

a member of the government some time ago. There is another point in connection with the province from which I come that deserves consideration. The Island of Cape Breton has sent an unbroken phalanx of members to support the government, and the hon. gentlemen in this Chamber from that island have also continuously supported the government, and it did seem to me that in the recent reconstruction of the government, some of those gentlemen from Cape Breton might have been thought worthy of a place in the administration. As it is now, the two members of the Cabinet from Nova Scotia are practically both from the county of Cumberland. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Militia are both Cumberland men, we may say; and in addition to that we find that the important office of High Commissioner in London is filled by another gentleman from Cumberland. I do not say that there is a family compact, but it looks like a county compact when, of the eighteen counties in Nova Scotia, only one is represented in the government, and that by two members of the Cabinet, in addition to the High Commissioner. I should hope the hon. leader of the government, in whose sense of justice I have great confidence, will see that this inequality—to put it mildly—is remedied before we meet again.

Taking up the Speech from the Throne, the first paragraph deals with the lamented death of the late Premier. If I were to undertake to add anything to what has been so admirably said by several gentlemen who have preceded me, beginning with the hon. gentleman from Pictou, it would be attempting to "gild refined gold," and I shall not undertake the task.

The next paragraph of the speech refers to the treaty with France. In that treaty I took a great deal of interest. We discussed it at considerable length during a previous session, and it was an open secret that the hon. gentleman who is now Premier and the hon. Minister of Finance, who now leads the House of Commons, were not at all in love with that treaty. I do not propose to discuss the subject any further, except to say that I can understand why these hon. gentlemen were not in love with the treaty. The Premier is, above all things, a protectionist; and this treaty, as far as it goes, is a free trade measure. It proposes to allow certain productions of France and, as a consequence, of Germany and Belgium, to come

into Canada at reduced rates of duty and—that is the important point—to compete with our own products. We know that numerous signed petitions against the ratification of that treaty came here from the vine-growers of the hon. Premier's own province, and I can understand how he should not be in love with the treaty. Then, again, the treaty is by no means a prohibitionist measure. It proposes to make wine cheaper to the inhabitants of this country; and I can understand how a gentleman like the Minister of Finance who, when he first entered Parliament, at any rate, was a champion of temperance and prohibition, should feel some qualms of conscience in supporting a measure which would render wine cheaper and more abundant.

The next paragraph of the speech deals with intercolonial preferential trade and expresses gratification at the fact that there will be an opportunity for the different colonies to reduce the rate of duty on goods imported from one colony to the other. I can hardly understand the attitude of the government with respect to the trade with the Australian and other colonies—because we see from the papers that they propose to reduce the duties on articles coming from South Africa as well as from Australia. It seems to me that if lowering the tariff barriers and allowing the products of those colonial regions to come into Canada is a good thing, there is no reason why it should not be a good thing to lower the tariff barriers and allow the products of England and the United States to come in at low rates. Why is this distinction made? Why does this government, which is a protectionist government, when we deal with England and the United States, become a free trade government when we come to deal with Australia, Cape Colony and, to a certain extent, with France? Is it because the products of England and of the United States compete chiefly with the products of our manufacturers, while the products of Australia, Cape Colony and France compete with the products of our farmers? Is that the reason? There does not seem to be any other sufficient reason given. Just look at this Australian trade. Last year we paid \$125,000 in steamship subsidies to enable the Australian farmers to compete with our own in British Columbia. Our total export to Australia was only \$322,000; and we paid