

Mr. KENNY. They have not abandoned it yet.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Pretty near it.

Mr. KENNY. Referring, Sir, to the abruptness of the change in the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, I find that in 1891 the hon. leader of the Opposition made a speech in the city of Boston, where he was quoted as follows:—

Touching briefly on the policy advocated by some in opposition to reciprocity—the Imperial Trade League—Mr. Laurier said simply that it was absurd. Trade could not be made to follow allegiance. He had no objection to British trade, he wanted Canada to get all possible of it; but they wanted United States trade, too, and Canadians, he thought, were not disposed any more than other people to throw away the Yankee dollar for the British shilling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what great change has come over the condition of the country since these words were uttered. It seems to me that the conditions of Canada and the United States are very similar to what they were then. If the Yankee dollar was so desirable in 1891, is it not equally so to-day? And yet the hon. gentleman seems to have forgotten entirely the Yankee dollar, and now to love only the British shilling. If unrestricted reciprocity was so valuable as it has been represented to be, why do hon. gentlemen abandon their efforts to secure it? My hon. friend from Central Toronto (Mr. Cockburn) aptly referred to the statements of the hon. member for South Oxford, that the result of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity advocated by a gentleman opposite would be to add \$10 to the value of every acre of cultivated land in the province of Ontario, and \$30 to the value of every horse. My hon. friend from Toronto showed that there are 22,000,000 acres of uncultivated land in Ontario, at \$10, \$220,000,000; and 1,250,000 horses, at \$30, equal to \$37,500,000. This would yield enough to pay off the national debt, and leave a surplus of \$7,000,000. If this would be the result, simply counting the value added to property in Ontario, what would it be if we count the value added to property throughout the whole Dominion? It surely would leave us a very handsome surplus after paying off our national debt. If the policy would do so much for Canada, why should it be abandoned now? Having nailed the flag of unrestricted reciprocity to the mast, why have hon. gentlemen opposite hauled it down so unexpectedly? As I said before, I think the reason is that we told the people of Canada exactly what was meant by this policy of unrestricted reciprocity, and Mr. Blake, their chosen leader, said it was so disloyal that he could not any longer associate himself officially with the party. We have to deal to-day with the subject of free trade as it is in England. But while I have before me the "Globe" report of the speech delivered by the hon.

Mr. KENNY.

leader of the Opposition at Boston, I will take the opportunity to explain a statement made previously. In the last session of Parliament, when reference was made by me to the speech which the hon. leader of the Opposition made at this Boston dinner, on 17th November, 1891, quoting from an American paper, I said that the hon. leader of the Opposition was reported as having said that:

England and Canada must separate, and it was manifest to him that the interests of his country were identical with the interests of the United States.

At that time, I had not in my hand his revised copy, the Toronto "Globe's" report of his speech; but the hon. gentleman stated in reply, he would be bound only by the report of his speech which appeared in the Toronto "Globe." He would not be responsible for even his ipsissima verba taken down at the time by a reporter, but he would be bound by the version of his speech which he had revised before it appeared in the Toronto "Globe." On looking over that revised report of his speech, I find that the following is the manner in which he himself admits he referred to the separation of Canada from England:—

Britain and Canada were, however, drifting further and further apart, and the time was coming when they must separate; but he was a British subject, and, as such, he hoped that when the final separation came about, it would come in friendship, as a son leaves the house of his father to become the father of a family.

Here, Sir, we find the leader of a party in a British country, the leader of a party in this British dependency, saying that Britain and Canada were drifting further and further apart and must separate. Sir, I deny that, I deny it most emphatically. Such is not the opinion of the people of Canada. It may be that hon. gentleman's opinion, and it may be the opinion of half a dozen hon. gentlemen who sit around him, but I tell him it is not the opinion of the majority of the people of Canada. They do not believe, they do not desire, that England and Canada shall separate. I say that such compromising language as that is unwise, unjust and unfair, unwise to himself and unjust and unfair to the people of Canada. I refer to that incident for the reason that it was a matter of discussion last year. Frequent reference is made to the condition of trade in two periods of our history, and the contention is made that the condition of our people is not as prosperous as it was in 1878; and further, that while a few "bloated manufacturers," or "thieves and robbers," as they are called by hon. gentlemen opposite, have been making money, the masses of the people are actually poorer than they were in 1878. Sir, I believe the contrary to be the case. I believe that in no period of the history of Canada has wealth been more evenly distributed than it is to-day; and I