

returns down to July, 1897, which embrace but two months of the whole year, that there is the smallest justification for the assertions they have made, that our policy has failed, is to trifle with the intelligence of this House and with the intelligence of their supporters in the country and elsewhere. Now, I do not feel particularly called upon to rise to the high moral altitude which mark the opening of the hon. gentleman's speech. All I can say is that I hope that in the future his practice will correspond to it, for up to the present time we have had, I am sorry to note, a marked divergence between his moral platitudes and his practical performances. But when he talks of our crude tactics and strategy, and more particularly when he wants to know whether we are satisfied with our leader, Sir, I think it is time to ask him whether he is satisfied with his. He is good enough to call attention to the quotations of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1898, and to remark that those are tolerably clear evidence and go to prove the high status of Canadian securities. Perhaps he would tell us what Canadian Pacific securities ranged at in 1896 when he left office. As to the moral quotations which go to show the difference between the position of Canada then and the position of Canada now, Sir, I do not want to recall those painful pages in our history; but let those men who desire to do so, mark the difference between the Canada of to-day and the Canada of 1891. Let them turn to the pages of the English journals which rang from one end of the United Kingdom to the other with the painful record of the corruption and the political debauchery, which was exposed in the committee rooms of this House in 1891, and let them compare those with the innumerable compliments justly and deservedly paid to Canada and to the representative of Canada during the course of the year which has just passed.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman was pleased to enlarge at great length upon the humiliation, upon the disgrace, which marks the position of Canada because, forsooth, the English law officers choose to disallow our contention as to the actual effect of a certain clause in our tariff. Of course I am not going to rely on my own judgment in a matter of this kind, but I have to tell the hon. gentleman this, that there are two wholly different contentions as to the effect of a reciprocity treaty, and consequently as to the effect of such clauses as we introduced. He knows right well that there is one school of jurisconsults, and a very good school, too, who hold with us, and there is another who hold with the English law officers of the Crown; but it is not worth our while to discuss now which of those may or may not be correct. This I have to tell him: The greater the difficulties that stood in our way, the greater the legal and technical obstacles that stood in our way, the greater the opposition to the carrying out of our po-

Sr RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

licy and the denouncing these treaties, the greater the credit that is due to this Government, and due especially to my hon. friend beside me, for conquering those difficulties, for obtaining the object we desired, and for reversing the policy injudiciously and indiscreetly entered into by former English Governments, and for obtaining for Canada the proud distinction of having been the first colony to emancipate herself and to emancipate her sister colonies from restraints which should have never been laid upon them, by the confession of the Premier of England himself. I say that was as great a political and diplomatic triumph as could well be conceived, and I repeat that the greater the obstacles, the greater the credit of the achievement.

Now, I return for one moment to the criticism on the result of our preferential tariff. Sir, the House will remember that that hon. gentleman put it in somewhat this fashion. He declared, as I took down his words, that we were giving privileges to nine-tenths of the foreign countries that traded with us, and denying them to nine-tenths of our own sister colonies. Who that heard those words and was not familiarly acquainted with the details of our trade and navigation, but would believe that we had entirely failed in our attempt to exclude foreign countries from the benefits. What is the fact? Why, Sir, that of the total volume of imports into Canada in the last year, six-tenths nearly came from the United States which are all excluded from the benefit of it, and three-tenths or thereabouts came from Great Britain, which are admitted. What does the remainder amount to? Why, Sir, deduct Germany, deduct Belgium, and deduct France, all of which were specially entitled under special treaties, one of which we ourselves had concurred in, and there hardly remains half a dozen millions, and those half a dozen millions are chiefly composed of such articles as tea and sugar, as to which the clause in our tariff did not apply at all.

Now, I turn to another matter on which the hon. gentleman bestowed considerable attention, and which it is certainly desirable we should bestow some attention, although I am bound to say that I fail to note any particular concurrence between the views advocated by himself and those of the hon. gentleman whom I suppose he still continues to call his leader, as to the question of our contract for opening up the Yukon and the Klondike. He is perfectly well aware, and I am perfectly well aware, that it is entirely out of the question to discuss with any profit the details of this measure until it is brought before the House in the shape of a Bill, and until the contract is laid on the Table. But there are certain, broad clear and distinct matters of fact as to which the House are at present in a position to form a fair opinion. Now, Sir, I am