

eastern Canada, every dollar of it, and that not one dollar of it should go to the deep sea fishermen. I do not mean to say that I would take away the bounty of the deep sea fishermen, but what they receive should be paid from the general revenues of Canada. If there is one man in this Dominion who should be re-established, it is the inshore fisherman, and he should get the full amount that he derives from that source. This is a very important matter, and I hope it will not be long before the Government takes it into consideration. In those days the inshore fisheries were the only fisheries we had, and even to-day they are worth a great deal to this country, although in many places they are more or less a thing of the past. So much for the Washington Treaty and my honourable friend's arguments for reciprocity. I have shown you that the United States were bound, and always have been bound, to give us nothing they could possibly keep from us.

We come then to the election of Sir John A. Macdonald and the question of the mandate, which I intend to take up later on. Sir John A. Macdonald lost his mandate and another Government had to be formed. The situation then was not as it is to-day: Sir John A. Macdonald lost his mandate, and a new Government came in under the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie; to-day the leader of the Government has the whole House behind him.

Sir John A. Macdonald inaugurated what is known as the National Policy, which is as good to-day as it was then. In 1878 the Government went to the country, and what happened? We all know what happened, so I need not tell you. Again in 1882 they appealed to the country, and I need not tell you what happened. They went to the country again in 1887, and on that occasion there was a real issue; but I need not speak of that: it is all dead and buried.

Again, in 1891, the time of which my honourable friend (Hon. Mr. Dandurand) spoke the other day, there was an appeal to the people. The honourable gentleman indicated that we had gone to the people on the question of reciprocity in natural products. That is not so. I want to put my honourable friend right. We went to the people on the National Policy, as we had done in the preceding election, and his party appealed to the electors on unrestricted reciprocity, and we knocked the "devil" out of them.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY.

What the Conservative party did say on that occasion was this: "If we are returned, we shall be glad to send a commission down to Washington, and, if we can, make a deal with the United States with regard to some natural products, or some products as to which we feel it will be of advantage to us." They were able to do nothing, and, thank God, we were able to get along without it, for any time we need help we shall get very little from them. A United States statesman once said that he could not say that every Democrat was a horse thief, but he could say that every horse thief was a Democrat, and I defy contradiction when I say that while every Liberal is not an annexationist, wherever you find an annexationist you find him under the umbrella of the Liberal party. There are some people to-day who are talking about opening up Canada to the United States. We are side by side with the greatest nation in the world—the richest nation in land and in everything you can think of, under the earth or on top of it; their climatic conditions are wonderful; and yet we are holding our own, which proves beyond a doubt that we are a great people and that this is a great country. We, with a population of nearly 10,000,000 people, are standing alongside this rich country with a population of from 100,000,000 to 120,000,000 people, and we are holding our own and are second to no country in the world.

My honourable friend was mistaken in saying that we went to the country on reciprocity in 1891. We did not go to the country on that issue at that time. We held up the old flag, and we waved it, and we will continue to wave it as long as it is there to be waved, and that will be for all time. We always went to the country waving that flag and telling the people what we would give them.

Then we come to the election of 1896, and later on the election of 1917, of which my hon. friend spoke very strongly, saying, I think, that it had been stolen. One thing about which I have no doubt is that he said it was won by a most stupendous fraud. I do not think it is wise to go back and bring up old accusations. What we should consider is the present and the future. I am sorry to say that my Irish friends in another land—friends to whom my heart is true, and for whom no man would be better pleased to give every moment of his life—have gone wrong, and are doing themselves a great deal of injury. I am afraid the same thing is