

Government to accept that, and it involved no loss to the people of Canada, then the conduct of this Government in 1886 was most impolitic and unstatesmanlike. It is only necessary to call the attention of the House to what their own High Commissioner had to tell us as to the action of these hon. gentlemen who, mind you, have always been anxious to cultivate trade relations with the United States. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper had to say in regard to his worthy colleagues :

"I would like to draw the attention of the House to what has been accomplished by this (Fisheries) Treaty. I told you in what position Canada stood in with regard to the United States of America before the initiation of these proceedings. I told you that we stood face to face with an enactment which had been put on the Statute-book by a unanimous vote of Congress, ratified by the President, providing for non-intercourse between the United States and Canada. I need not tell you that that Bill meant commercial war, that it meant not only the ordinary suspension of friendly feelings and intercourse between the two countries, but that it involved much more than that. If that Bill had been brought into operation by the proclamation of the President of the United States I have no hesitation in saying that we stood in the relation to that great country of commercial war, and the line is very narrow which separates a commercial war between two countries from an actual war.

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained, with few exceptions, by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of sixty millions lying on our borders."

There is the testimony of their own colleague, their own trusted colleague, the man who, to do him justice, twice saved them from ruin, as to what these wise statesmen who desire free intercourse with the United States brought on this country a few years ago. One would have thought that an experience of this kind would have deterred those hon. gentlemen from the foolish and mistaken policy which they have since followed; but what was their whole policy and conduct and argument during the elections? It consisted of one prolonged series of slander of the Liberal party as being traitors to their country, and the First Minister himself was not ashamed to declare to many public audiences that it was not possible for any man to advocate free trade with the United States without desiring to obtain political separation from the mother country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I find his friends here are willing to endorse that. I wish him and I wish them joy of it. I find they went further; I find that in State papers these hon. gentlemen used language very nearly as improper, very nearly as unfounded and unwarranted, as they chose to use during the campaign. Now, I am willing to make reasonable allowances for words which are used in the heat of a political contest, but when I find in grave despatches from the Privy Council statements like these, which appear to have been made no longer ago than the 9th December :

"The McKinley Tariff Bill is in force and is avowed to be designed to teach Canadians that they cannot avail themselves of the markets of the United States while they continue their allegiance as British subjects."

When I find them repeating :

"That this would be a most effectual method of impressing on the minds of the Canadian people the lesson that they cannot be British subjects and enjoy the American markets."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

When I find them further going on to say :

"That the Confederation which was effected in accordance with the strong desire of Her Majesty's Government in 1867 had always been viewed with unfriendly feelings by a large portion of the people of the United States, who continue, with great reason, to regard it as a means of consolidating British power in North America."

When I find statements of that sort made in a State paper, statements for which these hon. gentlemen have no sort of foundation, statements which are made absolutely and entirely, I believe, without one particle of basis—when I find statements like that, I cannot fail to see that all this is part of a premeditated plan on the part of these gentlemen—a premeditated scheme and design on their part, entirely to conceal from the people of Canada the real position in which they stand, and to prevent, so far as misrepresentation can prevent it, an honest verdict being given by the people on the questions which are really at issue before them. Now, Sir, what has all this effected for these hon. gentlemen? Well, I will tell them. In the first place, if they have any sense of self-respect left they must feel humiliated and disgraced by the reception they experienced lately, and by the knowledge that they have deserved it. But they have done worse than that; they have been inflicting great injury upon Canada, and have prejudiced the success of future negotiations by the course they have been ill-advised enough to pursue. Incidentally I may observe that in this, as in other cases which have come recently to our notice, there appears to me to be the clearest proof of the wisdom of the proposition long ago advanced by the Liberal party, that the time had come in the interests of Canada when we should have a resident of our own at Washington responsible to Canada, responsible to the Canadian Government, who should keep them advised of the changes and mutations of American sentiment, who should be able to keep them in touch, as they ought to be kept in touch, with what is going on in that great country beside us. I tell the hon. gentleman that, until and unless that is done, it is idle for them to expect to maintain such friendly relations as ought to be maintained between ourselves and our neighbours on the other side of the line. Now, I say there is only one way for these gentlemen to get out of their difficulty. I say their language, and notably the language used by the First Minister in the speech quoted by my hon. friend—and which was only one of a very considerable number of similar expressions used by himself and others in the course of the campaign—I say that, as these words contain, in my judgment, a public insult to the United States, it was his duty who had made them—and he admitted making them this afternoon—it was his duty to have retracted them as publicly as he made them. But what do we find him doing? We find him justifying, defending them, maintaining that there was nothing in the slightest degree out of the common course in the Minister of a friendly state daring to express the hope—because it amounted to that—that the United States, that fierce democracy, would be torn by revolution, while we would sit looking philosophically on. Then his second duty, and a very important duty it is, in my opinion, was to state clearly and distinctly to the House what they proposed to do with the Government at Washington. I do not ask for minute details, but we have most assuredly a right to know