

One would suppose that they were quite prepared, and understood the situation before placing themselves in an embarrassing position. They went to Washington prepared to remain some weeks or months to discuss the question, and they were simply told that the Government of the United States and Mr. Blaine were not prepared to discuss the matter with them at that time, and they returned home by the afternoon train. It is quite unusual that that sort of discourtesy is shown, and it is to be regretted that the Government of this country placed itself in that humiliating position, and brought upon itself, I will not say the contempt, but the reflection that resulted from their trip to Washington. It is preposterous to say that it will suit the convenience of the Government of the United States to discuss the question six months hence. It forcibly reminds us of the motion which is usually made when we wish to get rid of any objectionable matter: we move the six months' hoist; and so Mr. Blaine moved that the consideration of this question be postponed for six months, to October. The excuse was given that Mr. Harrison wanted to take part in it. It was rather singular that Sir Charles Tupper did not know that. He had been at Washington only a few days before, and it was announced that he had made everything satisfactory there, and the Government of Canada, or their representatives, would be received and negotiations informally entered upon. We found, however, that that was not the fact, and that the Government of the United States was absolutely unwilling to discuss it even in the most informal manner. The excuse was given that the President was going away; but he did not go for a week after that, and it would not have occupied a whole week had he chosen to discuss the question. I say it was extremely unfortunate, the announcement of the cause of dissolution and the course of the Government in connection with the whole question. It was exceedingly unfortunate and ill-timed, and it evidently, to my mind at all events, showed a want of judgment and of sound discretion somewhere. The United States put itself on record as to what it was willing to do. What was known as Hitt's resolution had been introduced in Congress two successive years. We knew what that meant: that they were prepared to discuss this question on the broad basis of unrestricted reciprocity; but the very mention of that was sufficient to at once bring down on the men of this country who supported it the opprobrium of being annexationists, traitors, men who were untrue to their country. That was the cry, not alone in the press, but on the platform, and by, I am sorry to say, the present Government, who denounced one-half of this country as traitors because they believed in the wisdom of better trade relations with the United States. Is there a statesman in England that would not coincide with the view that our trade relations would be improved? Has a single public man in Great Britain declared that our loyalty, or the fealty of this country to its sovereign, would have been in any way sacrificed or compromised because we trade in manufactured goods? The Government say that it is all very well to trade in what the farm, the forest and the sea produce. Our farmers, our lumbermen, our fishermen can all trade freely, and they do not sacrifice their loyalty, but the moment you touch the manufacturer, you are a rebel and a traitor to your country. You can trade in a horse, but it is disloyal to trade in the harness or the saddle. It will be treason if we exchange such products with our neighbours. It is all very well to sell barley or hay, but it would be treason to exchange the mower or the reaper that cuts down the grass or the grain; and so, all along the line wherever manufacturers had to be protected, friends of the Administration, it was announced that it was impossible to establish trade relations with the United States, because it affected the friends of the Administration. I think it was exceedingly unfortunate that this National Policy should at all stand in the way of an improvement in our fiscal arrangements with so important a country as the United States. We can have, of course, other opportunities to discuss that question, but I could not let this first occasion pass without making some comments on the very extraordinary course taken by the Administration in dissolving the late Parliament. They declared, in fact, that it became necessary to leave this question to the people, and yet, when the people were asked to pronounce upon it, there was no policy laid down. Nobody can tell to-day what the policy of the Government was. It is the treaty of 1854 with extensions and modifications. What are