

this side is not that. It is not that we are bound to give them such protection as they demand, but, having regard to the interests of the country, that they should have such protection as was an incident of the revenue propositions laid before the House, and which must be enacted in order to get the necessary revenue to carry on the affairs of this country. As hon. gentlemen opposite know full well, the First Minister in reply to the Finance Minister at that time declared: that should the Liberal party come into power it was their policy to raise the necessary revenues of this country as they had been raised when the Liberals were in power before, namely, from customs and excise duties; but that they should be levied with an eye to securing the necessary revenue.

I need not go into the details of the tariff because they will be dealt with in committee, when they will be fully discussed, and when we will be able to consider their effect upon the revenue, and to point out what advantages have been secured thereby. If there should be any defects, I have not the slightest doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their honest criticism, will point out these defects, and aid us, should we feel disposed, as I trust we may, to rectify any errors that may be made in the light of the principle that we hold.

But, Sir, exception has been taken to what is termed the reciprocal tariff contained in the resolutions laid before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) opposite denounced it very strongly, and the hon. the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Charles Tupper) was very severe upon it. He read the resolution and he declared himself utterly unable to understand it. He told us, that the ex-Finance Minister was unable to understand it, that the "Globe" newspaper was unable to understand it, and although he himself declared he was unable to make any sense out of it, he also declared in the most emphatic terms, that it was unconstitutional. He laboured that point. Now, it is extraordinary to see an hon. gentleman with his position in the House, seeking to impress the country that we were attempting to do something unconstitutional, to insult Great Britain, to cause her to violate treaties; to think that he should have fulminated in this way, and in the same breath candidly confess that he did not know what he was talking about, because he did not comprehend the resolution.

My hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) is strong on the constitution, and always has been.

We remember that our hon. friend told us that the constitution demanded that a certain Bill should pass this House which he was anxious should pass, and it did not pass; and the constitution is there yet, and the hon. gentleman is opposite, and he has let the constitution go—he will not touch it any more. Now, I do not know what he will

Mr. PATERSON.

do with the constitution in this case. I do not know whether he will be able to ascertain before this discussion closes what the meaning of this tariff is, or what it is not. It is strange to me that gentlemen of the intelligence of the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster) and the ex-Prime Minister (Sir Charles Tupper)—and I grant it to them, as the House freely grants it to them—cannot understand the resolution which is in print, which they have no doubt read time and again, when the newspapers three thousand miles away, which have got it by cable, seem to be able to comprehend it most thoroughly and completely. Who listened to the extract from the London "Times," read here yesterday, that was not convinced that the London "Times" understood that resolution fully in all its significance; and not only that paper, but all the papers throughout the United Kingdom everywhere, have understood it, and, understanding it, have approved and acclaimed it, while these hon. gentlemen have denounced it, though declaring that they do not understand it.

I need not remind the House of the strong language which the ex-Prime Minister used in reference to that reciprocal clause. I remember, when he was arguing that under that clause Canada must inevitably admit the goods of Belgium and Germany, if not those of twenty other countries—that it had been so declared and decided, that there was no other alternative, that it would be a breach of faith and a flouting of Imperial authority to refuse to admit them—a gentleman on this side of the House asked him if he had always entertained such views, and what he had said at the second congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire in the year 1894. The hon. gentleman replied that it did not matter what he had said—it was what Earl Ripon had said that he had to deal with. Well, I am not inclined to place that low estimate upon the hon. gentleman that he in his humility was willing to place upon himself. I say that he does know something in reference to this matter. When, however, I call to his mind something that transpired and some utterances that were made at that meeting, it will not be for the purpose of proving that the hon. gentleman either does or does not know anything on this subject, but to bring him as a witness to the view that is held by the leading statesmen of Great Britain on the very question now before the House. What are the facts? Canada was represented at that second congress of the Chambers of Commerce of the Empire. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada, occupied, deservedly, a high place in that assembly. Some of the greatest and brightest business men from Canada and from the other colonies of the Empire, as well as from all parts of the United Kingdom, were present. Subjects of vast importance were brought up and discussed. A subject of great importance was introduced