

say that, in justice to Canada, he was bound to terminate the negotiations. When he found he was dealing with parties who were utterly impracticable, he was bound to take the stand of asking the mother country to deal with this question of international law, and have it settled as all such questions are bound to be settled, and he should then have come to the Parliament of Canada and said: All my sunny ways have failed; I hoped that I would have had to deal with a generous and magnanimous people who, when they found I was ready to give all that I had at their bidding, would make some slight return, but we have failed in obtaining an adjustment of any of these questions, and I must be in a position to legislate for Canadians, as they have a right to expect they should be legislated for.

The New York "Times" does not quite accept the version given by my right hon. friend and Mr. Fairbanks. The New York "Times," as quoted in the "Globe" on the 25th February, says that the Alaska boundary is not the real point of contention, but the McKinleyism of the American Commission, and I do not think that my right hon. friend would like very much to contradict that statement. The New York "Times" says:

The lumber duties, the coal duties and the arrangements for reciprocal trade are known to be subjects upon which the two commissions disagreed, and so far as the public is informed, their differences have never been adjusted.

My right hon. friend's colleague, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) wrote on the 3rd of January a letter to a friend of his in Winnipeg, a member of the Corn Exchange, a letter which is published in the newspapers:

We, ourselves, at the present moment are in a state of uncertainty as to what the ultimate outcome will be.

And, no doubt, that was the position of matters when it was found that the Alaska boundary was about the best question they had to agree to disagree upon.

Having said so much, I feel it my duty to the right hon. gentleman and to the House to state frankly, for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite, the policy that we would propose, the policy that we would be prepared to sustain hon. gentlemen opposite in adopting, and the policy which, if they do not adopt it, we shall feel it our duty to press upon the people as the best calculated to advance the interests of the country. The cardinal principle of that policy is the principle of protection, principle that has been very largely acted upon by hon. gentlemen opposite. We go with the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) on that point. We want to retain such protection as is given to Canadian industries and to repair the errors—not very serious, perhaps, but still errors—made by hon. gentlemen opposite in this respect. Wherever they have departed

from our policy they have made a mistake. Let me advise hon. gentlemen opposite to cling to the life-buoy of the National Policy. It has held your heads above water; you would have been submerged long ago; you would have been driven from that part of the House if you had not clung with the tenacity of death to that life-buoy. That is the first principle—protection. Wherever there is a Canadian industry that fair and legitimate protection will enable to flourish, give it protection and we will support you. Then, there is the Fast Atlantic Service. I have already boldly challenged any gentleman on the other side to give a single instance in which this Government has done anything that has promoted the prosperity of Canada. I suggest the Fast Atlantic Service as one thing that they were compelled by the force of public opinion to profess to believe in and which they have, by their utter incapacity to deal with it in a business like manner, prevented from being carried into operation. Otherwise, to-day, we should have been in the enjoyment of it. When we went out of office we were in possession of a signed contract with Messrs. Allan, whose wealth and experience placed beyond doubt the excellent manner in which the service would be carried out; and when the late Governor General declined to sign the Order in Council which would enable us to close the contract, I wrote to my right hon. friend a letter so that, by getting that promptly done on his accession to office, he would save two years in securing that important service. Where are we to-day? Why, I am afraid we are further away from the Fast Atlantic Service than ever before. And why? The money was provided. Parliament had placed upon the Statute-books an Act granting \$750,000 a year for the Fast Atlantic Service, authorizing the Government to pay that sum to the contractors who would accomplish it. Finding, when I was on the other side of the water, holding the office of High Commissioner, that it was impossible to secure that service for the subsidy offered, I went to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and, after the fullest examination, the Right Hon. Mr. Chamberlain agreed to stand in with Canada in the matter. He so completely recognized the Imperial as well as the Colonial importance of this great work that he agreed, on behalf of the Imperial Government to bear one-third the cost. He agreed that if Canada had to pay £150,000 he would ask the Imperial Parliament to supplement it with £75,000. Thus, a little over a million dollars was provided to the hand of the leader of the present Canadian Government. And why has the work not been done? Because the right hon. gentleman refused, in the first place to accept the contract coming from the best possible source; and, in the second place, because he has been sending one of his colleagues, who is supposed to have the matter in hand, backwards and forwards—whether he wanted to keep him out of Canada I do not know; but