

can make it 12½ per cent, or 25 per cent, or 33 per cent, or 100 per cent if you like, and I do not think it will make very much difference. The government may have found it convenient to establish this preferential tariff. But what benefit has it been to Great Britain. Has it increased our imports from Great Britain? I will not trouble the House with figures of the amount of importations, but I will only give the percentage to show the effect that the preferential tariff has had on Great Britain. The increase of total imports to Canada for home consumption, from Great Britain, during the three years from 1896 to 1899, is 12½ per cent, the increase from the United States, is 50 per cent, from France, 28 per cent, from Germany, 24 per cent, from Spain, 48 per cent, from Portugal, 30 per cent, from Italy, 52 per cent, from Holland, 67 per cent, from Belgium, 151 per cent, and from South America, 107 per cent. So that in all these countries the increased imports to Canada have been very much greater—doubled in many instances and in some instances ten-fold greater—than in the case of Great Britain. Has the preference increased our importations from Great Britain? It has not. Our importations from Great Britain have not increased in proportion to the increase from other countries with reference to which there was no preference, and consequently it has not benefited the people of Great Britain. And how has the preferential tariff benefited Canada? I put the question to some hon. gentlemen who may speak after me. If the preferential tariff of 1897 and 1899 was the great success that the Liberals claimed for it, I would like to ask the government why they found it necessary to increase that preference from 25 to 33½ per cent? Have they been obliged to do it in order to carry out the threat made by some gentlemen in the cabinet—I charge this not on the Premier, but more particularly on the Minister of Trade and Commerce, (Sir Richard Cartwright)—have they increased the preference for the purpose of carrying out his threats that the Liberals would destroy the industries of Canada? There is another feature of this, which I do not think is at all fair. The Liberals assured the manufacturers that when the 25 per cent preference came into force, that would be the limit of it. But, they have increased the preference still further, and let me ask what is to be the finality? What are the manufacturers of Canada to understand? Now, Sir, as regards preferential trade itself, I am strongly in favour of Canada having preferential trade with Great Britain, and I believe that nothing would confer greater benefit on Canada to-day than would be a wise and prudent system of preferential trade between the two countries. We cannot complain that we are paying too much for what we are buying, but our great need is to find a market for our products, and

that can only be found in a country where they are greater consumers than they are producers. What we want is a market for our natural products, and when we get that to the full extent we will add largely to the prosperity of Canada.

I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), is not present, because I wish to speak of a matter personal to him. I approach this subject with a feeling of timidity and with the greatest caution. I wish not to say a word that could be construed in any way as if I were endeavouring to introduce into this House what has been called a race or a religious cry. Permit me to say, Sir, that there is no man in this parliament who holds broader and wider views than I do, on the great questions that are agitating this country amongst Christian denominations. No man dare charge me, that I have not the same respect for the right hon. gentleman who leads this government because he is a Frenchman and a Catholic, as I would have did he belong to another race and another religion. It is something that never crosses my mind. I care not how he worships or what particular church he goes to on Sunday, when he is ready to join me on Monday morning with the right hand of fellowship extended, working shoulder to shoulder with me with the same aspirations to advance the interests of this grand Dominion of ours, and to make here happy homes for ourselves, our wives and our children. There seems to be some peculiarity about the talk of raising race and religious cries in this parliament. If gentlemen on the other side of the House introduce race and religious cry, and we on this side refer to it ever so cautiously, or make any defence whatever, then we are charged with raising these unfortunate issues. I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to refer to an attack that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), made upon the Orange order, of which I am a humble member. The hon. gentleman without any provocation went out of his way to make an accusation which might better never have been made on the floor of this House. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), in his speech on the budget, said:

I remember when an Orange demonstration was engineered in the city of Montreal for the express purpose of setting religion against religion and race against race if it were to the detriment of the Liberal party. What did these men care then, or what do they care now if the streets of Montreal were to run red provided always that they scored a point against a Liberal administration.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? That we Orangemen would be guilty of murder or massacre, of dipping our hands in innocent blood, for party purposes. I say that a more slanderous, false accusation was never uttered by mortal man in this House.