

of the present tariff of the United States by Congressional action; which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment, through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

And with a reason like that, can my hon. friend seriously press this theory, that in defiance of that rule, such a proposal was ever made or conceived? But if a further answer were necessary, we have it in the American plenipotentiaries declining to admit:—

"That such a mutual arrangement as is proposed by Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, could be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. It still appears to the American plenipotentiaries to be possible to find an adjustment of differences by agreeing to the interpretation or modification of the treaty of 1818, which will be honorable to both parties, and remove the present causes of complaint, to which end they now—as they have been from the beginning of this conference—ready to devote themselves."

Well, Mr. Speaker, has it not been stated by hon. gentlemen opposite that the fixed and stated policy of Congress is now, and for some time has been, not to permit any such arrangements to be made by the executive? Is not the position taken in this debate that no authority outside of Congress can interfere with fiscal matters? If, at position be correct, how can he suppose that, on the contrary, such a proposal as is suggested, could have been made, or was ever contemplated? I will not weary the house by reading, as I could, a resolution from Congress, illustrative of that. It has been admitted on the other side. The Judicial Committee of the House of Representatives, in 1885, solemnly decided that no treaty could be made by the executive of the American Government which in any way interfered with the fiscal matters of the people of the United States, that all changes in the tariff were to be discussed openly in Congress; and that has been the reason, as everyone knows, why, since the treaty of Washington, no such arrangement has been entered into by any country in the world by the United States, and that was a long time ago. Treaties had been made, but no treaty touching fiscal matters has been ratified by Congress since that day. Therefore, it is unnecessary to argue further to show how utterly impracticable is the step that the other side ask us to take. I have gone on to show the sinister object underlying their policy. But I wish to point out, in addition, that these steps taken by hon. gentlemen in this

debate, the attitude adopted by them, are, according to their own opinion, calculated to prevent our receiving the benefit of a certain amount of reciprocal trade with the United States, and why? Everyone who knows that this party, the Government representing this party, is the only party that ever obtained trade advantages from the United States. They negotiated and obtained the Washington treaty. The negotiations for the reciprocity treaty in old Canada, were made by the Conservatives. We have the cause of irritation in reference to the fishery question so far removed that we have identified ourselves, our country, with the interests of a powerful and growing party in the United States. We now see a measure introduced into Congress in which nearly every article which we desire to be put on the free list—a great many of the articles of the treaty of 1854—are put on the free list, and when we are moving in this direction, is it wise, is it statesmanlike, is it worthy the Canadian people, that we should fall down and worship the Americans and tell them that if we fall short in this matter, we are left in a state of dire extremity? If there is any way, and I have the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite to back me up, by which we might be excluded from the advantages of reciprocal trade, it is that pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite, which tends to drive us into annexation with the American Union. I was not astonished—some things did surprise me—that the financial exponent of the Opposition should take special care not to give any details, or any scheme, or any definite statement as to the way in which this unrestricted panacea business would work, because that hon. gentleman years ago, used to come down to the house and, in the same emphatic and loud manner, tell Parliament and the country that they could mark his words, and that the imposition of certain duties would give a surplus of so much, whereas the general result was a deficiency. At Halifax, however, the hon. gentleman went further. He came there to enlighten the people by the sea, for whom he has expressed unqualified contempt that emboldened him to use language which I was sorry to hear from the lips of any man in the Canadian House of Commons. The hon. gentleman came to Halifax, as Minister of Finance, to endeavor to rally his party in that province. He talked a little about direct taxation then. He tells us now, in his