

carried the election upon that policy, and as soon as the elections were over my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and his government made a bee-line for Washington to interview Mr. James G. Blaine, who was then Secretary of State for the United States. But the excursion of my hon. friend on that occasion was not a happy one. Julius Caesar said I came, I saw, I conquered; but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) might have said after his trip to Washington: I went, I was seen, I came back; he was ushered in and shown out. But the following year—not at all, not at all discouraged by the cool reception of the previous year, the following year, in 1892, the hon. gentleman made another trip to Washington, and though he was more cordially received on that occasion, still the results were no better. Then, I suppose it is that my hon. friend would have us believe that the Conservative party and the Conservative government, after this last trip to Washington, abandoned forever the doctrine of reciprocity. On that I take issue with the hon. member (Mr. Foster), and I will show him how treacherous his memory is. In 1894 Sir John Thompson, then Prime Minister, made this statement on the floor of the House, speaking from the very place I now occupy:

'I may say, Mr. Chairman, that communications were indirectly made with the United States government to the effect that Canada would be glad to know of any desire or willingness on the part of the United States government to take measures towards the extension of trade between the two countries, and that Canada would be willing to reciprocate with due regard to the interests and industries of Canada, and with due regard to the revenue which would be necessary to Canada. At a subsequent stage an officer of this government went to Washington for the purpose of seeing whether it was the desire of the United States government or of the committee then having charge of the subject in the House of Representatives, to enter into communication with the government of Canada on the subject of tariff concessions on either side of the line.'

Remember, that was in 1894. And my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) also spoke in that debate. I may say that the occasion of the debate was a charge against the Conservative party by Mr. Charlton, then a prominent member of the Liberal party, that the Conservative government was insincere in its efforts to obtain reciprocity. And, the hon. member (Mr. Foster) spoke for about an hour to convince the House that the charge of Mr. Charlton was unjust to him, that he was perfectly sincere in wishing for reciprocity with our neighbours and, though I cannot quote the whole speech, I may with propriety cite a few sentences of his peroration:

'When they, the people of the United States, look over the items in our tariff as it shall have passed this House, they will find that line after line, article after article, grade after grade, we have given them a better chance to get into our market than they have given us to get into their market; consequently legislative recipro-

city so far as trade is concerned, shines out from the propositions that the government put before the House to-day in a far greater degree than it does out of the legislation which they have proposed, and which is in progress through their Congress.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will see at once how treacherous is the memory of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). He told us the other day that the Conservative party had said good-bye to reciprocity in 1891, but in 1894 he was proposing to the House resolutions from which, to quote his own words: reciprocity shines out brightly before the eyes of the American public. Then, in 1894, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) introduced a revision of the tariff, and I have here the Act entitled 'The Customs Tariff of 1894.' It is quite true, and I must give my hon. friend this credit, that in the last Tariff Act which he submitted to this House he removed from it the old standing offer of reciprocity which had been introduced in 1879, but that old section of the Act which I have read to the House and which was introduced in 1879 if put aside was immediately reproduced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) in another form, Section 7 of the Act which my hon. friend's government passed in 1894 contains this disposition:

The whole or part of the duties hereby imposed upon fish and other products of the fisheries may be remitted as respects either the United States or Newfoundland, or both, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council; which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the governments of the United States and Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in the said countries respectively.

Here, then, in the tariff of 1894, is an offer to the United States of reciprocity in fish and fish products. Here are other offers in the same act: Section 8—eggs to be free, when free in the United States; section 10—shingles and pulp wood to be free in Canada when free in the United States; section 11—green or ripe apples, beans, buckwheat, pease, potatoes, rye, rye flour, hay and other vegetables to be free in Canada when free in the United States; section 12—barley and Indian corn to be free in Canada when free in the United States. Sir, this is the way my hon. friend turned his back upon reciprocity in 1891. This is the statute of 1894; and in 1896, when my hon. friend's government went out of office, that was the policy of himself and his party.

Mr. hon. friend was also good enough to review our career, and he stated that in 1897, when he came into office, the old heresy of reciprocity had not been rubbed out of ourselves. It had not been rubbed out of his own composition either. But when he said that we abandoned the policy of reciprocity in 1897, I take issue with him altogether. We did not abandon our policy of reciprocity in 1897. We made ap-