

It was logical and admitted, with all its consequences, the necessity of crushing the clergy in order to make its programme victorious.

Then it goes on to say that in 1877 Mr. Laurier came to the front, and the old chiefs disappeared. Some died, and others were shelved like the Dorions. It goes on to say:

Laurier embodied the new policy. We will not do him the wrong of supposing that he has denied a single one of his Liberal convictions, but he took a new line, which he follows still, and the progress that he has made is none the less real. From his first speech in 1877 he freed himself of embarrassing questions, and no longer pretended to speak of the old programme; but, thank God, in the words of Gambetta, he thought about it all the time.

So he threw over the programme because it was troublesome and not easily managed, but all the time he was thinking of it and aiming at it. This is the character given the present Prime Minister by this brilliant French writer. He goes on to say:

We ask but one thing of Mr. Laurier. Let him speak openly and act above-board. What he does suits us, what he says does not suit us. We want not only acts, but we want words. Is that asking too much?

Now, Sir, in the light of the promises of the Prime Minister that I have read, has not this brilliant writer given us a few X rays by which we may comprehend an interesting, a fascinating, an inscrutable, but still a very undesirable character? If this analysis should be correct, it would make out the Prime Minister to be somewhat like those cynical abbés of the 18th century, who preached Christianity and believed in Voltaire. However, there is the description. Here we have all these promises—promises in regard to coal, promises in regard to iron, promises in regard to implements, promises in regard to articles which the farmer contends are his raw materials. We have all these promises from the Prime Minister as long as he is leading the Opposition, but when he gets into power he turns his back on them all. I reverse the language of this brilliant writer. He says that the acts of the hon. gentleman suit him, but not his words; the farmers say the words of the hon. gentleman suit us, but not his acts. He says, We do not want merely his acts, but we want his words also. Well, the farmers will dispense with his words, if he will only give them acts. He need never again throw one ray of his sunny manner over North-west matters, provided he gives us solid acts. As Alexander Pope says, we prefer solid pudding to empty talk. We prefer the solid legislation that would give us free implements, free coal oil, free iron, free coal, free lumber, a low duty on a number of things that farmers use. We prefer that, a good deal, to any brilliancy of rhetoric, or any charm of

Mr. DAVIN.

manner. Sir, I am really sorry in a way, I can safely say without affectation that I am very sorry for the failure of character on that bench in ten months. In Opposition they were virtuous; their elevation to the bench has been disastrous to them, morally. They have in ten short months sacrificed all claim to the confidence of the people of Canada. A distinguished colleague of the hon. Premier referred the other night to William Shakspeare, and to some things that he said. The hon. Premier is himself a student of Shakspeare, one can see that in his style; as he is a student of much else that conduces to purity of utterance. Let us look at the way free trade has been treated here by its friends, betrayed from that very side by the Finance Minister, one of the loudest self-styled free traders in Canada, or on the continent, or, for that matter, in the Empire. He is in charge of this policy, and he goes and slanders free trade all over with praise, and then betrays it at the close of his speech. Sitting behind him was the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He looked grim, I do not say he looked ghastly, he rather looked the reverse of ghastly, he looked rubicund; but he looked grim and angry, and even contemptuous. I could not help thinking that he felt that some of his heavy armour had been put on a much slighter man. But, Sir, I was glad, I may say to the Prime Minister, that the Finance Minister was a much slighter man, and I will tell him why. He has a distinguished follower behind him who owns a paper in Winnipeg; and when the Minister of Finance was up in Winnipeg, this follower of my hon. friend had an article in which he said that we had now found a leader. He quite filled me with alarm, he indicated, as I thought, a rival; and now I am only doing for that side of the House what an hon. gentleman opposite did for us yesterday when he warned the leader of the Opposition of a coming rival. I am not warning, but consoling, the Prime Minister that he need not fear a rival. I was alarmed, because I thought that when the Finance Minister broke out, we should have something very colossal indeed, and very overpowering. But I may say this, that after the experience of the last four or five days, I do not think that my hon. friend the Prime Minister need fear the rival that the editor of the "Tribune" would have given him. But, Mr. Speaker, there cannot be the least doubt about this, that the promises made by these gentlemen made a deep impression on the country, and the denial of these promises, the failure to keep the pledges made, the failure, above all, to keep the pledges made to the North-west Territories and to Manitoba, have made an impression on the country that I do not think will rapidly pass away. I was referring a moment ago to the turn for quotation that is possessed