

all. When my hon. friend talks about reciprocity in natural products he is talking nonsense; he is deceiving the country, and although probably he is not deceiving himself, yet such talk is calculated and designed to deceive the people. We have before us very satisfactory evidence as to what the Government of the United States will consent to in this direction.

My hon. friend, in the course of his speech the other night, said: "Mr. Blaine said a little and left a great deal unsaid." Let us examine for a moment what Mr. Blaine did say on the subject, and although the letter which I am about to read has been quoted before, it will be necessary to read it again. Mr. Baker, a member of the House of Representatives from a district close upon the border, in which Rochester is situated, wrote as follows to Mr. Blaine on the 29th January, 1891, just three or four days before the dissolution of our House:

"WASHINGTON, 29th Jan., 1891.

"MY DEAR MR. BLAINE,—It is reported in the newspapers of Canada and along the northern border of my State, where my constituents are deeply interested in the subject, that negotiations are going on between this country and Great Britain with a view to partial reciprocity with Canada, including natural products only and not manufactures, and it is stated that Sir Charles Tupper is on his way here as a commissioner to negotiate for such modifications of our tariff. I should be very glad if you would enable me to answer my constituents.

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "CHAS. S. BAKER."

Mr. Blaine was kind enough to enable Mr. Baker to answer his constituents and wrote him upon the same day the following answer:—

"WASHINGTON, D. C., 29th Jan., 1891.

"DEAR MR. BAKER,—I authorize you to contradict the rumours you refer to. There are no negotiations whatever on foot for a reciprocity treaty with Canada, and you may be assured no such scheme for reciprocity with the Dominion confined to natural products will be entertained by this Government. We know nothing of Sir Charles Tupper's coming to Washington.

"Very truly, &c.,

(Signed) "JAS. G. BLAINE."

My hon. friend stated that Mr. Blaine said a little, but he said enough to cover the ground. He told Mr. Baker that there were no negotiations whatever on foot between the two Governments—a statement which does not square very well with the assertions made by the Canadian Government that negotiations had been opened and that they wanted to get a new Parliament, as they did not wish to refer the legislation on these negotiations to what they called a moribund Parliament. Mr. Blaine distinctly states, in opposition to this assertion of the Canadian Government, that no such thing was the case, and he says further, that the Government of Washington will not entertain any proposition for reciprocity in natural products only. If the Canadian Government do not intend to go further than reciprocity in natural products, what is the use of their fooling the people; if they are not going further than such reciprocity they might as well keep their commissioners at home, for it is unnecessary to go to Washington on the 12th October next, and it is unnecessary to make a single move in the matter other than those they have already made. Then, Sir, when the news of the dissolution of this House reached Washington, we have the statement made of the position occupied by the other political party in the United States. The letter to Mr. Baker announces the position of
Mr. CHARLTON.

the Republican party and the Government of the United States. In the action taken by the Hon. Mr. Carlisle, leader of the Democratic party in the Senate of the United States, we have a declaration of the policy of that party. For the purpose of understanding thoroughly the ground upon which we stand, I shall read to the House a resolution introduced into the United States Senate on the 29th day of December by Mr. Carlisle, and which is as follows:—

"Whereas there are existing between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, certain controversies with reference to their trade and commerce and concerning the interpretation of treaty stipulations; and, whereas, it is desirable that the most friendly relations should obtain between the people of the two countries, and that a more extended trade and commerce be established and promoted by such friendly legislation by both countries as will remove all causes of irritation and every obstacle to the healthful growth and development of such trade and commerce between them; now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that for the purpose of carrying out the spirit and intent embodied in the foregoing preamble the President of the United States be and is hereby authorized and directed to invite the Government of the Dominion of Canada to appoint three commissioners to meet a like number of commissioners to be appointed by him on behalf of the United States.

"Such joint commission shall consider all questions relating to the commercial relations of the two countries under existing treaties, concurrent legislation or otherwise, and agree upon and recommend to their respective Governments such legislation as will settle all differences and controversies between the two countries, and which will, in the judgment of said joint commission, best tend to promote the growth of trade and commerce between the United States and said Dominion of Canada."

This resolution, as I have said, was moved by Senator Carlisle upon the 29th day of December, and on the 4th day of February, when the news was received at Washington of the dissolution of the Canadian House of Commons and of the pretension of the Government of this country that they had in fact instituted negotiations for a treaty in natural products on the lines of the Treaty of 1854, Mr. Carlisle thought it proper and necessary to further define the position of the Democratic party upon this question. We see that Mr. Blaine had already defined the position of the Government on the 29th January, and on the 4th day of February, Mr. Carlisle, as leader of the Democratic party, defines the position of his party on the question by moving this amendment to his resolution:

"Such joint commission shall consider all questions affecting the commercial relations of the two countries under existing treaties and statutes, and agree upon and recommend to their respective Governments such reciprocal legislation as will settle all differences and controversies between the two countries, and in the judgment of said joint commission best tend to promote the speedy and permanent establishment of unrestricted commercial reciprocity between the United States and the said Dominion of Canada."

We have, therefore, the position of both political parties in the United States clearly defined. Mr. Blaine, for the Government of the United States, says he will entertain no proposition for reciprocity in natural products only, and the position of the Democratic party, which controls the incoming House, is defined in the amendment of Mr. Carlisle to his resolution which proposes to empower the President of the United States to appoint commissioners to treat with Canada for unrestricted commercial reciprocity only. In view of all these facts, Sir, it is sheer nonsense to talk about