

people, and declaring they had framed a policy that must be repealed, or on the other hand, they must give an exclusive preference to England, without anything in return. I say the people will deal with those gentlemen later.

But there was a change of front, the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House entered upon a new policy, and that policy was to declare that we were not entitled to ask for anything. Let us see what hon. gentlemen have said on that side of the House with regard to this question. The hon. the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), is rather a cautious man. He is very careful of what he says. If he could keep a string on his friends, perhaps he would have less difficulty. Well, this is what the hon. gentleman said in his last speech :

The Conservatives insist that England must first give us a quid pro quo. Well, Sir, I am not one of those who will go so far as to say that England will never impose a preferential tariff for the advantage of her colonies. I have said before, and I will repeat it now, that while that is not a very likely thing to happen, it is within the bounds of possibility, even of probability.

Now, we will take the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He says :

Canada has nothing to offer England in exchange, and it is impudent to ask for a preference. . . . We have not earned a preference, and it would be to cripple England to get it. . . . It is not in our interest to get a preference.

The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd), has gone so far even, as to warn the people in England. He was not content to warn the taxpayers, but he waved the flag in distress to the 1,100,000 paupers in that country. The hon. gentleman says, that 'a preference is not in the interests of Canada,' 'it would be disastrous to both countries;' 'none but madmen would think of a preference.' The hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell), declares that 'Canada should be ashamed to ask for a preference;' that 'it is neither in the interests of Great Britain, nor of Canada, that we should have a preference such as the Conservatives propose.' The hon. member for North Norfolk declares that it is disloyal. Then the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Burnett), whom I do not see here to-night, made the utterance of a statesman. I commend it to the intelligent electors of his riding, and if they take kindly to it, I think they do not deserve very much sympathy from intelligent people. This is what he says :

Hon. gentlemen opposite talk about a superabundance of loyalty, while on the other hand they are glorifying themselves because they think they now have an opportunity to take advantage of Great Britain's troubles in the Transvaal to get better terms; in other words, they think that, by reason of the war she is engaged in, we can get out of Great Britain what we could not otherwise get, and can make our own terms. What do you think, Mr. Speaker, of an hon. gentleman, who declares that when Eng-

land's hands are tied, we can get certain terms that we could not get otherwise? But what does the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Russell), say :

Nobody ever questioned the desirability of such an arrangement if it could be obtained. To use the strong language of the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, a Canadian who would refuse such a proposition would be an idiot.

Now, Sir, we have the Minister of Finance declaring that he has never gone so far as to say it was not possible, or even probable; and we have nearly every hon. gentleman opposite declaring that it is nothing short of insanity, that it would ruin Great Britain and ruin Canada to have a preference. I am going to ask the hon. gentleman, if the possibility ever arises, what the people of Canada have to look forward to now. Hon. gentlemen opposite, one after another, have risen in this House and have declared that such a policy is against both Great Britain and Canada. There is not a single argument that can be used by the most sturdy opponent, in England, or in any other country, that hon. gentlemen opposite have not used against Canada. I would ask if any person can ever hope, under the leadership of the Liberal party, with these declarations on record, for better trade relations with Great Britain. Why, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely impossible, when we see hon. gentlemen in this House declaring in the most explicit terms that it would be madness itself to enter upon a policy of that kind, and then to tell us, as the hon. Minister of Finance has told us, that he has never said that it could never be had. He was very cautious. He says that it does not appear likely now, but, if it does not appear likely now, it is due to the attitude of the Liberal party, because hon. gentlemen opposite have done everything in their power to prevent the likelihood of it. It is because there is no effort could be more effective than the position which hon. gentlemen have taken to belittle Canada in every sense, or to put her in the light that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) seeks to put her in, when he declares that Canada has nothing to offer, that Canada's trade is only about 5 per cent of the total trade of Great Britain. Yet, we are told that as a result of this policy the heart of the English people has been touched. We are told that they buy our products more readily, and that if we have not a legal market, we have, in fact, a substantial market. I have always thought, and I am not going to change my opinion about that, that when Canadians sold their goods in Great Britain, or elsewhere, it was because they produced a first-class article, and because they were ready to go in and compete for that market, and if ever they abandon a position of that kind their market will go. There is nothing that will so belittle the Canadian people as the