

the negotiation of a treaty which shall be in conformity with the policy of the Government as it existed in 1878, which shall leave the National Policy untouched, which shall not permit the United States to import manufactured goods into this country free of duty in return for the privilege we ask of importing the natural products of Canada into the United States free of duty.

Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance tells us that last November a door was opened for negotiations. Well, I doubt whether it was the kind of door St. Paul refers to when he speaks of a great and effectual door being opened. I do not think it is a very effectual door. I would like to see what kind of door it is that has opened for the negotiation of a treaty with the United States on the line of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854. The hon. gentleman did not tell us what that door was, and I think we shall have to look for it with a microscope. I do not believe there is any prospect or possibility of such a treaty. I do not think the Government have any assurance upon which they can base a hope of negotiating such a treaty with the United States.

The other night when the hon. Minister of Finance was speaking of the Order in Council of the 13th of December last which had been sent to Lord Knutsford, I asked him whether at the time Mr. Blaine wrote the letter of the 29th of January, that proposal had been received at Washington. I would like to ask that question now: Whether the proposals sent by this Government to the Colonial Secretary to be forwarded to Washington had at that time been received there? We will assume that they were not received at the time the Government dissolved this House, and that the Government were guilty of an act of gross deception on the people of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you take the responsibility of that assumption?

Mr. CHARLTON. I take the responsibility of saying I imagine that is the case, and I think I have reason for supposing it to be the case, from the silence of the Government when I asked them to assure me that that proposition was in the hands of the authorities at Washington at the time of the dissolution of this House. Well, the upshot of it all is that the Government decided to dissolve Parliament for purely party reasons of the most selfish character, and, having carried out their purpose, they next proceeded to exercise much ingenuity in finding plausible reasons for the course taken. It need hardly be said that they have not succeeded in finding good reasons up to the present day. We had this contest sprung upon us; and what kind of a contest was it? One of the Government's first acts was to call into requisition sneak thieves to steal correspondence, which they paraded before the country in their organs for party purposes. I think that was a kind of conduct beneath honourable men. Then we had charges of treason and disloyalty; we had a wholesale resort to calumny and detraction; we had a river of gall and malignity—all these things characterize this contest, which had been sprung on the country by this Government in order to stifle a fair expression of popular opinion on questions of paramount importance—in order to snatch a verdict before the people, after an investigation of these matters, would have been prepared to give an intelligent

verdict upon them. Then, we had many personal charges. We had personal charges against my hon. friend the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). He is said to have gone to Washington. Well, my hon. friend the Minister of Finance once went to Washington. The hon. Minister of Justice went to Washington. My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance went to Washington. In the one case it is treason; what is it in the other case? I was charged with going to Washington, and I stand up to-day to admit that the charge was true. I went to Washington very much in the same capacity that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance went there. I went on official business, as Chairman of the Mining Commission of Ontario, to visit the Geological Survey Department and the Smithsonian Institute. We went further; we actually penetrated to the South, visiting Birmingham, Alabama, to examine a process in operation there for the reduction of phosphoric and sulphureous iron into steel; and we also visited Cleveland, Pittsburg and other places. We were very disloyal, if travelling about that country is a disloyal act. On another occasion since then, when I went to New York on business, having a few days' leisure I visited Washington to renew old acquaintance, to see the capital of a great country, to witness mighty interests contending for the mastery, and to feel the pulse heat of a great nation of 65,000,000; there is something inspiring in it. Now, I did not imagine that it was treason to go there. I do not think much of that feeling that considers it a crime for Canadians to make the acquaintance of American statesmen or to talk over with them the mutual relations of the two countries. I was treated in Washington as a member of any foreign legislature, Canadian or otherwise, would have been treated—with the greatest courtesy. I would like to see more members of this House visit Washington. I would like to see American congressmen come here; I would like to see the people of the two countries make the acquaintance of each other. I do not think any evil results would happen from the better acquaintance of the members of this House with the members of the United States Congress.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries asserted at St. John that I had modelled and passed the McKinley Bill. Well, it is rather a large amount of power to ascribe to one man; but I can assure the hon. gentleman that I have not the influence in the United States that would enable me to control their legislation. I presume he made that statement as an election story; but if he meant anything serious by it, this is the occasion on which to repudiate it.

On Friday afternoon we had the pleasure of hearing the old chieftain, the leader who went to the country with the old flag, the old policy and the old voters' list; and he was called to account by my hon. friend at my right for certain injudicious language which he had used at Halifax, and which had had a very irritating effect in the United States; and to my great regret, and I believe to the regret of everyone in this House who desires to see the establishment of friendly relations between these two countries, he refused to retract that language, and I fear he actually put his foot in it deeper. Now, in view of the fact that public men of Canada have been branded as disloyal and traitors because they have