

for the pound of flesh. If I had blundered as he blundered, I would have failed as he failed. But I pursued a different policy. I did not go about asking for the pound of flesh, I did not go about advocating the cause of preferential trade. Instead, I adopted the tactics of old Cato in Rome, who never made a speech in the Senate without in some way bringing in his famous denunciation "Delenda est Carthago." In every speech which I made in England, and heaven knows I made a good many, I never failed to impress upon the British public that they should give us help in obtaining from the Government the denunciation of those treaties. Well, Sir, on the 1st of August last, the treaties were denounced. Now, the hon. gentleman stated this afternoon, repeating what he has stated before in still more forcible language than he stated to-day, that after all we had obtained no advantage for Canada, that our policy had proved a complete fiasco, that though we had obtained a denunciation of the treaties we deserved no credit for it. Let me call a witness against the hon. gentleman here. I will call against him no less a person than the "Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B., M.P., Ottawa (late Prime Minister and ex-High Commissioner for Canada)." The treaties were denounced on the 1st of August. On the 7th of August there was issued a prospectus of the "British Empire Finance Corporation, Limited," and at the head of the board of directors I find the name of "Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B.," and all the rest. Let me read the opening words of this prospectus:

This company was formed to acquire and develop within the British Empire, and under the security of British laws, industrial undertakings and other enterprises of a sound character, and to assist in opening up the resources of the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain. The recent denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties, and the removal thereby of the restrictions hitherto existing upon preferential inter-British trade, will have the effect of developing enormous and profitable resources hitherto neglected in the colonies, and will throw open new fields for highly remunerative investments.

Sir, this is the result of our policy, acknowledged by the hon. gentleman himself when he had more interest to speak the truth than he has upon the present occasion. But that was not enough. After that victory had been achieved, the hon. gentleman says that if we had advocated the cause of preferential trade and asked for a quid pro quo, asked a preference against all other nations we would have attained it. Well, Sir, he has said so, he has said many things. He is a prophet after the event, he has been often a misguided prophet. On the 29th of July, not more than two days before the treaties were denounced, the hon. gentleman staked his reputation on the statement that our policy was an absurdity, was a

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

blunder, and the day would never come when it would be anything else, it would always remain a blunder. Two days afterwards he had received his own answer in the fact that the treaties were denounced, and the week after he could make the statement which has just been read. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman goes further. He says that in taking the position that I did take, I went back not only upon my policy, but upon myself. The hon. gentleman stated I had abandoned the cause of preferential trade. What I stated in Canada was, and by the words I stand, that if ever the cause of preferential trade is to become an established fact within the boundaries of the British Empire, it can only be upon the lines of free trade. The hon. gentleman has quoted in support of his doctrine the authority of Mr. Chamberlain. I take issue with the hon. gentleman. Mark my words, let them be marked on the other side. I say neither my hon. friend nor any one of the apostles of preferential trade on the other side of the House would accept preferential trade on the lines laid down by Mr. Chamberlain. The only man in England who has thoroughly studied preferential trade, given attention to it and taken an intelligent and statesmanlike view of it is the distinguished gentleman who is now at the head of the Colonial Office. Before I proceed further, I should like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite whether they are protectionists or not. Would it be an unfair question if I were to ask the hon. leader of the Opposition if he is a protectionist, or if the hon. member for York (Mr. Foster) is a protectionist, or if the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a protectionist, or the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who has always been a strong apostle of preferential trade, is a protectionist? No doubt they will one and all say they are protectionists, not only for Canada but also for England. Now, let me quote the language of Mr. Chamberlain. That hon. gentleman spoke several times on this question, but his most notable speech was that delivered at the Canada Club dinner in London on March 25th, 1896, and this is the speech from which hon. gentlemen have often quoted. Here is the very language used by Mr. Chamberlain:—

I have laid down four propositions which I think cannot be controverted. The first is that there is a universal desire among all the members of the Empire for a closer union between the several branches, and that, in their opinion, as in ours, this is desirable—nay, it is essential for the existence of the Empire as such. My second proposition is that experience has taught us that this closer union can be most hopefully approached in the first instance from its commercial side. My third proposition is that the suggestions which have hitherto been made to us, although we know them to have been made in good part, are, when considered from the point of view of British interest, not sufficiently favourable to be considered by this country.