

Commerce. But he itches for the old authority he once wielded, and I fear that in his jealousy and rage he is venting his spite on us instead of on the men who sit round him and who think so little of him. The hon. gentleman, I say, was slightly personal. I have a right, I think, to claim that. He invaded, not only the home of my respected sire, but he came into the nursery which I am responsible for, and brought before this House of Commons in the debate on the Address some tittle-tattle in regard to some personal relations which had existed with a certain high personage in this country, to whom no reference has been allowed on this side of the House for almost any explanation whatever. While I will not go into personal matters as to what happened before that certain high personage made a grave constitutional mistake—if that expression be allowed—and merited in this House, and out of it, the condemnation of the Canadian people, let me come to the reminiscence the hon. gentleman gave us when he said that the Tory party had been fond of rotten-egging Governors General, and let me remind him—perhaps it is unnecessary to do so—that no Governor General was ever rotten-egged by the Conservative party since that hon. gentleman left the party. But there has been at least one Governor General in Canada, Sir Edmund Head, who had for a long time to submit to the vilest abuse of a personal character at the hands of the Reform party, which that gentleman has joined, their press and their leaders heaping upon him epithets so gross and abusive as would not to-day be suggested by any person in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, either on your right or on your left. Then, the hon. gentleman, in the pitiful manner in which he attempted to dodge the points made in this debate on this side of the House, made the confession that, after all, in regard to reciprocal legislation, or reciprocity treaties, there were two schools; and the trouble, to sum up his argument, is this, that he either led or followed his colleagues into the wrong school. The hon. gentleman was bold enough—and there is no limit to his audacity, as we know—to discuss troubles which were brewing, as he supposed, on this side of the House—personal difficulties and personal differences. It did seem to me, if my vision was good, that some colleagues of his got very restless as he referred to party troubles. It did seem to me that the hon. member for Berthier (Mr. Beausoleil), the hon. member for Quebec West (Mr. Dobell), the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine), the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Madore) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Choquette), not to mention a whole host of that majority of which he boasts, all moved restlessly in their chairs and felt that a direct personal allusion to them might be uncomfortable. Then

the hon. gentleman, later on, in discussing the argument of the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster), spoke of six-tenths of the imports, as I caught the figure, being from the United States, which had been excluded entirely from the preferential clause, and he commented on the omission of the hon. gentleman to take that into account in the calculation he made. That enables me, in passing, to remind the Government and the House of a peculiar feature of that tariff that has not been dwelt upon very much in the debate so far. While the Government were pretending—ior, according to their own admission, it has turned out to be a pretense and nothing more—that they were consumed by a love and affection for the mother country, which they had been singularly deficient in for a great many years past, and were giving to the mother country great gifts and concessions, and while it was true that 'nominatim' the United States did not and could not enjoy this so-called preferential portion of the tariff, great care was taken, as we see by the results, to give the United States a tremendous preference in fact by the transfer of certain articles from the dutiable to the free list. Of this transfer the United States got the greatest benefit, owing to the choice made of the articles put on the free list, and the proximity of the United States to the Canadian market. In the case of iron and steel, and in the case of coal also, a marked preference has been given the United States.

If I recall another portion of the hon. gentleman's argument aright, he went on to rejoice, and to me it was an intense pleasure to find him rejoicing over prosperity in Canada. We are agreed in this respect, that there is a great prosperity in the country about which we can boast; but as to the causes of that prosperity, his modesty did not prevent him from ascribing them to the act to the policy and action of the Government. I am sorry that I cannot take that view, and the hon. gentleman himself has furnished us with reasons for being somewhat stubborn. I hold in my hand a speech delivered by the hon. gentleman—one more carefully considered than that he has just delivered—in which he assured the Liberal convention that fiscal reform was all good enough in its way, but that while something might be done for our benefit by fiscal reform, no prosperity could come to this poverty-stricken country, this country in which ruin and devastation prevailed at the time, unless we had free admission into the markets of the great American Republic. But the hon. gentleman to-night, forgetting that theory which he held for so long a time, endeavoured, in the excitement and enthusiasm of the moment, to take credit for the fact that in spite of the barrier being raised in that market higher against us than before, our trade has increased and prospered. He