

we never can get it unless we adopt England's system of free trade.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is what Mr. Chamberlain said.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Oh, no—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, only two days ago.

Mr. MONTAGUE. We will discuss that some other time.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Now is the time.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am going to quote what the hon. gentleman's leader said—

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Give us Mr. Chamberlain's words.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I think the Prime Minister is a more important man in this House. I want to see how these hon. gentlemen agree among themselves. The hon. member for North Norfolk says that any man with half a brain will see that it is absolutely necessary, if we wish this preference in the markets of Great Britain, to adopt the free trade system of England. Now, this is what the Prime Minister said in London :

England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade, such as she has it ; but I lay it before you, that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt the revenue form of tariff, pure and simple. These are the conditions on which we can have that boon.

There is no free trade there. What did the Prime Minister mean ? He meant that we should lower our tariff to Great Britain, and they, in return, would give us a preference in their markets over the products of the various parts of the world. Well, why did the hon. gentleman go back upon his promise in England ? He has never opened his mouth with any explanation. Was it for fear he would offend the Minister of Trade and Commerce ? Was it for fear that when he came to negotiations with the United States, a mutual preference would work against him in discussing these questions with that country ? Was it love of the 60,000,000 market, and an idea that he would be able to get a wide reciprocity treaty with the United States ? It makes no difference what it was. I say that the leader of the opposition was right when he said that the Prime Minister having in view his promise in London, betrayed Canadian interests when he refused to discuss this subject. What did the Prime Minister do then ? He put arguments into the mouths of those people in Great Britain who are opposed to that mutual preference ; he said : ' It would be almost a crime to interfere with your fiscal system, we do not ask you to do it, we give it to you as a free gift.' What was the statement of the hon. member for North

Norfolk last night ? When he was discussing this subject and practically appealing to the loyalty of the people of Canada, he said : It is positively disloyal to ask that we get something in return for the advantages which we are willing to give to Great Britain. Now, Sir, what is the hon. gentleman's resolution which he read, but which he cannot move ? I want to say to that hon. gentleman that all through the discussion of trade questions in this House, he, more than anybody else, he and the member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), are responsible for misleading public opinion in the United States. They made the people of the United States believe that we were willing to do anything to get reciprocity, that we were in a bad way, that our very existence depended upon getting trade with the people to the south. He does the same thing now, and he puts the same arguments into the mouths of those people in Great Britain who are opposed to mutual preference. What does he say in his resolution, a resolution which would be funny if it were not upon a serious subject, a resolution written by himself, which he says he would move if he had an opportunity. Among other things it says :

So long as Canada furnishes not more than 5 per cent of the total foreign and colonial trade of Great Britain, this thing is impossible.

The hon. gentleman is a good negotiator for Canada. The hon. gentleman is fighting for Canadian interests as he fought for Canadian interests in days gone by, and he is putting into the mouths of men in Great Britain who are opposed to this argument, that perhaps they would not have thought of, to prevent Canada securing this boon in the markets of Great Britain !

Mr. DAVIN. And a fallacious argument.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Yes, a fallacious argument, as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), showed last night when he came to contradict the figures. But the Minister of Finance says : ' Oh, but this will bring it'—not exactly in those words.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This or nothing ; if we cannot obtain it this way, we cannot obtain it at all.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I am satisfied, he says, to stand our chances of getting it. Well, that is an interesting off-hand statement. The Prime Minister says they do not want it ; the Minister of Finance says we will stand our chances of getting it ; the member for North Norfolk says it is positively disloyal to think about it. They seem to disagree upon this question. The member for North Norfolk says we are not entitled to it, and the *Montreal Herald* says that we never dreamed of getting it. The *Montreal Herald*, I fancy, expresses exactly the opinion of those gentlemen upon this question. Here is what the *Herald* says : ' Journals