

contained a report of a speech by Mr. Mercier at Montreal, in which are the following words :—

“ Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the inter-provincial conference of 1887, and he has promised to give effect to them when he comes into power.”

I am told by some of my hon. friends from Quebec that the message from Mr. Laurier was sent from Ottawa River to Gaspé, and made to do service everywhere. *La Patrie*, of 10th February, 1891, gives a similar report in words almost identical with those of the *Globe*, namely, if I may be allowed to translate :

“ Mr. Laurier has accepted the resolution of the provincial councils of 1887 and has promised to put them in force if he comes into power.”

A similar report, although not precisely in the same words, was published in *L'Electeur*. I am sorry I am not able to ask the leader of the Opposition whether the statements are true or false, whether Mr. Mercier was warranted or not in saying that the leader of the Opposition in this House had pledged himself to a new and additional expenditure of \$2,000,000 a year. I hope before the debate is closed, that this question will be put and a direct answer obtained, as it must be given by that hon. gentleman. I shall close by referring to the question of loyalty. That hon. gentleman sneered at our professions of loyalty for our Queen and native land. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) declared that we had entered on a protective policy, and under it, we taxed heavily our trade with that nation which was the greatest manufacturing nation to which our allegiance was due. He called us 35 per cent. loyalists. But instead of being 35 per cent. as alleged by that hon. gentleman, the duty on British goods is a little more than 22 per cent., for the hon. gentleman excluded free articles in his calculation. It may cause the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) some little anxiety if we go over his record during the last few years, but it gave some of us anxiety four weeks before the last election to see the utterances he made during the heat of the election, the character of the people who were in his pay and with whom he was locking hands in this country. In May, 1890, Mr. Ferguson, the member for Welland, asked the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) if it were true that in May, 1890, that gallant knight had been in Washington giving pointers to those who were preparing the McKinley tariff, and the gentleman said that he had not been giving pointers to the persons who were preparing the McKinley tariff. That denial he renewed this year and his word we implicitly accept, but the hon. gentleman did not deny that he had been in Washington, and, looking at that fact, in connection with so many other facts, we would like to know what that gallant knight was doing in Washington. It would be pure impertinence to ask this question if the visit to Washington were of a single and detached character, but we know very well that at that time certain foreign coadjutors of this gallant knight were engaged preparing a tariff and drafting resolutions, and that our friends on this side of the line were drafting resolutions. We know very well what was taking place there several months after. We know very well that when Mr. Hitt was moving certain resolutions in Congress the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was moving closely-related resolutions in the Canadian Parliament, and then there was a second resolution from the gentlemen down in Washington, and then a second resolution from the gentlemen up here, until they were like two distressed ships at sea signalling to each other and bewildering some of us simple-minded people who did not understand the signalling. That is a spectacle which during one hundred years has never been witnessed by the Canadian people, and I pray Heaven that for another hundred years it may never again be witnessed by them. The same gentleman goes to Boston and he makes a speech at Boston, and if I had not spoken at such great length I would read that speech at length. He made a speech which I think, without exception, is the most shameless speech which ever came from the lips of a Canadian public man. It has humorous aspects in some parts of it. The hon. gentleman sat in this Parliament and he saw the rivalry between the Atlantic ports, the city of St. John and the city of Halifax, which were both struggling for the winter trade of Canada and for the summer trade too. He saw that the city of St. John, relying on the strength of her natural position, was making a bold effort for the transatlantic trade, and he saw that the city of Halifax was pressing closely behind her. What adjustment of the dispute did this hon. gentleman propose? He proposed simply to strangle both of these cities and to give their trade to Boston, not only the winter trade but the summer trade as well. That gentleman had, I will say the shamelessness, to stand before a Boston audience and to deliberately propose to strangle Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, and to give their trade to Boston, and to guarantee to that city that it should hold the whole trade of 5,000,000 of people in fee. “ No man could take it from them,” he said. I hope he did not speak in the name of his party. I believe I may say that I know that he did not speak in the name of his party, because I know there are a great number of better men in that party. I know there are a great number of more honourable and high-minded men sitting around him and behind him, who were as much ashamed as I was alarmed by the destructive and dangerous utterances which this gentleman made. What else did we see? We learned twelve months ago from the columns of the *Toronto Globe* that Mr. Edward Farrer was a traitor. These were the words of the *Globe*—they are not my words—and a few months later we learned that that very gentleman was employed by the *Globe* as its chief editorial writer, and we learned also that this gallant knight from South Oxford had acquired a controlling interest in the *Globe*. And then came that famous annexation pamphlet of his paid servant; and then came his movements to Washington and Boston, and the intrigues of Mr. Farrer, and the movements of Mr. Farrer, who was in his pay, as we have heard. I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would contradict this. Was the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at Washington plotting the dismemberment of the Empire and the taking away of Canada from the Queen's Dominions? We know that he was in close friendship and comradeship and political association with Mr. Erastus Winan, a gentleman who came to Canada and boasted here, with impudent falsehoods on his lips, that he was a loyal Can-

Mr. WELDON.