

same language, but I treated every one of the points he treated—but he did not treat all of the points that I did. Mr. Blaine stated that the first proposal made was for reciprocity in natural products, with such extensions and qualifications as the altered circumstances required. I stated that; we agree in that point. Mr. Blaine stated that a list of manufactured articles was to be included along with that of natural products. I stated that the line must be in natural products and manufactures generally. There is a divergence, but that is all. Mr. Blaine stated that there must be discrimination against Great Britain; I stated there must be discrimination against Great Britain. In all these particulars we are exactly alike or we are very close together. For, the rest, I make statements and deal with subjects which Mr. Blaine does not touch, but which were discussed in the conference that took place, and discussed for some considerable time. Now, I ask my hon. friend, whether he has been quite fair to me in representing Mr. Blaine as having recorded all that took place, as giving the only record that should be relied upon, and refusing to take my statement as a record of the case, in refusing to look upon my statement as worthy of credence, at least, equally with that of Mr. Blaine. At least he should give me the credit that he felt disposed to give in the first part of his address, when he said that I had not wilfully misrepresented. I know that when the hon. gentleman reads what he has said and thinks over the matter, he will feel that he has been unfair to me in that respect, as no man should be to his fellow member, sitting opposite to him in the House of Commons, where all men are supposed to be gentlemen. Now, Sir, I have not one word or one syllable to retract of the statement I made last year on that point. I stand by it; I stand by it entirely; I stand by it without any mental reservation; I stand by it in the presence of my colleagues who were there with me. And I ask this House to judge of the sense of fairness of that hon. gentleman who can find the only authoritative statement on the part of the stranger and refuse all credence or credit for honesty to his fellow citizen and his fellow member.

#### WHAT THE OPPOSITION WANT.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word or two in closing, with reference to the general subject. I find that I have been kept close to the points which have been made to-night or recently, and that I have not touched the general points which I had hoped to deal with, which were made during the debate. I close with this simple thought, and I ask the attention of my fellow members on this side of the House, and I ask the attention of the country as well. These hon. gentlemen may not be very well agreed as to what they want, but they are perfectly agreed as to what they are against. When you come to sum up the

expressions of the foremost men as to what they want there is a wide divergence of opinion among them. They agree as to their positive faith in very few principles, and in other respects there is a wide divergence. The hon. gentleman for South Oxford (Sir Richard Carlwright) believes in unrestricted reciprocity; he wants access to the United States markets, and believes that it is the only salvation for Canada in the line of development and permanent prosperity. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is determined to devote his life to getting unrestricted reciprocity. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) is less definite and precise. He has found out that it is the best sometimes not to say too much or say it too positively, so this time he harks back considerably, and he sums up his policy in this wonderfully positive and definite form: "We desire the broadest treaty possible consistent with the commercial and political independence of Canada." The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had a little good humoured chaff with me because, he said, I was indefinite in my statement; but he capped the climax of indefiniteness. He declared: "I want the freest possible trade with the United States, consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries." He is much dissatisfied with me because I stated that I would do the best for the whole country. He determined to be very definite, and this is his definition. I can see my hon. friend going from this House and meeting a farmer, one of those depressed farmers of whom he speaks, and the farmer says: Mr. Paterson, you are just down from the Legislative halls. I know you are a very learned man, and a very famous politician; I know your keenness of vision and your breadth of comprehension. I want to know whether you are going to get me the market of the United States? And the hon. gentleman will satisfy the burning thirst of that poor, depressed farmer by saying: All I can tell you is that I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. Then he will meet one of those prosperous manufacturers of his own town, who will come to him with anxiety in his face, and say: Now, Mr. Paterson, what is to be the end of this matter; are we going to have reciprocity, and if we have it, as you say we must, are we to be mercilessly exposed to competition with the United States? And the good member will draw himself up to his full height and say: I cannot tell you whether it will be that way or not; but I can tell you my faith and creed—I want the freest possible trade with the United States consistent with the dignity, honour and stability of both countries. And so he will satisfy every one of his constituents with that most definite and positive statement and, if in his town they do not put up a monument sacred to the great N. P., I am sure they will put up a monument sacred to the positive clearness

and definite concept. The member for I the most conservative is not for revolution existing industry. H enue and would like could be elected in any of direct taxation.

ence or annexation t man no friend of Can ence or annexation a sitting very closely to has been talking indey months. And the ho (Mr. Tarte) has two pl is that legislation sho the profits of the farm

Mr. TARTE. I nev thing of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. If m Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.

Mr. FOSTER. No conversation with my f friend will turn up th at the report of his s look at the manifesto t he gave to his county, statements in it, or French.

Mr. TARTE. Perhaps

Mr. FOSTER. Perha I will leave it to him. said that he is going t as will raise the value ducts, and that Mr. La power, will leave two standing in the temple

Mr. TARTE. I neve anything of the kind.

Mr. FOSTER. Then French. I will look that wrong I will withdraw t That is what my hon. fri tive side.

#### WHAT THEY ARE

Now, I want to d of the House to what when they come to the there is no hesitation; definiteness. Their prop firm, and I want it to to the other of this coun propaganda? The hon. Oxford says:

Our policy from first to l this villainous system of p whether we cut its head off, o it in two in the middle—w destroy it.

There is no indefiniteness. Then, member for North (ton) says:

Protection, Sir, notwithstanding said in favour of it, is neither