

lations between Canada and the United States, but that he proposes to surrender, in order to obtain those friendly relations, a portion of the control of a great waterway through the Dominion of Canada, to a foreign country. That is the gravamen of the charge; and although hostility to the United States is one thing and a thing to be deplored, loyalty to Canadian interest is another thing, and a thing which above all others we must look after. If we cannot have reciprocal trade with the United States without discriminating against Great Britain, then we must not have reciprocal trade. If we cannot have the friendship of the United States and must have the hostility of the United States unless we surrender to them an important interest, an important property right, an important matter of management and government, which belong exclusively to ourselves, then I say that we cannot have those friendly relations and must get along without them. Fancy what would be the situation, if the United States enjoyed joint control over the St. Lawrence and the St. Lawrence Canals. Flowing from that would be the right to protect those canals, to police those canals, to manage them, to join in the appointment of officers in charge of them, to assist in the collection of tolls, if any were exacted, to divide those tolls in proportion to the population or the contributions to the cost, and to develop and improve the canals; and if any difficulty should arise between any foreign country and the United States or between England and the United States, we should have, as one of the first results of this arrangement, the United States taking possession of these canals, apparently for their own protection or the protection of their own property, and we should have a similar state of things here as exists in Egypt to-day, where Great Britain maintains a garrison and controls the government of that country.

Then, I repeat, that so far from the results of the last election having followed from our appealing to prejudice, they followed, as the result in the province of Quebec shows, from the national cry which was effectively raised in that province.

Mr. STENSON. I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, taking any part in this discussion, but I feel compelled to occupy the time of the House for a very few moments in replying to a statement which the hon. gentleman for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) has just made, and which I must qualify as a misstatement of a dangerous nature. The hon. gentleman said that the landslide which had taken place in the province of Quebec was caused by the sectional feeling that had been raised by the Liberal party and by that party securing the support of the clergy in that province. The Rouge clergy, the hon. gentleman said, but the hon. gentleman is well aware—no one in this House is better aware—that the Rouge clergy is far from

being the majority of the clergy in that province. More than that, from my own personal experience in this contest, it was very far from being the action of the Rouge clergy that had any effect on the election, for in my county, in the two joint counties of Richmond and Wolfe, there is only one Rouge, if I may so call him, who is to be found in the clergy there, and that one had to keep very quiet, whereas the others, to the number of twelve, worked and worked actively, several of them, against me in favour of the Conservative candidate, the friend of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Sherbrooke is perfectly aware—and were it necessary I could tell him more than that—that not only did the ordinary clergymen work to his knowledge but more than the ordinary clergyman also worked. My county, Sir, contains about two-thirds French Canadians and Catholics and one-third English Protestants; and I can say this, that certainly if I have been elected to support the Liberal party, it was not through the influence of the clergy, it was not through the influence of the French Canadian Catholics that I was elected, but I was elected by the majority of the Protestant English vote. Nor did I—and I defy the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) or any one else to say the contrary—ever attempt to raise, during that contest, sectional, religious or national feeling. On the contrary, it was on the merits of the Liberal policy that the battle was fought in those counties. On that ground alone was it fought and on that alone did we conquer in those counties, which for eighteen years had been the subjects of the Conservative party. We have conquered this time because those Conservatives found that the late Government were no longer worthy of their confidence and that a change was required. Religious or sectional feeling had nothing at all to do with it. It was not through religious or sectional animosity to any one that I was elected, but because the people realized that the country had been misgoverned, and were confident that the new Government would administer public affairs better than its predecessors. I said I would not take up much of the time of the House, and I shall keep my promise, but I am forced to protest against not only the insinuation but the false assertion that was made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ives), and which he must have known to be false.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Be good enough to take back that expression.

Mr. STENSON. I take it back. I hope I will be excused, on account of my youth in the House and of my being carried away by the assertion made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke, which I know to be not correct, and which I am perfectly aware the hon. member for Sherbrooke himself is satisfied was not exactly according to the facts.

Mr. IVES.