

question that may arise which the respective plenipotentiaries may be authorized by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

"May be authorized." That instruction was issued on the 24th October, 1887. The United States remained for eighteen days after these instructions were issued to the British plenipotentiaries, and then they issued instructions couched in almost the same language, and bestowing the same authority as that which had been bestowed by Great Britain on her plenipotentiaries. Therefore, the whole trade question was outside of the authority which the commissioners obtained from their respective Governments. Let me read the instructions which were given to the Washington plenipotentiaries:

"To meet and confer with plenipotentiaries representing the Government of Her Britannic Majesty for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit all or any questions relating to rights of fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland which are in dispute between the Governments of the United States and that of Her Britannic Majesty, and any other question which may arise and which they may be authorized by their respective Governments to consider and adjust."

You will observe that the language is nearly verbatim. Sir Charles Tupper said that he made an offer to the plenipotentiaries to settle the question on a wider basis of the trade relations between the two countries. He had no power to make such an offer, and the offer nor the answer to the offer was put in the protocols. It was said that it might be found in these protocols, but, when the protocols came down to this House, I found that the offer was printed on a fly-sheet and was not signed by anyone, but was issued, as it was marked, "By the authority of the Privy Council." Can it be said that Sir Charles Tupper made a *bona fide* offer? How could he do that when on the floor of this House every man who rose condemned, at the very time Sir Charles was in Washington, reciprocity, stating that it would destroy the interests of the Canadian farmers? It is true that, when Sir Charles Tupper came back he knocked the bottom out of many of their speeches. It was rumoured that there was a fracas in one of their caucus meetings and that Sir Charles Tupper said that, if the policy he advocated was not in accord with the views of the Conservative party, he would step down and out, and he did step down and out and went back to his office in England. At that time the party in power in the United States was in favour of free trade. They were Democrats, and the President and the Secretary of State were in favour of extending their commercial relations, and many of the Republicans of that day were strongly in favour of widening the trade between Canada and the United States. But it was not expected that in 1890 a little star would appear from which the Ministers here thought they could see a little light. They found that the colony of Newfoundland was trying to obtain extended trade relations with the United States, and they decided that this great Canada could not allow that little Island to settle its own affairs without their interference, so they wrote to Lord Knutsford stating that they desired that no further step should be taken by Newfoundland in regard to that treaty, until Canada was placed in the same position. Then Lord Knutsford was instructed to inform Sir Julian Pauncefote, and by this side wind our Government tried to get an introduction of some scheme of reciprocity. Then they went to the country and told the

people that the whole of the negotiations were initiated by the United States Government, and Mr. Blaine gives the lie to that in a communication which came from him and was placed on the Table of the House. Let me read what he said. This is in a letter which he addressed to Sir Julian Pauncefote. After referring to several other matters, he says:

"In view of the fact that you had come to the State Department with these proposals, and that the subject was then for the first time mentioned between us, and in view of the further fact that I agreed to a private conference, as explained in my minute, I confess that it was a surprise to me when several weeks later, during the Canadian canvass, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper both stated before public assemblages that an informal discussion of a reciprocity treaty would take place at Washington after the 4th of March, by the initiation of the Secretary of State. I detail these facts because I deem it important, since the matter has for some weeks been open to public remark, to have it settled that the conference was not 'initiated' by me, but, on the contrary, that the private arrangement of which I spoke was a modification of your proposal, and in no sense an original suggestion from the Government of the United States."

That proves that Sir John Macdonald and Sir Charles Tupper falsified the facts on the public platforms of this country, and Secretary Blaine stated in an open letter to his friend Mr. Baker that he was not the first initiator of the interview that was proposed to be held after the 4th March, showing that the whole scheme from beginning to end was an electioneering dodge. I am informed on good authority that before the elections came off, one gentleman was sent west to interview the leaders of the party there and ascertain whether it would be wise to bring on the elections a year before the expiration of the constitutional limit of Parliament; and that another was sent east to ascertain the opinion of the leaders of the party in that direction; and I understand that these two gentlemen brought back the statement that unless the Government went to the country at once, the popularity of the free trade policy would be such that they would be swept from office. Then they said to themselves: If we go to the country we must have some plea along the lines of reciprocity; we will make out that we are just about going to Washington to negotiate a treaty along the lines of 1854. And what were the lines of 1854? That treaty included the natural products of the farm. Now, Sir, I can prove from speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite that nearly every single one of them are opposed to the establishment of a treaty along the lines of 1854. Let me call attention to this fact, that even during this debate, many of those who have spoken upon the question have stated that the United States are not our natural markets. Why, then, seek to get our natural products into a market that is not our natural market? The Finance Minister stated in this House the other day that the United States were not our natural market. The Minister of Agriculture has stated on different platforms, in various parts of the country, that they are not our natural market. Here we have statements from prominent men in the Government who have told us that the United States are not our natural market, that their market is glutted, that they have far more than they can use of every particular article that our farmers send there, consequently there is no use seeking a market in that direction. Members and followers of the Government have stated time and again that they were opposed to reci-