

We shall not attempt—that would be foolish to put pressure on our colonists to go one step farther than they themselves desire to go. It is not for us to take the initiative. We would rather follow the lead; but what I think we have already accomplished is to convince them that wherever they live, however far their home may be from the centre and from the motherland, we, at any rate, are prepared to meet them more than half way in any approach which they may make to us, in any desire which they may express for a closer union, and gentlemen, it will come, if not in our day, then in that of our successors.

He says now, proudly, notwithstanding all the set backs received it will come, if not in our time, in that of our successors.

In what form I know not. It would be foolish to attempt to predict. It may be in the shape of commercial union of the Imperial Zollverein, which I do not believe to be so absurd as do some political economists. It may be in the shape of some Imperial council which will represent the federation of the British races, and which has been advocated by men as different in other respects as the late Mr. Forster, Lord Rosbery and Lord Salisbury; but in whatever way it is presented to us, we shall not be deterred either by the economic pedantries or the selfishness—which is a virtue with some politicians—from giving favourable consideration to any proposals which our brethren across the seas may make to us. And in such consideration I for one do not believe the English people will keep a strict account of profit and loss.

The hon. Secretary of State read where some two years ago Mr. Chamberlain was counting up the profit and loss; but now, he says, we have got a step further, we will not keep a strict account of profit and loss.

That they will seek to be assured of a present pecuniary gain for so much concession on their part. No! I think they will look, and look wisely, rather to a future time when we shall find our reward and that the splendid isolation with which our foreign critics sometimes taunt us, will be transformed into a union of the British race, and when the sons of Britain throughout the whole world shall stand shoulder to shoulder to defend our mutual interests and common rights.

Reference has been made to the flattering reception which the premier received in England, and the eloquent speeches that he made. In these respects we are all pleased. We are pleased notwithstanding his waywardness upon this great question—that as the representative of Canada, he was received with enthusiasm, and we are also pleased to know that apart from this question upon which he has made such a great and fatal mistake, he acquitted himself in a manner that was creditable to Canada. We are proud of his eloquence. We are glad that since it fell to the liberal party to represent us in England that it devolved upon him as far as eloquence was concerned to have performed the task, regretting as we do at the same

time that he fell so far short of his duty in respect to the most important of all questions with which he had to deal when he was in the motherland. Reference has been made by my hon. friend from Monck to a great mistake which was made in conferring the Cobden medal upon the wrong man, I agree with him, and I am serious in it. I think that the Cobden medal was not conferred upon the gentleman in Canada who had the fairest and the best right to it. If the free trade club had intended to confer any honour or distinction upon a man in Canada who has stood up for the principle of free trade they should have conferred it upon a gentleman who was in England also at the time, my hon. friend from Shell River, and not upon the premier of Canada, who I claim has no title whatever to any recognition of that kind from the Cobden Club, because so far from being a faithful adherent of the principles of free trade he stands to-day in the very opposite position in Canada. Now, I will read what Lord Farrar said when making the presentation to the premier of Canada. You will see how entirely they were mistaken with regard to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the attitude of his party on the trade question in Canada. He said:

There is a party amongst us who would willingly discriminate against German and Belgian goods, and would look upon the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties as a step towards what they have been pleased to call the commercial federation of the empire—a system under which commercial union in the different parts of the empire will be fostered by laws excluding or discouraging foreign goods. If this were to be the consequence of what you have done, I need hardly say that we of the Cobden Club would not have been here.

They would not have presented him with that medal if they understood that he was going to take advantage of the denunciation of the treaties for the purpose of giving advantage to British goods over foreign productions, yet we have my hon. friend the Secretary of State announcing a tariff change already, exactly in the direction that the Cobden Club said that if they suspected that was what Sir Wilfrid Laurier was going to do they would not have been there to present him with the medal. What the government called the reciprocal clause in the tariff of last year turned out not to be a reciprocal clause or a prefer-