

member from De Lanaudière (Hon. J. P. B. Casgrain) told us about the honourable member from Stadacona, who had moved the Address. He said that the honourable gentleman's character and standing and knowledge of business in the Dominion of Canada were such that anything he said should be taken for granted, because it would be right and could not be otherwise. At the same time the honourable gentleman, before he took his seat, gave us to understand that he was falsifying his own statement. Those of us who followed the speech of the honourable member from Stadacona, and who heard the resolution he moved, seconded in such an eloquent manner by the honourable gentleman from Pembroke (Hon. G. V. White), could not but feel that they had said all that could be said in the Speech from the Throne. But some honourable gentlemen on the other side, as is their custom, paid no heed to what was before the House. Long as they have been in this House, they are prone to do the things they should not do here, and thus they set a bad example to the younger men coming into the Senate.

My honourable friend from De Lorimier (Hon. R. Dandurand) started away back at 1854, in order that he might be able to say a few words. The honourable gentleman took up the time of this House for something like two hours talking about stealing elections and that kind of thing, and he thought he was making a success of that; but before he resumed his seat he discovered he had made a sad failure of it.

The honourable gentleman has referred to the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854, and I want to refer to that treaty for one reason and one reason only, and that is to say that if the United States had not misjudged the people of Canada and had allowed that treaty to continue, the probabilities are that there would have been no Canada today. We did not want that treaty abrogated, but they abrogated it, and for what? They had only one purpose in view—to try to force Canada into annexation. One cannot come to any other conclusion, though he may go over the course of history from that day to this. Who was interested in Canada at that time? Not Great Britain: she did not care very much for Canada at that time, although since then she has realized that we are her strong right arm. But at the time of which I am speaking we were only a bother to her—an encumbrance. But the United States played their cards wrong, and consequently when that treaty was abrogated the good men of this

Dominion, the men who were competent, the good men from the province of Quebec, the province of Ontario, and the eastern provinces came together and agreed that they must stand together for Canada.

My honourable friend has told us: "You were always looking for reciprocity." Yes, we were looking for reciprocity, and when we got reciprocity we did not want it, because it was got at the wrong time. It was got by the Liberals, and they always do things at the wrong time. They were always wrong and will always be wrong, as they are to-day, and you must be convinced of this wherever you may look. I purpose showing that before I sit down. I will show my honourable friend that the people of Canada have very little hope or trust in the party which he tries to represent here. As I say, the big men of Canada got together in those early days of reciprocity and decided that they must stick together, couple up the provinces, make a stand for interprovincial trade, bring about a national condition and start a nation in Canada. They did so, and we then formed what is known as the Confederation, and no men took a more prominent part in that movement than the leaders from the province of Quebec.

I shall not dwell very long on that point. I want to come to the treaty of 1873, the Treaty of Washington, which was the next treaty we had. I am not sure of the date, because I have not been very well since Saturday, and have not had an opportunity of looking these matters up. That treaty gave us the right to send fish to the United States free of duty. We tried to get free entry for lumber and agricultural products. We did the best we could, but that was all we could get. But what did the United States get under that treaty? They got free access to our inshore fisheries. They said, "We will appoint a commission to decide what monetary value is to be placed upon that concession," and that commission was appointed and decided that we, with Newfoundland, were entitled to get \$5,500,000, of which \$1,500,000 went to Newfoundland.

While I am touching on this point, let me say that the interest on this \$4,000,000 furnishes the bounty paid to the fishermen in the eastern provinces every year to the extent of about \$160,000. Let me suggest this—and I commend it to the attention of the leader of the House—that that \$160,000 should be paid to the inshore fishermen of