

mouthpiece and exponent to-night. Apparently the business community have more confidence than the hon. gentleman has in the present Government, and are well content to wait the reasonable leisure of this Government in dealing with this question. Now, Sir, to return for one moment to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. That hon. gentleman, as I have stated on many occasions, is a bold man, a very bold man, but I do not think he ever gave this House, or he ever gave the country, a greater specimen of his magnificent audacity than when he rose last night and solemnly claimed David A. Wells as an advocate of the fiscal policy which he and his friends introduced into Canada. Sir, I will recall his statement. He declared that under the ægis of the National Policy, Canada had passed successfully and triumphantly through a cyclone of disaster—if I recollect his words aright—which had tested the institutions of the United States to their very foundation; and he appealed to David A. Wells to testify to the truth of his statement, and most certainly, by inference, if not in so many words, did he allege that David A. Wells had declared in an article in the "Forum" that it was to its fiscal policy, to its National Policy, that Canada owed its exemption from this catastrophe which overtook the United States.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to correct him. He is entirely misstating what occurred. I stated the opinion I held that Canada owed to the National Policy the position which Mr. Wells had so favourably contrasted with that of the United States, and I gave Mr. Wells's statement in his own words, as taken from the "Forum."

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Exactly, as applied to the National Policy.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, no; I did not say that Mr. Wells had any reference whatever to the National Policy, but I said that under the ægis of the National Policy the condition of Canada was such as to draw the following contrast from an eminent statistician in the United States, and I gave his words.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And implied, if words mean anything, that David A. Wells was his witness, and an advocate of the National Policy which had brought about these results.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman did not mean that, his quotation was utterly pointless. Sir, the fact of the matter, I suspect, is this, that twenty-four hours have elapsed since, and probably the hon. gentleman, seeing I had sent for the "Forum," has taken the trouble to look up the article

which he had not read when he made the quotation. And I may observe that in reading a quotation from a scrap-book, it is a dangerous thing to take a chance sentence out of an article without knowing what that article is about, or without looking at the context. Now, I will tell the hon. gentleman what Mr. Wells was talking about, and what he was driving at. Here is the next preceding sentence used by Mr. Wells :

In the first place the immediate and principal cause—

Of the troubles in the United States, that is,

—was beyond all question a distrust of the very foundation on which the whole superstructure of trade and credit of the country rests, namely, its currency.

What Mr. Wells referred to was the superiority of the Canadian banking system over that of the United States. That is what the sentence which is quoted from Mr. Wells means, that and nothing else. He will see that Mr. Wells condemns in the same manner that I have condemned, the ignorance of political economy which led the American people to imagine that they could make themselves rich by doubling and trebling their taxes.

However, Sir, it is not with Mr. Wells, or with any misquotations of Mr. Wells, that I desired more particularly to deal. I think those in this House, and they are many, who have perused Mr. Wells's works and treatises, know perfectly well that the last thing he is likely to say is to praise the protective system of Canada, unless, peradventure, he might say that the system of his own country was a trifle worse, which it is theoretically, although the hon. gentleman and his friends will do well to bear in mind that while the United States may have, as to other nations, a higher tariff than ourselves, they have within themselves a thing which modifies its evil influences enormously, and that is the most perfect system of free trade among the numerous states which compose that nation, which exists on the face of the earth. But, Sir, as I said, this was not after all the worst of the crimes which the hon. gentleman has laid to the charge of my hon. friend beside me. Sir, what is the Prime Minister's chiefest fault, and chiefest crime? What is that offence he has committed for which, according to the hon. member for York, there can be no forgiveness and no redemption in this world, nor yet in that which is to come? Why, Sir, I shudder to say it, the Prime Minister of Canada has dared to state that he for his part felt sincere good-will towards the people of the United States. He has further dared—treasonably, apparently, according to the hon. member for York—he has dared treasonably to hint at a policy which might, if carried out to a successful completion, bring great benefit to a great number of the people of both countries. Sir, these are the