

self, upon going so far back upon every conviction that he had formerly declared he held, and as to this year of grace 1899, taking seven and a third more millions out of the poor white blood that was left in the farmers and the people of this country, and terrible to tell, in this story of decadence and deterioration, the hon. gentleman cannot find time to sit down and indict an article to the people of Great Britain, whom he was so anxious to enlighten then. as to the extra bleeding process which is taking place to-day in one of Her Majesty's dominions. It has been said that the exports and imports have increased, and it is referred to here as being the volume of exports. We have here no figures as to the volume of exports; everything that is stated by hon. gentlemen opposite is as to the value of exports, not the volume. When we come to take up the financial aspect of the question, as we will later, I think we shall be prepared to show that volumes and values are very different as applied in different periods, to the imports and exports of this country. Three years ago we imported into this country more than \$10,000,000 worth of iron goods representing a certain volume; should that same volume, in the same way, be introduced into this country in the year 1899, the values of that import would be, at least, double of what the values were in 1895, while the volume would be exactly the same. Apply that to the heightened scale of prices which runs along the whole line nearly, with the sole exception of one or two staples that the farmers of this country have to sell, the farmers' wheat for instance, apply the same argument in that way, and I think hon. gentlemen will crawl down a little from their high and mighty position, as comparing the volumes of trade, when they are really simply comparing the values of trade in two different periods. Let me go to another point. I noticed a strange conjunction—I thought it strange, but I do not now—I noticed a strange, as I thought, and a somewhat forced conjunction in this paragraph:

I have been instructed to convey to you Her Majesty's high appreciation of the loyalty and patriotism thus displayed, which—

And there something else follows. The two paragraphs preceding that and the paragraph succeeding it all have reference, solely and wholly, to the Transvaal war and to the contingents and in the essence of consistency and uniformity of composition and idea, no extraneous matter ought to have been dragged, by force, into this paragraph lying between them. But hon. gentlemen opposite could not forego the small opportunity of hitching on one of their pet policies to the question of the Transvaal war, and there is the conjunction:

—which, following the preference granted under the present tariff to articles of British manufacture, has had the happiest effect in cementing

Mr. FOSTER.

and intensifying the cordial relations subsisting between Canada and the mother country.

But these hon. gentlemen are not looking for political effect. They do not want to tie any of their little paper theories on to this great and tremendous and all absorbing question of a united empire—the aid of all the colonies and the fighting out of the destinies of Great Britain on the plains of the Transvaal. They are away above a thing of that kind. I said, that I thought it was a strange conjunction, but I can see exactly how it happened to come in. Whoever drafted it had in his mind the blunders of the administration. Why have we this partial preferential policy to-day? Because these hon. gentlemen never having intended it were forced into it and had to take it as the less of two evils. Does anybody on the other side of the House pretend to deny that? I will quote from my friend, the 'Onlooker' of the administration, who having leisure on his hands in that position, will have his memory unobscured and be able to keep in touch with all these varying phases of the policy of a varying administration. When he introduced—no, not he. He ought have done it by right; but, when the gentlemen by his side introduced the financial policy of the government in 1897, did they introduce a preference policy for Great Britain? No, Sir. They denied it. The motto then was: All the world for Canada. Oh, they were broad-minded men. The whole world was their theatre, and they were not going to be bound down to trade with a country of one million inhabitants, and another country of twenty million inhabitants, and another country of five millions. Oh, no; the whole world was to be open to this business administration, and they meant to take it for Canadian trade. And when it was suggested that this was a preference meant for Great Britain—at least that must be enjoyed only by Great Britain in view of the existing Belgian and German treaties, what did the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) say? He said:

I say with respect to the offer we are now making, that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true, legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it, and so may the Germans and Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it on the same terms and the same conditions on which England may take advantage of it.

And, when I interjected:

And the United States.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) answered:

If the Americans are willing to give us full and fair reciprocal advantages.

And did not these gentlemen opposite believe that the Americans were so willing?