

States, and no greater service could be rendered to the British Empire. If that is the policy of the Liberal party, how is it that their sunny ways have not accomplished anything in that direction? I find nothing in the Speech from the Throne intimating that a commission is to be appointed to confer with a similar commission to be appointed by the United States to deal with the trade relations between the two countries. An intimation of such an arrangement has been given to the public. Perhaps my hon. friend can tell me whether that is correct or not. It seems to me, however, that if there was any such arrangement between the United States government and the government of Canada it would have been heralded forth to the world in the Governor General's Speech. Is it merely one of those little side plays for the purpose of letting them down easily, or have they found out in going to the United States, that they were treated precisely as the delegation of the late Conservative government was treated when it sought extended trade relations with the neighbouring republic? The hon. gentlemen opposite denounced the Conservative party as being dishonest in their professed desire to extend the trade relations between the two countries, and they told the people, "Put us in power, and the moment we show our faces across the line the United States will at once come down from their high horse and will give us what we want." They have been met precisely as we were met. The spirit displayed by the late Hon. James Blaine, when he was Secretary of State, was that no system of reciprocity would be conceded to Canada until we were prepared to cast in our lot with the United States as a part of that country, or to discriminate against Great Britain. He told us that distinctly, and he stated it in a speech made in Boston; and that is the spirit which pervades the whole of the politicians of the United States to-day, if we except a few merchants of Boston and other frontier towns and cities which would benefit by reciprocal trade relations with Canada. Then what are we to do—I do not know that my hon. friend will tell me—what are we to understand is to be the tariff policy of the present government? Last night I heard the late Finance Minister ask a question across the House as to how certain information was obtained by people in Kingston

which induced them to set all their operatives to work again in their factories, for the reason as given by the manager, that the government did not intend to interfere materially with the cotton duties. We know that the Finance Minister made a declaration of the government policy in the city of Montreal in an interview in which he communicated to the people of the maritime provinces that the coal duty was not to be interfered with. The hon. gentleman forgot his duty as a Privy Councillor when he made that declaration, and any minister who gave information which enabled speculators to take advantage of the coming tariff changes, committed little less than perjury, for every minister is sworn solemnly to keep the counsel of the advice he gives to the Governor General in all matters relating to the tariff, or anything else, until he has the consent of the Crown to lay it before the people's representatives. Only to-day I received a letter from a gentleman in the town from which I come, in which he states that a certain person who has not been in business and has no more to do with the liquor trade than I have, has purchased three or four carloads of whisky, and my correspondent asks how did he get this information—why does a man, who is not in trade, speculate in whisky to such an extent? Has any intimation gone abroad that the duty on spirits is to be increased? If so, this man will be enabled to reap a profit on his speculation, or if not, he will sell the spirits and lose nothing. If the articles which appear in the press indicate the trend of public opinion, I believe the attitude of the government on this question is beginning to be understood. When a newspaper of the political character of the *Montreal Witness*, denounces the compromise upon the tariff question as a "mean" transaction, it is evident that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction. The *Witness* says:

A meaner attitude could not be taken than that into which the beheaded Nova Scotia government proposes to lead that province. If there is any province which has been steadily denouncing protection as a wrong and an oppression, and even a ground for secession, it is Nova Scotia. But the Nova Scotia government is willing to wreck the movement towards deliverance from this incubus for the sake of the interests of a small minority of people.

What says the *Halifax Chronicle* on this question? The *Chronicle* is the free trade journal *par excellence*—a journal that has