

Canada, in respect of negotiations with foreign powers, in no respect desire to be placed in the position of independent negotiators. On the contrary, they are fully convinced that it is through the influence and support of Her Majesty's Government, and by the effective use of their carefully trained and thorough diplomatic service, that they can alone look for any measure of success. And it is with the view most thoroughly to satisfy foreign Governments of the identity of interests of Her Majesty with themselves that they have so strongly sought the most official recognition possible for the representative."

So we find an express declaration in accordance with the Colonial Secretary, that it is not a position for independent negotiation at all on this subject, but one simply of giving advice and availing ourselves of that Foreign Office, which has done so much for us, and so successfully in the past, and through which we are to continue to carry on our negotiations on trade questions in future, after the same manner, being a singular discordance with the view contained in the memorandum, which pointed out there was a difference in the interest, in the commercial economy, in the principles of negotiation, which referred to the difficulty of making Her Majesty responsible for the representations, whereas this memorandum is in order to show how thoroughly identified in interests the two Governments are. There is this mistake in my opinion: Her Majesty's Government, on those matters which are of local importance to this country and to this country alone, should act by the advice of Her Majesty's Privy Council in Canada, and negotiations should proceed direct, and if not, until we decide to make that request no effectual change will take place, no effectual removal from the groove and the rut in which we have been, I can hardly say travelling but standing still for so long a time in this matter, will take place. None are so fit to negotiate as our own people, who thoroughly understand our situation, our capabilities, our wants, our requirements, what we have to offer, what we want to attain. The very principle of the negotiation, as they observed in the memorandum which I have read, was different. The very principle of the regulation of trade relations as it is to be looked at in our country and as it is to be looked at in England, is different, is opposite. England endeavors to convince the nations which have high Tariffs that a high Tariff is injurious to the nation that imposes it, more injurious to the nation which imposes than to the foreigner upon whose exports it is imposed, and endeavors to establish, by reasoning, that proposition, with a view to throwing down Tariff rates in the sense that they are injurious to those who set them up. Some of us believe that Tariff rates are injurious to those who set them up; but Tariff rates have existed here in the past; they are made higher now; and they will exist, no doubt, for a long time to come, and, therefore, for a long time to come, we will be in a position which, whatever may be the relative merits of the one and of the other great commercial systems, is essentially different from and antagonistic to the English system, and one which unquestionably, although its advantages may far counterbalance the advantages of that system, whatever its advantages may be, gives this advantage in dealing with a protectionist nation, that you can meet them on equal grounds, and you can say: "I quite agree with you that your Tariff is a benefit; I say our Tariff is a benefit; but if you will pull down your wall a little we will do the same," and that which was a benefit under other circumstances by reductions made on the principles of mutual concession will become a greater benefit still. We have something to offer, we have set up a wall and offer to pull down a stone or two; that no doubt in view of those countries which have adopted a similar system is something deserving of attention. But there has been and is, as has been stated in this memorandum, a great practical difficulty in English diplomatists bringing forward any such arguments. They do not believe in them. They think they are mistaken. They think they are contrary to sound principles

of political economy, and they have acted on that theory in their negotiations. A large school of them believe that commercial treaties themselves are an entire mistake because they are in violation of those principles. I do not, myself, share that view, but that is beside the question, because whether they be in violation of those principles as they exist in practical application in England, there can be no question that they are not in violation of the principles that have been, since we were confederated and before, in existence in this country. I say, Sir, that the circumstance of this difficulty has been called to our attention before to-day. In the negotiations with reference to the Treaty of Washington Lord Kimberley, in a despatch to the Canadian Government, in June, 1877, used these words:

"Her Majesty's Government are bound to add that whilst in reference to the strong wishes of the Dominion Government they used their best efforts to obtain a renewal in principles of the Reciprocity Treaty. They are convinced that the establishment of Free Trade between the Dominion and the United States is not likely to be promoted by making admission to the fisheries dependent upon the conclusion of such a treaty, and that the repeal by Congress of duties upon Canadian produce upon the ground that a protective Tariff is injurious to the country which imposes it would place the commercial relations of the two countries on a far more secure and lasting basis than the stipulations of a convention framed upon a system of reciprocity."

They, therefore, advised us, circumstanced as we were, having ourselves a very considerable Tariff, and our fiscal condition being, and necessarily being, founded upon a wholly different view, they advised us to abandon all the arguments which might fairly arise from our own state of circumstances as it practically stood, and to go on a basis of English commercial diplomacy, and to argue with the United States that their Tariff was injuring them and ought to be put down, instead of proposing a system of mutual concessions which it was in our power to carry out. The Tariff was there, and it would have been the height of pedantry not to take such advantages as were properly to be obtained from the existing fiscal conditions and Tariff of the country. Now, Sir, our system is wholly different, as I said. We do restrict. We restrict both for revenue and for protective purposes. We designedly restrict importations, and we are prepared to lower those restrictions if under particular circumstances with foreign countries we can obtain corresponding concessions which may be advantageous. We admit the great importance of improving our commercial relations with foreign countries. We admit the great importance, therefore, of successfully arranging conventions upon that subject; yet we make no progress in promoting them. Now, Sir, I say this can be done effectually only by altering our system, and by dealing with the subject through our own negotiators and according to our own views. But, Sir, objections are made to this. What are those objections? The first that occurs to me is the statement that our Envoy would not be treated with respect. I repudiate that suggestion. The Queen is the Queen of Canada as well as the Queen of England, and an Envoy sent by the Queen, through her representative in Canada, is the Queen's Envoy as much as if he would have been sent from the Court of St. James, and we need only ask that it should be so looked at, and that is the true constitutional view in which it is to be looked at. The authority is vested in Her Majesty; it is exercised by her representative here in her name, upon the advice of the Queen's Privy Council in Canada, and obtaining his power our Envoy would be received with all the respect due to the Queen's Envoy. Again, it is said we are a small country and that our interests are trifling. That, also, I entirely repudiate. I suppose they are trifling, but they will receive no more attention in consequence of the medium through which they are presented. In matters of trade, the magnitude of the interests involved measures the attention bestowed. The question in a matter of business is, what have you to sell and how much do you want from us.