

ing my campaign I met with as many farmers who declared that the Massey-Harris binder was equally as good as I did of farmers who favoured the McCormack binder.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I gave both sides.

Mr. ROCHE. The cotton lords also came in for a great deal of abuse at the hands of the Liberal party. The high protection they had enjoyed was pointed to as evidence of the injurious effects of the tariff; but the cotton lords to-day are in the enjoyment of a higher protection than they had under the old tariff, in many lines the protection has been raised, and their old cry falls to the ground in that respect as well. The people of the west were told how heavily they were taxed to maintain the employment of a few hundred men in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and that was described as another iniquitous tax, embodying the vicious principle of class legislation, that would have to go with the advent of the Liberals to power. But has it gone? No, and not likely to go; but, on the contrary, in view of expressions made by the Finance Minister, both in this House and out of it, in the event of the Dingley Bill going into force with a coal tax of 75 cents per ton, there will not only be a tax on bituminous coal, but also on anthracite, which is now admitted free, and this would be necessarily a retaliatory tax which the people of Canada would have to pay through the nose for. And this is from a Government who were supposed to be opposed to retaliation in any form and who were going to legislate irrespective of any action taken by any other country. Why, Mr. Speaker, that love of change, so indigenious to the Liberal breast, which characterized their actions while in Opposition, still clings to them now that they have assumed the responsibilities of office. Their many-sided ante-election policy has undergone another change during the last few weeks; and is not this very fact of a great political party changing their policy at every election, no sooner having met with defeat with the one cry than they hatch out a new policy, trot it out and advocate it with all the gusto imaginable, to be met with the same result and have the same process repeated, and having at last been fortunate enough to delude the electors into returning them to power—is not this instability in itself sufficient to condemn any party in the eyes of intelligent people, and pronounce them unworthy to occupy positions of trust and incapable of managing successfully the affairs of a young and thriving nation like Canada.

The Finance Minister declared that no person imagined that the Liberals ever advocated the immediate adoption of free trade, and he travelled all the way to England for an authority to bolster up his arguments in favour of getting here by easy stages.

Now, that was rather hard on some of his

colleagues who declared it was the intention of the Liberal party to use their own words—and it was the declaration of an hon. gentleman who occupies a specially high position—that they would not get there by easy stages, but by one fell swoop wipe away every vestige of protection.

The Finance Minister also expressed his admiration for the good old-fashioned method of doing business on the small scale. Well, the hon. gentleman is rather contradictory, for in another portion of his speech he said the world moves. And so it does, and Canada is moving with it, and with the modern and improved methods of doing business, the old style is not in it. You would imagine the hon. gentleman to be living in an ante-deluvian age. Canada cannot afford to be doing business on a back street, and must keep abreast with the progressive spirit of the times; so I see nothing in our present condition that should make us yearn for the non-progressive days of the past.

The speech of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) the other night contained, in my opinion, an undercurrent of disappointment and dissatisfaction. That hon. gentleman knew the many promises of reform that were made to the people in the western country, and with which the practices of the Government thus far do not tally; but while not at all enthusiastic in his praise of the Government, for party reasons, he did not desire to say anything calculated to injure them. He declared his intention of supporting their policy, because in none of the speeches delivered on this side of the House was there any better policy formulated. Does the hon. gentleman not remember the words of his leader while occupying the Opposition benches, that it was not the province of an Opposition to propound a policy for the country, that it was time enough to prescribe for the patient when he was called in, and now that he has been called in he prescribes for his patient in homeopathic doses on the instalment plan; and I presume if that is good logic when applied to the then Opposition, it is equally good when applied to the present Opposition. But the late Government, led by Sir Charles Tupper, had a policy and a good policy for the western country, and had they been permitted to carry that policy into effect it would have resulted in great benefit to that country. The hon. gentleman did not always think that the Liberals were friendly disposed to the west, as is evidenced by the following remarks delivered by him a few years ago:—

The reason that the people of the Territories do not kick more vigorously when election day arrives, is because they have no assurance that if the Opposition obtained power to-morrow, they would do any better in these respects than the Government is doing. The Liberals have never made a study of the North-west or its affairs, have never championed its cause or that of its settlers—more than to score a point for the party, when opportunity offered—and, indeed, have per-