

amples. I grant you that we have never been quite so hard up as to have to go around looking to gentlemen opposite for examples for what we ought to do; but I do say that we could go for an example to the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) who asks from this parliament for his constituents, what this resolution, in principle, asks from the mother country for the Dominion of Canada. We are told by gentlemen opposite that it was disloyal to ask England, disloyal to ask Her late lamented Majesty Queen Victoria, or our present noble King Edward VII., to give anything in return for the preference we give them. But, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) does not say that it is disloyal to this parliament to ask us to give to the North-west Territories something in return for what he alleges they gave us. I believe, Sir, that the reasoning which I have endeavoured to follow in this respect will be the reasoning which will be followed by the people of Canada when next they get the chance, and that they will expect the Canadian government to do business with the mother land upon terms which are just and fair to the people of the Dominion. I have heard it argued in this debate that Mr. Chamberlain, representing the English people, will not allow us to do a certain thing, and therefore it is out of the question for us to try and do it. Well, does any gentleman in this House believe that Mr. Chamberlain will desist from trying to get the treaties he wants with Germany or Russia because some man who is interested in trying to dissuade him simply tells Mr. Chamberlain that he cannot get these treaties. He is on the other side of the contract. Where is the astuteness and the business ability of this cabinet? When they go to England to make a deal with Mr. Chamberlain, they can only come back and tell us: It is true, we went there to get something in return for this advantage which we are giving to the mother country, and they gave us a Cobden medal, which we will lay on the Table, if necessary, and let you see it. Even if Mr. Chamberlain did regard that as a fair return, that is no reason why we should not go on and try to get just compensation for this country for the great advantages which we are giving to the mother land.

I want to deal for one minute with one or two things which have been said in the course of this debate, because they do not strike me as being correct, and my constituents would blame me if I sat silent and allowed such things to be said without rising to contradict them. It was said by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) the other night, that the charge of inconsistency against this government might well be laid by some people. I suppose he says that in politeness, instead of using the stronger word which we might apply, and say they might be charged with bad faith.

But he censured the hon. member for Pictou for laying the charge of inconsistency against them. That is the way hon. gentlemen opposite try to get rid of the main question in this debate. They take the ground that some one now supporting the opposition did wrong, and, therefore, no accusation of wrong-doing should be laid against the government. I submit that it is the government who are on their trial, and not the opposition. The opposition are not to be blamed for the sins of the government; and because the government are fairly chargeable with inconsistency, it is no answer to say to the individual making the charge: Six or eight or ten years ago you made a different statement, when, perhaps, the individual was not in the House at all. That is not the kind of argument which I think ought to prevail in this House.

Of course, I am influenced a good deal by the learned lecture which the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) gave us, being a new member like himself, and not very much older than he is. He gave us a long discourse of twenty-five minutes or half an hour about our duty in conducting this debate. I have no doubt that if we could all do, as he said, stick to the question strictly, we would be able to get along better than we do. But, the hon. gentleman made some remarks about the farmers of this country and the preference to England which I cannot allow to go unchallenged, as I represent a good many farmers, some 4,000 or 5,000 having voted in my constituency in the last election. He said the farmers did not mind the loss of a few paltry hundreds of thousands of dollars. I suppose he believes that the possession of the Cobden medal is worth that much to them, and was a full compensation for their loss on account of this so-called preference to England. Well, he must be speaking for the farmers of South Wellington alone. I wish it to be understood that his remarks do not apply to the farmers of the constituency I represent. Although they are not stingy men, who insist on the last dollar in a business transaction, still they believe in doing business on business principles; and if the government undertakes to do business for them, they expect them to bring back something better than a paltry medal. I do not doubt that the farmers of South Wellington are just as intelligent and as able to elect representatives as the farmers of my constituency. I am not insinuating for a moment that they are not. But, I do say, that when the hon. member for South Wellington made that remark, I believe he had not consulted the farmers of his own county, and when he goes home and explains it to them, if he can, he will get their orders not to make a remark like that again.

The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) told us the other day that there was no life in this opposition. The opposition do not mind any little jokes being made at their