

him, so that his own schemes remained buoyant. Napoleon's summary judgment of him is perhaps nearer the truth than any more laboured criticism, and his words are these: 'Talleyrand was always in a state of treason, but it was a treasonable complicity with fortune herself; his circumspection was extreme, he conducted himself towards his friends as if, at some future time, they might become his enemies—'

I think there is a little resemblance there.

—“and towards his enemies as though they might become his friends.”

I think we have had some evidence of that, too, not very long ago.

This, after all the apologies we have read of him, seems to be the sum of the matter, and however admirable such a character might be as a minister of foreign affairs, there is surely too much of the Mephistopheles element in it to satisfy any lover of honesty; it is a judgment, also, by no means *ex parte* in character, for the fact stated is implied in the very apology for him. What else is the argument that he shifted from one party to another, lest he should partake in the threatened corruption of the body of which he foresaw the decay, except another way of stating his treasonable complicity with fortune? and what would any cause be worth if all its supporters were in this state of perennial treason towards it? What, again, is the moral worth of that man, however great his capacity, who supports a cause on condition of its success?

Now, Sir, I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman will accept that in full of any criticism of him as regards the likeness that I have discovered between him and his great French prototype. But, Sir, the Toronto "Globe" came to his rescue. They found that the hon. gentleman was in a very tight place. They knew that he had declared in Toronto what he would do if he got into power, and they knew that he had done the very reverse of what he had promised, that he had done everything that man could do to prevent any person harbouring a sentiment favourable to preferential trade. The "Globe" came to his rescue with a falsehood—nothing more or less; and I will prove that, because it was not merely a misstatement—the "Globe" understands this question too well to be mistaken. They came to his rescue with this statement:

It is just as well that the real facts of the matter should be known. During the visit of the colonial premiers to Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain made the proposition that there should be absolute free trade between Britain and her colonies, on condition that the former placed a small customs tax on commodities from foreign countries.

Is that true? The right hon. gentleman knows that it is false. He knows that no such thing took place between the Premiers. What did take place between Mr. Chamberlain and the Premiers is on record. Mr. Chamberlain has placed it on the Table of the House of Commons, and has given the most emphatic contradiction to the "Globe". Now, I will quote the

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

hon. gentleman against himself and against the "Globe," and I will show that the statement made in the "Globe" that Mr. Chamberlain's policy was one of absolute free trade, is the very reverse of the truth. Mr. Chamberlain declared in the presence of the assembled Chambers of Commerce of the Empire, that he adopted the Toronto resolution, which was in favour of a revenue tariff, and that is the construction that hon. gentleman placed upon it himself. Now, Sir, the First Minister, in Toronto, on the 4th of June, 1896, is reported to have said—speaking then as leader of the Opposition:

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain—

I ask the attention of the House to this, because it sums up the whole case with a clearness, a perspicuity and an accuracy that I think are calculated to excite the admiration of the friends of preferential trade.

Now, the statesmen of Great Britain have taught that the governments of the colonies have come to a time when a new step can be taken in their development. What is that? That there should be a commercial agreement between England and the colonies. 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 in England a preference for their products over the products of other nations. What will be the possibilities of such a step if it was taken?

The hon. gentleman was then seeking power, not abusing it after he had got it.

We sell our goods in England. We send our wheat, our butter, our cheese, all our natural products, but there we have to compete with similar products from the United States, from Russia and from other nations. Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada; if the wheat, cheese and butter which we would send to England should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

Then the hon. gentleman was seeking the suffrages of the people. But not so when he begged England to turn her back upon that policy and to have nothing to do with preferential trade because it involved protection, and protection had been a curse to Canada, and he, as a Canadian, was anxious that England should be spared any such misfortune.

England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade.

There is the answer to the "Globe," there is the true answer, there is the policy of Mr. Chamberlain, as outlined in the clearest terms.

England does not expect that we should take her own system of free trade such as she has it; but I lay it before you that the thing the English people would expect in return is that, instead of a principle of protection, we should adopt a revenue form of tariff pure and simple. These are conditions on which we can have that boon.