

and that, acting as a protection simply does not protect, and the yeoman labourer of Canada must have his industry closed down, or he must work for the starvation wages of the competing country.

But, Sir, as I said, my hon. friend cannot make much of this. Now, can he make much of his argument for patriotism? I am afraid that he brought up a family matter there again. My hon. friend is not asleep.

The PRIME MINISTER. I might.

Mr. FOSTER. I dare say he might. I dare say that sometimes he would like a gentle opiate to sooth the pangs of conscience which must often come to him when he hears of broken pledges. My hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) had a phrase which he used in the city of Boston; it was one of his nicely turned phrases. In short it was this: the mistake, the fatal mistake, is to think that allegiance, British allegiance, is the basis of trade. He was speaking to his Boston audience. He was declaring, that what he intended to do when he came into power, was, to give them a free road into this country and to get a free road into that country as far as he could. He wanted reciprocity with the United States of America, and he was willing to give them unrestricted reciprocity. He was combatting the argument, that may be, in Canada the loyal sentiment would set into trade channels towards the mother country. He declared it was a fatal mistake to think, that allegiance, British allegiance, was the basis of trade. But what else did he say? Here, in this House, in the country, over and over again, he said: I would just as soon have an American sixpence as an English shilling. That is the way he put it, although I never could tell what he meant by it. What he probably did mean to say was, that he would just as soon have American as English money. How often has he said, that he is loyal but his loyalty does not ooze out of his fingers, and that when it comes to Canadian interests he is going to look after them, and let Lord Salisbury look after British interests. Patriotism under that calculation, will never bring the Canadian people to buy Canadian goods. I grant, to some extent, that Canadian people in certain cases, would rather have foreign than Canadian-made goods. There are natural causes for that. Men buy what they have been accustomed to buy; that is one reason, and it is hard to switch them off from that custom. Men buy for fashion sake, men buy in other cases for the name's sake, and for one reason or another, English goods, foreign goods, will be brought in, and higher prices will be paid for them even though they are no better than Canadian goods. But to say that that was a result of the National Policy, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) argued, was another complete non sequitur. He tried to base an argument against the National Policy, because for instance, people

Mr. FOSTER.

were not patriotic enough to buy Canadian goods. Well, Sir, there is one thing which has been done in the last ten years, and that is, that the National Policy has removed nine-tenths of that prejudice against Canadian goods. The National Policy and the Liberal-Conservative administration of it, has at least given Canadian capital, and Canadian labour, and Canadian enterprise, an opportunity to show to the Canadian people, that just as good things can be made in their own country as can be made in other countries. Well, Sir, up to this time during the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding), there was noticeable a blank look of sullenness on hon. gentlemen opposite. Just a few countenances were a little irradiated, but most of his friends began to think: well, after all, we believe they are going to carry out their pledges. They felt that they must have been mistaken when the whole trend of the argument was so irresistibly conclusive against, not only the inception but the continuation of the National Policy. Then gloom settled down upon these Tory-Grits that the Montreal "Witness" speaks of, who are about to betray their party, and a light and cheerful countenance was discernible only in the case of my hon. friend yonder (Mr. Mc-Millan), and two or three others of his kindred spirits.

The Minister of Finance was wonderful in resources last night. He could argue straight and dead against a thing, and he could turn around when he saw that his followers were becoming depressed and argue just the other way. And, so he took a different trend and the kaleidoscopic changes came swift and fast; red, and green, and black, and scarlet, and then a sort of a dazzling combination that no man on earth could fitly characterize. To use a classical phrase:

He wiggled in and wiggled out,
With many a twisting turn and bout,
And kept the hunters still in doubt
If he were in or he were out.

I cannot state the authorship, and I do not know whether it is a rhyme or not, but at all events it suits the subject.

Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) came to the crucial point. After having demonstrated that the National Policy in its inception was a failure, and in its carrying out was a failure, and after showing reasons why there was sufficient natural protection here without putting on any more protection, my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) at last came down to the point, and he asked: How is this to be brought about? Well, he had to buoy himself up. He went over to London and got a writer from the "Times" who declared, that you must not be too pedantic in your theories; you must bring about changes slowly. He then got hold of Lord Farrer, who evidently is a thinker on a parity with himself, and who