

negotiate these trade arrangements at Quebec, his hands were empty. He had given away everything he could give, and he got nothing for it. He has not got thanks or recognition or anything that is valuable to a public man; and he has only succeeded in bringing his country into contempt. I say it advisedly: I say, the feeling throughout the whole of this country is that the position of Canada would be infinitely higher, stronger and better to-day, if that commission had never been heard of. We have been suing and imploring on the platform and in the closet and everywhere; we have been begging favours from the United States of America, when there is not a country on the face of the globe that is in a better position than this Dominion of Canada to present a bold front and to say that we are in a position of independence that will enable us to deal fairly and justly between man and man, but that we ask no favour and no affection from any person whatever. Well, Sir, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) no doubt, was confronted with this little statement when he went down to engage in these negotiations. The hon. gentleman visited London in 1897, on which occasion he delivered himself of an address before a section of the London Chamber of Commerce; and what did he say? He said:

In 1895, the last year he had access to the tables, Great Britain took \$60,000,000 of Canada's products, while the United States took only \$40,000,000; Canada took from the United States \$60,000,000 of her products, and only \$30,000,000 from the mother country. When the Liberal party came into power in Canada, they thought something should be done to reverse that state of affairs. If it had been brought about by natural causes, those causes might well have been left to work out their own result; but when they saw that it had been produced by artificial means, they determined that all the obstacles in the way of the development of trade between Canada and the mother country should be removed.

Now, Sir, what did the hon. gentleman mean by that statement? He meant this—and it means nothing else—that the Conservative party in this country had been discriminating against the mother country and by unnatural means forcing the trade into United States channels. That is what it meant, and it meant nothing else. And now, Sir, we have the declaration that, when this hon. gentleman went to negotiate a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States, they said: We thought you were altogether opposed to having any trade with the United States. Are you the same gentleman who held up to execration the late Government for having by unnatural means increased the trade of Canada with this country? If these are your views, what do you mean now? Do you mean to say that you do not intend to carry out the solemn pledge you gave on the platform in the city of London to the English people and the

English merchants, that you and your Government intended to change all that, and to see that Canada would not take more from the United States than from England, and give less? Now, Sir, what is the result? Why, Sir, instead of the hon. gentleman having accomplished that by this sham preference given to England, but a real preference to the United States, he brought about that discrimination in favour of the United States and against England that he had denounced, and here it is. In 1895 the imports from the United States were \$54,634,000; in 1898, under the policy of my hon. friend, the imports rose to no less than \$78,000,000, or \$23,360,000 more than had been brought from the United States under the tariff that he denounced, and that he pledged himself to the English people to remedy. What would such astute men as Senator Fairbanks and the late Mr. Dingley—whose death we very much deplore—think when they were asked to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with gentlemen who had shown, either that they did not know what they were talking about, that they did not understand the subject with which they were undertaking to deal, or that they were most unfriendly towards the United States of America and determined to have as little to do with them as possible? While our imports from the United States exceeded our imports from Great Britain by \$20,000,000 in 1895, our imports from the United States exceeded our imports from Great Britain by \$46,000,000 in 1898. The free list given by the tariff of the hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury benches was 72½ per cent of the total free list given to the world, and the free list enjoyed by Great Britain was only 17 1-7 per cent. Was that brought about by natural causes? The hon. gentleman said this disparity in the figures was not the result of natural causes, and he and his Government were going to see that all that was changed. They have changed it, and changed it with a vengeance; and what is the result of all this? The result is that these astute gentlemen with whom they were negotiating, found that they were dealing with men who did not understand the subject with which they were charged, or, if they did, they had placed themselves in a most unfortunate position; and when they went to ask the United States to make a commercial arrangement with a Government that had put on the Statute-book of the country a preference for England, what was their position? Why, Sir, they were met at once: Gentlemen, are you the same men who, in 1891, made those speeches in which you declared that all that Canada required to make it the most splendid country in the world, all that Canadians required to make them rich and prosperous from one end of the country to the other, was to get unrestricted reciprocity with us? If you are the same men, if you have not changed your principles, we are ready to negotiate with you; but if you