

even should any difficulty arise under the resolution introduced by us in this House? That is the question I put the hon. gentleman.

And while I am upon this point, I would like to ask the ex-Finance Minister (Mr. Foster), who takes such strong ground on this point, whether in 1892 he was playing with the House and the country, when, at the close of his Budget speech, he used the language that I now beg to recall to his attention, and which he will find on record in the "Hansard" of that year. He was alluding to the fact that our neighbours to the south were not disposed to trade as freely with us as they should be, and he was looking forward to a portion of our trade with that country being stopped through the legislation that was being enacted there. If he had reason then to take that view, this Government have all the more reason now to adopt it, in view of the Dingley Bill, which has been introduced in the American Congress, and which, while we do not complain, will have the effect, if it becomes law, of stopping a portion of the trade now enjoyed by both countries. And this Government are determined by every legitimate means, acting in the best interests of the people, if one avenue is to be closed against them, to find other avenues. Now, what did the hon. gentleman say at the close of his speech, looking at the circumstances in existence then, and which are still in existence and stronger and more potent now:

So, Sir, I say we may face towards the old country, and for our varied products exploit those markets which are sure to prove profitable from their constant, and indeed, growing demands. And it may also be that, in the near future, considering this war of tariffs which is taking place the world over, considering the discriminating benefits which are given by some countries and denied by others, it may be worth the careful and thoughtful attention of the Government as to whether or not the time is not approaching, if it is not near at hand, when it will become the duty of this Government to hold out the hand of help to those that help us, to repay favour with favour, and interest with interest, and to give the best treatment in our markets to those countries which afford to us the best treatment in their markets.

Sir, there is nothing in that about a preferential tariff. I can remember the cheers with which it was greeted when the hon. gentleman sat down, and yet that same hon. gentleman stood up and denounced as unconstitutional, as something that should not be entertained in this House, the proposition put in force by us, which he himself was able to see would be beneficial, but never had the courage to adopt. Sir, the difference between the two parties is this. It is not a question as to whether we have done the right thing or not, because we are both agreed upon that. The difference is simply this, that he, knowing it to

be right, dared not do it, while we, knowing it to be right, did it.

The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke as if we had done something that was injurious to the best interests of our country. He said we had by our proposition thrown away the great advantage that was ours. He said that if this resolution, instead of being couched in the terms in which it was, contained an offer of preferential trade, stipulating that if Great Britain would put a tax upon the products of other countries and give us free access, while we lowered our duties somewhat in return, such a resolution proposed by Lord Salisbury in the House of Commons would carry immediately, and we would have preferential trade over the entire country. He did not then seem to see any difficulty in the German and Belgian treaties at all. What ground had he for this statement? Every one will admit that if Canada can obtain a preference in the markets of Great Britain, Canada would be very glad to receive it, and every legitimate means put forward to secure that would be hailed with pleasure by both sides. But I entirely deny that the course recommended by the hon. gentleman was the best. He proposes that we should not manifest any feeling, that we should awaken no enthusiasm, that we should excite no sympathy in the people on the other side, but should merely propose a cool and deliberate bargain, and say to the British Government: we will do nothing for you until you are prepared to do something for us. Sir, what will be the effect of this resolution, let me ask the hon. gentleman? What has been its effect upon the English people? We have not gone to them demanding the pound of flesh in return for what we concede; we have recognized the fact that this is a good step in our own interest, and we have recognized it all the more gladly because it is in consonance with our feelings to trade with the mother country. We have, of our own motion, said to the English people: We will give you advantages, though they are given to all nations that come within the provisions of that resolution—it applies, as they know, and as English statesmen know, directly to them in its operation. And what has been the result? Why, Sir, I venture to say that nothing has ever transpired in the history of Canada that has touched the English heart as has this very resolution which is denounced by the hon. gentleman. Who can read the expressions of their papers, when the very words I have made use of are to be found in their leading prints, without seeing that England has been more profoundly touched and moved than ever before, by this Act and its operation. No one can tell how far-reaching its effect may be. The hon. gentleman would make the country believe that we had weakened our position for receiving treatment from England

Mr. PATERSON.