

same ground, for they had been before the people for years with their policy, expounding it from Dan to Beershebah. It has not been a question of party with me; it has been a question of country. Are we going to give up all that we have to our neighbours? The policy of the Opposition is nothing but pure annexation, because we would allow the Americans to make our tariff—and that will be the result of it. I am not in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, because it is impracticable. What they will give us is this: they will give us reciprocity with Canada and a prohibitory tariff against the world, the mother country included. That is what those gentlemen would give us, and as soon as the people of this country find out what it all means they will have a different feeling towards such a policy. The Government are accused of being insincere in their expressed desire to obtain reciprocity. I am one who does not believe in reciprocity. There are, however, many other questions pending between the two countries, and for the sake of peace I am willing that we should have reciprocity; at the same time, I do not believe it will be of any great benefit to the people of Canada, for our neighbours produce the same kind of articles that we do, and we are not going to have much advantage in their markets. The Opposition should be ashamed of their record. They accuse the Government of wanting to give away everything, and they preach through the country that the people are ruined because they have lost the American market for eggs. We have five millions of people, and we export \$2,000,000 worth of eggs. Eggs are cheap food at a shilling a dozen, and the Opposition want us to forego our allegiance to our flag and become Americans rather than eat three dozen and four eggs apiece. They want us to give away our country to the Americans to get a chance to sell three dozen and four eggs each!! During the election they went so far as to try and delude the people along the Niagara River and in Essex by saying that if Mr. McGregor and Mr. Germain were elected free trade would follow next day between the United States and Canada. I merely rose on this occasion because of the assurance of my hon. friend opposite in finding fault with the Government because they did not wait and gerrymander the constituencies before the election. If they had

waited and gerrymandered, the Opposition would have had good ground for finding fault. I must admit that I was very much annoyed with the Government for bringing on the elections so suddenly as they did. They ought to have given us a chance, because it was a snap judgment, though the more it is discussed the worse it will turn out for the Opposition.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned at 4:40 p. m.

THE SENATE.

Ottawa, Monday, 4th May, 1891.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

A PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT.

HON. MR. ABBOTT gave notice that he will move on Wednesday next that when the House adjourns it stand adjourned until the following Friday.

HON. MR. DEVER suggested that if there was to be an adjournment at all it should be for at least a fortnight.

HON. MR. ABBOTT said he was in the hands of the House, and if it would suit the convenience of the majority he had no objections to a longer adjournment.

HON. MR. O'DONOHUE thought the adjournment should be at least until the Monday following.

HON. MR. VIDAL—It would be better to discuss the question when it comes before the House next Wednesday.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.) moved an amendment to extend the time.

HON. MR. MILLER—We have no notice beyond next Friday, and I do not think you can move an amendment to increase the time; you may curtail it. The regular way is to give another notice.

HON. MR. OGILVIE—If we are to have an adjournment we should have one long