

farmers hurried across the boundary with their hay and other products in the belief that they could sell them free of the McKinley duty. The hon. gentleman denied—and from his point of view, I dare say he was right in denying, as far as his intention is concerned—that unrestricted reciprocity will cause any political change in Canada. He therein differs from his late great leader, Mr. Blake, the gentleman whom he followed most—I was going to say blindly—but most completely and without any shadow of dissent, without any appearance of variance of opinion until that gentleman resigned the leadership. Mr. Blake held a different opinion and consequently deserted the party. He retired from public life, of which he was an ornament, and retired, apparently forever, into private life, because he could not follow a course which he believed, in its logical consequence, to use the expression of my hon. friend, must lead to annexation to the United States. The hon. gentleman talks about our shifting policy. Why, he will find, if he ever comes to press his policy in the manner he has announced just now it is his intention to press it, supported as it will be by the speech of the hon. member for South Oxford, that it will not receive the support of all those who are nominally the supporters of the hon. gentleman, and really his supporters on most questions, but certainly not on that. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to have had any dissolution until we repealed the Gerrymander Act. Why, what would have become of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if there had been no Gerrymander Act. He would have been non-existent; he would have been wiped out of existence. But even in the benighted riding he represents, believed to be hopelessly Grit—so hopelessly Grit that it was charged against the Government that it was made a Grit hive—even there the light has begun to penetrate; and the majority of the hon. gentleman is but half what it was at the last election. So you see, Mr. Speaker, even in the darkest localities, the deepest dens of Grit—I was going to say ignorance—Grit obstinacy, the light is beginning to penetrate. We have achieved a Pyrrhic victory which will last five years. The hon. gentleman had better take care that the Pyrrhic victory in South Oxford will not become a defeat at the end of that period. The hon. gentleman did, in the first portion of his speech, rather sail around the question of unrestricted reciprocity; but at last he mustered his courage up. I could see he had to stiffen his nerves when he came out with the expression that he was in favour of continental free trade. That is another term for unrestricted reciprocity. He did not like even to use the expression “unrestricted reciprocity.” He knew it was unpopular. He knew it was unpopular in this House and in the country. He knew he could not stand up with any hope of carrying the country if he acted upon the term in its naked deformity of unrestricted reciprocity. So he calls it “continental free trade.” Very well. That policy, the shifting policy which the hon. gentleman attributed to us, I can cast across the floor to him. Now, in regard to “commercial union,” which is the term they have used as they have used “unrestricted reciprocity,” and lastly “continental free trade.” After all, no matter what name you give it, it is merely, as Mr. Farrar said, hiding behind a mask—it all

means annexation to the United States, as we all know. The three names with which they have adorned their policy will not conceal or hide what the policy is, and the fact of their changing the name so frequently reminds me of the fellows who are brought up in the police court and are found to have a number of aliases; so the hon. gentlemen have a great many aliases. The hon. gentleman has stated that my language at Halifax was unfriendly and impolitic, with reference to the Government of the United States. I adhere to every word I said then. I said then, as I say now, that the United States is a great nation and will be a greater nation, that there is no limit to its future greatness, but I spoke in the same sense as the best and the ablest and the most patriotic citizens of the United States now speak. Look at any of the writings of their political men; look at the writings of their literati; look at the opinions expressed by all those men who ought to be more than they are, I am sorry to say, leaders of public opinion in the United States, and you will find that they have all the one cry of the approaching danger to the United States from the various circumstances to which I very shortly alluded. But I said I knew that country would overcome all those difficulties. Was it not a patriotic and also a common-sense expression of opinion of mine that, if history is of any value, if history is anything more than a mere almanac, the United States, like all democracy, must pass through the perturbances which are incidental to all democracies. Look at the history of the world, and you will see that all democracies have had to pass through a period of perturbation. I believe that, with the manliness of the vast majority of the races who inhabit the United States, they will overcome all their difficulties, but my common-sense statement was this: Why should we who are free from these dangers, why should we who have not the same causes of apprehension as the people of the United States have, why should we who are as yet free not only from the cause of socialism brought from Europe, anarchy brought from Europe, atheism brought from Europe, mix ourselves up in these questions—above all, why should we mix ourselves up in the consequences of the negro question, to which I did not allude at that time? All their writers agree that they are in great danger, and they are using their best intellects to see how they are to avoid the great dangers which are so imminent, and from which, under the flag of England, we have been free. We have no Carbonari here, we have no Mafia here, we have no sewerage from European countries, we have not here the hordes from Europe who fly from the majesty of the law; we have not the Hungarian, who is semi-civilized, though he belongs to a fine race. While we find these men convulsing the whole of the United States, we do not find them coming to Canada as yet, and, if they do, I hope they will come in small numbers and under strict supervision and investigation as to their previous character. I have nothing to take back of the language I used at Halifax, and I could tell the hon. gentleman that I have had sympathy and support from great men in the United States in regard to the expressions I then used. There is one other statement of the hon. gentleman to which I object. He stated that there was a great hostility in Canada to the