

ing his views. He first talked about various questions connected with the policy of the present Government, and, after condemning them in no unstinted terms, he said :

But before I sit down there is another question upon which I wish to say one word or two. I have told you the policy of the Liberal party. We want a party which will collect the greatest amount of revenue with the minimum of taxation. Now, what is the method in which this policy will be carried out? I am not a revolutionist. I am a Reformer of the English school. I know it is impossible to make changes without time. But we have the great precedent of Sir Robert Peel, who carried the change from protection to free trade, and did it by a gradual process. This is the programme which we intend to follow. This is the precedent. There never was a time in my career when I did not proclaim myself a disciple of Fox, of Peel, a disciple of John Bright, and a disciple of William Ewart Gladstone. (Cheers.)

The Hon. Mr. Laurier in those remarks said: I am not a revolutionist. Some people might have thought he was from what he said previously. He told the people: We are going from protection to free trade; that is the programme we intend to follow; that is the precedent we will be guided by in the event of the electorate of Canada returning us to power. It is strange, Mr. Speaker, that after this declaration, the Liberal party should come to this House to-day, and, in their declaration of principles, say scarcely anything about free trade, but only refer to a revenue tariff. There is another feature about the policy of the Liberal party to which it is as well to draw the attention of the people. They tell the people that while it is intended to collect a revenue they will have a tariff which must be divested from every incident of protection, or, in other words, if the requirements of the country should demand protection, and if the needs of the country should require protection, the Liberals declare that they will have no protection, because their principles are the very reverse. They tell the people of this country that they will not give the country protection, though they could do it, for their policy is against protection, and if they are returned to power they say they will sweep away every vestige of it. Here, then, we have a great difference between the platform of the Liberal party, as laid down in the House and the platform which they have preached to the people in the country. At Toronto, the leader of the Opposition declared for a free trade platform, but here they announce themselves in favour of a revenue tariff, and they desire to catch the votes of the people upon one or the other issues. If these gentlemen of the Opposition go to one section of the country, and if it is said to them: Oh, your policy is free trade; then they turn up their records of the House of Commons and they answer: Oh, our policy is embodied in that resolution, and

Mr. SPROULE.

that says that we shall have a tariff for revenue only. If, in another part of the country it is said to them: You are not in favour of free trade; then they can turn to the speech made by the leader of the Opposition in Toronto, and say: There is our motto, Mr. Laurier told them that his precedent was established by Fox, and Peel, and Gladstone; he was in favour of the free trade of England, and the Liberals were bound to have a tariff in Canada the same as they have it in the old country. The resolution of the Liberal party here declares for a tariff for revenue only, but the speeches of their leaders pronounce for free trade as they have it in England. Mr. Speaker, it is quite plain that the Liberal party of Canada is endeavouring to ride two hobby horses, either one of which they are willing to accept if it would only ensure their getting to the treasury benches. Their position reminds me of the story of the Wisconsin boy and the missionary. In the early history of that state, a Wisconsin missionary, one of the pioneers of the country, and a very good man, was travelling around from place to place, and he carried his worldly effects with him on a very poor specimen of a horse. He met a man on the road, and he asked: Which way he should turn to take the road to Bloomington, but he afterwards forgot whether the man told him to turn to the left or to the right. There was a boy standing at the corner, the usual specimen of a youth out there, with one suspender and a straw hat, but he had an eye for a good horse, and he paid great attention to the animal which the missionary was riding. He thought it was about the ugliest nag he had ever seen, and so when the preacher rode to the corner, he inquired of the boy, which way he should now turn to reach Bloomington. The boy was watching the horse, and did not answer. Then the missionary called out again: Are you deaf, boy, which way now to Bloomington? The boy said: Who are you, and where are you going? And the missionary replied: "I am a follower of the Lord." Well, the boy retorted, I do not think it matters much which way you take, for you'll never overtake Him on that horse. So it is with the Liberal party. I do not think it matters which of these hobby horses they will ride, because the people of this country are too intelligent, and they will never overtake the electors on that horse. They will never get into power by riding on either or any of their hobby horses, and, after the electorate poll their votes next election, I have not the slightest doubt that they will just be as far from power as they have ever been for the last fifteen years. Now let me turn my attention for a few moments to some of the criticisms directed against the National Policy by hon. gentlemen opposite. I take first the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton): what does he say? He says: "I deny in toto