

that now when that great people have shaken off the shackles of the protective system, the American market will be free to us and free to all the world to a very large extent. That is their hope, but until they see what they can do, these worthy gentlemen who resent American dictation so bitterly do not dare so much as to tell us what they propose. I say again, that if ever there was a policy of looking to Washington, it is the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite have followed. The only thing I regret is that from first to last, during the last seven years, they have exhibited such a marvellous want of tact, dignity and prudence in dealing with the United States that they have most seriously prejudiced the case of the country whose destinies are intrusted to them. What were almost the last words of Mr. Cleveland before he went out of office on the expiration of his first term. Why, Sir, they were a threat to suspend commercial intercourse with Canada. Has this House forgotten the very remarkable declaration rung in our ears time and again by Sir Charles Tupper when he told us, in 1886 or 1887, that his colleagues had brought this country to the verge of commercial war with the United States, a thing which he said, and said justly, he regarded as one of the greatest calamities that could befall the human race. As he correctly stated, from commercial war to actual war is but a step, and a war between the two great divisions of the English race, I entirely agree with Sir Charles Tupper, would be one of the greatest misfortunes that could befall humanity. Sir, I have pointed out the relations on which this Government stood towards Mr. Cleveland when he left office, and what are the relations in which they stand towards President Harrison now? Cleveland may differ from Harrison and Harrison from Cleveland, but, alas, for us, Cleveland and Harrison are apparently one in their appreciation of the character and conduct of the gentlemen who now govern Canada. I say that these hon. gentlemen opposite by their conduct ever since 1886, have gravely prejudiced our case. While I, for my part, hope that the people of Canada will imitate the wise example of the people of the United States and shake themselves free from protective shackles, and while we may reap some benefit from the return to common sense on the part of the United States, I cannot but feel that if there are any men who have worked diligently and assiduously to prevent the establishment of such a good understanding between these two countries, they are these very hon. gentlemen who sit opposite to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, at the risk of taking up even a little time in answering arguments and replying to a speech which has not at least the element of novelty to us who have been years in this House, my only excuse is, that as such matter has been brought to substantiate the amendment to the Address and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

placed upon the records of the House it might be well for a few thoughts to be added as a qualification, if not as a refutation, of some of the statements which have been made. Without attempting to traverse all the ground that my hon. friend has gone over this time, as he has gone over often before, I wish to direct the attention of the House for a very few moments to three points upon which he has specially laboured. The first is as to the exodus. It has been his endeavour to prove to-night, that not only does the exodus exist from Canada towards the United States, a fact which is not doubted on either side of the House, but to prove also that that exodus is due to the impolicy of the course pursued by the present Government. He laments the fact that there is this exodus, he deprecates it and to the bottom of his heart he is moved at the sad fact. He declares in round terms, that it is the duty of statesmanship to inquire as to why there is this exodus, and as to how it can be prevented. But the hon. gentleman forgets to-night, as he has always forgotten in this House, to go beyond declamatory statements and to attempt to work out why this takes place, and how it may be prevented. The hon. gentleman may have attended college, he may have sat in the university, he may have taken a course at the schools, but if in his school class he had committed the stupid syllogism that he has been guilty of here to-night, he would have been plucked out of the first form or rusticated for six months at least. He declares and quotes figures to show, that there has been an exodus from this country, and he also declares that it is due to the impolicy of this Government, but he has not attempted to give one single fact or figure to show that the policy pursued by this Government has caused the exodus or accelerated it, nor has he told us what other policy would keep the exodus from acceleration, or prevent people going from this country to the United States. It is a coincidence possibly that between 1875 and 1878 when there was a Liberal Administration there was a large exodus; it is a coincidence possibly that from 1878 to the present time while there has been a decreased exodus there was a Liberal-Conservative Government in power; but no man with a sane mind would contend that these coincidences stand to each as cause and effect. You have got to go deeper than that, and you have to show reasonable cause why, under a certain form of policy, a certain effect should take place. It is not sufficient to say that because two things exist side by side, therefore, one was the effect or the cause of the other. Now, Sir, it does not take a gentleman of the mind and of the reading of my hon. friend one single moment to arrive at the fact that there has been an exodus from Canada for a great number of years, an exodus which commenced before even the Liberal Government attained power in 1873, an exodus which continued throughout that Administration and which was accelerated year by year from causes which are