

If this contract was a good one for the Grand Trunk Railway, why should the government give to the Grand Trunk Railway further concessions? If the Grand Trunk Railway Company were bound by the terms of this contract, why should the government amend it? If the promoters of this contract, bound by the terms of the contract, put up £1,000,000 of guaranteed stock, why did not the government avail themselves of that security which they had accepted, and why did they not insist that the contract should be carried out? Why have the government gone to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and pressed further concessions upon them? Have these amendments been made at the instance of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or the promoters of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company? Are the negotiations in writing? If so they must certainly be laid on the Table of the House and we must find out whether or not the statements made in December last by the government on the one hand and by Charles Hays on the other hand are true or not. The elections were then impending. The Solicitor General has told us so. I suppose that my right honourable friend will not impute any want of knowledge to a gentleman so soon to be taken into the cabinet? The elections were at that time impending. Then we had this guarantee of stock put up, then we had the assurance of Mr. Hays that the railway would be carried through under the contract without amendment, and then we had the press of the government throughout the country declaring that the contract would be carried out as then contemplated and that no change or amendment was to be made, or was necessary.

My honourable friend from North Ontario very properly called the attention of the government to certain matters which were not mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I do not know whether or not he desired to reflect upon his leaders in that regard, but he found it necessary to mention the acquisition of Newfoundland and tariff revision and one or two other matters which were not referred to in the speech from the Throne. I observe that there is no reference to tariff revision in the speech from the Throne. The year before last the explanation was put before the people of the country that the members of the government were going to attend the colonial conference, and for that reason, it was said, it would be inexpedient to make any revision of the tariff. Last year the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) speaking in the debate upon the address, said that no tariff changes should be made during the session because of the approaching meeting of the joint high commission to negotiate with the government of the United States. This year both these excuses fail unless my right hon. friend is prepared to say that a further meeting of the joint high

commission is intended. I do not know whether any such meeting is intended. I really do not know whether that commission is still in existence, or whether it has been expressly dissolved, or has become a nonentity by efflux of time, but it is a long time since its deliberations have been carried on. However that may be, no excuse of that kind appears, and we have heard some remarkable statements from different members of the government as to the tariff. My right hon. friend last session folded his arms and in a somewhat dramatic style gave thanks, that having begun life as a protectionist, he had now become a free trader, and he reproached me, because, as he said, exactly the opposite result had obtained in my case. But, my right hon. friend has spoken since then. The other day in Montreal he told us that he was neither a protectionist nor a free trader, but a practical man. He is not in accord with one of his colleagues and I am astonished that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Fréfontaine) still continues to hold his portfolio because he has been preaching a strong protectionist doctrine in the province of Quebec. I think that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) has also been making some pretty strong declarations in that province, declarations absolutely inconsistent with the doctrines of my right hon. friend, especially inconsistent with the speeches of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance in the campaign in Yarmouth 15 or 18 months ago, and more particularly inconsistent with certain campaign literature which is being distributed by my hon. friends opposite throughout the western part of this country, where a strong free trade sentiment is supposed to prevail. I have been fortunate enough to obtain a copy of this valuable document. I have no doubt that my right hon. friend has a large supply of this literature, but in case he has not, I may be able to send a copy over to him.

This document consists for the most part of quotations from speeches from myself, Mr. Pope, Mr. Bell, Mr. Northrup, Mr. Sproule, Mr. Clarke, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Blain, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Brock and Mr. Henderson, in which we have expressed our opinion that we should have a policy in Canada which would afford adequate protection to all the industries of this country and would give the Canadian market to Canadians in respect to all the legitimate industries of this country. After quoting these opinions, the document which has been extensively circulated in the west proceeds as follows:

Summarizing the situation, several things are clear.

It is delightful to have my hon. friends on the other side of the House clear on any question that arises, and especially on this question. This, I think, is the first occasion on which there has been any clear statement of their views since 1896. These conclusions are divided up into paragraphs.