

Minister that when the Bill comes before the House, I will take the opportunity of dealing with the superannuation system, and showing how it has been abused.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister also tried to frighten the manufacturers of this country by saying that we had declared that our tariff would be death to protection. Well, Sir, I believe I am voicing the opinion of the entire Reform party in this Dominion when I say that as a party we have no bitterness or hostile feeling towards any manufacturing institution in this country that can fairly hope to exist. On the contrary, I believe that the Reform party are prepared to encourage any such industry in any way they can. One feature of the National Policy which we have denounced most strongly has been that feature which produced monopolies, which placed manufacturers in a position to combine and to extort from the consumers of this country excessive prices for the commodities which they manufactured; and I believe it is the determination of the Government, as it is the feeling of every Reformer in this Dominion, that that feature of the National Policy should be obliterated, but we have no hostile feelings towards the legitimate manufacturing institutions of this country. Many of these flourished before there was a National Policy, and I believe that they will continue to flourish after the new tariff is introduced, and that they will come to realize that while the National Policy professed to build them up and make them rich, they were bled in other ways to such an extent that when the annual balance sheet came to be made out, they were not in as good a position as they would have been under a reasonable revenue tariff. We do not want a single manufacturing interest in this country that can fairly hope to exist, to get alarmed. It has nothing to be alarmed at, if it is not one of those sucking monopolies that has been existing unfairly and unjustly by extorting excessive prices from the people.

In the next place, the ex-Finance Minister said something with regard to the Reform party having declared themselves in favour of free trade as it is in England. We would rejoice if the financial condition of this country were such that we could follow the example of the mother country in regard to free trade; but, unfortunately, hon. gentlemen opposite, during the sixteen or eighteen years of extravagance, of increased debt and increased expenditure, have placed this country in such a condition that we cannot hope, for many years, to adopt a free-trade policy; but that is the goal. We earnestly hope, however, that Canada's better day has dawned. The economy in public expenditure that has been so well commenced by the present Government is shown in the Estimates which they have brought down; and I hope they will continue in that course until, at some time in the future, we may be

able to follow the noble example set by the mother country, and adopt free trade. The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was a protective policy; every item in the tariff was placed there with the view of protecting the particular commodity it referred to. On the other hand, the policy of the Reform party is first a tariff for revenue, so adjusted as to reach fairly and equitably the entire consuming masses of this country, without doing any violence to any manufacturing institution that can fairly hope to live and prosper in Canada.

The hon. ex-Finance Minister appears to assume to himself the championship of the manufacturing industries of the country; he appears to think that no member of the Government has any sympathy whatever for any of these institutions. Well, Sir, I think he is greatly mistaken. I think he will begin to realize very shortly that he is under a delusion, as no Reformer desires to injure any industry in the country that can hope to exist under a revenue tariff, fairly administered.

Now, the hon. ex-Finance Minister has challenged the prudence, the propriety, the justice of introducing the measure now before the House. He has said that it strikes directly at the Conservative party, that it is intended to deprive them of the rights and privileges they enjoy. I would like to know in what way he can prove that statement. The provincial franchise as it now exists in the province of Ontario is entirely under the control of the municipalities. The reeves and councillors are not all Reformers. Even in townships which are looked on as Reform or as Conservative there is always a considerable body of the opposite party. These men lay the foundation for the provincial franchise, and they are in a much better position to say who, within the limits of the township shall be granted the right to exercise the franchise at municipal and provincial and Dominion elections, than any revising officer or any county judge. They are well acquainted with the neighbourhood in which they live, and they are usually scattered over the township. It is the privilege of every inhabitant of the municipality to appear at the revision and to ask that a name should be put on or taken off, and if the council declined to do what any individual deems to be simple justice, he has the right to appeal from the council to a county judge. Thus the last appeal is to friends of hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to know how, under these circumstances, hon. gentlemen opposite can claim that the proposed measure is a direct thrust at the Conservative party.

The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) very strongly advocated the continuation of the franchise now in existence. I do not much wonder at that, because it landed him in this House, and if the other system had been in existence, I doubt very much that he would have come here. So I