

ing not more than ten men. We might then expect to have Canada obtain the same justice as any other country would, for I do not believe there is any other country which deals with Great Britain in this way—getting nothing in return for something substantial given. There is no country in the world dealing with Great Britain or with Canada which does not insist on a quid pro quo for what it gives. In fact the argument of the government simply amounts to this: We do not know how to do this thing, you think you can do it, but we will not even ask you to assist us. On the contrary, we will declare that it is not in the interests of the country to do it because we do not know how. That is the whole sum and substance of their position. I would appeal to these hon. gentlemen opposite to take a more patriotic course, a more loyal course to Canada, and support this resolution. Let them do as they did with regard to binder twine, in which they admitted we had got the best of them. Let them hedge before it is too late and support this resolution, and we will have a unanimous vote. The position taken by the government is simply a declaration of incompetence, and inability to do the first piece of business they ought to have applied themselves to, one which they have been professing to deal with for some years, and which they claim to have at their finger ends. Yet they have accomplished nothing and will not even try to accomplish anything. Because forsooth public men on the other side of the Atlantic say we cannot get what we desire, they say we will not worry them with trying to get it, and lay ourselves open to the charge of not being loyal. But has England ever accused her subjects of being disloyal because they did their duty to those who put their trust in them? Does King Edward expect us to deceive the people who have entrusted us with the administration of their affairs in order that we may show him that we are loyal? Would he not, on the contrary, prefer that the government should show its loyalty by carrying out the trust reposed in it? Would the most loyal man in England blame the parliament of the Dominion for asserting its right in a legitimate and proper way? The argument that it would not be loyal to ask from England anything more than we are getting is childish in the extreme.

The right hon. the First Minister drew a very pathetic picture. He depicted the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) going to England and talking to the workmen and asking them for a preference, and he depicted their replying to the hon. the leader of the opposition: If we do this thing for you, what are you going to give us in return? And the leader of the opposition would reply: Oh, as we are protectionists people, you must not expect us to give you anything. But did not the right hon. gentleman, by this very illustration, convict

himself of wrong-doing. Because what did he say when he went to the workmen in England and gave them this preference in our market? Did he ask them for anything in return? He points out that the English workmen would want something in return for what he gave us. But did the right hon. gentleman ask Mr. Chamberlain what he was going to give in return for this preference? No, he came away with the Cobden medal and that satisfied him.

But if this matter were put before Great Britain as it should be, if the right and justice of our case were made out, we would accomplish one of two things. We would either get a preference in return for that which we give, or we would be perfectly within our rights in withdrawing the preference we have given, and thus show that we are not children and fools. I do not wish to detain the House longer, as I know there are a great many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who wish to speak. But as I have said at the beginning, I could not allow some of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite to pass unchallenged. I could not sit in silence—my constituents would blame me if I had, I say, sat here in silence—while things were said which they no more than I could give assent to.

Before sitting down, I must touch upon one matter referred to by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcl) — touched upon by that hon. gentleman very improperly and indiscreetly, it seems to me, touched upon in order to make the most capital he could for the premier of the government which he follows in this House. In a speech devoted to questions of race and religion, brought in under the excuse of being allowed to wander far afield and not stick to the question of the budget, which is before the House, he appealed to every one on the floor of the House to witness that all here were proud of the Prime Minister. If he means to speak of the Prime Minister in his individual capacity, I have nothing to say against the hon. gentleman's remarks. But if he meant, as I understood him to mean, that every one was proud of the Prime Minister in his official capacity, then I feel it my duty to my constituents to say that I am not proud of the Prime Minister nor are my constituents proud of him. And why are we not proud of him? Because, Mr. Speaker, he had it in his power, occupying the position he does, at a most prosperous time and at a time when Canada filled a large place in the eyes of the people of the empire—not because of anything that he had done, but because he was fortunate enough to be the premier of the country at the time when the fruit was ripe which had been sowed long before he knew how to reap it—to do honour to his country and to secure great benefit to his country, yet he showed that he was not fit to be trusted with the affairs of the country. Because, when he was in England he did not try