

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It never was applied for yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seemed to me that the growth of the country since 1882 had really given us that power without any formal motion and simply by the growth of constitutional usage.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am surprised that my hon. friend should make any such statement in view of the facts in the case we are discussing. What are these facts? A treaty was negotiated between the British ambassador at Washington and the United States secretary of state, Mr. John Hay. That treaty had to be ratified by the constituent powers—the President and Senate of the United States—and His Majesty the King. Before it was ratified, the Canadian government made the strongest possible representations against its going any further on account of the personality of the men chosen as jurists by the United States. We sent despatch after despatch protesting that the selection made by the United States was a direct violation of the treaty. Nevertheless, the treaty was ratified by His Majesty the King upon the advice of his ministers. But, suppose we had had our own treaty-making power, suppose the matter had been in our own hands, that would never have happened. The reason we ask the power is that we may be the masters of the situation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did not my right hon. friend guard against that by providing that the treaty should be ratified by the Canadian parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That would not have met the case. The British government could have ratified that treaty against our advice and we would not be any more advanced. We would have the spectacle of the Canadian parliament on the one side and His Majesty the King on the other. That shows the necessity of our having the whole treaty-making power in our own hands, so that, from the first step to the last, we may be the masters and deal with it, subject to the advice of the King of England. However, I do not propose to deal at length with this question at present. The papers will be brought down at an early date, and then we can take up the subject again and discuss it at such length as its importance demands.

But when my hon. friend came to the subject of the condition of the country, on which my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Grant) spoke with so much warmth and vigour, he could take no exception at all to the statement made regarding it in the speech from the Throne. In fact the condition of the country is simply marvellous. In no part of the world has there been any such development as there has

been in Canada since 1896. Canada has developed in every direction in a manner which no one could have foreseen some few years ago. True, our hon. friends opposite are not disposed to give us any credit for that prosperity. They attribute it entirely to Divine Providence. My hon. friend says that Providence has been kind to us. I admit that. No one can deny that Divine Providence has been very kind indeed, and we certainly have to thank Providence especially for having inspired us to adopt the tariff we did in 1897. But gentlemen on the other side are not satisfied with the action of Providence. They do not think that Providence has done well. They think they can do better and say that Providence does not understand its business. My hon. friends have different methods from ours of dealing with the tariff. Our method is to revise the tariff when the time comes. My hon. friend blames us for having said nothing about the revision of the tariff in the speech from the Throne. I have only to say to him that I never saw a revision of the tariff announced in a speech from the Throne. That comes properly in the budget speech. Whether there is to be or not to be a revision of the tariff is a question to be discussed by the Minister of Finance when he presents his budget and not before. It would hardly be consistent with a proper understanding of parliamentary government to announce in the speech from the Throne that there was to be a revision of the tariff, or that there was to be no such revision. That would give rise to speculations one way or the other. It is never safe, therefore, to deal with this subject until the moment has come, and then everybody has to take the revision as it is given. But my hon. friend has a way of reforming the action of Providence, and his way of doing this is by providing the country with what he calls 'adequate protection.' But what is adequate protection? My hon. friend has spoken often of adequate protection, but he has always been very judiciously indefinite. 'Adequate protection' may mean everything or it may mean nothing—'you pays your money and you takes your choice.' The man who favours general revision is free to say, 'This is the thing for me; I am to have my most extravagant hopes realized.' On the other hand the man who wants but little change can say, 'I am satisfied with things as they are, and I know that very little change will be made.' But, though my hon. friend tells us little or nothing we know at last what 'adequate protection' means. The cat has been let out of the bag by the newspaper which has become the chief organ of the Conservative party, the Montreal 'Star.' That journal is fighting their battle all over the country and is giving to the electors the explanations which they cannot get from the leader of the opposition. If you