

While, as a Canadian, I cannot but regret such an attitude in those who are entrusted with the future of this country, I must say, as a party man, it does not break my heart to see the Government and their friends the victims of such infatuation; for the truth is that, at the present moment, with the exception of the monopolists who have been made wealthier by the restrictions of the tariff, there is no class in the country who does not desire some reform in that tariff. It may be, and it is probably true, that with the greater number, the exact form the relief, which will be welcomed, ought to take, has not yet been formulated, but it is equally true that the great majority of those who, ten years ago, put their faith in the National Policy, are now reluctantly forced to the inevitable conclusion that the National Policy has been a failure. And how could it be otherwise? By the fruits we shall know the tree; and what are the fruits of the National Policy? Let us look around the country. The National Policy has favored a few. There is no doubt of that; but it has injured the many, and there is no doubt of that either. It has imprudently been stated that the price of land has increased near some of the railway centres; but it is equally true that the National Policy has reduced the price of farming land all over the country. It has reduced the price of farming land in the great Province of Ontario by \$22,000,000, as is shown by statistics. It has turned out millionaires, but it has made the lot of the toiling masses harder than it was before. It has created sugar barons, and cotton lords and railway kings, but it has put nails upon the doors and windows of thousands of homes and sent their inhabitants to a foreign land. Sir, I arraign the Government upon that issue. When the hon. gentleman was in Opposition, 12 years ago, he boasted to the people of this country that if he were restored to power he would introduce a policy which would put a check to emigration. The people of the Dominion took him at his word; they entrusted him with power, and the result is that at this moment emigration is a greater curse than it has ever been before. Now, I know very well what the answer will be to this statement. The answer will be—tergiversation. It is always easy to deny the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And to assert.

Mr. LAURIER. Especially to assert a fact which is within the knowledge of everybody. I appeal here to the intelligence and to the experience of every man upon these benches. I do not appeal to those who made the promises, but I appeal to those who believed the promises that were made, and I defy anybody to stand up here to-day and say that the anticipations which were raised in 1878 by the National Policy have been fulfilled; I defy anyone to say that the price of land has been improved in the rural parts, that in the rural parts of the country every family is contented at its own fireside. But if any man can deny these things, then by all means let him stand up for the National Policy. But if that man is bound in his conscience to admit that his anticipations have not been realised, that the price of farming land has been decreased everywhere over the country, that there is not, perhaps, in the rural parts one single family which is complete at its fireside, then I would ex-

pect that man, whatever would be his party preferences, to stand up for the cause of reform. Hon. gentlemen may deny, but the fact is plain. Whatever may be the language spoken here by the Government followers, I believe their conscience tells a different tale. They are like the man going through the woods who whistles to keep his courage up. They may speak bravely, but their actions once more show they have not escaped the general feeling of uneasiness which is at this time permeating the whole community. Since the hon. gentleman seems to be obdurate upon this question, I propose to show that in the ranks of those who follow him, even amongst his own colleagues, the impression is deeply seated at this moment that the country wants reform, that the National Policy has not accomplished what was expected, and that the farmers of this country, especially, must in some way be relieved. Not later than the Session of 1888 my hon. friend from East Middlesex (Mr. Marshall) proposed a motion which reads in this manner:

“That the establishment of mutually favorable trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies would benefit the agricultural, mining, lumbering and other industries of the latter, and would strengthen the Empire by building up its dependencies, and that the Government should ask the other Colonial Governments to join in approaching the Imperial Government with a view of obtaining such an agreement.”

The debate was participated in by several prominent members; amongst others was the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), a very strong supporter of the Administration. The hon. gentleman upon that occasion spoke not so much to the motion of the hon. member for East Middlesex, but he spoke to a motion of which he had given notice, which he moved, and which ran in the following language:—

“That it would be in the best interests of the Dominion that such changes should be sought for in the trade relations between the United Kingdom and Canada as would give to Canada advantages in the markets of the mother country not allowed to foreign states, Canada being willing for such privileges to discriminate in her markets in favor of Great Britain and Ireland, due regard being had to the policy adopted in 1879 for the purpose of fostering the various interests and industries of the Dominion, and to the financial necessities of the Dominion.”

The hon. member from Simcoe, in speaking to that question, stated that he and those with whom he was acting—all followers of the right hon. gentleman—were endeavoring to create a trade with Great Britain and to obtain a market in Great Britain for our surplus farming productions. The debate was participated in by several members; amongst others were the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also by the hon. and gallant member for Shelburne (Gen. Laurie), and by the no less hon. and gallant member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin), all to the effect that in their opinion the present condition of the country was not satisfactory, and that something ought to be done to relieve it. What was the meaning of that motion? If the National Policy had realised everything that we had in view, if it had developed the country in the manner which had been predicted by hon. gentlemen here, why should there have been such a motion? Why was such a question opened up? Simply because, in the opinion of those gentlemen, the condition of the country was not satisfactory, the condition of agriculture was not satisfactory, and something