

has not yet rightly apprehended the full significance of the verdict which was pronounced by the people of the country on 23rd June last. It is quite evident from the speech delivered that the hon. gentleman up to this day does not know what are the causes which have produced that upheaval, that earthquake which shook the whole of Canada, from the island of Vancouver to Prince Edward Island on 23rd June last—an earthquake which was very similar to some earthquakes which we read about in the olden times, and in which the sinners were buried alive, and the just were spared and saved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) told us in the opening part of his address, that the Liberal party had not obtained a majority on any of the issues submitted to the people of this country. I fail to understand what was the object of the argument of the hon. gentleman. He says we have not obtained a majority on any of the issues which were submitted to the people of this country. Well, Sir, I care not to go very minutely into that argument, but I look at the result only, and whatever may be the cause the result is: there is the hon. gentleman in opposition, and here are we at the head of the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) stated more. He said that although his party were in the minority in this House, yet that they had obtained at the polls, no less than 19,000 votes more than the party which is victorious. Again I refuse to go very minutely into those calculations of the hon. gentleman, but all I have to say is, that if the victorious party polled a minority of the votes in the country, what has become of the Gerrymander Acts of hon. gentlemen opposite? They certainly were never intended for that purpose, and if that be their result I am sure we shall have the support of my hon. friend when we repeal these Acts, as repeal them we shall. Nor do I consider that my hon. friend was any more happy in his reference to the hon. gentleman who moved the Address, when he said that although the hon. gentleman (Mr. McInnes) had a seat in this House he had a minority of the votes in his constituency. True there were three candidates in the field, one Liberal and two Conservatives. There were two different kinds of Conservatives, however, in the constituency of Vancouver, as in many other constituencies in this country. There were Conservatives who were Ministerialists and who were prepared to swallow everything in connection with the Ministerial policy, but there were also Conservatives, who though remaining Conservatives, and yielding nothing of the conviction of their lives, were, however, no longer ready to follow the Government of the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper). That is the reason why my hon. friend (Mr. McInnes) is here. But, Sir, if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) does not know

Mr. LAURIER.

yet what are the causes which have brought on this change of government, I may tell him. There are three causes. The hon. gentleman and his party were defeated because their fiscal policy, which by a strange misnomer has been termed the National Policy, had not fulfilled the expectations of the people, and although that policy had not fulfilled the expectations of the people, still the hon. gentleman adhered to it. The hon. gentleman and his party have been defeated because the administration of public affairs under his Government had been extravagant and corrupt. The hon. gentleman and his party have been defeated because upon a grave and important question,—a question which for its solution required great tenderness and care of treatment—instead of appealing to the honest intelligence of the people, instead of appealing to the convictions and to the consciences of the people, the hon. gentleman and his party appealed to sectional prejudices and to religious feelings. He was defeated, because by his policy on this question he created amongst the better classes of his party a distrust, which rent his party into factions which are now irreconcilable. Sir, these are the reasons why the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not succeed. And in view of the tactics which were adopted by the hon. gentleman and his party to succeed, in view of the methods which were resorted to by them, I say: blessed and thrice blessed is the day when these tactics were defeated, when these methods were rebuked, and when these appeals to sectional feelings were trampled under foot by the people to whom they were addressed. I am doing no injustice to my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) when I say, that his speech to-day was rather a doleful and mournful one. But there was a single ray of sunshine in it. There was a ray of sunshine in it when he came to speak of my hon. friends, the mover and seconder of the Address. He paid them just and well deserved compliments, which I am happy to re-echo, but he discriminated somewhat between the mover and the seconder. He said that the mover had been altogether too aggressive for his taste. Well, I thought that this would have been a reason why my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) would have paid a greater compliment to the mover of the Address (Mr. McInnes). However, he chose not to do it. As to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Vancouver, I have to say that he pleaded the cause of his native province in a manner in which I have never heard it pleaded in this House before. He did it in a way which will commend itself to the Government, and I am sure it will not be forgotten by them at the proper moment. Now as to my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), the seconder of the Address. His reputation for eloquence had preceded him to this House, and much as we expected from him still more has he given us, and with regard to both himself