

anything in return, in pure love and affection, to give this mighty boon to Great Britain. The hon. gentleman has the most remarkable faculty of any public man I ever knew for never making any two speeches alike on any public question.

The **PRIME MINISTER** (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I know some who have quite a different quality.

Sir **CHARLES TUPPER**. Quite so, and I would rather be known to the end of time as one who repeated the same sentiments than to be fairly charged with never making two speeches alike, and never maintaining a principle a second time, but always making every speech a contradiction of a previous one. I have watched the hon. gentleman's career, and have studied his public speeches with the greatest care and attention. I ask any hon. gentleman on either side of the House to name a single principle, a single public question, upon which the right hon. gentleman has affirmed anything without afterwards turning his back upon that position and affirming exactly the opposite. In my judgment, this is a fatal characteristic. If there is one thing more than another of vital importance to the country it is that there should be faith in the statements of public men. I charge the right hon. gentleman here and now with having violated every principle he ever professed. I know not a single exception, I am open to conviction, and if it can be shown that I am wrong upon a single point and if the hon. gentleman can name a single issue upon which he has not repudiated his own utterances, I stand ready to tender him an apology. On the other hand, I can name a score of the most important public questions on which he has at one time advanced one opinion and at another time the very contrary, just as I have proved that he did with regard to the question of preferential trade. In England he told them that this preference was a great boon. I wonder if the hon. gentleman does not think that the intelligent people of England will call to mind the old maxim "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes." Does he not think that they will begin to wonder how this was paraded as such a boon to them when they find that it has been followed by the reduction of their trade with this country of three and a half millions below the worst year they ever experienced before? But the hon. gentleman again, in that wonderful acrobatic style of which he is past master, vaults to the other side on his appearance in Canada. In England this was a mighty boon given to them, but he no sooner reaches Montreal or Toronto than he presents it in an entirely different aspect as a great sacrifice that England was asked to make for Canada, that they had to sacrifice 60 to 40 per cent in order to denounce the treaties. And thus on the same instrument and with the same theme he

plays an entirely different tune on this side of the Atlantic from that he played on the other. I do not think that that style of policy will last very long. It may do once, but I do not think that you can repeat it with the intelligent English people; and I think that great humiliation is in store for Canada when the English people learn, as they are learning by bitter experience, that they have been completely deluded, and that, notwithstanding all the furore, this preferential trade with Canada which was to have been such a boon was not merely a myth, but the very reverse of an advantage.

Now, not to show any undue partiality, I desire to say a few words to my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies). I dare say that hon. gentlemen opposite remember that there was a great convention of the Liberal party held in this city in 1893. They then settled what was to be the policy of the party. Many policies had been discussed and promulgated through the country, but now they came together and made a policy or pretended to do so. Then the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was sent as a missionary to the maritime provinces to explain what the change in policy was. He told them that there had been a good deal of misunderstanding with this unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, but this was all settled, and the party had agreed upon their policy for the future—it was to be a pure free trade policy. Speaking in 1893, he said:

Well, gentlemen, I say no more. Whatever doubts or differences there may have been about our trade policy in times past, there is none now. Our platform is clear and definite. To-day the people stand face to face with such an issue, and the next contest is to be won between free trade and protection.

He wanted to show what free trade was. He did not mean absolute free trade—nobody supposed that—but a revenue tariff. He said:

A 17½ or 20 per cent tariff was high enough to give protection to the manufacturer. If it were not, the manufacturer should go down.

Why did he allow a manufacturer, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) to make a 30 per cent tariff? I am glad he did so, as I think it was in the interest of Canada. But the hon. gentleman when he does that, must not claim to be a free trader. But what does the hon. gentleman suppose is the rate of duty exacted by the Government of Canada upon English goods under this preferential policy during this year? It is no less than 30.69 per cent. The hon. gentleman declared that a 17½ per cent tariff was enough, but upon the goods brought from England the duty charged was over 30 per cent.

My hon. friend and I had a little controversy on the question of discrimination, and I dare say that he remembers it. I thought