

simile which I am about to use, of the bat who one day fell among the birds and the other day fell among the rats. When he fell among the birds he said: Look at my wings, I am one of your tribe. When, the next day, he fell among the rats he said: Look at my claws, I am one of your tribe. So the hon. gentleman says, when he is among the farmers: I want to soar like the birds to reciprocity—here is the correspondence which I have brought down. But when he gets among the manufacturers, and particularly among the monopolists, he says: Look at my claws, I am one of your tribe; and, like you, I have still the people of this country to prey upon. There was another argument produced in the manifesto of the hon. gentleman. In that he appealed to the people of this country on their prejudices, and on the worst prejudices that could possibly be used against an Opposition. The only plea, the only argument he had was to say, that the policy of the Opposition was a disloyal policy, that it was likely to lead to annexation, and it was hostile to Great Britain. Loyalty? I am reminded here of the words of Madame Roland when she was led to the scaffold. She was one who had contributed to the French Revolution, and she fell a victim to the passions she had aroused but could not control. When she was led to the scaffold and was compelled to bow to the statue of Liberty, she exclaimed: "Oh, liberty, how many crimes are committed in thy name?" We in Canada have to ask how many crimes are committed in the name of loyalty. But, if the reason given to His Excellency for dissolving Parliament was the reason given in the ministerial press, namely, to obtain power from the people to initiate a new treaty on the grounds of the Treaty of 1854, that was merely a pretence and nothing else. It was certainly no good reason. There never was a minute since the year 1866, when the late treaty was terminated, when every Government in this country had not ample power to negotiate another such a treaty. There never was a public man in this country, whether on that side of the House or on this side, who was not prepared at any moment to negotiate a treaty on that line. Yes; there was one exception, the late President of the Council, Mr. Colby, who has just paid the penalty for such unpatriotic opinions. Why, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that. The National Policy even was a means to an end, that end being the renewal of the reciprocity treaty. The resolution has been quoted more than once in this House, but the memory of hon. gentlemen opposite is so treacherous, it is so defective, that I feel bound to repeat the language of the right hon. gentleman himself. The famous motion upon which the appeal to the country was made in 1877, after having recited what the National Policy would do, went on as follows:—

"That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of the National Policy which."—

And so on. And then it states:

"In moving as it ought to do in the direction of a reciprocity of tariff with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

It has been contended by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that this policy had been endorsed three times over by the people of Canada—in 1878, 1882 and 1887. If that is the case, was

MR. LAURIER.

it not simple mockery, was it not an insult to the Crown, to ask for power to dissolve Parliament on that issue, when the policy of the Government had been endorsed again and again, and affirming the necessity of such a treaty? Sir, it was a mere pretence. The true reason was that the policy of the Opposition was gaining ground and the Government took fright. The only reason was that the sense of what the country needs is developing in this country in favour of greater freedom of trade, in favour of the view that however satisfactory unrestricted reciprocity might have been at one time, it would be more satisfactory at the present time. Sir, the right hon. gentleman is a good judge of weather; he can scan the political horizon as well, and perhaps better, than any man living. He foresaw that the tide was rising, impetuous, irresistible, in favour of greater freedom of trade. He saw that his only hope of reaching port, if he wanted to reach port again, was to put to sea at once, for if he were to wait till the tide had reached its height, he knew very well that his leaky craft would be shattered to pieces under the surging indignation of a long, long-suffering people. I say that is the reason, and the only reason. Sir, I do not give my own statement alone on this point, I have the authority of hon. gentlemen opposite. I speak by the book, because I speak after Sir Charles Tupper himself. In an interview with the London correspondent of the *Toronto Globe* had lately with Sir Charles Tupper, that hon. gentleman was reported to have made the following statement:—

"If the Liberal party in Canada had adhered to Mr. Blake's Malvern speech, and the election had been postponed for another year, the Liberals would have gained a majority in the House of Commons. The Government had triumphed from their opponents' blunders."

You have it here stated by Sir Charles himself, that if the election had been postponed for another year the Liberals would have triumphed. It is true that Sir Charles Tupper stated immediately afterwards that the Government triumphed through the blunders of their opponents: but I think we all know Sir Charles Tupper sufficiently well to understand that when he speaks of the blunders of his opponents, he means exactly the reverse. The Opposition blundered, but still it was necessary to prevent these blunders from having their effect upon the country, but if the Government had allowed the Opposition to blunder one year longer, the former were undone, and it was to prevent the effect of the Opposition's blunders that the Government charitably came to their rescue and ordered the elections at once. Sir, if the Opposition were blundering, what shall we say of the policy of the hon. gentleman who, with all the blundering of the Opposition, with the iniquitous Franchise law at his disposal, only triumphed by the skin of his teeth? I would not object to a dissolution in itself. If I object to this dissolution, it is simply because there was no fair play in the dissolution at that time. A dissolution would have been welcomed at any time, but there was treachery in the dissolution at the time it took place. More than that, not only was there treachery in the dissolution, but I have no hesitation in saying that, coming as it did, it was an outrage, nay, a crime against the dignity of the Crown, against the rights of the people. It was an outrage against the dignity of the Crown, because