

so that they might go before the people of this country, and have the authorization of a fresh Parliament, not a moribund Parliament, to proceed to Washington to discuss reciprocity, as the United States Government had solicited such a conference. We all know the humility that the people of Canada felt when one individual high in office had afterwards to go to Washington, and upon his marrow-bones take back the statements spread in Canada that the United States Government had asked for reciprocity. I was astonished last summer, when at Clinton, I heard the First Minister state on the stump that when the Ministers went to Washington they offered reciprocity not only in natural products, but that they offered a list of manufactured goods as well. I had in my pocket the address of the President of the United States, sent in reply to a resolution from the Senate, to give a statement of what took place at the conference, and I took the opportunity of showing it to some of the Conservatives at that meeting, not five minutes afterwards the First Minister had made his statement. I was astonished that he would try to humbug the people and to impose on their ignorance and credulity in such a manner. That is what is being done by the Government all over the land, and the time is fast approaching when the Government will have to answer for it all. The Minister of Agriculture has told the people that the country is in a prosperous condition. The Controller of Customs and the Controller of Inland Revenue both tell us that the country is prosperous. From their standpoint, from the late augmentation of their finances annually, there is no doubt that they may feel that the country is in a prosperous condition. Five thousand dollars a year, besides their indemnity, going into his pockets, would make any man feel that a country was prosperous that could go on increasing its officials and officers and still further burdening the people with taxation. The people thought that this Government was going to be economic, and they asked me what this meant. They also asked me what was the meaning of a Bill which was brought into the House last year appointing a Civil Service Commission. They asked me if that commission was to be permanent and if there were to be any salaries? Why, Sir, they were astonished when I told them that there were two officials at \$300 a year, and one at \$1,250 a year, and his salary was to be increased until it reached \$1,500. When I was asked what the duties were I was stuck. I could not tell. I never heard it explained, and the only explanation that I could give was, that it was providing a good fat berth for some of the supporters of the Government, and that they were going to follow that up, because they were in a position that they required all the support that they could possibly get. I do not know that I am going to say a great deal more at the present time, but I do say that the

Mr. McMILLAN.

farmers of this country begin to understand this tariff. When the National Policy was introduced in 1879, many of them believed that the tariff would be a benefit, and they believed the utterances of the then First Minister: that the agricultural industry would be improved, that the country would consume all its own surplus products, and that all those tall chimneys which we heard so graphically described, would be towering throughout the whole land. But, Sir, we find that such has not been the case. We find that the manufacturing industries have not spread to any great extent. When the people of Seaforth saw in the last census returns the number of manufacturing industries in that town, they asked me to point them out, but no one, even though he had lived in the town since the first building was erected in it, was capable of doing that until such time as the report went back with the names of the individuals and the industries. And then, what a farce to see such industries pictured as if they were really industries that had been brought into existence by the National Policy. Let me say that the farmers of this country are a class of individuals that require no favours. We have been told that the farmers want to shirk the just incidents of taxation that ought to be imposed upon their shoulders. That is not the case. As I have said, the farmers ask no favours. All they want is that the Government shall remove the burdens that they have placed unduly upon their shoulders, and that they will give such legislation as will enable the farmer and the pioneer in this new country to reap the full rewards of his own labour without providing that a large part of the profits of their toil shall go into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country, and that the earners shall derive no profit from it whatever; but that, on the contrary, they—as I heard a farmer say—are to be made the subjects of insult and injury wherever the opportunity is presented.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to participate at any length in the debate that is now in progress. In that respect I shall imitate the example set by the Government. I am surprised, however—I cannot help expressing surprise—that the members of the Government, and the supporters of the Government, should allow the speeches that have been made on this side of the House, the arraignment that has been made of their policy, the attacks that have been made upon them, to go by default. I cannot help expressing surprise that the Government should sit meekly, and permit these assaults to be made without the slightest rejoinder. Silence is said to give consent, and certainly we may infer from the attitude of the Government that their case is a bad one, and that they have very little to say in answer to the charges made against them. I rise for the purpose of making reference to one point only; one point that has been alluded to in this debate,