

land. Why should Sir Alexander Galt be sent there if it is much better to obtain all we want through the British ambassador? If a Canadian ambassador is to be sent there does the hon. gentleman always desire he shall enter at the back door while the other ambassador goes in by the front? This almost leads me to digress for a moment to enquire if Sir Alexander Galt was really sent to England because of a pressing necessity to have a quasi-ambassador residing in London. We remember that Sir Alexander Galt was the very champion of the principle embodied in the resolutions which are now before the House; he spoke for it and voted for it, and, if I recollect aright, he characterized the right hon. gentleman on that occasion as the "Pecksniff" of the House. Was it because Sir Alexander Galt was estranged until 1878, was it because he declined any relationship with the right hon. gentleman, was it because he could not be taken into the Government here that room was made for him in England, and an office created for him full of profit, full however of national degradation and productive of no benefit to the country. The hon. gentleman said also that no progress was made in regard to commercial treaties or our dealings with foreign nations up to 1878. That wonderful period ending on the 18th September, 1878, is an epoch in our history. On that day the right hon. gentleman came back to power and from that time onward to the present, he told us to-day, that great efforts had been made by himself and his colleagues in order to develop the growth of national traffic, and trade and commercial relations with other countries. I would like to know a single step that has been taken. To be sure no grievous error has been committed which will tend in the opposite direction. The hon. gentleman, by his National Policy, has deviated from the Imperial policy of Britain which characterizes the legislation of all her colonies but one and ourselves and has thereby dealt a blow at the Imperial relationship which it will not be very easy to make good by remedial legislation. And that is absolutely the only thing he has done. We find that during the last two years our foreign trade has declined under the pressure of the incubus he has placed upon it by his policy. He stated there was another method by which commercial relations could be carried on. There was nothing to prevent Canada presenting by an Act of its Parliament certain advantages in its relations to another country and having that country reciprocate by passing a similar Act. Both being put in force would enable the two to exchange products on equal terms. I object most seriously to any attempt to obtain commercial advantages by legislation of that kind. A legislative reciprocity is in my opinion not only impracticable but most mischievous. Suppose we pass a bill admitting certain products of the United States free on the condition that they should pass a bill admitting some of ours free. That would not bind us or them for any specific term of years and the next season might find circumstances so altered in their legislature as to lead to the repeal of the enactment, and the reconsideration of former relationships, while in the meantime commercial establishments would have been established which the change would greatly injure. There is nothing in my opinion more dangerous than to tamper needlessly and carelessly with commercial legislation. What our business men want is permanence of purpose and a reasonable consistency in our policy. That is that there should not be constant changes made. I would rather have a large measure of protection even than a constant change of policy and a constant change of duties in the legislation of the country. I deny the proposition of the hon. gentleman that nothing was done in the way of advancing commercial business of a colonial kind during my own Administration. We set on foot a negotiation at Washington in order to obtain if possible a new treaty; we succeeded in having that treaty negotiated, but failed in getting it implemented by the Congress of the United States. That

was not our fault. We endeavored to do that, and we obtained from Her Majesty's Government a commission as plenipotentiary to our agent who went there, a thing unprecedented in the history of any colony. I do not think there was any instance where a colonist was appointed a joint plenipotentiary in order to negotiate a treaty. The right hon. gentleman was himself a joint high commissioner on one occasion in 1871 or 1872 at Washington. He had an opportunity to distinguish himself if he chose to do so, but he distinguished himself in a retrograde fashion by being a consenting party to a treaty which was one of the most shameful capitulations in English history in matters between nations. Everyone knows the humiliation that was experienced by almost every one in the country at the consent of the hon. gentleman to that legislation; and so far as I am concerned I can only say that I heard that opinion expressed by men of high standing in the old country when considering the results of that treaty in regard to the Fenian outrages on the frontier and the Alabama claims.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that one of his colleagues in the Government at his right and another one behind him voted for that shameful capitulation? Yet he took them into the Government of this country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have not forgotten it, Sir, but I dare say if my hon. friend had to give that vote now, he would not vote that way. I cannot at this moment recall a single treaty with the United States managed by British statesmen--and they were all managed by British statesmen--in which Canada and British America did not get the worst. Our boundaries were dealt with by English commissioners, and in their ignorance of the country and of the maps and of the people they had to deal with, we were deprived of a large extent of territory, and I believe that the only real diplomatic work that was ever done by Canadian statesmen was that of the arbitration at Halifax and managed by ourselves.

An hon. MEMBER. The Washington Treaty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Washington Treaty had nothing to do with that. It provided that there should be an arbitration, and when that arbitration was delayed from day to day and from year to year by the American Government, we entered our protest and with some difficulty got the English Government to make a protest for us. At last when we obtained the requisite authority to enter upon the negotiations the English Government sent a gentleman out here to attend to the matter, whom we declined to act with, making a demand upon them that a Canadian should be appointed, whom we would nominate. We did nominate a Canadian and we managed the whole business ourselves, and the result was the obtaining of that large award--not any larger than it should be, but still an award that was on the whole reasonably satisfactory to all parties. Now, I do not desire to occupy any more of the time of the House. I rose for the simple purpose of explaining my own position and pointing out to the House the constant recurrence of accusations of the kind mentioned by the hon. gentleman opposite, having been so frequent in his history and the history of his colleagues that they should be treated very lightly by other people. I have sat, I think, two Sessions, opposite the hon. gentleman, and I am sure during that time I have heard the same threat many a time, and many a time have seen gentlemen like the hon. Minister of Public Works raising the British flag with the greatest enthusiasm in order to rally his dispirited followers. It is an easy matter to raise the flag, but let us raise the flag of common sense for a little while, and let us consider, not those high-flown sentiments of extreme devotion and loyalty which the hon. gentleman dealt in so greatly to-night, but let us consider soberly and reasonably