

medal. I take the ground that in Canada his party do not claim to-day that they are standing on free trade principles. It would be folly for them, before the people of this country, or any one who knows the history of their tariff, or the effect of the tariff, to say that it is a free trade measure. It is by no means a free trade tariff. Even my hon. friend from Halifax pointed out some respects in which it is not a free trade tariff. He said the manufacturers were protected enough. He acknowledged the principle of protection was in the tariff, and he thought they had enough protection, and there might be a duty of 5 per cent imposed on raw material; and he pointed out another notable instance of the way this tariff is not only protective, but extremely protective, and that is in the matter of coal oil. It is notorious that in the contest which took place in Centre Toronto not very long ago, the candidate and the speakers in the interest of the government, claimed that the government had given the manufacturers a strong protection, which was to be continued. Therefore, I claim, that apart altogether from the condition which Lord Farrar attached to that medal having been violated by the announcement made by the Secretary of State: the policy of the government in the shaping of their tariff, and the effect of their tariff in Canada, precludes the hon. gentleman from honourably wearing the medal presented to him by the Cobden Club. In connection with that, and before passing from it—and that is the only further reference I intend to make to that question—I want to say that I think the present government are entitled to commiseration on account of the position they occupy with regard to the tariff and its protective character. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition in the House read to you extract after extract of speeches of almost every leading man in the ranks of that government when he was in opposition, telling the country what he was going to do in the way of demolishing protection—eliminate every vestige of protection—cut the head off protection and trample on its body—this villainous system of legalized robbery—scoundrels great and scoundrels small—applied to the manufacturers of the country were made to fly like rockets in our political atmosphere for 18 years. A chorus against protection was raised by the present members of the government when they were in opposition, and

it was joined in by their speakers and writers and the press, for a great many years, and culminated in their Ottawa platform as we all know. In the face of that we have, to-day, a strong protective tariff, almost as much so as the Conservative party would desire. In view of all these facts, and in view of this position which the government occupies to-day, it would be interesting to recall a warning and prediction made by Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce, a solemn warning which he uttered to his own party only two or three years ago in connection with this very subject. Here is what the hon. gentleman said:

There are two lessons which I think the Reformers of Canada should learn. One is presented for our example and warning in the fate that has befallen the Democratic party in the United States. It shows to all who chose to read the signs of the times, that when a party places itself at the head of a great popular movement, if the party tenders a stone instead of bread, it is half-hearted in the prosecution of the great aim it sets before it, and will be deservedly swept out of power by the very people who would have sustained and advanced it.

That is a prediction which the Minister of Trade and Commerce made himself, a solemn warning which he uttered to the members of his party, and I feel assured that it was a truthful and ominous warning, and the hon. gentleman, if he does not get out of the boat, will find the fate overtake him which he predicted would overtake all public men who, after having put themselves at the head of a great popular movement, would go back upon it, ignore it, and trample it under their feet. Now, we have heard a great deal about the denunciation of these treaties and it is claimed that the government have given evidence of a very great amount of statesmanship by the course which they have pursued in regard to this matter. When the so-called reciprocal resolution was submitted to the House of Commons last April by Mr. Fielding, the conservative leaders in the House of Commons at once told him and the premier across the floor of the House of Commons that they were proposing an unconstitutional resolution and one which they could not carry out. They warned them if they persisted in that resolution it would become the duty of the Governor General to withhold his assent from it; that it was impossible for the Governor General to assent to such a resolution. They based that opinion on the despatch of Lord Ripon of June, 1895. Any one would have thought it was so plain that school boys would have known its