

are left out of that Speech as well as those which it contains, and if there is one question more than another upon which this great Liberal government should have spoken, on the occasion of what we may call their first regular session, to the people of this country through its parliament, it was the question of reciprocity with the United States. They had sent two gentlemen to Washington in the early part of the present winter and surely it is due to this House and to the people of this country to know what progress these gentlemen made, whether they were well received, whether a measure based on the conferences which they had with the United States government was in contemplation. In my province, year after year, in all elections which have been held since the Conservative party were in power, we had the distinct statement that no sooner would the Liberal party get into office than they would commence negotiations with the government at Washington for the purpose of securing a reciprocity treaty, and the Hon. Mr. Davies on one occasion, in 1887, pledged himself that if his party were returned to power they would have a measure of reciprocity secured within six weeks from the date of their triumph at the polls. Now we find that, although a reasonable time has elapsed since the elections, and although they have sent deputations to Washington, there is no statement in the Speech from the Throne explaining why that deputation was sent, or what it accomplished, or what the government intend to do on this great question of reciprocity with the United States. We have no utterance whatever, and when questioned by my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in this House, the Minister of Justice declines to give a statement of the government's policy with regard to matters not referred to in the speech from the Throne. I am not at all surprised that my hon. friend, the senior member for Halifax who, as far as this government and party are concerned, assumed the position of defender of the faith, should at once interpose his objections when he finds a reference made to the question of reciprocity. I can tell my hon. friend that the very fact that it has not been referred to in the speech makes it a legitimate subject of comment, a subject for censuring the government for not having stated what they hoped to do on that question. Though they have not told us what their policy is, we are

not left altogether in the dark. The mover and the seconder of the Address told us that we are called upon to adopt a course with regard to our own tariff, different from what the party had advocated before, because the United States were not friendly because they were not disposed to give us a fair reciprocity treaty. We have, then, information coming from the mover and seconder of the Address, information which the leader of the House does not condescend to give us; nevertheless we feel we have a right to discuss this question and elicit all the information we can upon it, although it does not seem that we are going to get very much. The hon. gentleman who moved the Address said, among other things, that he trusted the government and the parliament of this country would never mind what had taken place, never mind what had been said in campaign speeches and campaign literature, but go to work as reasonable men and frame a tariff based on the present circumstances of the country. In one respect the advice is very good, but I can hardly think the other part of the advice, that is that the members of the government should pay no attention to their campaign speeches was very moral and I am sure such advice was not needed because, short a time as this government has been in power, they show that they need no mentor at their shoulder to remind them that they should pay no attention to their previous promises and pledges. They are amply able to perform that service of violating their pledges without any prompting from him. But while so much stress is laid upon the fact that the McKinley tariff is being revived in the United States as a circumstance which should alter the views of the government and the attitude of the parliament of this country towards the United States, have we forgotten that it is not the first time we have had to encounter the McKinley tariff? We had a McKinley tariff in operation before, and the Conservative party had to face that tariff and strengthen its national policy tariff in view of the action of the United States Congress. It was under the influence of the McKinley tariff that we strengthened our agricultural duties against the United States, duties that have proved to be greatly to the advantage of the farmers of Canada. The Conservative government of Canada,