pay any price at the expense of our dignity for the privileges we desired, we would say: We want none of it. We would say: We will remain as we are, and for my part I would turn about face immediately. But, Sir, it was not possible for the hon. gentlemen to succeed, and why? The hon. gentlemen did not want to succeed on the basis of unrestricted reciprocity: they wanted to negotiate only on the basis of restricted trade; and as mentioned in the letter of Mr. Blaine to Congressman Baker, which it is useless to cite again to the House, the American Government has intimated again and again that they would not negotiate on any other basis than that of unrestricted reciprocity. So their mission was bound to fail from the very outset. Yet I am glad they went, not because I expected they could accomplish anything in the way of securing reciprocal trade, but simply because I desire to see them open friendly relations with our neighbours. In that respect I am glad to see that their mission has not been without some effect. As a result of that mission we are to have, as I understand, an arrangement concluded for settling the boundary between Canada and Alaska. This is an important measure from every standpoint. It is not likely that that part of the country will ever be thickly settled, if settled at all; but, at all events, it is open to trade, and it is far preferable that the boundaries between the two nations should be settled now than at a later date after there may possibly have been a collision between traders, with all the consequences of such a collision. So far the visit of the Ministers to Washington has not been without fruit, and so far it is of some importance. Then, as another result of the mission of the Ministers to Washington, we are to have, at last, legislation for reciprocity of services in cases of wrecking and salvage. Well, this is certainly an important result of the mission to Washington. There has been, as I understand, a statutory offer of reciprocity on our part, standing for years; I do not know whether it still exists; if it has been repealed it has been done within a year or two. But it existed during many years, and was never accepted. Hitherto they have not exerted themselves in having such legislation passed. Once or twice, certainly once, the Bill was introduced, if I remember rightly, by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirpatrick) to establish such a reciprocity on our side of the line, which could be met at any time by legislation on the other side of the line. The Bill did not become law, it was killed by the Ministers;