

give preferential trade to Great Britain, and put it in the tariff just that way, and no other way, so that it would come into effect when Great Britain removed the treaties which prevented it from taking effect. Then we would have violated no treaties, we would have traversed no decisions. Then we would not have brought ourselves into humiliation and disgrace on every point taken by the Government, and the trade of Canada would not have been thrown into confusion, and we would not have had to eat the leek; and, in my view, it would have been infinitely more effective in Great Britain, for the people would have seen in the Canadian tariff an exclusive preference for British trade the moment they chose to allow it to go into operation by denouncing the German and Belgian treaties. That course would have obviated every difficulty; it would have appealed to the British mind infinitely more than the course which was adopted, and with that provision on our Statute-books, I doubt whether the right hon. gentleman would have dared to go over to the United Kingdom and raised his voice against preferential trade. It is a pity for Canada that this provision should not have been embodied somewhere, so that it would have controlled the right hon. gentleman.

To sum up. The right hon. gentleman is opposed to preferential trade because it involves protective preferential duties by England. This, he considers, would be a violation of free trade principles; this would be hurtful, primarily to Great Britain, and secondly to the colonies; therefore, he is opposed to preferential trade now, and, as preferential trade can never be brought about without a preference, which involves these very things, so his position is clear: he is opposed to preferential trade now and for ever.

I ask my hon. friend the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram), whether or not he declared in Toronto, that he was an ardent preferential trader, that he believed in it, and whether or not he canvassed votes on that statement? In his heart I believe he is, as the most of Toronto's business men are, preferential traders to a degree. He (Mr. Bertram) has heard the statement of his right hon. friend whom he follows. I ask him to settle in his own mind as to whither such a leader will lead him—a follower burning for preferential trade, and a leader burning with such an ardent desire to preserve the musty cobwebs of Cobdenism, that he is now and will be henceforth and for ever, opposed to preferential trade because it involves protective preferential duties being put on by Great Britain. A man cannot serve two masters and be honest with himself. If my hon. friend (Mr. Bertram) is a preferential trader from conviction, he must drive preferential trade into his leader, or, he cannot follow a leader who leads him into the depths of the Serbonian bog, rather

than into the light and freedom of commercial intercourse between the different parts of the British Empire.

I come now to mention another point in the Speech, in which it deals with the Yukon Railway project. We have not before us information as full as we should have had; that is locked up where so much other information is; in the breasts or in the pigeon-holes of the cabinet of this country. But we have certain information given to the Toronto "Globe," expanded a little by the mover of the Address (Mr. Bertram) and commented on very briefly by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government. The remarks I made this afternoon show my attitude with reference to this question from the *prima facie* point of view. This Government from the very start has shown a disposition to nullify the importance and the powers of Parliament. It did it in a high-handed way, when, after having voted down all the appropriations for the succeeding fiscal year, not only in detail, but a proposition to give a credit vote for two months; it then, when the elections were over and it was brought into power, by Governor General's warrants—a thing opposed to the spirit of the constitution, and to the actual legal enactment upon the Statute-books—this Government expended, or took power to expend nearly two millions of dollars. The Government made the next plunge on a railway deal, in which, without a resolution or authorization of this Parliament or a vote therefor—they having consequently as little power to undertake the arrangement as they would to drain the Red Sea—they undertook at a political crisis to administer a railroad not owned by the Government, and wrongfully involved this country into \$12,000 of expenses, and they had to come down and get themselves indemnified by having that sum voted by Parliament. Last year under the plea of urgency, a plea which has been utterly swept away by succeeding events—because the urgency of last year has prolonged itself into a year's time and the roads are not taken over, and the Minister of Railways is not in a position to operate them—but under a plea of urgency, on a matter which had never been discussed in this House, and for which there was no consent or resolution of the House, they bound themselves by a hard and fast contract to an expenditure which involved the setting aside of a capital of \$7,000,000 with which to meet that yearly expenditure. And, Sir, they dragooned their followers into voting that in this House, they dragooned the House into voting it too, and by what means? By means the most disreputable, Sir, that were ever employed by a Government in this country. An agreement which was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne is concluded, no papers laid on the Table of the House, a contract kept in the pocket of the Minister of Railways for nearly two months, and then at