

some risks which else we might have either declined or encountered with greater promise of success."

That is what the hon. gentleman for whom the First Minister has so much admiration says of himself and his Government. Let us hear what Mr. Blake says with respect to the policy which the Liberal party has been advocating during two or three years past, the policy on which the Liberal party went to the country and the policy which they are advocating at this moment:

"While that free market which the United Kingdom, on a just conception of its own interest, opens permanently with all the world is to us of very great value, and while every prudent effort should be made to enlarge our exports there and elsewhere beyond the seas, yet the results of all such efforts must be far below those to overflow from a free market throughout our own continent."

"The United States tariff will, (and indeed unless high sugar duties be reimposed, must) for a long time remain, like our own, decidedly protective; still there is a fair expectation, based on the last election there, that sounder economic views than those of the sitting Congress will very soon prevail, and that their tariff will be readjusted on a basis much more moderate and favourable to the consumer than that which preceded the McKinley Bill; and eventually approach what is known as a revenue tariff, incidentally, though still substantially, protective."

"Having regard to this expectation, unrestricted free trade with the United States, secured for a long term of years, would (even though accompanied by higher duties against the rest of the world than I for one admire) give us in practice the great blessing of a measure of free trade, much larger than we now enjoy or can otherwise attain; it would greatly advance our most material interests, and help our natural, our largest, most substantial and most promising industries; it would create an influx of population and capital, and promote a rapid development of forces and materials now almost unused; in three words, it would give us men, money and markets."

"Thus it would emphatically be for the general and lasting good. And this, although it would produce, as all great changes do, temporary derangement of business and local losses, would strike hard some spinning and exotic industries, wholly tariff born, tariff bred and tariff fed, and would put upon their mettle a good many manufacturers unaccustomed to the keen breath of competition, and others who would be obliged to adopt the specialization, and the improved methods of production and distribution, which, to the signal advantage of the general consuming public, a large market allows and demands."

These, Mr. Speaker, are the sentiments of the Hon. Edward Blake—first, with respect to the Government of the day; second, with respect to the results likely to follow the adoption of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and from neither of these points dwelt upon by the late leader of the Opposition can members on the Government benches, in my opinion, draw any satisfaction.

Mr. FOSTER. Why did he not support your policy?

Mr. CHARLTON. You hear his words, and you can account for the matter yourself. The hon. gentleman has asked a question, and the hon. gentleman can answer it himself. It is not my business to say why Mr. Blake did not support the policy of our party; he certainly did not support the policy of the Government.

I notice in the *North American Review* for this month an article written by the High Commissioner for Canada, entitled "The Wiman Conspiracy." I am at a loss to understand how a movement entered upon and advocated publicly, both in the press and on the platform, how a policy that became the policy of a great party and commanded that degree of support in Canada which this policy did command, can be characterized as a conspiracy.

Mr. CHARLTON.

The High Commissioner evidently seeks to placate American opinion. He says, in effect, to the Americans: Have nothing to do with the naughty Grits; they have condemned the Government for their liberal conduct towards you on the fishery question; they have taken the Government to task on every occasion when they have made concessions to the United States; they are not your friends, we are your friends, give your confidence to the Conservatives and have nothing to do with the Grits. The article of the High Commissioner is calculated to produce very little result. I repeat that the charge that unrestricted reciprocity is a conspiracy movement is essentially false. It has not a single character of a conspiracy. It was discussed year after year, it was deliberately adopted by the Liberal party as the platform upon which the party should appeal to the people of Canada. It is the policy on which the Liberal party stands to-day; it is the policy upon which the Liberal party will yet achieve victory. It is not a conspiracy, but it is a general movement in the interests of the great mass of the people, with a view to secure better relations between all English-speaking peoples on this continent. The characterization of this movement as a conspiracy is sheer nonsense.

Then, we have in the same review an article from a late Governor General of the Dominion—the Marquis of Lorne; and the Marquis tells us that the result of the election proves that Canada desires to pursue her own path. Although a very humble individual, I take leave to differ with His Lordship the Marquis. I think the result of the last election in Canada proves the power of slander, the power of misrepresentation, the power of gerrymander, the power of the revising barrister, the power of the Printing Bureau in the hands of the Government, with the power to stuff the voters' lists, the power of the decision to give insufficient time for the consideration of a great public question. This is what the result of the last election contest proves; all these things were factors to produce the result in that election.

Mr. IVES. The power of greenbacks.

Mr. CHARLTON. If any man insinuates that we have had any aid from Texas cattle ranches, or from Montana cattle ranches, or from American railways, or from any other influences in the United States, he asserts that which is false; but we were confronted by a Government which controls a great railway which ran special trains to carry its voters to the polls, and which threw the whole weight of its influence in favour of the Government. We were confronted with a Government which commands vast corruption funds through agencies it would not be fit for me to speak of upon the floor of this House. We stood face to face with a political party which controlled these elections by influences, the reverse of what are fair, and honourable, and patriotic; while the Liberal party fought the battle upon its own resources, and with its own means, and to the best of its own ability. We may have had the sympathy of some people in the United States as men advocating a broad policy and liberal, but further than their sympathy we had no aid.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Canadian people in the United States sympathized with us; not the cattle ranchers in Texas.