ufactured goods would have to be eliminated, but what we wanted was to send a commission to Washington to lay down a basis for a treaty. We would have supported our opponents in any similar policy, but, while professing a willingness to go to Washington and negotiate a treaty, they never had any such intention, and while with one breath they told the people they wanted to negotiate a treaty, with the other breath they said we were disloyal because we wanted to negotiate a treaty. (Cheers.)

LOYALTY TO BRITAIN.

You know the part disloyalty played in the last election. I am loyal to the British crown. I have often repeated in the province of Quebec, and I am happy to repeat it to-day, when so many of my fellow-subjects of French origin are present, that we owe a debt of gratitude to the British crown for the way it has treated us in the last 50 years. (Cheers.) Loyal although I am, I do not think it would be my part to say that the interests of a colony are the interests of the empire. Take the best families in the land; there is often a diversity of interests between members of that family, and there is a diversity of interests between the members of an empire. The commercial interests of England are not the interests of Canada, and the commercial interests of Canada are not the commercial interests of England; and there is no Conservative who can say that, for the fact that England is free trade and the Canadian Conservatives protectionist shows that there is at least a diversity of interests between England and Canada. Sir, I want now to say this, if the interests of Canada clash with the interests of England, is it any part of my loyalty or yours that we should make the interests of Canada give way to the interests of Great Britain? (Cries of "No, no.") What is the reason, I want to know, that my ancestors left the shores of France to come to the savage country? Simply because they were not satisfied with their condition in France and thought they would better it in Canada. What is the reason your own fathers left the shores of Great Britain, of England, Ireland, and Scotland, simply because your own fathers were not satisfied with their condition upon their native soil, but believed that by coming to this country they would build up for themselves and their families a better and more prosperous condition of things. And are we, their descendants, to be told when we find our interests clashing with those of the motherland we must stand by the motherland? I do not attempt any such loyalty, and I am quite sure of the position that would be adopted in any part of Great Britain. I would not hesitate to go upon any platform there and state the same thing that I say to-night. I am a British subject, and if it were my lot to have been a member of the British house of commons I would speak like an Englishman and stand up for England in preference to Canada any time.

CANADA FIRST.

But I am a member of her majesty's house of commons of Canada, and leave it to Englishmen who represent the interests of her majesty's subjects in the Imperial parliament to deal with the interests of the English nation, and I call upon the people of Canada to stand up for the interests of Canada; and if there be any man in this audience—no, there is no one in this audience—but if there be any man outside of this audience who says he stands up in preference for the interests of England, I tell him "go back to England." And in speaking as I do, I claim I am perfectly loyal, because her majesty the Queen does not expect that any of her Canadian subjects should abase themselves or should refuse to stand up for the interests of their country; but she expects from us upon every occasion that the interests of Canada be paramount. (Applause.) Again, I say, this is loyalty such as I understand it. But there is more than this to satisfy the conscience, the supercilious conscience of those extreme Conservatives who, I am afraid, will not be satisfied with anything except the possession of power. Let me tell them this, that if a treaty is negotiated by Canada with a foreign country that treaty will have to be ratified by the government of her majesty the Queen in England and if the British government object that we should make such a treaty, then, sir, and not sooner, it will be time to raise objections. What I claim is that upon this policy of reciprocity, it should be well known and well understood that while claiming to do the best for our country, we know full well that our action is subject to the approbation of her majesty the Queen. These two questions, in my judgment, ought to constitute mainly the programme of the Liberal party. (Applause.) The battle in which we are engaged at this moment is a battle for the welfare of Canada, and the welfare of Canada depends upon her fiscal policy.

But there are other questions still. One of the evils of the national policy and the system of protection has been here, as everywhere else, to lower the moral level of public life. It is a subject, however, into which I do not desire to enter at length. I speak of it more in sorrow than in anger; but I tell you this, if you want to purify the political atmosphere that not a cent is to be levied except what is necessary to carry on the legitimate expenses of the government economically administered. I speak of this subject more in sorrow than in anger, but there is not a man who has in his bosom a patriotic heart that does not see with shame that the name of Canada has become the byword of corruption among the civilized nations of the earth.

THE MAJORITY MUST RULE.

There are other questions, but we have not the time to take up too many. One or two, however, ought not to be forgotten. We should endeavor to retain in every election an honest expression of the public mind and of the public will. We must be governed by the majority. I do not say that the majority is always right, but until we have something better we must abide by the rule that the majority must govern. What I want is atrue and honest expression of the public mind. I object, therefore, to those laws which have been placed on the statute book by which the men in power continue not to have an honest expression of the public mind, and distort the true expression of the public will. I denounce it to you as infamy. I say that the best and safest principle is to resort to the old policy we had in former years of having a provincial franchise. This system prevailed for the first eighteen years after confederation and I never heard a single complaint against it. The majority ruled, but in 1885 this infamous act was passed. So infamous is it that the men who promoted it dare not put it in force because the law requires that there should be revision every year. But a revision every year costs so much that the government are begged by their followers not to put that expense upon them. But the act is put in force on the eve of an election because it gives to the party in power an unfair advantage. Again I denounce this other infamy, the system of gerrymander. Under our own system of government it is necessary that there should be after every census a redistribution of seats. There is but one basis to adopt, the basis of the mother land. There have been redistributions in the mother land, but there has never been a word of complaint, because the redistribution takes place upon a well known basis and principle, and that is that the boundary of no county should be interfered with. That is a principle which ought to be adopted here, and I hope that upon this we will have a most emphatic expression from this convention.

There are other questions, and it would not be fair on my part not to deal with them. Within the last fifteen days I have received several applications from different parts of the country asking me, "What are you going to do about temperance?" "What are you going to do about prohibition?" I ought to speak frankly upon this. I don't pretend at this moment to give you any more than my views. On a former occasion I already announced that this was a free, democratic convention, in which no cut-and-dried resolutions are to be placed before you. You are free to move upon prohibition or anything else that you choose, but I ask you simply to allow me to give you my views. You are aware that two years ago, against our protest, however, the government of the day appointed a commission to investigate the liquor question not only in this country but in other countries as well. This was done against our protest. We believed, I still believe for my part, that we have all the information we require on which to form an opinion upon this subject. The Dominion Alliance, which is the great prohibition parliament of the country, has a representative to speak for it upon the floor of the house of commons. That gentleman is Mr. Dickey. You know very well that, not upon one occasion but during two sessions—the sessions of 1892 and 1893—the Dominion Alliance, by the mouths of its spokesman and the other members of the alliance upon the floor of the house of commons, declared that until that commission had reported the question of prohibition should be left in abeyance, so far as the Dominion parliament is concerned. Well, sir, for my part, I do not see how, as long as this report is to come, as long as this investigation is to proceed and as long as the Dominion Alliance professes to be satisfied with it, the Canadian parliament, the Liberal party, can deal with it. Let me go one step further. As far as I am personally concerned, I am prepared to give my views now and at once upon this question, and as soon as it is removed from the state it is in now I shall not hesitate to give my views with no uncertain sound. It would be premature to say how I should speak or vote, but my mind is made up and I will be prepared to give my advice to the Liberal party for them to act upon it or not, just as they please. As long as the commission is deliberating it would be impossible for us to frame a policy. If they did, the government would go to their friends and say "This is not fair to-

ALEX. WHEELER, president Reform association, Toronto.

wards us, we are seeking information at your request," and therefore do not ask us to have an issue on this, and, gentlemen, I want to have an issue with the government on every question that comes up. (Hear, hear.) There is another question upon which I have read several communications urging me to take a course upon that question. Different persons in the various provinces have asked me to take the opposite courses. To them I have given no answer. I give it now, gentlemen; I wish the question were in any other condition. Those of you who follow political events know that last session Mr. Tarte on the one hand and Mr. D'Alton McCarthy on the other agreed that the government were a pack of cowards—(cheers)—that they did not deal on that subject in a manly way. Upon my part I spoke in the same sense, and I now say that the government acted in a cowardly way and did not dare to speak either one way or the other. It was their bounden duty to say one thing or the other, but instead of acting like men of courage they allowed passion to be inflamed in Manitoba and Quebec and never dared to stand up like men and put an issue of the question. They are to be blamed for this. (Hear, hear.) They shunted the question to the courts, where it is now. The opposition are not in a position to take any action until such time as a report has been given by the courts and until the courts have decided whether or not the government have the right to interfere. Then, sir, it will be time for us to say we will act or not. In my estimation it is not prudent, now that the question is before the court, to deal with it because it would be appealing to prejudices which it would be better to be left aside. (Applause.) For my part, as on the temperance question, I say it is possible the time may never come to speak on this subject again in parliament, because, if the courts decide that the government have no right to interfere, that will be an end of the question forever. (Hear, hear.) One word more. It is now 26 years since confederation. It was openly said at the time that the object of those who framed the constitution was to make this Canada of ours a nation under progressive British institutions. For my part, I have always regretted that upon that

JOHN FLETT, Toronto.

occasion a province was trampled on, instead of an appeal being made to the best instincts of their hearts. Such an appeal would have reconciled them long ago to a system which, in my estimation, is a noble one because it has a great aim. Now and for ever, whether we are in opposition or in power, it will ever be our aim upon every occasion to appeal to the generous heart of the people and not resort to force or coercion. (Cheers.) We are divided in this country as to race and creed, but I am glad to see that in the high aim we have in view there is no creed or racial division. There is something superior upon which we desire to build up a nation; but is it sufficient to have a moral basis for a people? We must have material prosperity, and the prosperity of the people depends upon our fiscal policy. We are probably on the eve of a general election. When it will come is among the secrets of the gods upon Parliament hill yonder. It is possible we may have a repetition of the deceit of the last dissolution and it, therefore, behooves us to be henceforth prepared for the fray, whenever it comes. Let us resolve, here and now and henceforward and for every moment from this day or until the battle has been won, that we shall never cease our efforts, and for my part in this struggle I shall endeavor to do my duty to the best of my ability—(loud cheers)—and I hope, nay, I am sure, that every one of you, general, colonel, captain and private, whenever it comes, will always be found at his post. (Loud and prolonged cheering, the entire convention rising and cheering vociferously.)

MR. LAURIER'S SPEECH IN FRENCH.

Mr. Laurier, at the conclusion of his address, made also a few remarks in French, alluding to the principles laid down by such men as Papineau and Lafontaine, and calling upon his fellow-countrymen to follow in their footsteps. His remarks created the wildest enthusiasm among the delegates from Quebec.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The report of the committee to strike committees, which was read by Mr. Chas. Hyman, recommended the following gentlemen as members of the committee on resolutions:—Hon. C. A. P. Pelletier, Hon. W. Ross, Hon. F. Langelier, Hon. F. G. Marchand, Hon. D. A. Macdonald, C. Beausoleil, P. A. Choquette, M.P., C. Deschene, M.PP., Dr. Guay, M.P., A. Turgeon, M.PP., L. H. Brodeur, M.P., Dr. Christie, M.P., J. I. Tarte, M.P., I. Scriver, M.P., S. A. Fisher, ex-M.P., Dr. Rinfret, M.P., Jules Tessier, M.PP., George Carroll, M.P., Dr. Godbout, M.P., C. R. Devlin, M.P., Dr. Vaillancourt, M.P., Hon. E. P. Thompson, Hon. A. H. Gillmor, W. F. George, George C. King, G. Hadlow, J. L. Carleton, G. F. Gregory, J. U. Ellier, Jas. Domville, James O'Brien, Hon. J. A. C. Prendergast, Hon. Robt. Watson, Mr. Bechard, M.P., Hon. J. H. Ross, Hon. James Richards, Hon. David Laird, Malcolm MacDonald, Hon. L. H. Davies, M.P., Hon. B. Rogers, J. W. Carmichael, W. H. Chase, M. Dwyer, Hon. A. G. Jones, George J. Troop, G. H. Murray, D. C. Fraser, M.P., Hon. A. McGillivray, Mayor Keefe, Mayor Allan, Dr. Borden, M.P., Hon. R. W. Scott, Sir Richard Cartwright, Hon. David Mills, M.P., John Charlton, M.P., John McMillan, M.P., George C. Gibbons, James D. Edgar, M.P., R. C. Clute, D. Burke Simpson, James Sutherland, M.P., James Conmee, M.PP., Robt. Jaffray, W. Mulock, M.P., W. Patterson, M.P., W. D. Balfour, M.PP., Andrew Pattullo, Hon. James Young, Chas. Mackenzie, M.PP., F. T. Frost, A. T. Wood, J. R. Stratton, M.PP., T. O. Anderson, James McMullen, M.P., T. P. Gorman, Hon. J. M. Gibson, N. A. Belcourt, E. D. O'Flynn, W. R. Aylesworth, Joseph Tait, M.PP., W. Gibson, M.P.

The committee further recommended that Mr. Laurier and the president and vice-president elected by this convention be ex-officio members of all committees. The report was unanimously adopted.

THE SECOND DAY.

When the convention opened this morning the delegates were present in large force. The appearance of Sir Oliver Mowat and Hon. H. G. Joly aroused a burst of cheering and applause. The crowd rose and waved their hats and fans with enthusiasm.

Sir Oliver announced that as most of the speaking had been in English they would all be glad that their fellow-countrymen who prefer the French language should hear a speech in the language they love. He called upon Mr. Joly to address them. The announcement was received with cheers by the French delegates, who filled all the seats near the platform. Mr. Joly, speaking to his compatriots, told them that upon their return to their province they would be able to tell their people that they had seen one of the grandest of spectacles here. Their chief acclaimed by thousands of persons; their leader, whose characteristics were courage and frankness, who went to Toronto, where some people said he would not dare to speak, and had repeated the same things he had said in Quebec. That was the reason he was respected in Ontario. The people of that province respected him for his courage. That, Mr. Joly said, was the man who would lead them to victory by the straight line of honor and loyalty. When they returned to their people they would also tell that they had been sitting here side by side with delegates from all parts of the Dominion, and that it was impossible to tell who were French-Canadians and who were English when Mr. Laurier was speaking. Referring to political questions, he said the situation in 1878 was the same as to-day. There was a commercial crisis then and now. The people in 1878 were asking Mr. Mackenzie if he could not do something to lighten their burdens. Mr. Mackenzie's reply was that it was not by legislation they were to seek relief, that the remedy was in the people's hands, and that they must depend upon the abundant resources of the country. Then there appeared a doctor who said he had a universal panacea. Mr. Joly said that he himself at that time had a certain confidence in the remedy, and the great majority of the people of the country decided to try it. Mr. Mackenzie fell with honor, and to-day was the day of his rehabilitation. What has been the result of the remedy whose doses had to be increased from year to year? Manufactures had certainly risen, but it was by forced growth and they bore no fruit. They were therefore now obliged to see if they could not prune some of the top branches, lop the mouldering branches away, and, said Mr. Joly, the axe must be laid at the trunk of the tree. He referred to the formation of combines by which small industries had been crushed, instancing the case of the rope factory at Montreal. The people had had enough of protection. During somewhat extensive travelling over the country in Manitoba and other provinces he had heard the same cry for a change. He explained that although in 1878 he had been inclined to believe in the national policy, he went with Mr. Mackenzie and fought with him. To-day the commercial crisis was worse than then, and thousands of their people were leaving Quebec. His speech aroused frequent bursts of enthusiasm, and when he had done the audience cheered him again and again.

Sir Oliver Mowat said the convention would now have the pleasure of hearing another representative of the French race. They had the advantage over the English in that they spoke equally well in both languages. Those whose language was French liked to hear it; those who spoke English, many of them not having the advantage of understanding French very well, would like to hear the gentleman who was about to speak. They had not always agreed with the gentleman in the past, and he dare say there were matters in which they did not agree with him now, but nevertheless they would be delighted to see and hear him. He was known as being an independent, fearless and persevering politician and member of parliament. He need not tell the convention that he was referring to the member for L'Islet, Mr. Tarte. (Applause.)

MR. TARTE.

Mr. Tarte received an ovation from the French-Canadian delegates, which was joined in by those from other provinces than Quebec. He remarked upon opening his speech that he was a new comer amongst them, and that he appreciated the honor they did him and his county by calling upon him. He reminded them that they had marched from the county of L'Islet to Vaudreuil from victory to victory, and he felt sure they were to be followed by successes in many other counties. As he understood, he went on to say, they were not met here to do the government's business, or to do a service to the government. Speaking of Archbishop Tache's letter with regard to the Manitoba schools, he said it had come too late. If it had come last session, when the archbishop was as well informed as now, then the members of parliament would have taken advantage of it. The Liberals had the courage of their convictions, and would have acted upon them. The government had refused to accept the solution offered by the Liberals, and now they must bear the responsibility. Mr. Laurier had yesterday spoken in prudent terms, but had not contradicted his previous utterances. They had leaders who possessed the confidence of the people of all the provinces, and allies such as Mr. Mowat, who had done so much for their fellow-countrymen in Ontario. At this point in Mr. Tarte's speech the bell in a chapel near by began to ring, and the crowd cheered and applauded the remark that it was ringing the death knell of the government. Proceeding, Mr. Tarte said that in 1873, when he was a Conservative, he wrote a letter, which has caused some discussion. He was thinking then of the time when Sir John Macdonald would disappear, he was foreseeing all the infirmities of Mr. Clarke Wallace, and that Mr McCarthy was the only man of ability in the Conservative party. Had not the predictions he then made been verified? He asked what the ministers of the government had done for their language or their schools. They had then got more of their portfolios. And by what right could the government ask a man who had not the authority of a majority to present a solution? He was proceeding to speak of the bishops, when a delegate cried shame. Mr. Tarte said it was not shame upon the bishops. They were men of good faith, and were therefore not in a position to negotiate with men who had none. He referred individually to Hon. Messrs. Chapleau, Ouimet and Angers and Sir Adolphe Caron, and declared the three French ministers were without influence. He left it to his fellow-countrymen to look at the two parties

C. S. HYMAN, ex-M.P., London.

and draw conclusions. They would only be respected by their allies, he declared, in the measure they respected themselves. (Cheers.)

When Mr. Tarte had concluded his address in French there was a demand for a few words from him in English. He said:—"Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—I don't speak very well in French and I am very sorry to say that I speak very badly in English. Still, as you are kind enough to call upon me to say a few words, I must submit. Gentlemen, you all know that I am an old Tory—(laughter)—that I have committed many sins, but at the same time I am bound to say that I have made up my mind to do a little better if I can. (Applause.) For the last two years I think I have to a certain extent made up for the past waste of time, and my friend, the Hon. Mr. Laurier, and myself have been in the past on very friendly relations. I have not always been in accord with his political views, but I have always found in him a man of honor and a man of great ability. (Applause.) One good morning came when I saw the errors of my past, and I found in myself enough courage to tell my associates of the past that I could not any more work in harmony with them. I suppose I could not be accused to-day of having gone from the weaker to the stronger party.

A voice—Stronger in honesty and the right.

Mr. Tarte—But I have come over to you when brilliant offers were made to me to remain.

A voice—We welcome you.

Mr. Tarte—I found in my heart and conscience enough courage to tell me that

President MACLEAN, of the Ottawa Reform association.

it was better to follow the path of duty and the path of honor. I think if the Conservative party and the Dominion had had representatives at this magnificent gathering the result of the next election would be already decided. We are making for a platform and a programme that will be acceptable to any honest man. The platform will be open to the acceptance of any man who has at heart the welfare of our country. I have spoken in French of the rights of the minority. Although I cannot express myself in English with the same facility as in French, I must say to you in English what I think, because, as I said a minute ago, honesty is the best policy. I appeal to my English fellow-countrymen to give me five minutes of your good attention. We are accused by the Tory papers of the province of Ontario of raising prejudices and religious hatred. The motion I have made in the house of commons on the school question is attacked upon all sides. I have been represented to you as a fanatical man. Gentlemen, I feel that I am not that sort of man, but I feel the same man who has enough courage to say in French and to say in English what he thinks is right. (Applause.) I feel, gentlemen, that when the French element have acquired rights they must not be trampled upon. I feel that all citizens of this Dominion have the same rights on this broad soil of America. (Applause.) We don't ask for anything more than that, but we won't take any-

Gable view of a prominent member of the house.

thing less, and we feel that with the Liberal party we are safe on that ground. On that school question we are in no way responsible for the difficulties existing to-day. We are not in power. We did nothing to make us responsible for the present position of affairs. Before the elections of 1891 (and what I am saying now I am prepared to prove) Sir John Macdonald, the then prime minister, sent to Archbishop Tache the Hon. Mr. Chapleau, who was secretary of state, with full power and authority to negotiate with Archbishop Tache about that school question. What was agreed was this: It was agreed that Sir John Macdonald would not disallow the law, because it might injure the Toronto element; but Mr. Chapleau, who is still living, who has read my words uttered in the house of commons, and who does not deny any one of them, pledged himself that after the elections were over, if the courts of justice, to which the case was then submitted, decided against us, the government would take the matter into its own hands. There was the pledge. We said at the time, and we say now, that it was a deceitful and a shameful pledge. Members of her majesty's privy council have no right to make such pledges. Well, sir, the pledge was made. Archbishop Tache is living, and Mr. Chapleau is living, and I challenge either of them to deny the fact. My English fellow-countrymen, you should not be surprised if we insist upon having that pledge carried out. That pledge was given to us. It was not given only to Archbishop Tache. I knew of that pledge myself, as did others. We were given a formal pledge that the government itself would settle the question, and if Archbishop Tache can deny it, I challenge him to do so. If Mr. Chapleau can deny it, I challenge him to do so. But the question has been referred to the courts of justice. Let it be well understood that, whatever may be the decision of the courts of justice on any question, the rights are the same after all. We may be obliged to submit to the law, as all citizens are obliged to submit to it, but I claim all the same that our rights have been infringed by this Tory government at Ottawa. This is our position. We are ready to stand by our declarations, but we don't want to be misunderstood. Now, I have said a few words to you as well as I could. When I was 27 years old I could not speak one solitary word of English. I was ten years in a parish before knowing that there were any English people on the surface of the earth, but my boys won't be in the same position. I have a boy nineteen years old who can speak English better than I can myself. Don't believe what some people say, that we are not progressive men in the province of Quebec. We are progressive men. When I read The Mail and The Empire, insinuating, and even saying, that we are a retrograde lot of habitants, I come to the conclusion that they don't know what we are. Come down and see us. I invite you to visit my own fine county of L'Islet. Come and see us, and you will find to-day in the old province of Quebec men willing to work hand-in-hand with you. You will find a lot of men, of whom my friend here (Mr. Laurier) is the worthy and revered chief. (Applause.)

MR. LAURIER.

There were cries for Mr. Laurier, who had entered the rink in the meantime, and upon his coming forward the immense audience, rising, cheered until the rafters rang. He spoke in French for half an hour. He reviewed the condition to which protection has brought the country, and spoke of the evils of the hidden taxation of the protective system. Referring to the Manitoba school question, he declared that he would not have referred it to the courts—that he would have had the courage of his opinions and would have settled it. When he had finished his speech, there were cries of, "English, English." He explained that the time for adjournment had arrived, and that the report of the committee on resolutions would be presented on the reassembling, and that he would then have the agreeable duty of moving one of the resolutions.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

As the committee on resolutions was not quite ready to report at the opening of the afternoon session, brief, pointed, telling speeches were delivered by a few of the prominent delegates in response to calls from the audience.

Mr. D. C. Fraser, M.P., of Guysboro', stirred the convention to greatest enthusiasm by his eloquent appeal for freedom of trade. He said that the delegates had assembled under the conviction that certain members of the community, by means of legislative enactment, were receiving more than their share of the products of industry. The delegates had come prepared to fight against the system. (Applause.) He ridiculed the notion of Messrs. Bowell and Foster travelling through the country investigating the effects of the tariff, and pointed out that they could obtain more information from such an array of delegates than they could from certain favored parties, in the closet, who commanded them. ("Hear, hear." "That is it.") They reminded him of the Scotch laird who had a son possessed of no more brains than he ought to have. The laird therefore determined to send his son travelling, "to see the world," as he told a friend. "But," said the friend, "do ye no ken that the world will see him?" (Great laughter.) When Messrs. Foster and Bowell started out they never thought the world would see through them. (Hear, hear.) The Liberal party was determined to have such reform as would give those who toil and sweat some chance to live. The convention would miss its force if the delegates did not go home with convictions deepened and ardor stimulated to throw off the shackles upon trade. He believed the delegates would go home to start an intelligent crusade, in order to lay deep the principle that every blow they struck and every dollar they earned should give them, as God designed it should, the benefit of their labor. (Great cheers.)

REPORT ON RESOLUTIONS.

The report of the committee on resolutions presented by Hon. W. S. Fielding, and unanimously adopted, is as follows:—

The tariff—We, the Liberal party of Canada, in convention assembled, declare:—

That the customs tariff of the Dominion should be based, not as it is now upon the protective principle, but upon the requirements of the public service;

That the existing tariff, founded upon an unsound principle, and used, as it has been by the goverument, as a corrupting agency wherewith to keep themselves in office, has developed monopolies, trusts and combinations;

It has decreased the value of farm and other landed property;

It has oppressed the masses to the enrichment of a few;

It has checked immigration;

It has caused great loss of population;

It has impeded commerce;

It has discriminated against Great Britain.

In these and in many other ways it has occasioned great public and private injury, all of which evils must continue to grow in intensity as long as the present tariff system remains in force.

That the highest interests of Canada demand a removal of this obstacle to our country's progress, by the adoption of a sound fiscal policy, which, while not doing injustice to any class, will promote domestic and foreign trade and hasten the return of prosperity to our people.

That to that end the tariff should be reduced to the needs of honest, economical and efficient government.

That it should be so adjusted as to make free, or to bear as lightly as possible upon, the necessaries of life, and should be so arranged as to promote freer trade with the whole world, more particularly with Great Britain and the United States.

We believe that the results of the protective system have grievously disappointed thousands of persons who honestly supported it, and that the country, in the light of experience, is now prepared to declare for a sound fiscal policy.

The issue between the two political parties on this question is now clearly defined.

The government themselves admit the failure of their fiscal policy, and now profess their willingness to make some changes; but they say that such changes must be based only on the principle of protection.

We denounce the principle of protection as radically unsound, and unjust to the masses of the people, and we declare our conviction that any tariff changes based on that principle must fail to afford any substantial relief from the burdens under which the country labors.

This issue we unhesitatingly accept, and upon it we await with the fullest confidence the verdict of the electors of Canada.

Reciprocity—That, having regard to the prosperity of Canada and the United States as adjoining countries, with many mutual interests, it is desirable that there should be the most friendly relations and broad and liberal trade intercourse between them;

That the interests alike of the Dominion and of the empire would be materially advanced by the establishing of such relations;

That the period of the old reciprocity treaty was one of marked prosperity to the British North American colonies;

That the pretext under which the government appealed to the country in 1891 respecting negotiations for a treaty with the United States was misleading and dishonest and intended to deceive the electorate;

That no sincere effort has been made by them to obtain a treaty, but that, on the contrary, it is manifest that the present government, controlled as they are by monopolies and combines, are not desirous of securing such a treaty;

That the first step towards obtaining the end in view is to place a party in power who are sincerely desirous of promoting a treaty on terms honorable to both countries;

That a fair and liberal reciprocity treaty would develop the great natural resources of Canada, would enormously increase the trade and commerce between the two countries, would tend to encourage friendly relations between the two peoples, would remove many causes which have in the past provoked irritation and trouble to the governments of both countries, and would pro-

ANDREW PATTULLO, editor Sentinel-Review, Woodstock.

mote those kindly relations between the empire and the republic which afford the best guarantee for peace and prosperity;

That the Liberal party is prepared to enter into negotiations with a view to obtaining such a treaty, including a well-considered list of manufactured articles, and we are satisfied that any treaty so arranged will receive the assent of her majesty's government, without whose approval no treaty can be made.

Corruption—The convention deplores the gross corruption in the management and expenditure of public moneys which for years past has existed under the rule of the Conservative party, and the revelations of which by the different parliamentary committees of inquiry have brought disgrace upon the fair name of Canada.

The government, which profited politically by these expenditures of public moneys of which the people have been defrauded, and which, nevertheless, have never punished the guilty parties, must be held responsible for the wrong-doing.

We arraign the government for retaining in office a minister of the crown proved to have accepted very large contributions of money for election purposes from the funds of a railway company, which, while paying the political contributions to him, a member of the government, with one hand, was receiving government subsidies with the other.

The conduct of the minister and the approval of his colleagues after the proof became known to them are calculated to degrade Canada in the estimation of the world and deserve the severe condemnation of the people.

Economy—We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

The Franchise act—Resolved, that the Franchise act since its introduction has

J. BRIERLEY, editor St. Thomas Journal.

cost the Dominion treasury over a million of dollars, besides entailing a heavy expenditure to both political parties;

That each revision involves an additional expenditure of a further quarter of a million;

That this expenditure has prevented an annual revision, as originally intended, in the absence of which young voters entitled to the franchise have in numerous instances been prevented from exercising their natural rights;

That it has failed to secure uniformity, which was the principal reason assigned for its introduction;

That its provisions are less liberal than those already existing in many provinces of the Dominion, and that in the opinion of this covention the act should be repealed, and we should revert to the provincial franchises.

Dominion lands—That in the opinion of this convention the sales of public lands of the Dominion should be to actual settlers only, and not to speculators, upon reasonable terms of settlement, and in such areas as can be reasonably occupied and cultivated by the settler.

The gerrymander acts—That by the gerrymander acts the electoral divisions for the return of members to the house of commons have been so made as to prevent a fair expression of the opinion of the country at the general elections, and to secure to the party now in power a strength out of all proportion greater than the numbers of electors supporting them would warrant.

To put an end to this abuse, to make the house of commons a fair exponent of public opinion, and to preserve the historic continuity of counties, it is desirable in the formation of electoral divisions that county boundaries should be preserved, and that in no case parts of different counties should be put in one electoral division.

Prohibition—That whereas public attention is at present much directed to the consideration of the admittedly great evils of intemperance, it is desirable that the mind of the people should be clearly ascertained on the question of prohibition by means of a Dominion plebiscite.

Ministerial misconduct—The convention regrets that by the action of ministers and their supporters in parliament, in one case in which serious charges were made against a minister of the crown, investigation was altogether refused, while in another case the charges preferred were altered and then referred to a commission appointed upon the advice of the ministry, contrary to the well settled practice of parliament; and this convention affirms that it is the ancient and undoubted right of the house of commons to inquire into all matters of public expenditure, and into all charges of misconduct in office against ministers of the crown, and the reference of such matters to royal commissions, created upon the advice of the accused, is at variance with the due responsibility of ministers to the house of commons, and tends to weaken the authority of the house over the executive government, and this convention affirms that the powers of the people's representatives in this regard should on all fitting occasions be upheld.

The senate—The present constitution of the senate is inconsistent with the federal principle in our system of government, and is in other respects defective, as it now makes the senate independent of the people and uncontrolled by the public opinon of the country, and should be so amended as to bring it into harmony with the principles of popular government.

Hon. Mr. Fielding concluded by moving that, owing to the limited time and the large number of subjects, the mover and seconder of each resolution should be restricted to ten minutes, and other speakers to five minutes. This suggestion commended itself to the judgment of the convention, and was unanimously adopted.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. Laurier on coming forward was received with unabated enthusiasm, the delegates first cheering spontaneously and then, growing in the warmth of their greeting, rising to their feet and waving hats, coats and handkerchiefs, the cheering continuing with surprising vigor in such an atmosphere. The leader said:—"I have to move the first resolution on the tariff. I will read it again."

"Gentlemen," continued Mr. Laurier, when he had read the resolution, "gentlemen, I do not know but I would say your judgment will agree with mine that this resolution is complete in itself. Of course it is now open to discussion and amendment, but it seems to me that it could hardly be improved upon. It is a thorough arraignment of the policy the government has followed. It sets forth all the evils which have flowed from the system of protection, and it draws the line clear and distinct and forcibly between truth on the one side and error on the other, the policy of liberty and freedom and the policy of slavery, because, I leave it to the judgment of every freeman, to the farmers, and above all I leave it to the workingmen in the cities, if protection is anything else but slavery. (Cheers.) The government has no right to take from the earnings of anyone anything except what is due to carry on the business of government. (Cheers.) The moment the government takes one cent from your pocket, and that cent does not go into the treasury of the country, that is robbery to your prejudice. (Cheers.) Therefore, I think the resolution should meet with your approval, and I am glad to say that from this day we have a clear arraignment of the government, which we shall not cease to urge until the great battle is fought and we have achieved victory." (Loud cheers.)

The Liberal leader then read the resolution in French, and resuming in English, said:—"Now, I have already spoken at length on this subject and am glad to see the views I enunciated yesterday fully covered by this resolution. (Cheers.) I move its adoption."

Mr. Wm. Paterson, M. P. for South Brant, one of the popular Liberal leaders from Ontario, seconded the motion in a weighty and eloquent speech. He was received with loud cheers. He said he saw before him men thoroughly posted on all questions of interest in the country in which they lived. He took exception to the view that alliance with a political party was inconsistent with good citizenship. It may be true with regard to some parties but not with regard to the Liberal party. (Cheers.) What was to be found in the platform of the Liberal party or its principles to lead any man to sever his connection with that party, which had such a glorious record for all that was good and right? (Cheers.) "What is that record?" asked Mr. Paterson, who was evidently in touch with the great audience. "Why, sir, I speak in the presence of men who know; who went through battles in times past when every right and liberty and justice we now enjoy was secured for us by the Reform party. We are here to-day a free people, living in a land rich in the variety of its resources, and while we have not met with the progress which a people blessed with our natural advantages ought to have made, the reason is that wrongs have existed in the administration of government. In this resolution you have laid down in clear language what is true. It is nothing new, but you have the principles of the Liberal party again asserted, that in levying duties regard should be had only to the necessities of the revenue, and that in taxing the people the necessary requirements should be the aim of the government, and that they should not seek by tariff legislation to favor any particular class in the community. (Cheers.) I say it is no new principle. A revenue tariff was in force under Mr. Mackenzie, and he and his government fell because they would not yield to the cry for a protective tariff. From that day to this the Liberal party have not ceased to proclaim that they did not believe it right that protection as a principle should be recognized by a government, but that the necessary taxation only should be raised to enable a government to discharge its duties effectively, and leave the people free to work out their own destinies, giving no portion of the community an unjust advantage over any other portion. To-day you have that principle embodied in the resolution—freedom of trade against restriction of trade. (Cheers.) I consider this resolution makes the difference between the policies clear and distinct. Our Conservative friends believe in restricting trade; we believe in extending and expanding it, believing that increased commerce will bring prosperity; that it is a right principle, because it recognizes the equality of all the provinces and all the different interests, and says that no one shall by legislation have an advantage over his neighbor, one province not having an advantage over another, one class not having an advantage over another, one interest not having an advantage over another; but all having a fair field, asking no favor, that we may go on each one fulfilling his own duty and endeavoring to build up into a great and prosperous nation this Dominion of Canada, in which Providence has cast our lot, and of which we are all proud. I second the resolution. (Loud cheers.)

RECIPROCITY.

The chairman announced that the next question would be that of reciprocity, which would be presented by Hon. Louis H. Davies of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Davies was cheered as he came forward to move the reciprocity resolution. He said:—Mr. Chairman,—Some eleven years ago I had the honor of being elected a representative in the Dominion parliament. I had the further honor on my election of being entrusted by my then leader with an important resolution favoring reciprocity with the United States. To-