

was before Congress. The Wilson Bill contained a provision which I may as well read, in order that it may go on the record :—

Provided that any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs 672 to 683 inclusive when imported from any county which lays an export duty on the same or any of them shall be subject to the duties existing prior to the passage of the Act.

This was the Wilson Bill as it was then agreed by the Senate Committee of the United States. Mr. Charlton memorialized the Senate over his own signature as follows :—

But the proviso contained in that will not reach the purpose intended, but if the interpretation of your memorialist is correct will result in the imposition of American duties upon the articles only, that Canadian export duties are imposed upon, thereby supplementing the Canadian export duty and furthering the purposes of the Canadian government.

It is respectfully submitted that this proviso should read as follows :—

Provided that if any export duty be laid by any foreign country upon any of the articles mentioned in paragraphs Nos. 672 to 683 inclusive then all said articles imported from said county shall be subjected to the duties existing prior to the passage of this Act.

The United States proposed in the Wilson Bill that if an export duty were placed by Canada on any of the articles in the lumber schedule, it should be met with the duty imposed under the McKinley Bill on the same article. Mr. Charlton pointed out that that would not be a sufficiently severe blow to the government of Canada, and suggested that in the event of Canada imposing an export duty on any one article in the lumber schedule the McKinley rates should apply to the whole schedule. They seized the suggestions and put it in the Wilson Bill, and it prevented Canada from putting an export duty on saw-logs, because the moment Canada imposed an export duty on saw-logs the whole of the provisions of the McKinley Bill were revived against Canada as far as the lumber schedule was concerned. I have no hesitation in saying that the conduct of that gentleman on that occasion, going to the United States and securing such a drastic measure as that against Canada, was unpatriotic and that it bordered on the very verge of treason. I dare say that one remark which I made yesterday afternoon may be challenged by some hon. member in reply, because I heard a similar statement challenged before now. I charged the Liberal

party, with a few honourable exceptions, with having committed themselves to the policy of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity with the United States and I said that the policy was disloyal to Canada and to the empire to which we belong. I am aware that many of these gentlemen have denied that any recognized member of the Liberal party ever advocated commercial union with the United States. In answer to that I shall just read a few words from a speech delivered by Mr. Davies at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, on the 23rd of August, 1887. I am quoting from the *Patriot* newspaper report, and I may say the *Patriot* is Mr. Davies's own organ. He said on that occasion :

The difference between commercial union and reciprocity is that the former would do away with all custom houses between the two countries, and they would have a uniform tariff against the rest of the world. * * * The key note should be struck in the lower province. Commercial union means a uniform tariff from the north pole to the Gulf of Mexico. The Reciprocity Treaty of 1856 he was prepared to accept, but he was afraid the Americans were not willing to concede. As commercial union seemed to be more easily attainable he was prepared to support it because he believed it would secure to us wealth, peace and happiness.

Hon. Mr. POWER—I should like to ask, as a matter of curiosity, what particular paragraph of the Speech the hon. gentleman is now dealing with.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I am dealing with the question of loyalty, which was referred to by the hon. gentleman from King's, N.B., who undertook in his speech to reprove the Conservative party for accusing their opponents of disloyalty.

Hon. Mr. POWER—The only reference in the Address to loyalty is the Diamond Jubilee, and I do not see what the hon. gentleman's remarks have to do with the Diamond Jubilee.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—My hon. friend seems to be anxious to limit discussion on this subject. I notice that he did not detect any departure from the rules of debate until I touched the question of reciprocity with the United States. The question of reciprocity is not in the Speech and because it is not there he thinks we should not speak about it, but I feel when we discuss the Speech from the Throne we have a right to point out what important public questions