

and vociferous acclamation, pounding his arguments in by striking his desk. I was perfectly astounded, carried away, mesmerized, for my respect for the hon. gentleman is such that I accepted his statements as being founded upon fact. Listening to his arguments, I thought that the Conservative party were done for. If the government had saved so many millions of dollars to the people of this country, there was no use in the Conservative party undertaking to compete with such a government. He set forth the reductions that had been made in the tariff, and, by the way, I do not think that he did it with very much respect for the party on this side of the House; for he placed two tariffs side by side, calling one 'our tariff' and the other 'the old Tory tariff.' I do think that we should try to elevate the tone of debate in this House, and when we refer to the party opposed to us, it should be done with that degree of respect which becomes discussion in the House of parliament. But I find that nearly all the reductions referred to in the hon. gentleman's statement had been made by the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) in 1894, and that the present government had placed on the free list only twenty-one articles altogether, against hundreds placed on the free list by the Conservative party. Among these twenty-one articles are four different kinds of steel, which really are only one article. Counting them as such, we have eighteen articles only placed upon the free list by hon. gentlemen opposite. I do think that when hon. gentlemen address this House they ought to observe the principle of honesty and fair-play in presenting their arguments.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a few words about the principles of the great Liberal party in the Dominion of Canada. I have observed that when we touch upon that subject—what some hon. gentlemen call broken pledges, but what I will call the principles of the Liberal party—hon. gentlemen opposite become perplexed and worried. Why? Have we not a right to speak about those pledges? Have we not a right to make some reference to them? When were those pledges made? They were made when the Liberal party were appealing to the country to be returned to power. They made certain promises to the electors in order to obtain power, and we have a right to know what those promises were, and to hold them firmly to the promises and the pledges they made. Did they say that the Conservative party was corrupt and extravagant? Well, Sir, have they been anything else since they obtained power? Did they say the Conservative party had increased the public debt, had increased the expenditure? Have they lessened the public debt and the public expenditure? Here are a few of the principles of the great Liberal party: Free trade, reduced expenditure, reduced public debt, purity in elections, independence of parlia-

ment, superannuation and prohibition. Now, how many of these pledges have they carried out? Have they given us free trade as a fiscal policy? No, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate them for not having done so. Have they reduced the expenditure? By no means, they have increased it by millions. Have they reduced the public debt? By no means, they have increased the public debt. Now, Sir, what shall I say about purity of elections?

An hon. MEMBER. Impurity of elections.

Mr. BELL (Addington). No, I do not want to call it impurity of elections; but I do say that there is no man in this House feels more keenly than I do the disgrace that has been brought upon this fair Dominion of ours by the corrupt practices they have introduced in elections.

Sir, another promise given by the Liberal party was to procure reciprocity with the United States. We were told that the markets of 70,000,000 people were our natural markets, that it was in our interest we should have reciprocal trade with the United States. Some hon. gentlemen deny that, I think the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has denied it. But we have on record statements made by the Premier himself and by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others. I will not repeat these statements, but I will quote a statement made by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce before he became a member of the government. He made a speech in my county during the campaign, where the hon. gentleman frowned severely on the corruption of the Conservative party, and he frowned on protection. You know, that when that hon. gentleman smiles he smiles most serenely, but when he frowns, Mr. Speaker, I will not undertake to describe it. I have here a report made by a reporter of the speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the village of Harrowsmith, in the county of Addington, and I know that it is correct. He said:

The national policy had ruined the country, real estate in consequence not worth one-half what it was previous to 1878; nothing would save Canada from utter financial ruin but unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, with sixty-six millions at our door; absurd to think we could build up a profitable trade with Great Britain, 3,000 miles away. And, oh, the robbery of that horrible national policy, robbing the poor, not for the benefit of the whole, but solely for the benefit of those cormorants, the voracious manufacturers. He dwelt on cotton, sugar, coal oil, the millions taken from the poor on such articles. Coal oil, something awful; the poor, down-trodden workingman—

How sympathetic he was.

—paying 14 cents a gallon. If it were not for that abominable national policy, we could buy the best for 8 cents—'just think of the sin of it.'

These cormorants would sell cotton cheaper to the Chinamen than to the people of Addington. Away with protection; cotton would be