

from the right hon. gentleman this sneer, not at the Conservative party alone, but, if the "Globe" stated the truth, at every intelligent person in the country.

There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for 'quid pro quo.'

But that is, Mr. Speaker, the very basis, the foundation of preferential trade within the Empire.

The Canadian Government has ignored all such sentiments.

Was that the language the right hon. gentleman held in London, Ont., when he said he was as strong in favour of preferential trade as I was, or the language he used at Toronto when he said that his best efforts would be used to obtain that preferential trade, of such vital importance, on the lines suggested by the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain? The right hon. gentleman continued:

We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

If the right hon. gentleman were in a position to cut adrift from the obligations which he solemnly assumed and which rested upon him, if he were in a position to place a value upon a Cobden medal that was over and above all the interests of Canada, then it would have been all right for him to use such language. No terms that can be found in the English language more calculated to violate the pledge the hon. gentleman had given to the people of this country as to what he would do when in power. And when he was clothed with power, and on that great jubilee occasion, when the English people were ready to give us everything for nothing almost, he had no right to say on behalf of Canada that he was looking simply to this mess of pottage which he had made up his mind to secure. I shall not have to labour much to bring every unprejudiced mind in this House to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman did not realize our just expectations and failed to discharge that duty towards his country which his country expected him to discharge. Again, at Birmingham Mr. Chamberlain, in glowing language, showed the vital importance of adding the tie of interest to the tie of sentiment, of having a mutual bond of self-interest binding the colonies and the mother country together, of recognizing this principle of commercial confederation. But what language did my right hon. friend use? He said:

Many schemes of union had been suggested, but they all had the fatal objection of interfering with the freedom of trade of the colonies.

Does the hon. gentleman say that we want such freedom of trade in the colonies as will prevent our products, when sent to the great markets of the United Kingdom, obtaining higher prices than they obtain

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

now? I think that such an interference with our trade would be welcomed by every man of any intelligence. My right hon. friend continued:

The colonies had already granted certain concessions to the mother country, but they asked for no 'quid pro quo,' no pound of flesh.

I have, Mr. Speaker, been fighting the battle for preferential trade actively since 1839 down to the present hour, at the boards of trade all over the United Kingdom, and in every section whenever the opportunity offered, and the bitterest opponent of preferential trade never took grounds stronger, more emphatic, more determined against it than the right hon. gentleman took on this question, which, the organ of his party declared, was considered by every man of intelligence in Canada as of great importance to our country, and which he had himself endorsed in the fullest possible manner. Let me quote still stronger language which the hon. gentleman used, as if he were determined to break down, at once and for ever, this agitation for preferential trade between the mother country and her colonies:

What we give you by our tariff we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada; we would not see you come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

Now, Sir, this is the mode in which the hon. gentleman disappointed the just expectations of the people of this country in reference to this vitally important question of preferential trade. I leave it to the judgment of this House, I leave it to the candid consideration of every intelligent man in this country, whether I should not fail in my duty as a member of this House and as a citizen of Canada if I did not draw attention to the facts.

But, Sir, the right hon. gentleman seems to be equal to any fortune. When I came from England, I was interviewed on the subject of what had taken place on the other side of the water, and I then gave expression to the view I am expressing now—that the leader of the Government when clothed with power to represent the Dominion on this great jubilee occasion had utterly failed to redeem the promises that he had made. And the hon. gentleman himself seems to have come to the conclusion that I was not very far wrong. He attended a banquet at Toronto and made a speech there. Let me contrast that speech with his previous utterances. The hon. gentleman, having performed the acrobatic feat of taking a double somersault between Canada and Great Britain had returned to Canadian soil and now found himself face to face with the men he had betrayed. I do not use too strong a term when I say that he had betrayed the men who took him at his solemn pledged word