

not think that I ought to object too much to the hon. gentleman's right to criticize and to be facetious at the expense of the National Policy when the hon. gentleman treated as he did his favourite theory of unrestricted reciprocity. He made but a momentary allusion to that subject, and he had to go to the Indian village of Caughnawaga to find an illustration in favour of it. After years of consideration, the hon. gentleman is able to tell us that the Indians of Caughnawaga, under free trade with the United States, obtain more for their baskets and their moccasins than they otherwise could. Now, if the hon. gentleman had been a little more impartial in the quotation he made from the debates of this House when the National Policy customs arrangement was discussed in 1877 and 1878, he would have found a much better answer to his arguments from members of his own side than he has found from our friends. He accuses us for not having legislated so as to keep the population of this country within its borders, so as to find employment for our people and prevent their going to the United States. If he had read a little more from "Hansard" of fifteen years ago he would have found that the answer which his friends and his party gave day by day was that legislation could not change that state of affairs, that it could not create prosperity, and that it was hopeless to expect such a result. If then, as they said, the task was hopeless, it is not fair to charge us with not doing what it was hopeless to expect us to do. But the hon. gentleman knows that the legislation which was then introduced has found employment for thousands and tens of thousands in this country who would otherwise have swollen the exodus, and for classes of people who had been swelling it previous to 1879. The hon. gentleman knows it, for I read it in his countenance, as well as heard it with my ears, when he proclaimed this doctrine, that there were figures and figures, that he makes a difference between some figures and others. Yes, he will take the account of the population in this country now, and compare it with the statistics made in 1881 under different circumstances and different conditions, and will decline to take any figures which tend against his own argument and in favour of the National Policy, and which show the increase of employment which has been given to mechanics from one end of Canada to the other. The hon. gentleman does make a difference between some figures and others, and that is where we condemn his reference to the statistics of 1891, in which he holds us distinctly responsible for the want of an increase in population, but declares that we are not entitled to any credit for the increased employment given to our people, by which tens of thousands have obtained employment here, of the classes which had to seek employment in the United States when the friends of the hon. gentleman were in office. I was not surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman in reference

to wrecking and towing and in reference to the rebate on the canal tolls. He is somewhat mistaken in his criticism of our action in reference to wrecking and towing. The Government of Canada are and have been willing that kind should be given to vessels of any States the same privileges as those which other vessels have at present in our canals. We have never disputed that the wrecking vessels owned in that country should pass as freely through the canals as any other vessels, but the point of difference was as to the carrying on of wrecking operations in the canals, and we regarded it as serious that privileges of that kind should be given to vessels of any other country. In one point of view it may seem immaterial. One could hardly fancy wrecking operations being carried on in a canal under ordinary circumstances, or that owners of wrecking vessels in the United States should seriously desire that privilege in our canals, and it may be that the privilege which was so earnestly pressed upon us was not of very great consequence to them. It is, however, open to considerable doubt and demands considerable caution, because the traffic in a canal lock might be completely blocked if, by international agreement, the wrecking vessels of another country were enabled to come and go at their own option in order to remove a wrecked vessel from our canals. If there is, as I assume there is, good faith on the other side, a very few words ought to be sufficient to make it clear that, if tugs are engaged in towing vessels through a canal and a slight accident should happen to one of the vessels towed, assistance could be given, and as far as I am aware that has never been prevented. But on the other hand it should be understood that operations of a protracted character in our canals should be in any case under the control of the Canadian authorities owning the canals. Let me point out that this was not contemplated in the original arrangement which was made. The principle of that arrangement was that there should be wrecking and towing reciprocally in the waters contiguous to the two countries, and the canals can hardly be said to come under that definition; but we would not stand too strictly upon that, if facilities in those canals are essential to the fair working of the agreement. We have only desired to restrict United States' wrecking companies by regulations which apply to our own vessels. The United States have felt themselves unable to agree to that on account of the bald statement in the Act of Congress that the President of the United States can only extend reciprocal privileges to us if they are extended on our side to the canals in Canada, as well as to the contiguous waters. The hon. gentleman was also mistaken in regard to the rebate on the canal tolls in Canada. That rebate has been in effect for years, and it was not made the subject of criticism by our opponents in this House or serious remonstrance on the part of the United States until a considerable time had elapsed. Last year when we were required to deal