

the country. And since then he has skipped the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Richardson) would not lay these facts before Parliament. With him it depends on whose ox is gored. He pointed to the Winnipeg election as evidence that the people of that city were enamoured of the Liberal policy. The people of Winnipeg, and I give them credit for it, look out very carefully for No. 1. They did not put up a candidate against the Liberal nominee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Why ?

Mr. ROCHE. I will tell you why. An Independent labour candidate ran against the Liberal nominee who is a renegade Tory. The Conservative party decided that they would not seek to prevent the election of a supporter of the Government. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has paid a visit to Manitoba and to Winnipeg since last session. He has had some surveys made by an engineer of the Red River and estimates made of the probable cost of certain works which the people of Winnipeg and of Manitoba generally are very desirous should be gone on with—the St. Andrew's Locks. The people of Winnipeg thought it would be right to give the Liberal party an opportunity to prove the value of its professions, and so did not oppose the Liberal nominee. But, at the end of five years, if they have not fulfilled the expectations of their friends, those people will have something to say.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he will state how many surveys of the Red River were made by the engineer of the late Government ?

Mr. ROCHE. That is the hon. gentleman's usual way of arguing: "You're another." That has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the present case. Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. members on this side of the House, who are in favour of the policy of protection to our agricultural, manufacturing and labouring population, the principle underlying the tariff introduced by the Finance Minister, should not prove so disappointing. But to those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who vainly imagined that in tariff revision the principle of free trade would be adhered to the result must have come as a most painful surprise. But, above all, among those deluded electors who gave their support to the Liberal candidates and put their trust in them on the distinct understanding that with the return to power of the Liberal party the whole fabric of protection would be torn up and destroyed, root and branch, that, irrespective of any action that might be taken by any other country, on tariff matters the guiding principle of the Liberal party of Canada would be free trade. The fact that this Government adopts the

much abused policy of their predecessors in office will create a feeling of resentment at the duplicity which has been practiced upon them. Confidence has been so shaken that in future any promises emanating from the same source will be taken cum grano salis, and with a very large grain at that. Nothing is more calculated to destroy confidence in our public men than to see the promises held out to the electors unfulfilled, principles abandoned and the very things that the present Government had so decried announced as the policy of the Government. When the Minister of Public Works, in addressing this House, touched upon the tariff issue, he said that we on this side expected that the Government, in dealing with tariff issues, would make fools of themselves, but that is where we got left. I presume the hon. gentleman meant by that that we on this side of the House naturally expected that as honourable men they would keep their pledges to the electors, but they were not such fools as to do so. They had the option of keeping their pledges and making fools of themselves, or of violating their pledges and making fools of the electors, and they chose the latter alternative. This may be good politics on the part of the hon. gentleman, but it does not bespeak a very high standard of public morality. However, the hon. gentlemen who have been inured to the cold shades of Opposition for eighteen long years, and who have been growing more reckless in making pledges upon each successive occasion, whose sole aim and object appeared to be to gain power by hook or by crook, and having gained it, to retain it at all hazards—to be sure, to such hon. gentlemen public morality does not count for much, except, like their free trade doctrines, it is all well enough in theory, but in practice they, as a party, have no use for it. Now, those hon. gentlemen must take the people of Canada for a very gullible class indeed. They must be imbued with a good deal of what my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Craig) declared to be the Barnum idea, that the people like to be humbugged. But there comes a time, even to the most obtuse, when he catches on to those humbugging him, and then woe betide those who have been instrumental in befooling the victim. Now, the Liberal party have been in power but a short time, and still not so short a time but that they have given evidence of their intention to violate almost every pledge given to the electors upon which they secured power. A number of those pledges have been referred to by hon. gentlemen beside me, and it will not be necessary to enumerate them all, nor will it be necessary for me to enter into lengthy details touching any of them. Suffice it to say, that prominent amongst them was the promise to reduce the expenditure and the public debt. In neither case have they done so; they have increased both items. They promised if they were given opportunity that