

upon Canada by the National Policy in the very fact that the gentlemen now in power—who for eighteen long years engaged in fierce and bitter denunciation of it, who pledged themselves solemnly that they would uproot and destroy it—declare in the face of the whole world that the National Policy is one that they dare not attempt to change. Sir, the National Policy so commends itself to the intelligent approval of the great mass of the electorate of Canada that these gentlemen, if they attempt to interfere with it, would be swept from office. And how did they obtain power? Not upon the issue of the National Policy, nor upon any other issue. Sir, these gentlemen opposite sit there representing no policy and no principle. I challenge any man in this country to point to one single particle of policy or one single principle that they avowed before the people, which they have since attempted to carry into effect. They obtained power by inducing the people of one section of the country to believe one thing, and by inducing the people of another section of the country to believe the opposite. They obtained power by delusive promises which they have never carried out. I am prepared to show any hon. gentleman opposite that there is not one single question of public policy to which the Liberal party in opposition was committed which they have attempted to accomplish since they came into power. I say that without any qualification whatever. A large number of the hon. members of this House are perfectly familiar with these matters, and they know that what I am stating is absolutely correct, but less my hon. friends from East Prince (Mr. Bell) and Montmagny (Mr. Martineau), who have not had the same opportunity to inform themselves, might think me mistaken, I will give them a little evidence of what I am saying. I will show these hon. gentlemen whose policy it was has made Canada the cynosure of all eyes, whose policy has enabled the Government of Canada to put in the Speech, as they have properly done, this glowing account of the magnificent position our country occupies to-day. Any speeches that emanate from my right hon. friend, who with so much ability leads this House, I have always read with great interest, but not always exactly with approval. I am not always able to agree exactly with the view in which he clothes in those delightful and eloquent sentences for which he is so famous. I have begun to think, Sir, when I read the speeches of my right hon. friend, that one of the most essential features of oratory is to be able to say whatever the occasion may require without any reference to the facts. I will give my right hon. friend the evidence on which I make that statement. In a very memorable speech, one which I am quite sure will become historical, for it was one of the most import-

ant he had ever delivered, when all its consequences are regarded—a speech which he made on January 4th, 1899, as reported in the Montreal "Herald," he said:

If we are now purchasing more from England, England is purchasing more from us, and that is what we want. We want a market for our produce, and we find it in England. Thanks to our policy.

Now, Sir, what was his policy? What policy did the hon. gentleman carry out? In the first place, the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken in supposing that those two things have any necessary relation to each other at all. The hon. gentleman knows that our purchases from England have been relatively insignificant for many long years, long before he had anything to do with formulating a policy. The hon. gentleman knows that our purchases from England have been infinitesimally smaller than our exports to England. But that is not all, Sir. What is the result of this policy, this magnificent policy which the hon. gentleman claims has made Canada what it is to-day? Why, Sir, in 1897, the first year for which the hon. gentleman says he was responsible, England took over \$500,000 less from us than she did before his policy was dreamed of. That does not look as if what we sent to England had any relation to the policy of the hon. gentleman. And while that was the case, there was an enormous, a gigantic increase in our exports to the mother country. Therefore, the hon. gentleman will see that the one statement has no relation to the other. The hon. gentleman is aware, I suppose, that his policy, while professedly a pro-British policy, was an anti-British policy; for under it, while England sent us in that year \$500,000 less than she had done before, the United States of America sent us \$19,000,000 more than they had done before. Was it because we had sent more to the United States? The hon. gentleman knows that it was the very reverse. I take the last six months, and what has this wonderful policy done—this policy that the hon. gentleman lives upon, and for which he attained an amount of kudos in Great Britain that we were all delighted to see him obtain if it had only been done on a sound basis? What was this wonderful boon that the right hon. gentleman said he conferred upon England? The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was asked in the House of Commons the other day by Sir Howard Vincent: "What is the increase of trade sent from England to Canada during the six months ending the 31st day of January?" Why did he say the 31st day of January? Simply because, as was admitted very frankly by the hon. Minister of Finance when at Sheffield, the treaties were not denounced, and the policy did not come into operation until the 1st day of August: so that the first six months of