

the imports of this country from the United States since the adoption of that tariff as compared with the imports from Great Britain. The fact remains however that while that tariff has not benefited British trade, but has worked advantageously to the United States trade, yet it was at the time apparently an unfriendly act towards the United States, which could not help rendering difficult the task of the representatives of this country when they undertook to frame a treaty. I go back and say that as far as these gentlemen at all attempted to shape events leading up to negotiations with the United States, they put nothing but difficulties in their own way, and all the advantages that came to their help in the matter of these negotiations came from sources and influences to which they contributed absolutely nothing. I remember all that we were promised about what the "sunny ways" were going to do. Who in this House has not heard the fable of the sun compelling the traveller to take off his coat, while the north wind had the opposite effect. The sunny ways were to be applied to Uncle Sam, and great things were going to be produced in that way. I am afraid that Uncle Sam has proved somewhat of an iceberg, as the sunny ways have not been as effectual as it was believed they would be. We cannot congratulate the government on the result of the long and protracted deliberations, and I must say that I believe there was a general feeling of satisfaction, a feeling of relief in Canada among their own friends, amongst the people generally when the commissioners came home, because the tenacity with which they persisted in endeavouring to make a treaty, the length of time which was applied to it, indicated clearly that in their intense desire to do something there was a great element of danger that the best interests of Canada would be sacrificed. I feel that the people of Canada to-day are much better pleased that they came home without a treaty, than with the kind of treaty that the public believed they would have if they had succeeded in coming to a definite conclusion with the United States. This does not say much for the power of sunny ways, or the boasted influence of this Administration aided as they were by all the power and influence of the British Government represented by a statesman of the greatest ability and of world-wide reputation, one of the ablest jurists in the

world. Notwithstanding all the influence that he was able to bring to bear, they were not able to settle the questions pending before them. A sad commentary on all the boasts that were put forward about what the sunny days would accomplish when dealing with the United States, is the remark of Lord Herschell when lying on what proved to be his death-bed, "I have spent six months and all I have got for it is a broken leg." There is another paragraph of the speech to which my hon. friend has devoted a good deal of attention. That is the plebiscite upon the question of prohibition. My hon. friend, feeling the extreme difficulty of his present position, actually tried to get others into it. It is a comfort in misfortune if you can draw some others into the same position as yourself, and he actually tried to draw the hon. leader of the opposition into it, because he had not divided the House in regard to the Plebiscite Bill, hon. gentlemen know very well that the government have to take that responsibility entirely to themselves, and that they cannot shift it upon the shoulders of the temperance people of Canada, because the temperance people, as my hon. friend very well knows, did not ask for a plebiscite: asked for prohibition. They asked for they bread and the government gave them a stone. They pleaded that a plebiscite was not necessary, but the members of the present government when in opposition, in the Ottawa Conference of 1893, decided that they would take a plebiscite on the question, and they created an impression on the country that they would act in good faith with all parties and that the decision of the majority would rule. I am confident I speak the sentiments of the majority of the people when I say that that impression was created, righteously, created that the majority would prevail when the vote was taken. I believe my hon. friend the leader of the House is almost the father of the plebiscite idea, because he moved a resolution in 1889 in the House of Commons on the subject and supported that resolution in a speech, and I will read some extracts from that speech which show that my hon. friend clearly meant at that time that the view of the majority should prevail. The hon. gentleman said:

I quite admit that on the great majority of public questions it is desirable that Parliament itself should assume the responsibility of legislation; but Parliament has already pronounced its opinion that prohibition legislation is desirable, but it has said