

county who gave you your tea after you had held forth and explained how you were going to do away with the duty on coal oil, how you were going to give us our glass-ware free—no more 30 per cent on lamp chimneys or six cents a gallon on coal oil; we trusted you and here we are in torment. That will be the worst punishment of the hon. gentleman when he finds himself in the inferno for faithless souls. And, if there is one man in that government who, more than another has broken every promise he made to the people, and betrayed every confidence reposed in him, it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. That hon. gentleman is unfair to his country to this day. I called attention a few moments ago to the manner in which he manufactured the figures for Dakota and Minnesota to the disadvantage of our fair province of Manitoba. He compared the growth and progress of these new countries. Why did he not do it fairly? What were the states of Dakota and Minnesota? They were a territory lying at the outskirts of the union, the only place left to be filled up by the overflowing population pressing upon them from the south. On the other hand, the province of Manitoba, with which he compared them, was cut off from eastern Canada by that long, desert, rocky district which intervenes between it and the thickly settled parts of Ontario—no border settlement, no possibility of people flowing in from over-populated provinces adjacent. Nothing could be done for that province until the government of the day had succeeded, by completing the Canadian Pacific Railway, in bringing it into a position where it could be filled. And, of the enormous progress made by the province between 1881 and 1891, amounting to 144 per cent, practically the whole of that ought to be credited to the last five years of that period when, the railway being finished, it was possible for population to flow into that province. I have said enough—and more will be said by hon. gentlemen on this side who will complete the demonstration I have started—to indicate the absolute futility, folly, and inaccuracy of the statements of the hon. gentleman. It would be better, far better if both government and opposition, instead of trying, for petty party purposes, to show that our country was not progressing, or to try for similar purposes to show that it had progressed only when men of our political stripe were in office, were we to recognize the fact that in Canada we have a country so fine, opportunities so great, that nothing can keep down the growth and development of the Dominion. I cannot, for my part, conceive how advantage is to come to our country from such criticism as has been, at times, indulged in by hon. members of this House. For myself, I am glad—and this is characteristic of all hon. members on this side—I am delighted at the progress made by Canada whether under a Liberal or under a Conservative administra-

Mr. BELL.

tion. That progress is admirable, it is what we all wish to see; and we should join hand in hand to make still greater the speed with which our country is advancing to the front rank among the nations of the world.

Mr. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) addressed the House a few evenings ago he likened the debate to a revival meeting, the chief business of which was a political confession of faith. The comparison was not inapt. We have had this programme continued this afternoon and evening, and it is likely that it will be continued for some days. This afternoon and evening, we have had a confession of faith from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell). There is nothing extraordinary about that confession of faith, except that it differs somewhat from a confession of faith we have heard from that hon. gentleman on some former occasions. However, it may be fashionable in those days to change opinions, and I have no doubt that the hon. member for Pictou has found that ample reason to change from his profession of faith some years ago. It is not my purpose to find fault with anything the hon. gentleman has said, because it differs from what he said on the occasions I have referred to. But, now that the hon. gentleman has concluded his observations I must confess that, for my part, I am somewhat in doubt as to whether he is a protectionist or, like myself, a revenue tariff man. The speeches that have preceded that of the hon. member for Pictou on that side have made several things abundantly plain. They struck me as being somewhat contradictory, because they went to prove different things. Some of these speeches went to prove, in the first place, that Canada is prosperous and, in the second place, that the government which hon. members on this side are supporting is in no way responsible for the prosperity Canada is now enjoying. In the third place, these speeches went to prove that this country is not prosperous; and in the fourth place they went to prove that the government is entirely responsible for the want of prosperity which characterizes the country. And, in the fifth place, some of these speeches made it abundantly clear that hon. members on the opposite side are not satisfied with the present government. It is not my intention to quarrel with hon. gentlemen opposite because of that, and I think I speak for hon. members on this side when I say that there is not much worry on this side over the matter. It is of far more importance to myself, and, I take it, of far greater importance to every hon. member on this side that the people generally are satisfied with the government. And we have had opportunities, not so long ago, of ascertaining very clearly, that the country is satisfied with the manner in which the present government has administered public affairs since 1896.