

far as the resolution before the House goes, it will let in other countries as well as England. The resolution does not specify England, and the Government may bring in other countries or invite them to come in under that schedule. What would be the position supposing the United States, Germany and other countries competing with Canada were permitted to send in their goods under that schedule? Such concessions could only have the effect of destroying Canadian industries, and driving away the people employed in them. We are told that the tide of immigration would at once flow to Canada, that an impetus would be at once given to business. For what purpose would people come here, if there were no manufacturing industries and little employment obtainable? It is clear that capital and employment would diminish under a policy of this kind. It is almost impossible for the people here now to drag out an existence, and it would be strange indeed if people in England and other countries could not understand the question, and the consequences of such a policy being adopted in this country, or at all events evidence would be soon forthcoming in this country as to the impracticable nature of the tariff.

With respect to the question of preferential trade, which is involved by the resolutions now before the House, I may say that this is no new question in Canada. It is a question respecting which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have been anxious. It cannot be monopolized by hon. gentlemen opposite or considered as a question on which political parties have been divided. I believe that the sentiment in the Liberal party as well as the Conservative party has been favourable to preferential trade.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I want the hon. gentleman's "hear, hear" when I now say that the Liberal party placed itself in a position in the past from which it was utterly impossible to approach the question in this light. They advocated other means of relieving the ills of the country. Their remedy was not preferential trade; they took a position which put preferential trade out of the question. They adopted a policy of unrestricted reciprocity. I have evidence of this from the mouth of an hon. gentleman, a colleague of the First Minister and occupying a high and distinguished position. I refer to a letter written by Sir Oliver Mowat to Hon. Alexander Mackenzie. It was after the defeat of 1891 at the general elections of the Liberal party, and grew out of the policy the party then pursued, that policy on which Mr. Blake was unwilling to follow his party and to which some reference is made in this letter, but which I will not trouble the House with to-night. This is what Sir Oliver Mowat had to say on this question:

Mr. CLANCY.

At the last general Dominion elections we lost some votes in Ontario, from a fear, created by Conservative management, that Liberal leaders were looking to political union; and many more Liberal votes would have been lost but for the confidence of Liberals generally that the charge was false.

So much as a matter of party tactics and the policy of the Liberal party. That hon. gentleman came from Toronto to Ottawa, and he brought his policy and his warning with him. Further he said:

As a mere matter of party tactics, therefore, and in addition to all other considerations, it is our policy to see that our party shows itself on all occasions to be as true to the British connections, and as little disposed to surrender this great Dominion to our neighbours, as the most British of Conservatives are.

I am not sure but that this letter was the birth of the preferential trade policy, or at all events gave rise to it, and followed the advent of the introduction of new blood in the Liberal party at Ottawa.

There was another fact that stood in the way, and which yet stands in the way of the Prime Minister of to-day, and which justifies the position of the Conservative party, and that is the speech made by the Prime Minister, in Boston. The Conservatives have been rather ridiculed and sometimes shouted at whenever they quote from Mr. Laurier's speech at Boston. It is always said that this is done to injure him; but this expression of opinion comes from the Minister of Justice. This is what Mr. Laurier said:

In the very nature of things, from the sole fact that Canada is growing, developing and progressing, the interests of Canada and the interests of England must be divergent, and whenever the interests of Canada are on one side and the interests of England are on the other side, the only consideration to me is what is best for Canada, leaving it to the people of England to consider, and do, what is best for England. This is not a question of sentiment, and, for my part, I am firmly convinced that the economic interests of Canada lie with this continent, and it is on the broad basis of continental freedom of trade that I place the question.

We have been told that this preferential trade policy has been most favourably received by the people of England, that they are grateful for the position taken by the Liberal party of Canada, that it is a duty on the part of the Canadian people to make some concessions, and the Government have given some evidence of the loyalty of our people. I make no apology for saying that I believe that the intelligent policy for the people of this country to pursue is not one of sentiment. Sentiment is very good in its place and we are as desirous of being moved as much by sentiment as any enlightened people should be moved. This is entirely a question of dollars and cents, and it is absolutely distinct from sentiment. The concessions offered by the Liberal party to the people of England have not been de-