

if he judges us from the summit of his own estimate of himself, he has very good reason to be severe upon us.

It is not every man who can say that he has made Canada. To-day my hon. friend gave the testimony to my late lamented friend, Sir George Etienne Cartier, that he had been one of the foremost promoters of the confederation of Canada. But I must tell the hon. gentleman that in doing this tardy justice to Sir George E. Cartier he was very unfair to another gentleman, he was very unfair to no less a person than Sir Charles Tupper, because we have it upon the authority of Sir Charles Tupper himself that he it is who made Canada. On a certain occasion he spoke in this manner :

My history is the history of the Dominion of Canada ; my history is the history of the confederation of Canada ; my history is the history of the progress and prosperity of this country.

Sir George E. Cartier was one, Sir John A. Macdonald was another, George Brown was another who, we were all under the impression, had had a good deal to do with the history of confederation, but they were simply puppets in the hands of my hon. friend ; he, and he alone, did it. Well, Sir, I have only this to say to my hon. friend : Every thing is relative in this world. I will not compare him to ourselves, but I will simply answer him in the language of a celebrated gentleman in the old Parliament of France in the time of the revolution, in the language of L'Abbé Maury, who being taunted once by Napoleon that he thought a good deal of himself, said : "No, I think very little of myself when I judge myself, but I think a great deal of myself when I compare myself with others."

What shall I say now, Sir, of the unseemly attack, of the most unseemly attack, which was made by the hon. gentleman, without any provocation whatever, upon the representative of the Queen in this country, upon the Governor General? Sir, I can always forgive a man for speaking hard words in the heat of debate, but I cannot forgive a man for making a deliberate attack upon a gentleman who cannot defend himself, and then sneaking out of the consequence through a poor subterfuge such as we had an exhibition of to-day. However, Mr. Speaker, we can allow this to pass. That attack will do no harm to the august person against whom it was directed. Neither the honour of Canada nor the credit of Canada will suffer by it ; if anybody is to suffer by it, it is the hon. gentleman who, forgetting himself, forgetting his station, used the unseemly language which we have heard this evening.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend told us this afternoon that he was not a poet ; but I think he showed us that he could take many licenses, though they were not poetical. But I must give him this credit, that he did not attempt to challenge the figures and

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

the statements brought forward by my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Bertram) when he spoke of the prosperity of this country. Canada is prosperous as it never was before. The fact is that ever since this Administration came into office, Canada has gone forward with leaps and bounds. The hon. member for Centre Toronto this afternoon said nothing but what is well known, when he said that Canada occupies a prouder station to-day, not only within the Empire but throughout the world at large, than she ever did at any previous period of her history. The fact is, Sir, that Canada has seen more progress during the last eighteen months than she ever realized at any similar previous time in her history. When the historian comes to write the history of this country from confederation up to the present time, he will make a jump from the year 1867 to the year 1897, and will date from the latter year a new era in the national development of this country. Neither did my hon. friend challenge the statement, though he has denied many things, that Canada has been blessed by Providence with a bountiful harvest. In the days of the old regime a good harvest would have been attributed to the National Policy. I have heard that said. We simply give credit to Providence for our blessings in this respect. But if we have good harvests we have also good prices. My hon. friend hastened to say that it was not due to the tariff. If I were to use the same kind of language formerly used by himself and by his friends, I would say directly that the price of wheat is due to the tariff. Why, Sir, has not wheat risen to the price of \$1 per bushel, and have we not heard the statement made by followers of the hon. gentleman that \$1 a bushel was the Grit price of wheat. We have got back to the Grit price of wheat. But we do not claim anything of the kind. We never claimed that the prices of the products of the land could be regulated by the tariff. What we do claim, however, is this, that the tariff has been revised in such a fair and judicious manner as to give confidence to the people of this country, and to make it possible for them to take advantage of every opportunity that offers to increase our trade with the world. We do not go beyond that claim. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman had still some little blame to cast upon my hon. friend who framed the tariff. He claimed that what changes we have made in the tariff had proved unprofitable to the people of Canada. Let me quote him an authority which he will admit upon this point, as strong and valuable as any authority that can be quoted. Mr. Edward Gurney, the late President of the Toronto Board of Trade. This is the way he spoke of the changes which have been made in the tariff :

I believe that in a large measure the confidence of to-day is attributable to the able and