

shall know what it means, the same young gentleman will go down and discuss the subject with the editor, and the next morning you will see a leaded column wholly different tone. Sir, I attach no such importance as hon. gentlemen opposite affect to do, to the opinion of the "Times" or the "Daily News," written on such meagre data as they have received; I would attach a great deal more importance to a deliberate opinion from a Canadian journalist. What is the standpoint from which this matter will be looked at in England? It is the standpoint of the English manufacturer; it is not the standpoint of Canada, or of the progress of Canada. No doubt the account that has been sent over to England has indicated that something special has been done for her; but when it is found that the name of England does not occur in the resolution, that there is no real preference for England, their opinion will change.

What happened this evening when my hon. friend was defending the Ministerial position? He quoted a speech of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in order to buttress the position taken by the Government. That speech was, indeed, like all the speeches of the leader of the Opposition, thoughtful, statesmanlike, a speech strong in its enthusiasm for preferential trade, and for the unification and the consolidation of the Empire.

But surely it is one of the most extraordinary things in the world that this should have been quoted by my hon. friend: for what the leader of the Opposition advocated on that occasion was something wholly different from what has been done by the Government. The leader of the Opposition quoted Lord Salisbury and other statesmen as in favour of denouncing the treaties with a view to securing preferential trade which would confer advantages on Canada. What hon. gentlemen have done is as far as they could, to violate those treaties, and thus make it impossible that the statesmen of England should denounce them until whatever controversies arise over them are settled. Now that this has been done, if any complications have arisen, no matter how trifling they may be, the statesmen of England can not denounce those treaties until the controversies have been settled. Thus at every step, instead of precipitating denunciation of the treaties, they have for the moment any way made it impossible.

A word as to what my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) said about delay. The hon. gentleman said the delay caused no inconvenience whatever, that it did not paralyze trade, that there was no evidence that such was the case. The hon. gentleman is very strong in pinning his faith on newspapers when it suits his purpose, and he is willing to quote the "Times" and the "Daily News" as indicating English public opinion, although there has not been time for the facts in relation to the tariff to percolate

through the minds of the people of the United Kingdom; but the hon. gentleman apparently does not know that the monetary and commercial newspapers of this country, the "Monetary Times," for instance, have declared that our business was paralyzed in consequence of this delay. And we know as a fact it was so. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) last night, said that the ex-Minister of Finance had been disingenuous. If I were as frank, I would say that the attitude taken to-day by the Controller of Customs, that taken on Thursday by the Minister of Finance, that taken subsequently on Monday by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, of standing up and saying that they had fulfilled their promises, that their promises had been carried out and their pledges redeemed, was one of the most impudent acts in the history of parliamentary effrontery. There never has been such a spectacle as that presented by this Government, which is simply an organized perfidy. They have come into power, having made promises and pledges and having given their political note of hand to do certain things. What have they done? They promised to give free trade as it is in England, that we should get reciprocity with the United States, that they would abolish protection and not leave a shred of the curse in the tariff. But hon. gentlemen laugh at the people now. They laugh: We have bamboozled you at the elections, and we are going through with it. Never was a more cynically impudent attitude taken by any Government.

What were the pledges we had west and east? Did not the Prime Minister visit Winnipeg and promise that the Liberals would give us free trade as it is in England? Did not he go to Montreal and tell the people that he would give them free raw material? Did not the Minister of Trade and Commerce at Morrisburg and from a hundred platforms declare that not a single element of that scandalous principle of protection would be found in the tariff which the Liberal Government would give to the country. Were not specific pledges given respecting lumber and coal? The Prime Minister went to Montreal and promised free coal, and that promise went all over the west. Were we not told by leading members of the party that we should have free implements in the North-west? Is there any lowering of the duties on implements by this tariff? Hon. gentlemen opposite have given, as I will show a tariff which is not even a square protectionist tariff, because it is a highly-piggedly, which Dr. Johnson defined as a conglomerated mass of heterogeneous matter. They have given the country a tariff, which has more marked protectionist features in it than any tariff which has heretofore been seen in Canada. Take its preferential element. That is a strictly protec-