

favour of free trade in natural products : but if the United States refuse to grant us that, we are willing to go further. We are willing to allow a large proportion of manufactured articles in the United States to come into this country free, provided we are given the same privilege of sending the manufactured articles of this country into their markets free. We do not say that we can formulate to the very letter the terms of a treaty that might be formed, after consideration of the whole question, but we are liberal on this side of the House, and if we were in power, I am satisfied that, within two years, we could place upon our Statute-books a treaty which would give us great advantages in the United States' markets, and give the Americans great advantages in ours. But we are told that we could not get that. We do not know, we are not positive of anything in the future. It was said in 1849 that we could not get a treaty along the lines of the Treaty of 1854. It took us seven long years of continuous negotiations every year to secure that treaty. We were refused, year after year, and ultimately, after a thorough consideration of the relations between the two countries, we succeeded, in 1854, in getting a treaty beneficial to Canada. But hon. gentlemen opposite appear to think they can get a treaty in one month. They dissolved Parliament last winter at a very unseasonable period. For what purpose? For the purpose of having a Parliament fresh from the people to consider the treaty they were to formulate with the United States; and yet, in the face of that appeal to the country, not a single step has been taken in order to secure such a treaty. My opinion is, that hon. gentlemen opposite are not in favour of a treaty at all with the United States which will materially widen our commercial intercourse. I make bold here to state definitely, from my place on the floor of Parliament, that it is my candid opinion they have no more intention of seeking a treaty with the United States than they had of getting a treaty with the Sandwich Islanders. Why, their whole history for the last two or three years proves that to a demonstration. We were told repeatedly, upon the public platforms and in this House, that they have been in favour of reciprocity for the last twenty years, and that they have placed upon the statutes of this country an offer of reciprocity to the United States. And what is that offer? They place a list of scheduled articles on the statutes, and say to the United States: If you will allow those articles to go into your country free, we will allow similar articles to come into Canada free; or if you will allow them to go into your markets at a less rate of duty than the ordinary duties charged, we will lower the duty on similar articles brought into this country. If these hon. gentlemen believe what they have been stating for the last few years, namely, that a treaty in natural products would destroy the farmers of this country, what are they offering the United States to-day? They are telling the United States that if they accept that offer placed upon our statutes, it will ruin our farmers, but, they say, we place the ruination in your hands, and if you wish to ruin the farmers of this country, all you have to do is to accept our offer. Does the Conservative party to-day say they are in favour of a treaty in natural products? Not one of them does. I challenge any hon. gentleman opposite to say that he is in favour of a treaty in natural products with the United States.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

States. And if they are not in favour of a treaty, and if they are not in favour of interfering directly or indirectly with the National Policy—if, on the one hand, they exclude raw materials or the natural products of the country, and, on the other hand, they exclude the manufactured articles of the country, I would like to know what articles the treaty is going to include. But we were told that Sir Charles Tupper, in 1888, made an unrestricted offer, to the United States, of reciprocity. Now, Sir Charles Tupper never made a *bonâ fide* offer to the American Government with regard to a treaty at all. I make that assertion here, as I have made it before, that Sir Charles Tupper never made a *bonâ fide* offer to the commissioners appointed by the Washington Government in 1888? And why did he not? He had no power, he had no authority delegated to him to make any such offer to the American Government. Sir, previous to the appointment of the commissioners for the settlement of the fishery question in 1887, Secretary Bayard wrote to Sir Charles Tupper in the month of May. His letter congratulated Sir Charles Tupper upon his patriotism—of course he knew that was one of his weaknesses. He hoped he would be appointed as one of the commissioners who were to meet in Washington the following fall, for which appointment Sir Charles Tupper afterwards asked, according to his own letter, and he was appointed one of the commissioners for Canada to settle the difficulties existing between the two countries. Now, according to the tenor of that letter, a private letter sent by Mr. Bayard, who knew the policy and views of the American Government upon the trade question, who knew what they were willing to do at that very time, Secretary Bayard suggested to him that the whole trade relations of the country should be discussed when those commissioners were appointed, and these are the words of his letter. After preliminary congratulations upon his ability and patriotism, &c., he says:

“The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been a *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded.

“I am confident we both seek to obtain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment, on a liberal and statesmanlike plan, of the entire commercial relations of the two countries.

“I say commercial, because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to affect the legislative independence of either country.”

There was an offer just as if he had said to Sir Charles Tupper: You are about to be appointed commissioner; seek to impress upon your own Government, and through them upon the British Government, that they should give powers to the commissioners to negotiate on these lines. But the British Government did not give these powers at all. I believe that Sir Charles Tupper was in favour of more extended trade relations with the United States, but the Government at Ottawa were not in favour of that policy, and no such instructions were given. How do I know that? Here are the instructions issued to the commissioners:

“Whereas for the purpose of considering and adjusting in a friendly spirit with plenipotentiaries to be appointed on the part of our good friends the United States of America, all or any questions relating to rights of the fishery in the seas adjacent to British North America and Newfoundland, which are in dispute between our Government and that of our said good friends, and any other