

able to grapple with these great works to which the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) alluded, their nerve has been tested, and we stand to day in a position in which we are able to make out such a magnificent case as that which was made by the exponent of the National Policy, of the policy of this Government, while the hon. gentleman opposite had time and again attempted to arraign that policy and endeavored to destroy it, though he showed his utter inability to meet that statement to any extent. In conclusion, I believe that, as in the past, we are able, so long as we remain a portion of the Empire, not merely to govern ourselves, and prove ourselves worthy of responsible Government, but, as has been shown, to maintain the interests of this country, either in regard to commerce in general or in regard to the fisheries; and, while we are willing to make any fair compromise, or any fair settlement of these subjects, we are not ready to surrender the commercial interests of this country to the United States any more than we are to surrender our fisheries interests, which have been so much discussed of late.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. CHARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see absent from their places to-night the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to whose remarks I wish to direct a few words before proceeding with the more important part of the discussion. If the Finance Minister were present, I would compliment him upon the creditable manner in which he made his maiden financial statement, a statement which was, I am sure, satisfactory to his friends upon that side of the House, and one which, on the whole, reflected credit upon him. I hope that the hon. gentleman will be able to redeem the promises that he has made to the country with reference to preventing an increase in the public debt, keeping down the expenditure, and engaging in a career of economy that has not characterized the Government's financial history for a few years past. I must warn that hon. gentleman, however, that many influences will be brought to bear to thwart his laudable purposes in that respect. The party with which he is connected and for whom he acts as Finance Minister, has for many years engaged in the expenditure of money in a lavish manner, and I fear that reformation in that respect is scarcely to be hoped for. I only hope that he may be correct in his anticipations, and may be able to give us an administration of public affairs such as he has promised in his Budget speech the other afternoon. With regard to some of his statements I shall have occasion to refer to them in the course of the few remarks which I shall make to-night. I wish, also, to refer briefly to a few statements made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) who spoke this afternoon. He is a worthy son of a worthy sire, and to use a common expression which has more force than elegance, he is "a chip of the old block." His father, I recollect, some years ago, promised us that about this time we would be having 640 million bushels of wheat annually from the North-West. We have not had the wheat yet, but the son this afternoon did as much as he possibly could to give us the chaff. The hon. gentleman dealt rather severely with my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright). I think, however, it scarcely needs any trouble on my part to attempt a defence of that hon. gentleman, whose record itself is a sufficient defence, and who is amply capable of defending himself. The hon. gentleman seemed to suppose that because the arguments produced on this side of the House to the country had not carried the elections of 1882 and in 1887, that, perforce, we were wrong. Now, majorities are not always right, minorities are not always wrong. You may advance truth

that will not convince the public, that is more often the case than otherwise. But, Sir, there were other reasons that might be cited to account for the result of those elections, than the arguments presented to the country. We had, for instance, the Gerrymander Act of 1882, by which, in the Province of Ontario, 200,000 Conservatives were enabled to exercise as much power in the elections as 300,000 Reformers, and which, at least, gave to the present Government 12 or 14 seats. We had in 1887 the Franchise Bill, and we had called to the aid of the Government, the revising barrister, and this one Act in 1882, and this other Act in 1887, were sufficient to account for the results of those elections; and I feel certain but that for the revising barrister's kindly intervention in behalf of the Government in 1886, the Reform party would have carried the elections in this country in 1887. Then the hon. gentleman makes a feeble attempt to defend the Finance Department from the charge of cooking the accounts. Now, Sir, this is useless. It is beyond all controversy that the accounts are cooked, that the book-keeping is of a character that would not bear the investigation of an accountant, that the expenses chargeable to the administration of Dominion lands in the North-West are charged to capital account, and the receipts are credited to consolidated fund; and in this way and in other ways of that kind, the public accounts are made to represent a result which the facts do not warrant. We have his reference to the fact that my hon. friend, as he asserts, had said that in case of war with the United States, we would not be able to secure very great assistance from England. Now, Sir, unfortunately, that is the case. In case of war with the United States, England would be utterly unable to place an armed force upon the frontier between these two countries, adequate to the defence of Canada. The United States, with no greater exertion than was put forth in the rebellion of 1861 to 1864, could place in the field an army of 3,000,000 men, and it is folly to talk of England being able to cope with such a force, in British North America, so far from her base of operations. It is true that, so far as land operations are concerned, England would be unable to afford to us adequate assistance and protection. Then the hon. gentleman refers to the exodus, and he charges upon us responsibility for the exodus from this country. As well charge upon the physician responsibility for the occurrence of the disease because he had given a diagnosis of the case; as well charge the physician with responsibility for the result of a disease whose treatment had been repudiated and not adopted. The Liberal party merely pointed out the causes that led to the exodus. They urged the Government that these causes should be removed, and they have, in their places in this House, and in their efforts in the country, from time to time, striven to remove the causes that produced this lamentable state of affairs. But so far from responsibility resting upon their shoulders, they merely have labored to the best of their ability to avert the evil results, which unfortunately, have fallen upon us in this regard. Then the hon. gentleman accused my hon. friend, at my right, of attacking protection, and then moving a resolution in this House by which he proposed to double our protection. The hon. gentleman is evidently unable to dissociate in his mind the nature of the resolutions demanding unrestricted reciprocity and commercial union. It is not commercial union that is advocated by my hon. friend it is not commercial union that is asked for by this resolution, but unrestricted reciprocity, and unrestricted reciprocity would leave in our hands the entire control of our own tariff, except in so far as relating to imports and exports between this country and the United States. He says that Mr. Hitt and Mr. Butterworth are protectionists, that they want possession of this market, that they desire to reduce the people of this country to the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water. Mr. Hitt and Mr.