

Now, let me return to the Liberal platform. I remember, in addition to the tariff how the appointment of members of Parliament to office was denounced. It was one of the iniquities of the old Tory party, and I thought when the Liberals got into office, "Now everything is pure, everything is correct." Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker,—and I am going to ask you to tell me your opinion privately, because I have a high estimate of your character—would you believe it that in eight years—I have the figures here but I will speak subject to correction—the so-called Liberal Government appointed more members of Parliament to office than their predecessors, whom they so roundly denounced, appointed during their entire administration.

Now, I have referred to the public expenditure, and I have referred to the appointment of members of Parliament to office, and I now come to the Senate. The Senate had been cursed by the Liberals in opposition as a body of old women, as a graveyard, as a political excrescence on the body politic, until there seemed to be nothing left to be said against them. Indeed, on the hustings Liberal speakers exhausted themselves in denouncing the Senate. They would have a girl or a woman at the meeting with an accordion and when the speaker came to speak of the Senate she would sing "They are going down the valley." Of course, they were going down the valley; the Senate was to be either abolished or reformed. But the Senate was continued identically along the same lines by the Liberal Government. When our old friend Bob Watson, of ancient memory, used to stalk about the constituencies in the West and tell the people what the Government had done after the Liberals came into office, somebody would put the question to him: "Say, Bob, tell us about the Senate; what did you do with that?" "Oh," says Bob, with his thumbs under his suspenders, "we have reformed the Senate all right; I am in it"—and that was regarded as the reformation of the Senate.

I could go on indefinitely in this vein, but I am sure that I have gone sufficiently far to convince this House and the country that there is a great deal of difference between a party in opposition and a party in power.

Let my friends on the other side, and particularly the prophet from Brome (Mr. McMaster) might think I am unduly hard and critical and unfair to the Liberals, let me say this: I have come to the deliberate conviction, after thirty-five years' study,

[Mr. Richardson.]

that the difference between the two political parties which held sway in this country is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. There never was any difference between them, and that is why I want to quarrel publicly with my friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder), who talked about being read out of the Liberal party. My dear sir, there is not any Liberal party. Yes, there is "the" Liberal party, but there is not "a" Liberal party. Mark the distinction. They have the trademark all right, but I have demonstrated to this House what the practices of that party have been. I think that the member for Brome is perfectly sincere—a great many of them are—and honestly thinks that if his party got into office they would reform the tariff; that they would wipe out every vestige of protection. Not so, my good friend. You have associated with you the Clifford Siftons, the L. M. Joneses and the Billy Patersons and a lot of the people who live, move and have their being in protection—and you just try it some day. When I came down here to Parliament after one election, having stumped the country on a coal oil can, I thought that we would get free coal oil. I used to tell the farmers that the ties of bondage were gone, that they would get their agricultural implements free of duty. And do you know what I found? I found that the question was not whether the duty should be wiped off agricultural implements, but how much it should be increased. L. M. Jones—"old slippery L. M." we used to call him out in Manitoba—was the head of the combine in Canada, and he spent almost an entire Sabbath with me pleading with me to agree to have the duty increased. Now, L. M. is gone; he is not here to offer any defence, and I shall not repeat the conversation; I shall let it go with that statement. Well, I forget what was really done with the duty, but it was left practically as it was, and L. M. Jones was singled out for distinction by the Liberal party; he was made a knight, forsooth, a Knight Commander of the Bath, and died as such.

This is a kind of experience meeting Mr. Speaker and I am putting the cards on the table. I do not want any Liberal to be fooled as I was. I want to be the beacon light—not the one that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) referred to—to warn any simpletons who may think that they can get all they want in reference to the tariff from the Liberal party; and that is why I am taking the position that I do this afternoon.