

It is something like the platform adopted at the Ottawa conference, and for the benefit of the House and to remind my hon. friend of the policy of his party in the west, at least, I will read these paragraphs one by one.

1. The Conservatives by formal resolution and by speeches in parliament, have declared for high protection; for a tariff according to their leader, Mr. R. L. Borden, as high as the United States tariff, which averages over fifty per cent.
2. The Conservative policy is the same as that of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, whose only purpose is to increase, by means of the tariff, the price of all goods they have to sell.
3. The Liberal policy is directly opposed to the policy of protection. The Conservative papers and politicians recognized this and vilify Messrs. Sifton, Fielding and Fisher and other ministers who have prominently championed the consumers.
4. Support of the Conservatives means support for a policy that will increase the price of all manufactured goods.

It must not be amiss in passing to remind the House that since this government came into power the price of nearly all commodities in Canada has increased by forty or fifty per cent.

5. Support of the Liberals means support for a policy calculated to make necessities low priced.
6. No matter what individuals may say, the two parties stand distinctly divided on the tariff. The Liberals for low tariff, the Conservatives for high tariff, and any voter who is interested in tariff matters can therefore have no difficulty in expressing his opinion at the poll.

We are glad, I may say, to have this clear and distinct exposition of the policy of the Liberal party in regard to the tariff, an exposition which none of the Ministers of the Crown have had the courage to make up to the present time. I trust that my right hon. friend will not pain my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) by repudiating any part of this programme and I should feel pained if my reference to this literature should result in any divergence or any friction between the hon. Minister of the Interior and my right hon. friend. I trust, therefore, that, when my right hon. friend arises in his place, he will at once accept this platform which has been laid down for him by his friends in the west under the guidance of the hon. Minister of the Interior and that he will at last explain to the people of this country in the terms of this document exactly what the Liberal policy is and will be.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, immediately before the House took recess at six o'clock, I had called attention to the absence of any mention of tariff reform in the speech from the Throne; an omission which

caught the eye of my hon. friend from North Ontario (Mr. Grant), who specially referred to the subject. I regret that my hon. friend is not in the House just now, for I wish to say that I do not think he was quite himself when he was referring to the fact that the Hon. Geo. E. Foster had during the past year gone to the United Kingdom, on request, I believe, and delivered certain speeches there in favour of mutual preferential trade within the empire. I would have thought that my hon. friend (Mr. Grant) might have spared any sneer, if it were intended as a sneer, as to that; because I think that without regard to party we may all be proud that Mr. Foster, speaking in the mother country as a Canadian, was considered, next to Mr. Chamberlain himself, as the ablest and most eloquent advocate of that great policy of mutual preferential trade.

Now, there is one matter which was referred to in the speech from the Throne in somewhat peculiar terms, and I call attention to it on account of the remarks of my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) last session. We are told in the speech:—

A Militia Bill will be introduced containing several important amendments to the present law rendered necessary by the growth of the force and calculated to promote its efficiency.

My hon. friend from Haldimand, who speaks with the authority of an expert and who has taken a greater interest in this subject than perhaps any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House did not seem to consider last session that there had been any very effective growth of the militia force. I quote from Hansard what he then said:

I have said that we are called upon to furnish the skeleton of a skeleton. I now state that we have actually turned out the shadow of the skeleton of a skeleton. Can anything so ghostly be longer called a militia force.

The hon. gentleman from Haldimand thus pronounced himself in the House, and no reply was given to him owing to the unfortunate absence at the time of the Minister of Militia; but in the face of that, we are told that a Militia Bill will be introduced because it is rendered necessary by the growth of the force. I shall be prepared, however, to give the fairest possible consideration to any measure of the government which will tend to the efficiency of the militia force, and in saying so, I am speaking for my hon. friends on this side of the House, in so far as I at present know their views.

There is another remarkable omission in the speech from the Throne, and that is the utter absence of any reference whatever to the great question of provincial autonomy, which so especially concerns the people of the west. I believe that at the present time the people of the Territories are almost a