

want to know from that hon. member whether he would give five pounds of nails one cent cheaper to a British subject than he would to an American? Would he give binder twine to the people of Canada cheaper than he would to the people of the United States. Why, if you went to buy nails or razors or axes from the hon. member from Hamilton, even if you were his great uncle, he would say: Business is business, sentiment is sentiment; I respect you as a relative; but I want full price for these articles. We find these hon. gentlemen saying that it is childish to think of bargaining with Great Britain. Are not all questions of international trade, whether between the motherland and the colonies, or between the colonies themselves or between different nations—are not they all questions of discussion and bargaining and arrangement? Will the hon. gentlemen opposite tell me that England ever asked us to do this? She never expected us to do it, she never wanted us to do it; she knew that we had a fight for life here, that we had a work to do in building up a nation that calls for all our energy. She knew that we had a great competitor to the south of us; she knew that we had to meet circumstances that she had not to meet, that we had to deal with conditions instead of theories. Therefore, she never asked us to give her any of our patrimony, to yield for her benefit any of our advantages; she was willing, and more than willing, that the revenues of the Canadian people, their zeal and their industry should be used by us as British patriots to build up a great British nation on the northern half of this continent, that in times of peace should be an honour to her, and in times of trouble might prove, as it has proven, an arm of strength and defence. What does the hon. member for North Norfolk say in his highness and in his mightiness, as to getting a return preference for the preference we have given? He says that it is useless, that it is senseless, that it is deceiving, that it is dishonest, that it is shameful, that it is sublimely and infinitely impudent, that it is positively disloyal. I said this afternoon that by the acquirement of facility in the use of bitter adjectives the hon. gentleman was qualifying for the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce, and I think I have proved it by the expressions I have just quoted. Well, Sir, if to seek a preference from Great Britain is useless, senseless, is deceiving, dishonest, shameful, sublimely and infinitely impudent and positively disloyal, what does the hon. gentleman think about his leader? The hon. member for North Norfolk says that it was positively dishonest to go to the country with any such policy as this—namely, a policy saying that we hoped to get a preference in the markets of Great Britain according to the lines of our resolution. Let the hon. gentleman

Mr. MONTAGUE.

ask his leader what he promised the people of the province of Ontario in the city of London; let him ask him whether he did not say that it was a good policy; let him ask him whether he did not say that that practical statesman, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain had practically extended an invitation, and let him ask him if he did not say that the moment he got into power, he would send a commission to Great Britain to get for Canada this preference in the markets of Great Britain. And when he gets his answer from the Prime Minister, I will be able to tell him whether we are dishonest in regard to this policy which we are expounding for the people of Canada, and upon which we are prepared to take up the fight for supremacy in the confidence of the people. What did the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say in London:

That practical statesman, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, has come to the conclusion that the time has come when it is possible to have within the bounds of the empire a new step taken which will give to the colonies of England—

What? Where are those adjectives? I have lost them now, but I hope they are on *Hansard*.

—a preference to their products over the products of other nations.

I think I may very well leave the hon. member for North Norfolk in the hands of his leader; I think I may well let him put his adjectives against the argument of the Prime Minister. Now, what does the right hon. gentleman still further say? He says that the leader of the opposition, when he stated that the Prime Minister had betrayed Canada when he went to the old country, was making an outrageous statement for which there was no foundation. What did the Prime Minister do when he went over to the old country? Mr. Chamberlain extended to these gentlemen an invitation to discuss this question. The Prime Minister did not ask for it, he would not even consent to discuss it on behalf of Canada, though the promise was still ringing in the ears of the London audience that he would send a commission to get preferential trade with the mother country. He said: No, we do not want anything in return; we give it to you as a gift—

Mr. DOBELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And one hon. gentleman, the originator of the bottle-necked steamship idea in this country says, 'hear, hear.' And I say that the Prime Minister of this country—knowing the promise he had made to the electors of Canada, and to his audience in the city of London and refusing to even discuss the question with these statesmen, betrayed Canada and the best interests of Canadian industries.

Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk says it is nonsense to talk of this, because