

self, a protection which is incidental, but which, in a purely revenue tariff, is never designed.

That is what a revenue tariff is; and I gather that that is the tariff which will be the ultimate goal of the government of the present day; but, hon. gentlemen, that goal cannot be reached immediately. The members of the Liberal government are not revolutionists. They are, as a rule, speaking in a non-political sense, conservative and men of conservative habits of thought; and the Liberals of this country are as much interested in the manufacturing interests of the country as their Conservative friends, or very nearly so, and it is not likely that they would adopt any policy which would deal unfairly with the interests which derived benefit from the present tariff. If there is to be a tariff reduction, I presume it will be moderate and gradual, and that the protected interests will receive due notice of the changes. We are not left to speculate on that point, hon. gentlemen, because the leader of the government has on various public occasions declared himself to that effect, and the hon. gentleman who now leads this House laid down, in his letter of the 2nd May to Mr. Laurier, published in the *Toronto Globe*, of the 4th May, the policy which the party proposed to follow. He declared distinctly that it is not to be a revolutionary policy and that as this paragraph in the speech says: the changes are to be made and the burdens of the people are to be lightened, doing as little injury as possible to existing interests. Now, I have already said something, hon. gentlemen, about the fact that the Conservative press and speakers appear to be in an undue hurry for this new tariff. Tariff reconstruction is a very difficult and important task, and it is better that it should be considered carefully and deliberately, so that the tariff when adopted may be lasting, than that something should be done in a hurry to be undone in a very little while. I know it is slightly irregular to refer to debates which have taken place in the other chamber, but I happened to be present during a portion of the speech made in that chamber by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and to my astonishment I heard that gentleman say that free trade was a bad thing, that a revenue tariff was a bad thing, but that the terrible uncertainty in which the people of this country were now living was worse than

either free trade or a revenue tariff. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks that that is the case and that there is a panic throughout the country, but the only panic which exists is in the minds of the hon. gentlemen who have had to cross from one side of the House to the other. I do not think they have discovered any panic in the minds of the business people of the country. They are sensible men and know that there will be no revolutionary change, and that the government can be trusted not to do anything injurious to the interests of the country. I know there is panic in the minds of hon. gentlemen who have had to pass from the government side of the House to the opposition side. It is cooler there, perhaps, and that is one advantage just now, and it is freer in a sense. I can speak from a long experience, that it is freer and easier for members speaking in that part of the House.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—
You have just come to that conclusion?

Hon. Mr. POWER—Oh, I came to that conclusion long ago. The fourth paragraph of the address states:

Immediate steps will be taken to effect a settlement of the Manitoba school question, and I have every confidence that, when parliament next assembles, this important controversy will have been adjusted satisfactorily.

Every lover of Canada will be glad to know that immediate steps will be taken to effect a settlement of the Manitoba school question. That question has for years, particularly during the last few months, been the occasion of a great deal of bitterness and ill-feeling amongst different sections of our population, amongst whom there ought, by rights, to be good-will and harmony. I am not in the secrets of the government myself; but this does not seem to me to be an empty promise, because already there has been a meeting between members of the Cabinet of Canada and members of the Cabinet of Manitoba. A friendly conference has taken place, and there is, at any rate, reason to hope that some general basis of a settlement has been arrived at; and if this course had been adopted several years ago, I believe that this question never would have become what it did become—the basis of partisan warfare. That the school question, the question of the violation of the