

part of the country that their policy is the old National Policy? Sir, that is the case. The present Minister of Justice, when he delivered his first speech in the late campaign, said they were going to enter into reciprocity with the United States, along the lines of the treaty of 1854. Sir John A. Macdonald, in his letter to the electorate of Canada a few days afterwards, never mentioned, from one end of it to the other, anything about reciprocity with the United States. But he did say something in regard to the National Policy. He said: We go to the country on the same policy as in 1879, in 1882, in 1887, and in 1891 with the same policy also. Here was the leader of the Government telling one story and his first lieutenant another story, and the people of the country waiting for the great meeting to come off for the purpose of getting at the Government's policy. In my own town a little occurrence took place, which I will mention. Just after the Minister of Justice delivered that speech in which he declared that the Tories were in favour of reciprocity in natural products, a Tory in the town said that his party had always been in favour of reciprocity in natural products; but, when Sir John Macdonald's letter came out, he and several Tories went back on their opinion and said they would stand by the National Policy. It is our duty to ask the Government for a declaration of their policy, because they are in a responsible position and we are not. The people have a right to know from their mouths what kind of policy they intend to pursue, so that the people can judge them. We are often asked what our policy is. It is as clear and distinct as the light of day. We want reciprocity of the widest character with the United States. We do not want to hand over any of our legislative power to the United States. What is reciprocity, as I understand it—and I have discussed reciprocity on the public platform before it became a political or party question? Unrestricted reciprocity, to my mind, means this: Our political position will remain as at present, and we will impose any duties we please on articles coming from foreign countries, and the United States will do the same; but goods from the United States will come in free, and the same liberty will be given to Canada to send her goods free to the American markets. So we would have complete control of our tariff; we would place any duties we pleased on goods from foreign countries, and the United States would follow the same course with regard to themselves. In reviewing the whole question we must come to the conclusion that the policy of the Government is still the National Policy, and that they are determined to stick by the manufacturers and the combines of this country who have extracted millions from the pockets of the people and placed them in their own pockets to enrich themselves. Mr. Redpath, the great sugar refiner, after he had made millions out of the Canadian people, did not feel disposed to remain and spend the money here, but he went to England, purchased a great castle and is living there in luxury on the money he has taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada. So it is in regard to many other manufacturers of the country. The Government stick to the manufacturers because they have plenty of money and are capable of contributing large sums to the boodle fund as has been proved this session by the investigations going on. I predict that

the day is not far distant when all this corruption will be unearthed, and that the characters of those who have been guilty of corruption and dishonesty will be exposed before the righteous indignation of the people, and then more honest and better men will be placed in positions to govern this great country. The Liberal party has been accused of being narrow-minded. The hon. member for Albert (Mr. Weldon), in his speech the other night, referred to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who is one of the broadest and most liberal-minded statesmen of this country, and who possesses a greater grasp and deeper insight into its affairs probably than any other man in it, pointed to him with a finger of scorn and said, referring to our party, and to the hon. gentleman as one of our leaders, that the political sky is too near his head and the political horizon too near his fingers. What a charge to bring against the Liberal party! The hon. gentleman has studied the constitutional history of Canada. Has he not found therein the great works the Liberal party have done? Who fought in 1837-38-39 for the great principles of responsible government against the strong arm of the Family Compact? Who was the party, with that spirit of broad liberalism which stepped into the breach, who fought and won the great battle of responsible government and made it one of the corner stones of the constitution of the country? It was the Liberal party, still further down in our history, that declared that the various municipalities should have local government to manage their affairs, so that they might expend their own money for local purposes and assess themselves to meet their obligation for local improvements? The Tory party, ever lagging behind, declared that the Liberals were opposed to British principles, that they were seeking to follow the customs and habits of the United States, and the Conservatives went so far as to call the municipal institutions sucking republics, and they called the Liberal party disloyal and unpatriotic. What was the result? These institutions were established, and to-day there is not a single Tory in this country who would look back and say that the Liberals of that day were wrong. Still further down in the history of this country which was the party that first agitated and largely carried out our system of free education? It was the Liberal party, and under our system the sons and the daughters of the poor man are educated side by side with those of the rich, and are educated to take part in working out the destiny of this country. Again, it was the Liberal party that suggested the confederation of the provinces, and was largely instrumental in its successful consummation. We have often heard it from public platforms, as well as from the members of this House, that the late leader of the great Liberal-Conservative party was the father of Confederation. The Tories of that day fought against the principles of Confederation, and when a dead lock took place between the people of Upper Canada and of Lower Canada, who was the man who saw and suggested the remedy? It was the late George Brown, the great leader of the Liberal party. He came to the front; he asked Parliament to appoint a committee of twenty to take into consideration the propriety of uniting the separate provinces into one great country. That committee considered all the details of this question. The committee was directed upon the question.