

their policy and brought it to this House. Why have we preferential trade with Great Britain today, and for Great Britain and some of her colonies alone? Because hon. gentlemen blundered into it, and for no other reason whatever. When they sat down together, we will suppose, with their wits about them, and laid out their line of policy, their line of policy was not for preferential trade to Great Britain alone was not preferential trade to Great Britain at all. Their line of policy was in the line of what my hon. friend indicated, I think, in Toronto, when he said that now the policy of this Government was to be, not Canada for the Canadians, but all the world for the Canadians, to trade with all the world and to all those countries that would give to us favouring tariffs, we would give favouring tariffs and favoured treatment. That was the policy, which they laid down in their cool moments, knowing what they desired to accomplish. My hon. friend has said something, too, with reference to their getting the treaties denounced. He said, I think, to-day, that a preferential treatment to Great Britain, as everybody knew, would have to be given to Belgium and to Germany also. Everybody knows it now, but everybody did not know it when that policy was first propounded. I put the question to my hon. friend myself, as to whether, under that resolution on that item; Belgium and Germany would have a right to that treatment as well as Great Britain. My hon. friend got up, in the plenitude of his power and his knowledge, and declared:—

I have no hesitation in answering my hon. friend. I say emphatically that neither Belgium nor Germany can have any right to that preferential treatment.

Now he says everybody knew that when Great Britain received that treatment, it must be accorded equally to Belgium and to Germany, because these had the favored-nation treatment. My hon. friend simply blundered into what he calls preferential trade with Great

Britain. His policy, as laid down and as explained by himself, as explained by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and by the Minister of Finance, was a policy of favorable treatment to every country which would favorably treat us, and so to make our trade bounds as wide as possible. My hon. friend next took credit for having abrogated the treaties with Belgium and with Germany. I think he arrogates too much to himself. As I read the history of those negotiations, and the history which preceded those negotiations which resulted in the denunciation of the treaties, the working up to that result had been a matter of many years. It is always the case that abuses which are and have been long established, require time in order to disestablish or to abrogate them. There always must be a period, longer or shorter, of agitation, of preparation of public sentiment, and of conveying that public sentiment to the authorities that may be, and of the dispositions which must take place between the contracting parties in order that changes may be made. That process had been going on with reference to these treaties for twenty years, started long ago and persistently held to by the Government of Canada, whilst my hon. friend was in opposition, and adhered to by the Government of every British colony, who, by their representatives, with Sir Charles Tupper, when he was High Commissioner in London, pressed again and again upon the British Government the idea that these treaties stood in the way of desirable legislation, and that they ought to be abrogated. These led up to their final result, and that final result was brought about by the co-operation of all the colonies, as is distinctly shown in the records—aided very largely by the feelings which were aroused on the occasion of the Jubilee of Her Gracious Majesty. These all in their years of work led up to the final abrogation; but, Sir, it is quite too much for my hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to take for himself or for the Canadian Government the sole credit of having abrogated these treaties.