

down the country, and, worse than all, would have been a perpetual *mandement* and promise to the Premier of the Province of Quebec to go on with lavish expenditure to whatever extent he pleased, and when it was piled up too high to make a combination with a Dominion party and get it saddled on the General Government. If a majority of four or five in a Province had been obtained at such a terrible expense of consistency and right I would not have the face to stand in Parliament and boast of such a majority and so unworthily obtained. I think I have occupied all the time that is necessary, although I might take up other points and make remarks upon them. For instance, the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) assails the manufacturers. He has always called them monopolists: he has learned another term, and now he calls them vile monopolists, and he declares it is un-British to have a protective policy in Canada, the result of which is to foster those vile monopolists. And yet he has been urging throughout the length and breadth of the country a tariff twice as high, which will breed vile monopolists twice as large and numerous. It is said to be un-British to have a tariff of 30 per cent. which does not discriminate against British manufacturers an iota—

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER—but it is thoroughly British when you allow the United States manufacturer in free and raise the tariff up to 40 or 50 per cent. against Britain. The British manufacturer now makes woollen goods and brings them to Quebec, where he pays a certain duty upon them; and the American manufacturer, making the same grade of goods, brings them to Montreal and pays precisely the same duty on them. There is no discrimination. But there is a discrimination which is mischievous, which is unnatural besides being un-British, when you allow the American manufacturer free ingress, and place against the British manufacturers' duties of 40, 50 or 60 per cent. There are some great difficulties for hon. gentlemen opposite to reconcile before we can take their policy of unrestricted reciprocity plus continental free trade. They have to show us where the revenue is to come from. They have never done so. They have to show what kind of a tariff we are to have, and who are to make it. They have never shown that either. They have to show us whether or not the inevitable tendency of such a state of things would not be to drift us into political union with the United States. I give my opinion diffidently on that point. But Mr. Blake says that a rift commenced between him and his party in 1887, and it rapidly widened year by year until after repeated admonitions, when the elections were ordered on, he thought it his duty to give vent to his feelings and to express his views, but from the sympathy he had with the old men of the party who had worked with him and acted under his leadership, he left the performance of what he considered to be his duty to his country until he should see whether his party carried the elections or not. Then his statement appeared, and these three points to which I have referred were made by Mr. Edward Blake with a terseness and force which has not been answered and cannot be answered by hon. gentlemen opposite. So they have to reconcile these difficulties. These have to be cleared away before they can

Mr. FOSTER.

hope that the people or hon. members on this side of the House will accept their nostrum of unrestricted reciprocity and continental free trade. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to know what the Government will not do or will do, I can tell them in a few words. The Government will not negotiate a reciprocity treaty with any country, which treaty would shut us out from every other country in the world, Great Britain included. The Government will not negotiate a treaty which would place the framing of its tariff in the hands of a more powerful and greater country, and would enable that country to place upon us a tariff entirely inordinate and entirely unfitted to our needs. But as regards the people of the United States and their institutions, together with the continuance of the peace, the prosperity and progress of the American people, no member on this side of the House who thinks, and we all think on this side of the House, has any other hope or wish than that they may become consolidated and stable as a people, that their prosperity may be great, and that they may continue to thrive and grow and become an increasing factor in aid to the general civilization of the world. But alongside of that wish is the thought of hon. members on this side of the House, and of the people of the country largely, that we are now in too strong a position, that we have sacrificed too much to gain it, and have too great prospects in the future, to be willing to prejudice it, and, moreover, that we are not in a position to necessitate a choice as between Canada and Great Britain and the interests of each, but in a position where the best interests of Canada can be most wisely and constitutionally maintained in connection with the best interests of the mother land.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is not my intention to closely follow the observations addressed to the House by the hon. Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman has discussed a number of topics that can more appropriately be discussed at a later period of the session, and these I propose to pass by this evening. The hon. gentleman has complained of a combination between a Local Government and the Liberal party in this House. I am not aware any such combination existed. But I do remember that a short time ago the hon. gentleman's predecessor, who was a member from the same Province as himself, took an active part in the provincial elections in another Province. That course, I think, no other hon. member of this House, much less an hon. gentleman while a member of the Government, ventured to pursue. The Minister of Finance says the Government are here. I dare say the Government as a corporate body are present in this Parliament, but I think there were two colleagues of the hon. gentleman who sat in the House of Commons in the last Parliament, immediately before dissolution, who are not present this evening, and it was hardly in good taste on the part of the Minister of Finance to indulge in the boasting which characterized a very considerable portion of his speech. The hon. gentleman has told us that it is true the Government may not be quite so strong at the present time as it was in the Parliament that immediately preceded this one, and he invites us to wait and see how strong the Government may become. The hon. gentleman predicts that four or five years hence the Government will become quite a strong