

down its measures promptly, the session would be reasonably short. That is not, I think, the proper way to put the matter. The session will be reasonably short if the opposition is not unreasonably verbose; but I confess, after experience, that I have my doubts as to that, though I may be mistaken. If we find that the opposition have had a change of heart, that they have turned over a new leaf, and that, in addition to the art of speaking, of which I know they are masters, they have learned the art of stopping speaking, then I will be the first to proclaim the fact to a grateful people.

I must extend my congratulations to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. He has set a good example, which I hope will be followed by those behind him. I must also offer to him my very sincere thanks for the generous manner in which he has spoken of our departed friend, the late Dr. McIntyre. Nothing could be too good to say of Dr. McIntyre. He was one of those rare men, who, to a brilliant intellect joined a kind heart, and he had nothing but friends on both sides of the House. I also appreciate the generous compliment which the hon. leader of the opposition paid to my friends, the mover and the seconder of the address. Indeed, in the course of a long experience it has not been my fortune to hear on such an occasion utterances at once so brief, so pertinent and containing so much matter.

I am afraid that I cannot meet all the requests that my hon. friend has made to me. I cannot discuss all the questions he has raised. I do not see any occasion at present for discussing the prosperity of the country. We are prosperous, and we do not grudge the prosperity of other nations, because we claim that Canada is more prosperous than any other country.

Neither do I propose to discuss at present the expenditure of the country. My hon. friend has stated that during the ten years in which we have been in office we have taken from the public \$321,000,000 more than the Conservative party took from them in the same length of time. I do not dispute this, but I have not observed because of this any discontent on the part of the people of Canada. It has been an easy task for my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to get money from the people. My hon. friend the member for North Toronto recalls the days when he was Minister of Finance, and he will agree with me that he was sleeping on a bed of thorns, whereas my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is sleeping on an easy pillow. He has no difficulty in getting the money he requires, because he has a wealthy population to draw upon, whereas my hon. friend the member for North Toronto was drawing money from an impoverished people. If ever there was a period in the history of Canada when the people were con-

tented and happy, it is this period in which we live.

Neither do I feel called upon at this moment to discuss the question of the completion of the Transcontinental railway. I can leave this to a future time, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will give all the particulars to my hon. friend. The same remark applies to the question of the Quebec bridge. But before I leave the point raised by my hon. friend as to the completion of the railway, I would observe that the remarks of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, the President of the Grand Trunk railway, were hardly justified and have been falsified by the event. He complained that the line from Winnipeg to the Lake Superior branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific had not been completed, and that therefore this year the railway could not serve to carry the crops of the Northwest to Lake Superior. I am happy to say that since the words of Sir Charles Rivers Wilson were uttered, the railway has been completed and opened for traffic, and that at this moment wheat is being carried over it from the prairie provinces to Lake Superior.

With regard to the waterways treaty, we have about made up our minds on all points except one, which requires some further consideration, and it will be our duty if we come to a conclusion on this point during the present session, as I hope we shall, to communicate it to parliament as soon as it is arrived at.

I have nothing to say at present on the French treaty. According to my own view, neither the French treaty nor anything in the legislation of Canada can be construed as an act of discrimination against the United States, and therefore the article in the American Tariff Act does not apply.

My hon. friend has not discussed the question of naval defence, which is the very question which I think on the present occasion should be discussed, for this reason, that the policy which was adopted unanimously by this House last session has been singled out for attack in quarters from which we had reason to expect support. Last session, when the House unanimously came to the conclusion that Canada should organize a Canadian naval service in co-operation with the British Admiralty, we informed parliament that we were going to send to Great Britain two members of the cabinet for the very purpose of discussing that question with the admiralty. Shortly afterwards, His Majesty's imperial government called a conference of all the self-governing colonies for the purpose of discussing the larger question of imperial defence. Two ministers of the cabinet, as we informed the House were appointed to attend that conference, my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) and my hon. friend the Min-