

affairs which has produced a revenue far in excess of our expenditure, and to a Tariff which has promoted and built up new industries, a Tariff which is day by day developing the material resources of our country. We have to choose between these two parties: on the one hand, we have a disorganized party, having a divided fealty, recognizing no particular leader either within or without Parliament; a party desiring to obtain power for their personal aggrandizement and not for the interest of the country; a party bound together for the defeat of the Government, but for no other special purpose; a party which, when in power, turned surpluses into deficits and did their utmost to destroy the prosperity of the country. On the other hand, we can point with pride and satisfaction to the fact that we have a Government with a policy well defined and well matured, a policy which extricated our finances from confusion and filled our Treasury to repletion; we have a Government able to deal with the question of the development of the North-West Territory; we have a Government which has done its utmost to encourage and foster the industries of the country, and I do not hesitate to express my belief that when the electors of this country shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon its policy they will render an overwhelming verdict for the Government which has sought to encourage the struggling industries of the Dominion and protect the rights and liberties of the people.

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words before this debate closes, and in doing so I will try to remember the desire of the Government that the debate may soon be brought to a close, and also to remember that there are other gentlemen who desire to speak on this question as well as myself. I will, therefore, endeavor to limit my remarks to a few points that seem to me necessary to be touched upon. It would be a difficult matter for a member on this side of the House to say anything very new, very fresh or very interesting on this subject after the long, able and exhaustive speeches of many members of the party to which I belong. Still, we all have our own way of presenting our case, and I desire to present the question at issue between the two political parties as they strike my mind, as I see them, as I feel them to be. And I would say that, while I fully recognize the fact that the speaker who has just sat down has reminded us of, and which we are constantly reminded of by every speaker who addresses the House from the Government benches, that we are but a miserable minority in the House, and but a miserable minority in the country, as they affirm; yet, though we may be but a minority, hon. gentlemen recognize the fact that there is some little life to be found on this side of the House yet. I do not deny that the party to which I belong was defeated in the election of 1878. Hon. gentleman opposite are very fond of reminding us of that fact; that fact was borne home on our minds, that we could not fail to note. The hon. the leader of the Government, in a congratulatory speech he made shortly after the elections of 1878, was reported to have said that on the day after the election it was impossible to find a Grit in Ontario, or a Rouge in Quebec, even if you offered a reward. Their faces were so long that our good friend Mr. Geo. Brown, who has gone to his rest, and whom the Conservative party did honor to in common with ourselves, after he had gone, was charged 15 cents for shaving on the day following the contest, instead of 10 cents, on account of his face being so long. The Reform party believes in the eternal fitness of things. There is a time to laugh and a time to refrain from laughing, and, it strikes me, there was nothing particular for the Reform party to laugh at on the 18th September, 1878. I will not say it was a time to weep, but it was not the most appropriate time to laugh. We had been defeated in the country, we were passing through a long period of depression; but if it were true we

Mr. RYKERT.

had been so beaten, if it might be said we should have hidden our diminished heads, hon. gentlemen opposite, at all events, know that the heads have since come to light; that though beaten at the polls, there is a party which stands by the principles contended for at that time, a party that is represented in this House, a party not represented in this House in proportion to its numbers in the country, but a party that we believe, when an appeal is made to the people again, will come back to this House numerically stronger than they are at the present time. It is not always a proof that men are right because they secure the verdict of the people. If the people had the questions fairly presented and if they were properly understood, then I would bow, and I bow now to their decision, but I would bow more complacently to the public will as expressed at the polls. But the contention of the party to which I belong is this: that the people of the country did not pronounce in favor of the policy that hon. gentlemen opposite have given us, and which they term the National Policy. The question that was asked the public was to place in power men who would give the manufacturers better markets, larger markets, bring more of them into existence than before, that would give the artisans higher wages, and give the farmer higher prices for the products they had to sell. It was an appeal to the pockets of every class in the community, and though hon. gentlemen would not redeem the promises they had given, because to fulfil one would have been in conflict with another, they were careful in the different Provinces and on different platforms to make such promises as, for the time being, they thought would catch the popular ear. And thus it was they attained to power, while the hon. the Finance Minister himself is an evidence of the fact I am pointing out. The hon. the Finance Minister—if newspaper reports of meetings are correct, I have no reason to doubt they are not—stood on a platform in his own Province, a few days previous to the election of 1878, and though he did not use the words himself, his colleague running with him—he, the hon. the Finance Minister, being on the platform with him, and by his silence endorsing what his colleague said—stated that no statesman would ever propose to place a duty on flour. The hon. the Finance Minister did not deny that on the platform, and the audience no doubt interpreted, from the promises and statements made by the colleague of the present hon. Finance Minister, not challenged or contradicted by him, but endorsed by his silence, that the policy of the Conservative party, if restored to power, would not be a policy that would tax the food of the people of his Province. The hon. Finance Minister himself, knowing that the people of his Province were opposed to the burthens of taxation being increased, assured them that it was not contemplated to increase the Tariff, but simply to readjust it. When the leader of the Government was giving utterance to sentiments different to that from platforms in Ontario, word was passed over the wires to New Brunswick, and a telegram was sent from there to him, to ask if he meditated and had stated there would be an increase in the Tariff, and he replied that it was nonsense, that there was no increase of the Tariff meditated, but simply a readjustment of it. Then I ask whether the people of the Maritime Provinces gave their verdict in favor of the policy which hon. gentlemen said they had pronounced on. Hon. gentlemen said that if restored to power they would not increase the taxation and not tax breadstuffs; and as they were restored to power on these distinct pledges, it is for the people of those Provinces to settle the question with hon. gentlemen opposite who certainly misled them at that time. Another cause that led to the disaster was the continued misrepresentation of the Reform party with regard to the position they occupied towards the manufacturing interests. From every platform we were denounced as the enemy of the manufacturers, we were told that