

nade as they have it in Great Britain means. Here is one of their own friends who has no difficulty in expounding the policy we are advocating with respect to developing and advancing the interests of our people in Canada.

But, we are sometimes told that we are not very consistent in our advocacy of trade relations, and that one time we talk reciprocity, and continental free trade, and trade with Great Britain, and lots of other statements are made like that. I want to give to you, Mr. Speaker, an authority on the advantages to our people of trade with the United States that will not be disputed by even the Minister of Finance himself, when I quote it. It is the opinion of a gentleman who has been in this House for many years, and this is the statement he makes before his electors, gathered last summer for the purpose of discussing the selection of a candidate for his county. He said :

He had a duty to perform before leaving Parliament, and he had already induced the United States Government to reduce the tariff on horses, barley and coal, and he was still in communication with an agent of the United States Government to bring about a further reduction in the American tariff which would benefit the farmers. He further stated that no person would be more disappointed than Sir Mackenzie Bowell, if he did not receive the nomination.

Is that not rank heresy to proceed from any gentleman who is a supporter of the National Policy? Why, Sir, it is worthy of a Grit of the deepest dye. He says that it is a benefit to the Canadian farmer to have the United States tariff reduced, and that he is securing reductions on horses, barley, and coal. Why, Sir, it was my respected friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) who said this; and I am quoting from a report in an organ of the Government of the day, written by a friendly hand.

Sir, I have been grieved and ashamed to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite denouncing day in and day out the position of the mother country—the country that has never failed to stand by Canadian interests, that has given us the shelter of her protection and the shelter of her name through good report and evil report. Yes, these men are never done telling us that in free trade Britain distress prevails everywhere, and that people are suffering and in want, and are travelling towards a protective policy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are preaching blue ruin in England.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). Yes, preaching blue ruin in England. They carefully quote to us some of the campaign speeches of the Conservative party in England, made a year or two ago; but they do not quote to us the divisions of the House that have recently taken place on any of those questions. It may do to go into the country and tell the farmers that they are oppressed,

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth).

that competition from the outside is straining their resources and reducing the income of their estates; and if you apply that statement to the proprietors of those estates, it is perfectly true; but if you look back through the history of England for a few generations, you will find that some of those gentlemen gave very little, indeed, for the estates from which they are drawing large revenues to-day. Suppose the prices of the products of the farm were doubled to-morrow, and kept so for a few years, how much of the increase do hon. gentlemen suppose would fall to the average tenant farmer? Would not the aristocracy who control their lands immediately proceed to put up their rents to match?

But I want to call attention to another quotation, bearing on this very question, from a journal which cannot be accused of Grit proclivities or of being unfriendly to the Government of the day; and I commend to hon. gentlemen opposite the sturdy and vigorous language in which it characterizes their conduct in thus belittling the mother country that has done so much for us. If they turn to the "Orange Sentinel" of the 25th April last they will find this paragraph, headed, "Distress in Great Britain":

Many United States and some Canadian papers are constantly telling us that great distress prevails in Britain. The British Parliament appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of affairs. The inquiry included the period of the great storms in Britain, storms unprecedented for more than fifty years. In spite of this terrible weather, the people of Great Britain suffered less actual distress and have been more prosperous than those of any other country under the sun.

The commission sent out inquiries to all localities in England, and received 1,194 replies from districts representing over 20,000,000 of a population, with these results: 569 localities, with a population of nearly 7,000,000, report no exceptional distress; 454 localities, with a population of over 10,000,000, report that there is exceptional distress, due solely to the severity of the winter; 144 localities, with a population of 3,700,000, report exceptional distress from want of employment, due to slackness of trade, depression in agriculture, or particular local or industrial causes.

Scotland, Wales and Ireland are dealt with separately, and show that, apart from the severity of the weather, no exceptional distress prevails.

The returns prove conclusively that the mass of the British people are not suffering. Britain holds her own in everything that tends to make a people great, and lying telegrams to Yankee papers are only sent to help the combines and commercial thieves in the United States, who find it pays to abuse Britain.

We regret that any Canadian paper should reproduce these lying despatches and try to bolster up Canadian combines.

That, Sir, is no statement from my side of the House. It is a statement from a journal that has never staggered in its allegiance to hon. gentlemen opposite; but the force