

persons to unite ourselves politically with the United States, it is by adopting just such a policy as we on this side of the House advocate, which might give us, what we have a right to ask and to obtain if we can secure it, the advantage of free commercial intercourse with the United States, without in any way disturbing or altering our own form of government. There is another act which the hon. gentleman did, but which no hon. gentleman with the slightest respect for British institutions would have presumed to do. What is the ground work on which the hon. gentleman bases his support of the National Policy, under which various vile monopolies were empowered to tax the people for their own private and individual benefit? The hon. gentleman has dared to trail the British flag in the dust and to flaunt the British flag as the flag under which these same monopolists are protected. If there is one thing settled in the United Kingdom more than another it is that they shall have free trade. That is a settled part of British policy; I may say it is almost part of the British Constitution, and all leaders of the great parties without exception have declared again and again that so far as Great Britain is concerned the policy of free trade is fixed and will remain forever. But, unfortunately, there are no doubt among us, as there are elsewhere, ignorant men who may be led to connect the protection of these vile monopolies with allegiance to the British flag, and if in the future evil consequences should result they will be due to this cause more than any other that the First Minister sought to use as a justification for maintaining a policy which is as un-British as it is possible to conceive the improper allegation that it was in the interest of Great Britain that this policy which has enormously reduced British imports, that this policy which was deliberately designed to prevent British merchants having free intercourse to our markets is, forsooth, necessary in order to maintain our connection with the mother country. The hon. gentleman is face to face with the fact that he has made no progress whatever in his negotiations with the United States. The hon. gentleman cannot even get an audience with the United States Government. What suggestion has he or his friends to make? They know right well that the people of this country at the present moment are suffering very materially from the effects of this same McKinley tariff to which I have alluded, and for which we have largely to thank the present Government. What do they propose? They propose simply this: To maintain these monopolies, to impose more taxes on the people, to further burden the farming and other producing classes; and having done so, and having driven hundreds of thousands out of the country, then, perchance, they will endeavour to negotiate what they are pleased to call fair extended trade relations with the United States. Our duty is clear. It is first and foremost to unmask these deceptions, to show to the people of Canada how utterly false were the pretences on which the late decision was given. We are also bound to make the people of Canada understand the situation, to make them see clearly and distinctly that it is utterly impossible, and the Government know it is utterly impossible, to obtain material modifications in our present strained relations with the United States, except on a vastly wider basis than the hon. gentlemen appear in the least degree disposed

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to offer. If the hon. gentleman is disposed to adopt the policy which we, on this side of the House, have advocated, I can assure him we will support him in carrying out such a proposition. He has nothing to fear from this side of the House, if he only comes out and declares boldly and frankly that, having found that there is no possibility of obtaining reciprocal trade relations with the United States, except on the basis I have indicated, he feels it his duty in the interest of the country to accept it. We do not care whether the hon. gentleman remains in office for three, or four, or five, or six years longer; but we do care a great deal that the policy we have advocated, and which we believe to be the sole and only policy which can really relieve the people of this country, should become the law of the land. Now, Sir, it is idle talk about interrupting negotiations; there are no negotiations to interrupt; there have been no negotiations to interrupt, and I tell the hon. gentleman that, so far as the trade policy is concerned, there will be no negotiations to interrupt, unless and until he is prepared to accept the policy which is laid down from this side of the House. However this may be, I maintain that the country at any rate has the clearest right to know where these gentlemen really stand on this question. Our position is plain enough; our position has been thrice defined and thrice enforced by vote on the floor of this Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows it; the hon. gentleman has had the assurance of the leader of the Opposition and as it was so it is to-day; but where are the Government? Are the Government to be found with my hon. friend the President of the Council; are they determined to have no reciprocity at all; are they disposed to declare as he does that reciprocity in natural products is the worst thing that could happen to the farmers of Canada; are they with the Secretary of State, who declares that he is disposed to go to the very utmost limits for the purpose of obtaining a repeal of the McKinley tariff; are they with the First Minister in his offer to exchange free coal, or are they with the Minister of Marine in his declaration that no such thing shall be done, First Minister or not to the contrary notwithstanding. Are they with Sir Charles Tupper, who, according to his own statement, was willing to make an unrestricted offer of reciprocity to Mr. Bayard, as long as four years ago, and who could not be induced, although he was Minister of Finance at the time, to appear in this House and argue for one moment against the proposition which I brought forward in 1888. Are they with him, or where in the world are they? This I have got to point out to the Government. If they really only desire reciprocity in natural products; if that is their policy, if they are not prepared to include manufactures, then what business have they sending embassies to Washington at all? They have had the emphatic declaration of Mr. Blaine that the present Government of the United States will not listen and have not the slightest intention of listening to any proposition for reciprocity in natural products only. That has been reinforced by the authoritative declaration of Senator Carlisle, who, the First Minister well knows, is a very prominent leader of the Democratic party which now control the House of Representatives. For the matter of that, Sir, if time permitted me to quote, I have the authority of the First Minister himself, announced several years