

**Sir C. H. Tupper Greeted With an
Overflowing House Last
Night.**

The Policy of the Government Defined and Explained—Protection Vs. Free Trade.

Attitude of the Administration on the Great Questions Specially Affecting British Columbia.

The opera house was crowded from floor to roof Monday night to hear Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, address the electors of Victoria. Sir Charles appeared on the platform surrounded by a large number of gentlemen prominent in the business and political life of the city and province. To his left sat Hon. Theodore Davis and Senator Macdonald; on his right, Lieut.-Col. Prior, M.P., Thos. Earle, M.P., F. Barnard, M.P., and Hon. G. B. Martin. Behind sat several rows of gentlemen numbering members of the legislature and other leading men, including many members of the Liberal Conservative Club. After a burst of applause interrupted by some cannon-noise made by the guns in the audience, the orator of the evening was introduced.

Lieut. Colonel Prior in a few opening remarks, presented Sir Charles to the audience. The province had been more fortunate than usual during the past few years in being visited by some of Canada's leading public men. Sir Charles had been in the province that Hon. G. E. Foster had visited in 1891 and last summer Hon. Mr. Laurier the silver tongued orator. (Liberal applause.) Now to-night they were visited by Sir Charles Robertson. (Lupper applause.) We thought that Sir Charles was the only man whose house was not one of the least man-to-manly in the province. Sir Charles came from a province with riches of lumber and fish like our own, and a province that turned out as much of the best of itself as we. And as British Columbia had just been a long time might come when British Columbia could run its budding politicians with the best of them. The Chairman also paid a compliment to the ladies of whom many of the most interesting ladies showed by their presence.

[illegible]

Now, ladies and gentlemen, some people say that we are on the eve of a general election. And some people think that politicians such as I, or those better, or those worse, are so anxious to make their best bow before you, that they will do anything they possibly can. I may to some extent not have the entire confidence of this meeting. But if you will allow me to make a simple childish confession, I will be very ready to acknowledge that I believe that I may not know when a general election is to take place; that I have never heard the question discussed in the House of Commons at Ottawa; but that I have heard some of the members of the government of the day at Ottawa, those who do not at present advise the Governor-General on those questions, that an election will be held at this time is fixed, and that though the day is not known, the month is to be February next. I have, an absolutely in the dark upon that point. But whether the election come in February or in March, or in April, or in May, or later or sooner, you will not find a gentleman who has travelled across this continent who will tell you that the Liberal-Conservatives on the Atlantic are in the slightest degree anxious as to when the election shall be. Applause. And I should do so without any idea that I can make a vote; I hope that I can leave this province without having lost a vote that should have been given to the Liberal-Conservatives. I have been in this province at this season of the year because I believed it to be my duty to come. And I have been more than gratified by the welcome which I have received. And I have also had the great pleasure of giving assistance at every hand in regard to the questions which, for some time, at any rate, no matter what your politics may be, must be considered by the government of the day. And it would be a great time for the Conservative party, and if you will allow me to say so, a sorry time for the province of British Columbia and the spirit of the people of this part of the Dominion's domain, if the government of the day by Sir John Thompson could not obtain in any part of Canada at least a respectful hearing. I enter upon the discussion to-day with no other object in my mind, than to say no fear whatever on another. I am not on the discussion of questions that interest you and with the solution of which the government of the day of which I am a member is concerned. The first duty that I shall perform this evening is to say that I cannot do adequate justice to them, or

you; but I have at the present moment not the slightest degree of fear that I will not receive at your hands the same courtesy that has been shown to me at every representative gathering that I have already met in the city of Victoria, and that I will receive at your hands that attention and indulgence that is extended to men occupying my position, in any part of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Laurier was received with open arms in this city. I was glad of it. It was a relief to him; it was due to the position that he holds. He has charms of many kinds, and he holds a position that at all times should win for him at the least courtesy and kindly regard. I think that the position that it is only right he should be treated with is a position of respect; for when you see him again I firmly believe he will be holding it still. (Applause.) I take it that Mr. Laurier should be forgiven well; I think that sympathy should be freely extended to him. E. Ross had been heavy, his political views were checked, and I think that, after all is said and done, considering that when at the last general election he was advocating a policy apparently aneignous to the position that he was then in, I am convinced that it was the better for him to have been so. I think that the people are convinced that the well being of every man in Canada, and considering that, when he saw you, after that general election, he had not one word to say about that policy, that he was not going to come back, that he was not your indulgence. What did you have to say, Mr. Laurier from this platform? What did any man at any of the eighteen meetings that he addressed in the province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories and in the Northwest, say to you? I think that I may to-night that no reporter ever noted that he had one word to say, good, bad or indifferent, for the policy upon which all your fortunes hung in the balance at the last general election—the policy of continuing the policy of the last general election. Anything of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity? Did he tell you that under that policy and that policy alone could you hope for a development of your fisheries, of your wealth in minerals, of your agricultural resources? Did he tell you that the people of the Northwest Territories and every horse would have \$10 more in value put upon him; that the lands in our country, far and near, would jump at once until the value was increased by \$50 an acre? He told you not a syllable of that; and yet those are the things that he is now saying. I heard them session after session; I heard them from the stump; I heard all those promises at the last general election in the East. And to his credit, and to your credit, that he has given me the best of the park, he never deceived me. One single argument that character which he put before the peo-

But they are on the eve of a great trial. It is true they have put away on the shelf those policies and promises of old times, and they have endeavored to dazzle your eyes and my eyes with something entirely new and novel. The policy, I understand, in this city has been discussed recently; and as a Conservative you will pardon me for having been anxious to find that after that discussion the people of this city were not you, his faithful followers here in conclave assembled only a night or two ago were discussing and endeavoring to ascertain what it really meant. (Applause. — Voices: No!) I am glad to hear that. I am glad to hear, too, and I wish to God that none was to-night, that I wish we could meet in a new policy, a new state and new definition as the policy that has been governed by the policy of this city since 1878. (Applause.) Good or bad, this policy has been hanging there, so that anyone who runs may read. But can any man seriously tell you that there is an element of honor in the policy of this city? Can any man in connection with a policy that is defined in one breath to be a policy of free trade; that in another breath is a policy of free trade as near as may be; in another breath, a policy of free trade as near as may be; and free trade as they have it in England, and then with a conclusion that though that is the policy it is only an ideal; that after the next general election, as Mr. Laurier told us, the policy of this city should not promise you free trade, but that he will have the goal? (Hear, hear.) When is it to be reached? Can anyone here tell me? I have come thousands of miles, and if I can find the secret that has been revealed to me in the city of Victoria, then I will have come this distance in vain. No man on the Atlantic coast can read that riddle. No man in any city in the Eastern Provinces can tell me what the tariff is, or what is the Liberal triumph at the election. And, with all respect I say it, there is no man in this hall — there is no man in this city — that can rise up and tell me what the tariff is, or what the tariff is, or what the most complete triumph at the election. (Applause.) What does tariff for revenue only mean? I can fancy some man telling me — (A voice: No hoode!) Now, are we going to discuss tariff or hoode? I discuss both. I have nothing to say about both (applause); but let us stick to the subject. Don't try to evade; if you want to interrupt me give me intelligent interruption, give me a straight answer. Why do we put a tariff for revenue only, for the credit of the city give me some other answer than it means "no hoode." Make something plainer than that. I am not here to advocate every element of the tariff, but I am here for the whole consideration, as I must leave it in your hands when my voice stops.

From 1878 until now you have always known what the policy of the Liberal-Conservatives was as to the tariff, and be it good or bad, as free men, be you or I, you ought to know, you ought to know definitely and exactly what the policy that is to take its place. Our friends beat about the bush; you ask, and they will tell you, "That is all very well; but is not the tariff in the opposition to define a direct policy?"

Unfair? What is there unfair about it? Upon the solicitation of business men are they afraid to define their policy on the question of prohibition? Are they afraid to define their policy on the question of school taxes? Are they afraid to define their policy on the question of subsidies to railways? Are they afraid to define their policy on the question of subsidies to steamship lines? Are they afraid to discuss their policy on the question of the proposed international convention of one of the grandest rivers on the face of the globe—though it happens to be in our own country? Are they afraid to give their opinion on the hundred and one questions that are before the House, and which are decided every session? You know as well as I do that on all those other questions they have taken their stand, right or wrong; and on this question of trade they have had opportunity to give their opinion, as reforms have been proposed as changes have been suggested, to define exactly and in terms

what the lines will be that they will go upon. But while our friends are anxious to fish, to catch the fish, to get the fish, our traders who come to settle in our midst, from the British trade nation, from the mother land, who are they are anxious as politicians to draw all these fish to their nets, they find there here where experience in this country has made them so sure to find they have been engaged in with them also. And what do you reckon with them also. And every general election? I give you my experience; you have your own; compare it, if you please. I went into parliament in 1832. I have been again since, and have been engaged in several general elections. I have heard long-mouthed and ranting free-traders in the house of parliament. I have met them in different parts of the country. But I tell you that the voice of the free trader is low, and the voice of the protection comes when he has to ask for the vote of the people of this country and answer the question, "Are you in favor of protection to native industries or are you not?" Go back to the States. Ask if you like; read his address in 1832. He says, "I am a protection man; read his speech in the face of the manufacturers of Montreal; and if you can find any prospect of free trade in those ut-

herances you will find what no other man has ever found. But you will find this confusion on meeting the manufacturers, who are selling their goods to the ville, government and the extravagance of the Tories, so large a sum of money has to be obtained from these people every year for free trade is impossible; that \$300,000,000 of profit is sent to the manufacturers, \$100,000,000 of \$38,000,000 now—it is no better in that respect—had to be raised by hook or by crook to carry on the affairs of the Dominion of Canada, every year; and that the manufacturers are getting more revenue being such—free trade in this country is impossible, and the manufacturer had therefore nothing to fear. Would the manufacturers have nothing to fear, think you, if they could believe that these arguments were being put forward in such terms, in magnificent terms? were founded upon any serious determination? But we will come a little later on to that. I merely call your attention to this fact that as an example of the kind of the kind of periods you have the anti-mortem deposits of the Liberal party, so to speak, that they didn't know it was loaded," that "they didn't mean what they said," and "they were free trade, and that the votes of the electors were really in the perspective of that consideration." "We have had all that since 1873; you know that as well as I do. But still Mr. Laurier, I think, possibly believes that the victory is nearer than they think it is, and is nearer than ever—it could not be farther away. I never knew a day when the Liberal party went into a fight so utterly destitute of material and resources as at the present time. I may be wrong, but I think I can make the prediction that the result will be very similar to the experience of one of our city avengers, who when he took a bear into his country and had heard of the far-famed strength of the bear, he was so suspicious and anxious to ascertain what that ferocity amounted to, started off, and when he came to the field where the bull was, said: "In this the little bull is very strong," he said, "and he said, "That is the little bull," and he said, "It is a very small bear; do you mind my going over to him to take a look at him?" O, certainly not," "I would like to know how he will turn out," and the farmer said he had not the slightest objection to his tackling the little bull. So he went into the yard and took the bull by the nose, and the result was that after four or five minutes of the bear's looking on consciousness, he opened his eyes and said, "How far did I throw that bull?" (Great laughter and applause. I think after the general election Mr. Laurier will be able to say he threw that bull

There is anything the Britisher likes, or a man waving the flag, it is the plainest of things. Now then, a gentleman in this audience suggested something about boodle. And it is an offensive term, I suppose. As any rate he has heard one side; let me give him for a few moments the other side. Mr. Laurier has said that he has written a letter to the Government, in which he has said that he would where he made eighty speeches, as I understand, descended into this line of argument. Now, I may be misinformed, I have it only second-hand of course—that after Ingratiation I may be right. (Applause.) Give us your policy. Mr. dear Sir, your policy is written on the wall. (Applause.) I cannot convince any Britisher that my policy is better than his. At this late day I may say by it. But am going to have some for it. (Applause.) Now, with your policy (Applause.) Now, that is what I am informed of the modus operandi; and I may be wrong. But in ingratiating himself in his most winning manner, Mr. Laurier has won with all the audiences, Mr. Laurier after getting a sort of reputation of being a very fair-minded man, struck the very fondest blow, straight below the belt, as I think, into the honour and the credit of my opponent. He has taken a sands of mile away from him. I would be glad to know that it was not so; but after I get through referring to some of his references I fancy no man will be able to do so. (Applause.) It will affect the honor of every man in the Dominion cabinet. And I am claiming at the hands of this audience—as I would at the hands of any audience of my fellow-countrymen—that I am entitled to ask them to question before they form their conclusions. (Applause.) Now then, time will not permit me to go into every subject of boodles, of scandal, of slander—slander, that fondest of all vices, of which I have heard a great deal of one of his charges. I will ask you to make now. I will ask you to form conclusions, not from his charges but from the facts that go either to support or to refute

Now, Mr. Laurier could not have made a more serious charge than to be made on this platform or in this city. It affected the honor of every member of the cabinet at Ottawa. It affected your dearest rights. And I say, as a Canadian, that if there was any man in the Government of Canada to which I am going to refer, you would not be men—you not be worthy of your citizenship, you would not be worth living—if you did not rise up en masse and as one man demand of the Government of Canada, that the Government of Canada should be more conservative, from now on. There could be no worse scandal suggested than the one to which I refer. What was it? He charged that for political reasons the Minister of Justice, the Attorney-General of Canada, had recommended His Excellency to release of two prisoners from jail. And I say that the man that will do that, the man that for political reasons will give liberty to two prisoners, that man should not be given to convict. He is a man who has committed other infringement of the rights of citizens, or at the release of other prisoners, or undue incarceration of other prisoners. There could not be a fouler blot on justice than that. I say that the man who has done this, McGreevey and Connolly were granted their release from jail for political reasons on the recommendation of the Attorney-General and the Prime Minister of this country. And I say that this charge was not made

not be first heard from a public platform or the stump; but you would hear of him in sentences from the mouths of his political opponents. His only statement, that on a certain day an important state document were to be laid on the table of the house and a serious debate was to be challenged, where the minister was to put upon their defence, and on that subject he was silent, was the only thing he did, of any government. I exaggerate this in no way. It was held up to you as something to consider before you cast your votes at the next general election. Now, I am here to prove and establish that a meander or more towards the right was the only thing that was of man, whether he was alive—rugged or whether he was baser-tongued. I am about to put you in a pious of "not guilty" to that high crime and misdemeanour. (Applause.) While these prisoners were all coming in, released, no man in parliament ever asked to see the papers; no man in parliament ever challenged debate by formal resolution. But it was left to the leader of a great party to make a statement of crimes from his opponents and utter slanders against their backs in order to walk over their ruined reputations—their slandered characters—to

place and power.

What are the facts? I will give you the facts. The facts are these: McCreery and McGowan were prosecuted. The opponents of the government were prosecuted. "This prosecution will be a farce"; the prosecution cannot go on because the government know that McCreery holds in his pocket a bomb which will shake the government to the very base. The prosecution will be a farce and end in nothing." What followed? The ablest counsel in the Liberal party in the province of Ontario was called in to defend the government. In the case of the crown was put into his hands without his being in the slightest degree influenced by any considerations. He was charged to prosecute these prisoners charged with the crime of treason. He was instructed with at the hands of the Premier, to the very utmost; and yet Mr. Laurier said in this city that if it had not been the case the prosecution was under the charge of Sir Oliver Mowat, there could have been no conviction. Compare this with what he said at Ottawa when asked for an explanation of these allegations. He said that Sir Oliver Mowat secured the conviction, and Sir Oliver Mowat knows that he never was consulted in connection with the case, and he never dreamed of it or interfered with it in any way. He was not responsible for Mr. Kerr, a respectable and eminent counsel, to assist Mr. Osler; and Mr. Osler was also authorized to use the name of the Attorney General in the prosecution. But the officers of the government were not responsible; the chief of police of the Dominion government was the active man, under the instructions of the Dominion counsel, that brought into the Dominion of the men that had tried to run to England. He was not responsible; another; but by these means they were brought back, and evidence was given leading to their conviction, and they were sentenced to a term of imprisonment to be confined in jail for a term of years.

The first of these prisoners by Sir John Thompson were such that had they been presented to the Home Secretary of Great Britain he would have carried out the same course. If Sir John Thompson had valued his political position and the rights of his country as his personal honor or the honor of his government, he might have been prompted to advise his government not to release these men. (Applause.) But the Conservative Party was strong enough to do right. (Cheers.) John Thompson recommended just the course that precedence has established, which was the release of these men. (Laughter.) Some one laughs. Let me read the certificates upon which the release of these men was made. In Ottawa as in other places, the physician is the one whose duty it is to advise upon the health of prisoners. The physicians in the prison in which these men were confined were C. R. Church, one of the oldest physicians in Canada, and Dr. C. R. Church, another doctor, a leading man in his profession. This is their certificate upon which the release was made:

"To His Excellency the Governor-General:—The Queen versus Thomas McGreevy and John Thompson. The undersigned has the honor to call attention to the certificates of Dr. C. R. Church, F.R.C.S., attending physician to the Carleton County Jail, with regard to the condition of the health of the prisoners above named. Dr. Church is a member of the 1st January the 3rd: During the past five or six weeks, in my capacity as jail surgeon, Thomas McGreevy and Nicholas C. Connolly have been under my professional care and have been in the best of health. The Carleton County Jail is a most comfortable and desirable condition of health." (Laughter.)

"Sir Charles Tupper—That was funny perhaps to you; it was not funny to either Connolly or McGreevy. The next sentence is perhaps more humorous still.

"Connolly is suffering from kidney trouble of an aggravated form; both McGreevy and Connolly suffer from insomnia, while McGreevy is suffering from inflammation of the middle ear. I consider that further confinement in each case would be placing life in jeopardy, and that their release from imprisonment is the only means of averting disaster." (Laughter.)

Sir Charles Tupper—I am glad that the climate out here enables such men to laugh at such forms of disease.

"On February 23d Dr. Church wrote to the undersigned as follows:

"In a former communication I called your attention to the grave condition of health in the cases of Messrs. McGreevy and Connolly, confined in the common jail of the county of Carleton, and advised their release from imprisonment as the only means of effective restoration of their health." (Laughter.)

"Sir Charles Tupper—All this pain had lasted for a month. Now I think there should be increased laughter.

"Their condition has not improved, but in spite of medical care has in each instance become more unsatisfactory. I would strongly urge their immediate release. Under these circumstances the undersigned respectfully recommends that the prisoners be released.

"(Sd.) JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.

(Sd.) JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.
 "Minister of Justice."
 "In view of the above medical report
 which has been subsequently corroborated by
 Dr. Wright, I approve."
 (Sd.) ABERDEEN."
 "OTTAWA, Feb. 28, 1894."

"*SIR*,—I examined Messrs. McGreevy and Connolly to-day in the common jail of the county of Carleton, and am prepared to corroborate the statements of Dr. Church, the jail physician, as to their failing health, and would recommend their speedy release.

"I have the honor to be,
"Your obedient servant,
"(Signed) HENRY P. WRIGHT, M.D."

This matter may be fun to you, but in another case it would have been death to others. Under those circumstances it became the duty of the Minister of Justice of the day to do as Sir John Thomson did. I say that no man ever heard Mr. Laidler

say here or anywhere else, or in the newspapers, when overruling the government of Canada with defiance of duty in this matter, that these were the facts upon which this release took place. (Applause and laughter.) Some men appear to think that these certificates are flimsy. Why were they not challenged? If that be so what do they think of their champions of Liberalism for not having these papers challenged? Voice—Has there

Voices—Has there been a session since?
 Sir Charles Tupper—There has been a session since and Mr. McMullen was the only man who raised any question. He got such a drubbing that he not only held his tongue, but no others seemed at all anxious to get into the same position. In connection with the hilarity of some people I may be permitted to refer to a high judicial officer who was known as the hanging judge of Ireland. He was only known to weep once, and that was once in witnessing "The Beggar's Opera," where a reprieve arrived in time. (Laughter and cheers.)

"No," (Laughter and cheers.)
 "Well, then, I have told you that the
 charge has been made on the foundation.
 Let us see what Mr. Laurier has said."
 Brandon he said, "these men were released
 that their health might not be impaired."
 At Winnipeg he said that "it was because
 their health was suffering!" Is there any
 one here who will say that these certificates
 support his theory? (Cheers.) Now,
 then, ladies and gentlemen, I will consider
 the Liberal leaders. They are the only ones
 many times that the trade issue of our
 country are so predominant that they have
 no time to discuss Canada. We must pro-
 ceed to the great questions of the
 day. I will take it that since these gentle-
 men have taken up the discussion of the
 day, we must assume that their trade policy
 is a little weak. (Cries of hear, hear, and
 laughter.)

Voice—What about the post office?
 Sir Charles Tuppér—We will come to that later on. These gentlemen charge that the policy of protection is a policy of corruption; that a policy of protection breeds corruption. The voice: "Hear, hear." A friend here believes in leaving a Post-Office man alone. He has had a capital idea. Mr. Laurier's visit was a capital idea. He has induced one man to believe that. (Cheers and laughter.) Let us see whether protection breeds corruption, or whether without protection you will be without corruption. As gentlemen, we have had more experience of Mr. Laurier and his friends. Let us see the result of Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's visit, that without protection you are without corruption. He was supposed to be carrying out the duties of his years 1874 and 1878. Here is what he has to say to his followers:

"I would like to be relieved of the public works department. Friends expect to be benefited by offices they are unfitted for, by contracts they are not entitled to, and by the money they have not earned. I have offended at least a dozen of them, and I will defend the citadel." (Liberal chases.)

This is all very well for Mr. Mackenzie, but what about the twenty free traders who keep him there defending the citadel? (Conscience chases.)

These are the men who have made the history of the country between the years 1874 and 1875, and the man will be bold who will say that it was free from corruption. Take the case of the Canadian Pacific. Laurier in the shade in the discussion of trade questions. He is a man who charges protection as being synonymous with robbery.

A Voice—Right.
Sir Charles Tupper—So says Cartwright. (Laughter.) But Sir Richard Cartwright made a little confusion once as to the manner of man he had been. "I bought up," he said, "a large number of men once, and spent a large sum of money on them." He is one of the free trade purists. (Laughter.)
A Voice—He is not; he is a tariff r.

Sir Charles Tupper—Well, I am glad to hear what he is, but I may say that he is now engaged in the county of Oxford trying to save himself from political death, as the Patrons are hard after him, and he swears by all that is holy and true, that he is a free trader out and out. (Renewed laughter.)

Now, I would like to hear what Mr. Laurier is: There is a significant dumbness upon that point. (Cheers.) Doubtless we shall be right in saying that they are not protectionists. Mr. Laurier addressed the faithful in Quebec in 1877, when he said: "I would have you mainly rely upon the justice of your cause, yet I have learned by experience that we must not forget those human devices that are so essential to victory." (Tremendous cheering and derisive laughter.)

gentleman will tell you that when you get rid of protection you get rid of the political criminal. I think you will find that the political criminals will disappear evenly on both sides. Look at Hon. Mr. Mercier, who ruled the Province of Quebec. Mr. Laurier never had a more faithful friend, and Mr. Laurier never had a more useful friend when the capturing of counties was concerned than this same Mercier. He would be an ungrateful Liberal, indeed, who would refuse to say that the hardest man to meet was this same Honore Mercier.

A Voice—He is dead now.
Sir Charles Tupper—And politically some other members will be dead soon. I know I am hitting a little hard now for some people, but I think they can stand it. Honore Mercier kept as far away as he could from protection. You would expect therefore pure government. (Laughter.)

A Voice.—He is dead.
Sir Charles Tupper—I hear a gentleman says he is dead. Well, I will give him the views of the Toronto Globe, the leading Liberal journal of Canada. You cannot rewrite history, whether a man be living or dead. This is the record of a free trader who had a chance to rule or misrule in a province of his own country. In the Globe of January 23, this is the verdict:

"Respectable French Canadians feel humiliated these days. The Mercier administration is shown to have been corrupt to the bone. Money was filched from the provincial treasury by scores of thousands and hurried into the election campaign to the demoralization of the people, or squandered in riotous living by the shrewd, whose position as ministers of the crown, has rendered their evil example all the more pernicious."

Why do I give you this point? Because I claim that by the use of such arguments as I infer that they infer that according to free trade or protection you have honest or dishonest government.

A Voice—What is your policy?
 Sir Charles Tupper—On that point I refer you to history. (Cheese.) Mr. Laurier, surrounded by two or three hundred, comes from the East screaming out "free trade." These men will tell you that protection means corruption. Between 1871 and 1878 he repeatedly said that if prohibitory duties were necessary he would favor prohibitory duties. In 1878 he defended protection; protection and crime, protection and robbery; protection, the breeder of this corruption. (Cheese.) Let me refer to Mr. Mackenzie, who is dead, and Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Laurier who are living. Mr. Mackenzie tried to hold on to power

pledged with the manufacturers that the Liberals had increased protection from 11 to 17 1/2 per cent. Mr. Maclecher said in this tariff there had of necessity been introduced incidental protection. Sir Richard Cartwright stated a truism which is now denied by Mr. Lauder. "You cannot have a revenue tariff without more or less protection." If this be so, what avails them to make exaggerated charges? They have admitted that the only tariff under which Canada has been governed has been a tariff having more or less protective duties incorporated in it.

[illegible]

We have asked the governments of Australia to send their representative men into our midst. We have asked the colonies of South Africa to send their representative men, and the mother country has sent Lord Jersey, to a trade conference held in the capital of this young country. And it must have been a matter of pride to every true Canadian to hear the opinions of this man (Lord Jersey) in reference to the progress of this country. You have but to refer to the blue-book to see it; and the manner in which this country was governed, ever since 1867, if you like, has been wise and that expenditures have been indoligently made.

St Sir Charles Tupper, continuing to discuss the financial condition of the Dominion and the judicious way in which its affairs had been administered, said: "I have referred to banking men and financial men, now let me give you the opinion of Lord Ripon, colonial secretary, delivered at a public meeting held in the city of London last year. In discussing the expenditures made in this country Lord Ripon referred to the growth of our credit, Dominion 34 per cent selling at 1032, and said: 'I put this

question to this assembly. What better evidence could there be that your expenditures have been wise, and have been to the benefit of the country, than the fact that you come from a part of this country where we have had to fight for our political lives in connection with a large part of that (C.P.R.) expenditure. My friend Mr. Fraser of the Government has a very appropriate remark to strike me down because the Liberal-Conservative leaders had tried to impose a heavy obligation upon the Eastern counties for the sole benefit of the Western provinces. He said that the people in my counties were told they were to receive no benefits. But all these old difficulties and prejudices are dying out in the East, and I say, God help the Conservatives, they are helping the country, if after all we have had to do in order to get on these public works there should be any of this feeling shown in that part of the country which more than once enabled the Government to carry out that policy which has won the approval of the good opinion of the sister colonies in every part of the British Empire. (Cheers.)

With respect to Mr. Laurier I would quote him as a witness of the success of the National Policy. Look at what the country's credit is in spite of the Liberal opposition, and see it also in the testimony I give from his own lips. I would have paid that gentleman's expenses to Victoria to have that statement from him. (Laughter.) In the East we have been going through a fight that threatened to drive one province into opposition against the sister provinces. Mr. Laurier has a certain number of lieutenants. Mr. Fielding is an able lieutenant. He is the Premier of Nova Scotia and Canada at the Liberal convention held in Halifax in 1893. Mr. Jones is another United States representative.

Heutenant; he was a colleague of the late Mr. Mackenzie. Then there is Mr. Davies, the Martinique Province, another Heutenant, and I could have named a great many more, but I will not. I claim some more than anything else the splendid results of the National Policy. All these gentlemen whom I have named have joined the National Policy against the province, but to break up confederation by a series of jealousies and ill will. Their contention in every campaign down to the present time has been that the money raised by the National Policy has been squandered by the Far West to the detriment of the country by the Atlantic seaboard. Mr. Fielding wrote to the London Standard that the Canadian Government was squandering money in the Far West. Mr. Jones, who calls himself a Conservative, wrote to the Standard that much the same doctrine in 1888. Mr. Davies in 1893, only one year ago, in referring to the time when Prince Edward Island joined the confederation, referred to it as "the time when the Island voluntarily joined confederation." But Mr. Laurier, who is a Liberal, and the country, for which the Conservative party was willing to risk the political life in bringing it into federation. After sixteen years of the National Policy, he said in Victoria, "I have never seen when the country realized that Confederation was worth living for, or dying for, if need be." (Tremendous cheering.) What better testimony could I give? We had to fight in the provinces to make that Canadian citizenship, which is the result of living for the (Cheers.) now. We have endeavored to make the race prejudice. Thank God we have nearly lived them down. (Cheers.) I believe we are now strong enough to stamp them out.

A Voice—What about the post office?
Sir Charles Tupper—If the Liberals had