

ould show, had hon. continued in office with those we can could be the real the state of the onzie Administra- until to-day as actually is under Had hon. gen- and in power what We should have tending probably nipeg. East of ve had the water we no North-West of Canada would . Now, take the suppose we have iting or increasing anyone suppose not take place in power?

Yes. gentleman must because he knows cal cause of that surprising spirit of such as ours. To be attributed in the Government e of perceptive a state of things 878, when every- a gloom and no up cur manufac- that with the dition we have to by the enterpris- cated young men

Neither will I gentleman said er all that has ith I want to negotiations at the hon. member said concerning the Ministers, of Finance, as tton dishonestly, obstacles in the e went on to say atly to be blamed ties on the Cana- a certain treaty

under discussion. But the hon gentleman evidently fails to see that showing there was a difficulty on the Canadian side would be no evidence of a disinclination on the part of the Finance Minister to have a treaty. If he had shown difficulties on the American side, that would show he had disinclined to make a treaty. (Hear, here.) Can anyone who knows anything of our Conservative and Reform politicians doubt that every enlightened man in this country would be ready to make a treaty with the United States which would be useful to Canada? Nobody doubts for one moment that we would be ready to enter into a treaty on the line of that of 1854 modified by present conditions, and nobody doubts that such a treaty could be made if the Americans were willing to meet us half way or even a quarter. But, as the Finance Minister says, the history of our negotiations shows that our proposals there are no counter proposals, and that when the hand was stretched out by Canada, no hand was stretched out to meet us. In fact, the conversations between the Finance Minister and Mr. Blaine reveal what might have been known from inference and from the political situation in the States, the character of the party to which Mr. Blaine belongs, and Mr. Blaine's own character, and that is that it would be impossible to get a commercial treaty with the United States unless on terms this country would never submit to. I was sorry to hear the closing remarks of the hon. member for Quebec's. He talked in a vein of humiliation we have too often heard from that side of the House, but which the country has declared they will have none of. He said nothing could more tend to disloyalty than to have it go forth that it is difficult or impossible to make a treaty with the United States. What would that mean? It would mean that 5,000,000 of Canadians doubt their power to lay the foundation here of a great nation and are looking humbly, pitifully, to the United States? Can you imagine anything more contemptible? If that is the position of Canada the sooner we get cap in hand to Washington the better and

say, as it is impossible for us to do anything without your permission, as you are master of the situation, let us make the best arrangement we can for annexation. That is what the language of the hon. member means, if it means anything. But, Mr. Speaker, the people of this country by their votes in the past elections, have expressed their opinion. When I heard him talk about St. John and about the effect of our commercial legislation on New Brunswick, I could not help thinking that there is but one man from New Brunswick in this House. Are the people of New Brunswick all crazy that they will support a Government which is destroying their vitality and bleeding them white? Are the people of Canada, belonging to the most enlightened races, with education diffused so thoroughly amongst them, so utterly lost to their own interests that they will vote for the men who will destroy their own prosperity? The thing carries absurdity on its face, and the only thing needed to refute and denounce it, as I do this night, is that it is a pity to have the time of this House taken up, as it is and has been, by pounding at a cry that is entirely played out and waving a banner that the people will have nothing to do with. There is a member on this side of the House whom I greatly honor. He is a man of chivalrous soul—I mean the leader on that side—and, if he is going to stick to this cry, he will be like Cadot the hero of the fine poem written by Mr. Louis Frechette, "*Le drapeau fantome*." Cadot was with France when Canada was ceded to England. He still waved his white flag over his little fort. A number of English soldiers summoned him to surrender, and he refused. They were called away. Twenty years passed by and still the flag floats idly on its swaying mast, although it has no longer a meaning, and the unhappy man's chivalry is all wasted and astray. I say there is not a man on that side fighting for unrestricted reciprocity who is not fighting under a phantom banner which every sensible man can see has no longer any meaning. The Opposition commenced by taking a depraved line. First they took unre-