

argument is entirely without reason, as a policy of tariff reduction and abolition would be the best for the Dominion, no matter how high the American tariff might be.

And, what was the Prime Minister's declaration at Winnipeg? He said: "We are told that if the Americans put up a high tariff that we must put up a high tariff too; that is equivalent to saying that if they are fools we must be fools also." When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said that, he was not Prime Minister, and now when he is Prime Minister, because the people of the United States are fools, witness the Dingley Bill, we must be fools too, and thus in regard to that as to every other promise, they have turned their back on it. There is not a shred of the principles which they advocated, when in Opposition left. And in regard to the Dingley Bill, gentlemen opposite do not seem to be aware, as statesmen should be, that it is the Senate of the United States settles the tariff. It is not what the House of Representatives does, as the Finance Minister seems to think, it is what the Senate does that fixes the tariff, and if gentlemen opposite are anxious to get that reciprocity upon which they set so much store, then they should not have jumped because of any action of the House of Representatives, but should have waited until they had the decision of the Senate of the United States. We were also told, that if the Minister of Agriculture went across the water, then because of this preferential tariff he would be able to make a powerful argument in favour of raising the embargo against our cattle in England. This shows complete ignorance of the reason why our cattle were scheduled. Sir, that embargo was placed upon our cattle because the farmers of England wanted to have protection, and because the Government determined to give the farmers that protection for which they were asking. Anybody familiar with the facts knows that. The Finance Minister also told us, that one of the subjects upon which the people pronounced upon the 23rd of June, was, this fiscal policy. He told us that the people decided between two parties, one party believing in protection and the other party believing that protection was a curse to the country and that free trade was the great panacea for all our ills. If the Finance Minister believes this, he believes that on the 23rd June the people of this country declared that they were in favour of free trade, or at least, that they were in favour of a revenue tariff pure and simple, a tariff in which there would not be no evidence of consideration for manufacturers. Why is it you do not give the people what they pronounced in favour of? Let me lay down this proposition, that from a constitutional point of view, when an appeal is made to the people of the country, and they decide in

favour of a given policy, it is a grave and serious evil to that country if that policy is not carried out by the party which comes into power. This appeal is the great wheel in our constitutional system. We believe in an appeal to the public mind at recurring intervals. We go to that public mind and ask for its verdict, and it is of the utmost importance to the constitutional working of our system that that great wheel should be allowed to turn, and that whatever the people have decided on should be carried into effect. That is the only possible way in which our public men can preserve their character before the world. To-day, so far as the Government could bring it about, all confidence in the public men of Canada has been destroyed. If we were to meet the Prime Minister or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any of their colleagues in private, and they gave us their word, we would believe it; but is there a man who has heard their promises and pledges within the last twelve months who would now believe one word of theirs uttered in public? There is not a syllable of their promises that they are not ready to forswear, not a pledge that they are not ready to break. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) referred to my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) as "that lean and hungry Cassius." That was a most appropriate application on the part of the hon. gentleman, and I will tell you why. The application was stolen, as all his acts and principles at this hour are stolen. I have read of an elephant in India which on a certain gala occasion stole all the clothes of the Rajah's greatest enemy, and went around in the stolen apparel. That is the position of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. That application to my hon. friend was made in 1893 by the late Sir John Thompson when in the city of Toronto. Even the hon. gentleman's Shakspearean quotation is stolen, like his policy. But there is a quotation which the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in rummaging through his Shakspearean memory, might have used. If, instead of going to "Julius Cæsar," he had gone to "Hamlet," he would have found there expressive language descriptive of another great statesman who had come to ill-gotten power of whom Hamlet says:

A cut-purse of the empire and the rule,  
Who from a shelf the precious diadem stole,  
And put it in his pocket—  
A king of shreds and patches.

There is a quotation which he might appropriately apply to his leader and himself. He has stolen his policy and the tariff before us is a thing of shreds and patches. It is edifying to hear him talk of their principles; we all know him so well. We remember him going about the country trumpeting against