

to instruct the dairymen of Canada. By this means, and by distributing literature bearing on dairy work, cheese-making has been improved to such an extent in Canada that we are now almost confessedly at the head of the world. A few years ago we were nowhere compared with the United States; now we are ahead of that country in the English markets, and it is an actual fact that Ontario cheese-makers have been taken home to England and Scotland to teach the dairymen of that country how to make cheese.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to give one reason why Canadian cheese has gone up?

Mr. CASEY. Certainly; state it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Previous to the introduction of the National Policy the Americans shipped inferior American cheese through Canada as Canadian cheese, thereby lowering the reputation of our make, but now they must make themselves responsible for their own cheese or else pay the duty.

Mr. CASEY. This shows just about how much hon. gentlemen opposite know of the effect of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman attributes to the National Policy the fact that bad American cheese has ceased to be marketed as Canadian cheese, and he is not aware apparently that the National Policy has not increased the duty on cheese at all.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds.) I know we had two cents a pound before the National Policy.

Mr. CASEY. Two of the articles with which the National Policy has not interfered at all are butter and cheese, and I have, therefore, taken those two articles as illustrating, most particularly, the fact that wherever the Government kindly leaves an industry alone it prospers, and that wherever they do interfere they injure. No, Sir; I say the National Policy, as regards the farming industry, has been a huge and gigantic failure, and that the improvements which have taken place in agriculture—and they are great—have been due to the industry and enterprise of the farmers themselves, and to the assistance of the Local Government of Ontario, and perhaps the Governments of the other Provinces, though I am not so fully posted with regard to them.

But, Sir, the National Policy is only one of the many failures of which the present Administration has been guilty; and I say "guilty of failure," though we would not ordinarily say that, because when they came into power they professed that they were going to be always successful, that Providence was with them, and that they were sure of being successful at all times, so that if they failed it has been by some wrong doing of their own; they are "guilty of failure," and have not merely been unfortunate. There has been a superstition that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has a talisman which makes him always successful; and I do not know anything which has contributed so much to his success as the widespread opinion that he always would be successful, that everybody believed in his star. But that superstition is rapidly becoming obsolete; if not, it shows that those who once enter on the service of a leader—those who follow the fortunes of a prophet—cannot detach themselves from him no matter how severely they are admonished by facts that his star is no longer in the ascendant, and that the continuous success which they hoped for is failing him. It must shake the belief of those gentlemen in the right hon. gentleman's success—in his talisman—his star—to find that in regard to the liquor question, in regard to the boundary question, in regard to the disallowance question, he has led them into courses which have been disastrous to the party.

Mr. CASEY.

In regard to the liquor license question, first of all, he was wrong in policy in attempting to get control of the liquor business in the different Provinces. It was not a thing he should have desired as a matter of policy. It was a troublesome thing. It would give him a little patronage; but the trouble it would cost him would be greater than the good he would get from the patronage. But, Sir, actuated by a feeling of personal rivalry against the Premier of Ontario, whom he described as a "little tyrant," and to whom he was going to teach good manners, he determined to get control of that business. In doing so he was doubly wrong—wrong in policy, and wrong in the means he adopted for carrying out that policy; for after having one Act after another, we know that at present, by the decision of the highest tribunal to which the question has been carried, the McCarthy Act is not the law of the land in any of the Provinces, and we do not believe it is going to be. He has made enemies amongst the temperance people, and amongst the liquor dealers as well. That one blunder has cost him more votes than he could have hoped to obtain if the means he used had been successful. With regard to the boundary question, his blunder was equally great. He refused to accept the decision of a fair tribunal as to where the real boundary of Ontario was; he has fought for years against accepting that decision; and now we have the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire, that the territory of which he tried to deprive Ontario, always did belong, and now does belong, to that Province. Now, I want to emphasise that he was not only wrong in contending as he did in reference to that matter, not only mistaken in law and in equity, but that he was committing a gross blunder in the way of policy. He could not have made a grosser blunder in policy than in setting the sentiment of Ontario against him as he did in the boundary matter. He has dashed forever the hopes of his lieutenant in the Local Legislature to lead a Government in that Province, by compelling him to follow him in that policy. Whatever hopes that gentleman had previously entertained, when he was compelled to follow the mistaken line of policy of his leader in this House, he lost his hopes in Ontario. Blunder upon blunder, not only in the nature of the policy to be pursued, but in the method of carrying it out! But now we come to the greatest blunder of all, the blunder of the Canadian Pacific Railway policy. I am not at present discussing whether the action of the Government in regard to that work during its whole history has been a crime or not, but I wish to show that it has been what is much more reprehensible than a crime in the opinion of many people, and that is a blunder. I am not going to give my own authority, but the authority of the official organ of the Government itself. The *Toronto Mail* in February last, said:

"A mistake was made at the threshold of the undertaking in supposing that the line could be constructed for 30,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000. This blunder was perpetuated in 1881, when it was assumed that the road, as it then stood, with 426 miles from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and 215 miles from Kamloops to Port Moody, under construction by the Government, could be completed for 25,000,000 acres and \$25,000,000. If the land subsidy could have been sold for two dollars an acre within the period occupied in construction, both the first and the second estimates might have sufficed for the work."

Why could not the land subsidy be sold for that price during the progress of the work? Simply because the railway company, the creatures of the Government, followed the example of the Government itself, and blundered too. They blundered by constructing the road twice or three times as fast as was necessary. They were told, time and again, by the best minds of the country that this was a blunder, but they went on blundering as the Government had done in the first instance; and after unnecessarily increasing their expenses, and building faster than the country could be settled, they found their land subsidy left on their hands comparatively valueless. Then the *Mail* goes on to