

defeat it so effectually as to say, in thus unburthening his heart to the press of a foreign country, that Canada is practically dependent upon the great republic to the south of us, and is prepared to do anything, to go upon our knees at any moment, to grant any concession that may be necessary.

Now, Sir, I have another objection to this matter. The hon. gentleman says that among all these questions he proposes that the bonding system shall be taken up. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he not know that the bonding system enjoyed by Canada to-day is under a solemn treaty made between Great Britain and the United States of America. Occasionally, some people in the United States, who are very anxious to create trouble with Canada, who do not hesitate to do everything in their power to hand us over to the United States, have been kind enough to suggest to the United States Government to stop the bonding privilege as a means of bringing Canada to her knees, just as they have been kind enough to suggest that the United States have it in their power to adopt a course that they saw would render the great railway lines of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, bankrupt in a very short time. That is a policy that I can understand emanating from the Farrars, from the Wymans, and from the Glens; but I cannot understand the First Minister of Canada committing himself to a declaration that is tantamount to saying that the bonding privilege is one that we have yet to settle. Sir, it is a privilege that has been conceded after the most solemn declarations by the plenipotentiaries of both countries and has been ratified by a treaty under which we now enjoy it. I do not intend to take up the time of the House longer in reference to this matter, but I felt that it was absolutely necessary that the earliest opportunity should be taken of showing the consequences of this extremely reckless and imprudent course which the hon. gentleman seems disposed to pursue.

Now, I have only one word more to say and that is in regard to the postponement of the consideration of the fiscal policy of this country for the next eight or nine months. I may say, Sir, that a more fatal policy for Canada I do not believe could be conceived. Free trade would be bad enough, a revenue tariff would be bad enough, a declaration that the industries of Canada were to be struck down at a blow would be bad enough; but, Sir, uncertainty is worse. I say that while it was not necessary, under the view which those hon. gentlemen take, to call Parliament for the sake of getting supplies, it is necessary, and it is in the most vital interest of the people of Canada, that they should know what is to be the policy of the Government of this country. Does the hon. gentleman not know what was the cause of that frightful disaster that has wrought ruin to millions of people in the great re-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

public to the south of us? Does he not know that the election of President Cleveland, with the declaration that protection was to be struck down and that free trade was to be the policy of the United States of America, paralyzed every industry in that country? Does he not know the frightful financial and commercial disasters that ensued from that hour, until that country was brought into a condition that every person must deplore, a condition that we of all others have reason to deplore, because, situated as we are, separated by an invisible boundary line for so long a distance, it is impossible for that country to undergo a great financial and commercial crisis without its being severely felt throughout Canada, and such was the case. But, Sir, under the ægis of the National Policy, Canada withstood—

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will give the hon. gentleman an authority, not Canadian but American. Let me tell him what an eminent statistician of the United States of America said in regard to the position that Canada held, at the same time that this wave of depression, which did affect us, was crushing the great republic to the south of us, and causing hundreds of thousands of people to suffer for the want of bread, and carrying misery and desolation into the homes of millions of people of that country, for the reason that commerce was paralyzed, the industries of the country were paralyzed, because they did not know what was to be the fiscal policy of the country. Sir, under these circumstances, I will give hon. gentlemen, who seem so much amused at the position which Canada occupied, affected as it was to a considerable extent, but which, under the ægis of the National Policy it was enabled to withstand even to the overflowing of injurious results that naturally fell upon the country from its proximity to the United States, a statement which appeared in the "Forum," early in 1894, from Mr. D. A. Wells, the well-known American economist. He said:

In the Dominion of Canada, separated territorially from us on the north by an imaginary line, there has been no panic, no unusual demand for money, no stoppage of industries, no restriction of trade, no increased rate of interest; in short, nothing beyond the ordinary course of events, except so far as these events may have been influenced by contiguity to what may be termed a financial cyclone, whose pathway of destruction was contiguous to, but not within, Canadian territory.

This opinion as to the condition of the two countries is not from a Canadian, but from a high American source. Does the hon. gentleman want to bring about in Canada the same disastrous conditions in every section of this Dominion from which the United States is now suffering? If he does, he is pursuing the best way to accomplish his