

give him a part of this great spending department which was left vacant by the resignation of the hon. member for St. Mary's? These are questions which affect the internal government of the Liberal party. Probably it is, that, the late hon. Speaker of the House, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) having been taken in to the administration, those people in the province of Quebec who were a little afraid of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries have had their fears appeased, and the respectability of the Minister of Inland Revenue has probably gone far in allaying the fears with which the people of Quebec were impressed when the right hon. leader of the government chose to take into his administration the hon. gentleman who now occupies the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Let me tell the right hon. gentleman that if these pledges are to be implemented, if these promises are to be carried out, now is the time and the electors of Quebec will take no more such pledges or no more such promises even if my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he is authorized to make them.

When I speak of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—and again I say I regret he is not in the House to hear what I have to say—it recalls to my mind what took place last session in connection with the establishment of a line of steamers between Canada and France. Every one knows that when the Prime Minister proposed the adoption of this contract between a certain syndicate formed in France and the Canadian government, he took very good care to say that officially he did not know Mr. Carbonneau. But as soon as Mr. Carbonneau got back to France, he announced in his paper 'Le Canada', that he had been successful in the negotiations which he had carried on with the government of Canada, and that he had established a line of steamers between Canada and France. I would like the Prime Minister to tell me what has been the fate of this contract between the government and Mr. Colombier, or Mr. Carbonneau. The newspapers announce that Mr. Carbonneau is now in New York, and that he has come to this continent to perfect the arrangements with the government which he began last year. What has the Prime Minister to say to that?

Let me pass to another subject which is not mentioned in the speech from the Throne but to which the mover and the seconder of the address devoted a good deal of time. I refer to the prosperity of the country. Let me contrast the conduct of the present Conservative opposition, with the conduct of the Liberal opposition in this respect. When the Conservative party was in power and when the country was prosperous, the Liberals went from end to end of Canada preaching blue ruin and prophesying national bankruptcy if the Conservative

policy were to continue. Look at the position of affairs to-day. Nobody in the land is more proud of the prosperity of Canada than are the members of the Conservative party in this House, and their followers in the country. And if the policy announced by the Prime Minister in 1895, when he promised to wipe out the last vestige of protection; if he had carried out that policy since he came to power, what do you think would have happened? What would have happened if he had carried out the policy announced by him in Winnipeg, when he declared the doctrine of protection is bondage. What would have happened had he not taken a leaf out of the Conservative book, and continued in a measure at least, the national policy which was inaugurated in 1878, and against which for 18 long years the Liberals ranted in season and out of season. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) and the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Rivet) have spoken about the great surpluses of which the Minister of Finance can boast; but, Sir, these gentlemen were not in the House and they were probably not in politics when some of the leading members of the Liberal party had a different story to tell about surpluses. The Halifax 'Chronicle' which at the time I refer to was edited by the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) had this to say, and it is interesting under present circumstances:—

If these surpluses were created by the government in some magic way there may be in them a cause for thankfulness to Sir John Macdonald and his followers, but when it is considered that every dollar of the surplus is money taken out of the pockets of the people without a shadow of an excuse, money not required even by the reckless expenditure of the government, there is not much cause for rejoicing.

That millions of dollars should be unnecessarily taken yearly from the consuming classes of the country, and this without being absolutely necessary, is a cardinal principle of the Finance Minister's, to which even his best friends do not unreservedly assent.

They see that a surplus of millions at the capital is just so much money withdrawn from the trade of the country. How long can the Dominion stand the drain? Certainly not many years longer.

And this is what the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Rt. Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) said in 1882:—

I asked how the surplus was got. \$1,100,000 was derived from two of the most odious and oppressive taxes which were ever imposed in any civilized country before, under similar circumstances at least, the taxes on breadstuffs and fuel. If he really wants to relieve the people, let him remove the taxes on breadstuffs and coal.

And if these gentlemen want us to believe to-day, that they are the real friends of the country, why do they boast of surpluses which are caused by this most odious and oppressive taxation, and why don't they relieve the people by removing the tax from breadstuffs and coal?