

matter of our relation with Great Britain to a head,—

He is not satisfied.

--and if the Opposition in this House possess real courage and patriotism, they will accept the advice tendered to them by the London "Times." I say, Sir, that, instead of carping at the proposal, they should be glad to help it forward. Sir, in time past these hon. gentlemen have made every hustings ring, have made the floors of Parliament ring, with their professions of loyalty and devotion to the old flag. They have a chance to prove their loyalty now. They have repeatedly declared their desire to show independence of the United States. They have declared, some of them, that they wished Canada would assert herself. Canada is asserting herself now. Let them stand by us, shoulder to shoulder, and help us to assert ourselves in the eyes of the world.

It seems he is not certain whether we can do so or not, but he has taken the ground that we should take action first, and find out afterwards whether we can carry it out. He has taken a leap in the dark, and does not know what the consequences of that leap may be. There is one feature of this matter that attracted my attention. They have amongst them Sir Oliver Mowat as Minister of Justice. He is regarded as a high legal authority. When he was Premier of Ontario he had a great deal to do with some questions concerning which absolute knowledge was not in his possession. Take, for instance, the temperance question. Did he first pass a prohibition law and say: We will see whether we have the right to pass it or not. No. He said: We do not know whether we have the right to enact a prohibitory law or not. We do not want to throw the country into confusion, and so we will submit the question to the highest authority, and if they decide that we have the power to act, we will act. But this is a comparatively small matter beside the one that is now before us. This may mean a disturbance of international trade and of the relations between England and her colonies, and between England and other countries. It means a great disturbance of trade with our own country. But, still, hon. gentlemen opposite, think it is not worth while to ascertain whether they have a right to adopt any such legislation as this or not. They proceed to act first, and the country may take the consequences.

We have heard a great deal of what the British papers have said in eulogy of what the Canadian Government has done. I do not wonder at it. We have given them concessions in our market for which they give us nothing in return. Would not any nation eulogize a people that would do that for them? In the generosity of their heart the British people are aiming at free trade the world over. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) says that this tariff is a step in the direction of free trade. Its effect is to give the British

producer a larger market. That being so, why should they not be pleased? Standing here I put myself in a position second to none in my loyalty to the mother country. But my loyalty does not lead me to give away the rights of the people I represent unless I get something in return. I want the mother country to give me something in return for what I give her. We are charged here with a certain duty. What is it? To look after the interests of the people of Canada. The Scripture says: "He that provideth not for his own is worse than an infidel who denies the faith." We are told that England is pleased with this concession. Why should she not be pleased? She gets from us a concession she never got before. She is reaching after the ideal of the Cobden Club. Few countries have done for her what we have done; I do not wonder that she is pleased. But we have no right to give away Canada's estates and rights, which are valuable to her, without getting something in return. We as Canadians are willing to do our duty, but we should not be called upon to do more than our duty. Now, assuming that we have the right to make this tariff, I come to the second phase of it. What does it mean? It means that within a year from 30th of next June, at latest, a tariff change will commence that will reduce our revenue by \$3,782,000 a year, according to our importations of the last year or two. Now, that has got to be made up in some way. It can only be made up, as my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) has said, by increased importations in these lines or a higher duty on some other lines of goods. Assume that there are to be increased importations? What does that mean to the manufacturers of Canada? It means the killing off of some of their industries. It means an increase in the importation of cotton, which will strike at the cotton man. It means an increase in the importations of woollens, which will strike at the woollen men. Representatives of lines say that they cannot stand it if the tariff is reduced. Now, we take the first year. A reduction of one-eighth in the tariff, according to the importations of the present year, would mean a falling off of \$1,891,000 of revenue. Then it is a serious drawback to the raising of a revenue in that respect; but on the other hand, if it brings in goods enough to make it up, then it is a very serious thing for the manufacturers of the country. Now, what does it mean to the manufacturers of the country? They think they are barely able now to live under the tariff that has been in force, which is a protective tariff. Well, it means that the tariff will be lowered to three-fourths of what it is to-day, or one-fourth inside of two years. What does it mean to the farmers of the country? Let me show the change that it will make in some of the principal articles of produce: