

again with United States statesmen. They desire to enlarge the boundaries of the country; they would like to add Canada to the United States; they said, let us hold off a little longer; let us refuse them reciprocity, and Canada will fall like a ripe plum into our mouths. What was the result? It turns out now during the present sitting of Congress that there is not the slightest chance of this same Spanish treaty being ratified at Washington. The hon. gentleman has stated that he has heard a great deal about our attempt to develop the trade of Canada—that we had two commissioners appointed to England, and yet we have not heard of any results. The United States has had ambassadors appointed to France and Spain, and you do not hear of any results yet. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, and the majority of this House and of this country will believe me when I say that the Government keep their attention constantly, earnestly and most actively directed to the development of the trade of Canada, and the obtaining of commercial treaties with the various civilized countries of the world. And I say this, that we have, I am happy to say, from Her Majesty's Government, every assistance in doing so. They have, for instance, taken the step which the hon. gentleman may perhaps consider insufficient, but which I consider all sufficient. They have joined our High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, with the Spanish Ambassador at Madrid as joint envoys in order to attempt to negotiate a treaty between Canada, as part of England, and not only the Spanish Antilles but the mother country—Spain. So with respect to France. The attention of the Government has been steadily given in that direction. The continual changes in government in France and the various circumstances connected with their own government are such that we have never been able to induce them to approach this subject with an earnest desire to come to a conclusion, but by and bye we may have successful negotiations. At all events we will keep "pegging away," to use the homely phrase of Abraham Lincoln; we will lose no opportunity of extending and developing the foreign trade of Canada. The hon. gentleman congratulates the House on there being no mention of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, that is all very well. There is no necessity for mentioning it, inasmuch as there is no legislation that we are going to lay before the House—that we propose to lay before the House just now. What we may do in the immense future, and with the immense future of that railway, we must leave to the future. At present we do not mention the Canadian Pacific Railway, as we do not propose to lay a measure before the House on this subject. But the hon. gentleman asks a great many questions about the progress of the work, the grades, and other cognate questions. I will take it that the report of the hon. Minister of Railways will settle that question, and therefore there was no necessity for encumbering the hon. gentleman's speech with any remarks about them. I do not think that it will answer any good purpose to follow the hon. gentleman in his discursive remarks on the various subjects of public interest. It was rather a waste of time, when the facts and papers are not before the House, to discuss the question. Therefore, I will say not a word more about the railway policy or about the land policy, or about the receipts for land sales, and so on. By the way, however, I will call the attention of the House to the rather unfair—I was going to say uncandid—remarks of the hon. gentleman, in which he pooh-poohed the receipts for the sales of land. He says that the receipts were so much and the expenditure was so much, and that there is a very small balance left. The hon. gentleman ought to have told the House that the receipts for the sales of land were for a particular year, while the expenditure, on the other side, was for the surveys, which will last for all time to come. The Government have been going on surveying township after township—we have surveyed a kingdom, almost, in area, and we have paid

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the expense of those surveys. Those surveys will last for all time; the receipts were merely the receipts for one year. The hon. gentleman would like to know very much whether there is going to be a Factory Bill introduced or not. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), has rushed to the rescue at once for fear there should be a dereliction of duty. We will see, by and by, when we have my hon. friend's measure before the House, how that will be dealt with. With respect to the factory law, the case stands thus: Already in two of the Provinces there is factory legislation. If at any time it is found requisite for the protection of life or property that offensive breaches of the factory law should be made a crime, a misdemeanor, of course we must act here. The Provincial Legislatures have no power to declare any breach of the law a misdemeanor; they can of course fix certain penalties in civil law to any breach of their law. The constitutional Act provides that they may by decision imposing a fine, protect their legislation, but they cannot interfere with any portion of the criminal law. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we ought to have mentioned an Act to give representation to the people of the North-West. I think before we can do that we must know what people are there, how they are divided, where their settlements are, what divisions are to be made, how the electoral franchise is to be exercised, what the electoral franchise is. We can have no satisfactory adjustment of that question until we know the number of people that are there, where they are situated, how they are scattered, in order that we may, hereafter, if Parliament thinks proper, give them representation in Parliament. The time must come ere long when these districts will be made Provinces, and if made Provinces they will, as a matter of course, be represented in this Parliament like any other Province. In the meantime, the first and necessary step must be taken of having a census. The hon. gentleman objects very much to some remarks I made in England, to the effect that the Liberal-Conservatives are the true Liberals. Well, I have said so in the House and in the country; I have not the slightest reason for not repeating the same thing in England. I believe the Liberal-Conservative party is the progressive party, the party that is going to develop this country. I believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in taking our place, a restrictive policy would be introduced, and the prosperity of this country retarded and obstructed. I said so there and I say so here. The hon. gentleman said I spoke unfairly of their party when I said the Conservative party drew its inspiration from England and the other from the neighboring Republic. I thought I was doing them full justice when I said I believed they were as loyal a party and as true to British interests as were the Conservatives. I could not go further than that. I did not state in my speech, though I might have done so, that they were anxious for any constitutional changes. I simply stated that in their legislation, their general legislation, they drew their inspiration from the United States, from the neighboring Republic, and I believe, if you look at the Statute Book, from 1874 to 1878, you will find the proof of my assertion.

Mr. MILLS. Fiscal policy, for instance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. member for Bothwell has really mentioned the exception which proves the rule. That is the only case in which we have adopted the policy of the United States. The hon. gentlemen laugh over there. I wonder if the members do not think we were right in adopting, in that instance only, the policy of the United States. I know many of them do. Then the hon. gentleman, in order to wind up his speech, although it had not anything to do with the Address from the Throne, brought up, in the first place—

Mr. LANDERKIN. The License Bill.