

condition of the country, we might fairly congratulate the hon. gentleman and allow his speech to go with nothing except an expression of concurrence. But we are unable to do so for the reason I have just mentioned. Whether perversely or otherwise he insists on stating as His Excellency mentions in his speech, and as we have stated on many occasions, that the condition of the country to-day is a matter for which Canadians ought to be proud and grateful. Whether we consider the economic condition of our people, their industrial progress, or whether we consider the matters which the hon. gentleman in a moment of forgetfulness five minutes afterwards referred to in his speech as the progress of this country towards nationality, we have every reason to feel proud of the position this country occupies, and if the hon. gentleman insists, as he and his party have frequently done, on inscribing on their banner "war, pestilence and famine," the hon. gentleman will find the standard is not one that will rally the youth, the hope and pride of Canada under it. The hon. gentleman compared Canada to a young giant struggling with all his energy, but manacled by shackles. In stating the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, the hon. gentleman singularly misapprehended us, because we conceive that the policy which he has urged on the House to-day, which he and his followers have urged on the country, is not one that will free the energies of the young giant, but will compel him to take on new shackles and limit the field of his exertions. In the same breath my hon. friend referred to the members of this House who had, and perhaps still have, high hopes that a favourable arrangement may be carried out by Great Britain, whereby a preferential market will be afforded to the colonies of the Empire, and he invited those gentlemen, in view of the proceedings which have taken place in the Imperial Parliament, to turn over a new leaf and seek for markets elsewhere. Sir, we believe that whether with or without a preferential market the markets of Great Britain are the greatest markets for the products of this country; and the gentlemen upon this side of the House who either expect or do not expect that preference will be given to the products of the colonies in the British market, are at any rate not willing to submit to a policy by which our people shall jeopardize that market and which shall exclude the products of that country from ours. The hon. the leader of the Opposition in this connection read an extract from a speech by General Foster in the United States, in which he referred to the position of this country as regards the power to negotiate her own treaties. The hon. gentleman has studied that speech in vain, if he has not found that General Foster's impression of the situation amounts to this: that the difficulty in obtaining a treaty with Canada such as the people of the United States most desire, is not merely the technical difficulty of the right to negotiate our own treaties, which can be, and has been time and again, conceded by the mother country; but the peculiar position which Canada occupies in negotiating her treaties as part of the British Empire to which she owes duties, to which she owes allegiance, and to which she is attached by ties of interest as well. It does not become me in speaking on an Address in answer to the speech from the Throne, to go into a minute discussion of that question; but General Foster

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

may, or may not, have correctly stated the difficulties which stand in the way. He may or may not have magnified them; but the difficulty which he pointed to, is one which stares hon. gentlemen opposite in the face, even if their resolution with regard to the right to negotiate our own treaties should be carried to-morrow and acquiesced in by the Government of the mother country. I am glad to know, Sir, that the hon. gentleman appreciates the results likely to flow from the mission of Ministers to Washington. I am glad to know that he regards the fact that an intimation came from the United States indicating that such a visit would be acceptable to the Administration of that country, as an intimation of friendliness on the part of that country. I am the more glad to know this, because last session while we were accused of the most dire unfriendliness to our neighbours to the south, we were at the same time taunted and gibed for having sought an interview, and having opened negotiations with the Government of that country. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that the expression of any intimation from that Government favouring an interview in which the relations of the two countries whether as regards trade, the boundaries of our countries, the joint fisheries of our countries, or any other question, can be discussed frankly and fully and a complete understanding arrived at as to the sentiments and interests of each country, is an advantageous one, and is likely to lead to increased friendliness, a friendliness which no gentleman on this side appreciates less than the leader of the Opposition, who has spoken so highly of its desirability. Now, Sir, with regard to the question which the hon. gentleman touched upon particularly as one of the results of our mission, namely, the question of wrecking and salvage, the hon. gentleman has made allusion to our policy in the past. He has indicated that in spite of the measure introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), and in spite of the support which that measure received from a large body of the members of this House, including nearly the entire Opposition, the Bill as then introduced was opposed by the Government, or, at any rate, had not received the cordial aid or co-operation of the Government. That is true, Sir. The question upon which the friends and the opponents of that Bill divided was this: Whether at the first suggestion on the part of the United States, and without guarantees of the sufficiency of the details of the measure, we should accept that proposal and agree to free reciprocity; or, whether it was not desirable that the progress of the measure should be delayed until there were inserted the additional safeguards which the Minister of Customs explained to the House as being necessary, and which we will discuss by-and-bye, but, which I venture to say in advance, have been secured by the negotiations which the acting Minister of Customs personally conducted. The difference between our policy and theirs is that they propose to give away everything at the first glance and to take the risk of its being satisfactory, while the position of the Government was that the matter ought to be the subject of farther negotiation, with a view to secure necessary safeguards in the interest of the industry affected. The hon. the leader of the Opposition has called attention, naturally enough, to the fact that while several royal commissions are mentioned