

tionist principle. But there is the principle of the high bonusing of industries. Is that free trade as they have it in England? That is a strong protectionist principle. Hon. gentlemen who promised a tariff in which there should not be a vestige of protection have brought down a tariff that has the strongest protectionist features; high duties; bonuses; retaliation; preferential trade; anything but the tariff which was promised. What they have done is to try and please everybody. The speech of the Finance Minister was as extraordinary as the tariff he heralded, because he devoted the greater part of it to eulogizing free trade and denouncing protection, and he ended with announcing a tariff which is the reverse of a free trade tariff. I was reminded of an incident in one of the letters of Dr. Russell. Shortly after the Crimean war, he was travelling between Versailles and Paris and met an old woman with handkerchiefs over her left arm. It was summer time. He asked her what her business was, and she replied, "To blow the noses of invalid soldiers who have lost their arms; but at the present time, it being summer, I am a little short of employment." The Minister of Finance had on his arm a lot of free trade rags, remnants of free trade principles; but he finished by telling the House that the demand for his free trade rags was at a low point just now.

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about the preferential element in the tariff as though they had discovered it, when the fact is, that it is and has been one of the planks in the platform of the Conservative party. But, the Conservative party would never think of trying to bring about preferential trade by a course which would compel England, if she sanctioned it, to violate treaties. We ought to be informed by this time, whether or not hon. gentlemen opposite have had a communication from the Home Government on this subject. I have been assured by a person very well informed, that a despatch has arrived from one of the Secretaries of State to the Prime Minister, saying, that the Government of England was gratified at the manifestation of Imperial feeling in Canada and the desire to give England a preference, but that the English Government could not sanction this legislation. I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that be so?

**THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. Davies).** I do not see why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davin) wishes to ask me. He says he knows all about it, and he has given to the House the substance of what he thinks it is.

**Mr. DAVIN.** That, Mr. Speaker, is a sample of the kind of thing we have had ever since the Government got into power.

**Mr. DAVIN.**

They take upon themselves to negotiate, and they receive information, and so long as they dare they keep this House without the knowledge. That is not a proper answer to give to a member of Parliament speaking from his place in this House. The proper answer was, either to deny that the Government had received such a despatch or else to acknowledge its receipt.

Both the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Controller of Customs (Mr. Paterson), who have been for ten months incubating this tariff, indicate that the brood is not perfect, and that it is not a hatch they are ready to stand by.

**Mr. BENNETT.** They change the eggs every day

**Mr. DAVIN.** I suppose they do. They say that changes may be made, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce bowed that they were not too proud to make changes. Well, from this side of the House, and from the North-west Territories, pressure will be brought upon them to change their minds and to carry out their pledges to the North-west, and not to leave the farmers there, worse treated than they could possibly have feared. The hon. the Minister told us that England will avail herself of the earliest opportunity of getting rid of these treaties, and he seemed to think that she would do so now, because her heart had been touched. But we ought to know whether the Government have any ground for saying that England will get rid of these treaties. We should have the facts on the Table of this House before we proceed further to consider the tariff. The Minister of Trade and Commerce read an extract from a speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) delivered in 1893, and we were told that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), because of legislation then passing through Congress, expressed himself as likely to inaugurate a retaliatory policy. At the time my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) spoke in that way, how were hon. gentlemen opposite speaking and how were their journals writing? When this legislation was being promoted in the United States in 1893, the "Globe" had an article in which we read:

But a more enlightened public opinion is abroad, and the people have learned that the freedom of their own is more important than the freedom of other markets. \* \* And it is evident that a majority of the farmers of Canada have learned to clearly analyse the situation. This belief is strengthened by the result of the Winnipeg election, that city being dependent, to a great extent, on agricultural prosperity. The real demand of the Canadian farmers is not for more duties on farm produce, but for relief from duties now imposed for the benefit of manufacturers. The existence of the American tariff has been used as an argument in favour of retaining protection in the Dominion. Of course, such an