

whereas in 1854 objections would have been taken, in 1874 the same objection would not have been taken. Why, Sir, England realized that Canada had progressed; that Canada has interests distinct from England, and that Canada, having been given the power to govern itself, should be allowed to exercise that power in its entirety. And mark, Sir, the road that had been travelled from 1854 to 1874. In 1854 all the articles included in the treaty, and they were many, were placed upon the free list of Canada. The following are the articles included in the treaty of 1854:—

Grain, flour and breadstuffs of all kinds.
Animals of all kinds.
Fresh, smoked and salted meats.
Cotton wool, seeds and vegetables.
Undried fruits, dried fruits.
Fish of all kinds.
Products of fish and of all other creatures living in the water.
Poultry, eggs.
Hides, furs, skins or tails undressed.
Stone or marble in its crude or unwrought state.
Slate.
Butter, cheese, tallow.
Lard, horns, manures.
Ores of metals of all kinds.
Coal.
Pitch, tar, turpentine, ashes.
Timber and lumber of all kinds, round hewed, sawed, unmanufactured in whole or in part.
Firewood.
Plants, shrubs, and trees.
Pelts, wool.
Fish oil.
Rice, broomcorn and bark.
Gypsum, ground or unground.
Hewn or wrought or unwrought burr or grindstones.
Dye stuffs.
Flax, hemp, and tow unmanufactured.
Unmanufactured tobacco.
Rags.

As soon as the treaty had been signed and completed and ratified by the Senate of the United States, and ratified by the Legislature of Canada, all these articles except one were placed upon the free list. That one article was dried fruits. Now, of all these articles which were placed upon the free list, and thus made free to Britain, we did not import from Britain any except one, that is coal. As to coal, there could be no discrimination against England to a large extent for the reason that coal cannot come by vessel further than Montreal, and cannot come much in competition with American coal west of Montreal. And what was the reason dried fruits was not placed on the free list? Simply to discriminate in favour of the Americans. The Americans at that time produced dried fruits, and therefore we discriminated in their favour. It is true, we did not import dried fruits directly from England; but we did import them from Greece, with which country we had, at that time, a treaty on the most favoured nation basis, so that in 1854 England consented to our discriminating against nations with which she had treaties of commerce. In 1874 she consented to discriminate against her own goods. What is the objection raised

by hon. gentlemen against reciprocity, limited or unlimited, when England herself has agreed and consented that Canada should discriminate against her if Canada found it to her advantage? Now, Sir, upon this question I cannot do better, I think, than quote to the House an article which I extract from a newspaper, an independent newspaper, the "Week," of Toronto. The "Week" speaks thus in its issue of the 27th January last:

But is free access to the markets of the United States attainable on any conditions which Canada could accept without sacrifice of duty or self-respect? Singularly enough, this is a question in regard to which we have directly contradictory testimony from the only two parties who are in a position to know. According to the version of the late conference given by Messrs. Blaine and Foster, the ex-Secretary, and the present Secretary, respectively, of the United States Government, the conditions offered were such as most persons would pronounce fair and reasonable, viz., that the list of goods to come under the treaty of reciprocity must include manufactures as well as natural products, and that the tariffs must be mutually preferential. This would have involved discrimination to a certain extent against the mother country in common with all other nations, but such discrimination is of the very nature of reciprocity treaties and could not be objected to by Great Britain, who would be only too glad to see a revival of Canadian prosperity and progress upon such terms. On the other hand, according to the recollections of Sir John Thompson and our Mr. Foster, reciprocity was offered only on condition of Canada's adoption of the United States tariff, which is of course a very different matter. This matter should be fairly faced and discussed during the session, not so much to settle the question of correctness of memory, which would be a delicate and unprofitable business, as to pronounce upon the desirability of now taking the American representatives at their word, and seeking a renewal of negotiations on the lines which they have distinctly laid down. It is scarcely conceivable that the incoming Washington Administration will be less favourable to such an arrangement than the outgoing one. What attitude will our Government take, is one of the test questions.

Why, Sir, who does not know that if we had a reciprocity treaty with the United States the prosperity of Canada would be increased to a very large extent? Hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot dispute it, for they admit themselves to be in favour of reciprocity. Therefore, Sir, if our prosperity were increased, our purchasing power would be increased, and if England might suffer in one direction she would benefit still more in another direction, and, therefore, instead of injuring England, as is contended by hon. gentlemen opposite, we would actually confer a benefit on England, on Canada and on the United States as well. This is the reason why we are in favour of that policy. Sir, there is another question to which I want to allude, that is, an issue of fact which was raised the other day by my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who said that when the Government dissolved the House in 1891 they asserted to the people of Canada that they could and would obtain a reciprocity treaty for them with the United States. The hon. gentlemen opposite denied that; but, Sir,