

it is ignoring our history to refuse to acknowledge the fierce and spiteful struggle of which Lafontaine, Morin and Cartier were the objects. Lafontaine went out of politics, disgusted with the outrages with which he was overwhelmed by the Liberals. Morin, his successor, was insulted, slandered, and abused by these same Liberals. Cartier, the continuator of their work, was crushed by the Liberals, and haunted with their enmity, even while lying in his grave. The party founded by Papineau cannot reckon Lafontaine and Morin among its authors. The party that had Dorion for its leader cannot declare itself connected with Cartier.

I refer to this utterance of the leader of the Government merely to show that the very men who, like Sir George Etienne Cartier and the others, were instrumental in founding confederation and who were attacked so violently at different periods by the old Liberal party of Quebec, are now recognized by the Liberal party as the great men, whose opinion, upon one of the most vital and important question which has ever arisen in the history of Canada, should have been taken instead of the opinions of such men, able as they were, as Sir Aimée Dorion and other Liberals. It required, indeed, all the eloquence and ingenuity of the hon. gentleman to build up such a speech as that he has made upon such a flimsy foundation as the Speech from the Throne. I must say that ever since I entered Parliament I have heard the taunt thrown across the House that the bill of fare in the Speech from the Throne was very scanty, that there was very little in the political programme which the Government was submitting to the representatives of the people. But I am sure it would be difficult to find in the history of Parliament, since confederation, at least, any precedent Speech from the Throne in which so very little was indicated to the people of the policy which the Government intended to follow. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the Government hardly attempted to defend the charge made against the Administration of having given no intimation of his policy in the Speech given by His Excellency. But he stated that at this season of the year too generous a diet would be deleterious to a delicate stomach. Whether he considers that the Canadian stomach is too delicate to receive more than he has given them or not, it is hard for me to say. But I am quite sure of one thing, and that is that Canada will certainly run the risk of inanition instead of dying of surfeit if the hon. gentlemen stick to the homœopathic practice which they have followed on this occasion in distributing in the tiniest globules the information which the people are entitled to. If the Speech is looked into, I think it will be found that it can be reduced to two items. The first is the reason given by the Government for calling Parliament at this inconvenient season. Well, Sir, I wish to ask any man of impartial

mind, I will put it to any hon. gentleman on either side of the House, if it is not the fact that the reason why Parliament was called at this season of the year was that the gentlemen who are sitting on your right, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Government, during the last session of an expiring Parliament, had recourse to a system of obstruction, a parallel for which it is impossible to find in the history of any parliamentary assembly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, knowing that Parliament could not sit beyond a certain period of time and knowing that the Government had submitted to Parliament one of the most important questions which has ever come under the consideration of an assembly of this kind—the Manitoba school question—forgetting the duty which they owed to the country, determined by means of obstruction, to prevent the Estimates from being passed. The eloquent member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said that it was right to refuse to give supplies to a party who intended to change the Government existing at that time, and to form another. But every effort was made by the Government of the day to meet any objections that could be raised. It was proposed that the Estimates should be voted only for the Civil Service, if Parliament would agree to that; it was proposed that the Estimates should be voted only for six months, if Parliament would agree to that, or for three months if Parliament would agree to that. And if any of these reasonable propositions had been accepted, if gentlemen opposite had thought only of the interests of the country at large, and had forgotten party strife and party advantage for the time being, this session need not have been called, and the Canadian people would have been saved an expenditure of \$10,000 a day, or \$300,000 a month. Could these supplies have been used for any other purpose than that for which they were voted? Was it possible, under the rules of the constitution, and with an Auditor General in office, for the Government to apply Estimates otherwise than as Parliament directed? How, then, could any risk have been incurred by accepting one of the reasonable propositions which were then made? But they were all rejected, and it is for that reason that we are called together at this inconvenient season, and at a very large expense which will have to be explained to the people of Canada—and I think that when the time comes for the people to consider the reasons why they have been put to this very large expenditure, they will see that it was not the Conservative party who placed them in that position, but the hon. gentlemen who now sit on the Treasury benches. There is another question which, from my standpoint, certainly should have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. It is impossible, as we know, to change the fiscal policy of the country without causing widespread disturbance of industry. Within