

Who can doubt the influence they possess for ensuring the healthy progress and peace of mankind? But if this influence is to be fully felt, they must work together in cordial friendship, each people in its own sphere of action. If they have great power, they have also great responsibility. No cause they espouse can fail; no cause they oppose can triumph. The future is, in large part, theirs. They have the making of history in times that are to come. The greatest calamity that could befall would be strife which should divide them.

Let us pray that this shall never be. Let us pray that they, always self-respecting, each in honour upholding its own flag, safeguarding its own heritage of right and respecting the rights of others, each in its own way fulfilling its high national destiny, shall yet work in harmony for the progress and peace of the world.

Sir, these words are as eloquent as they are wise. I commend them to the careful consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, to the careful consideration of the people of Canada, the people of the United States, and the people of England, and I say that in spirit, if not in letter, these words represent exactly the sentiments to which my hon. friend gave utterance, and which hon. gentlemen opposite see fit so loudly to condemn.

Mr. IVES. Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Government in the course of his speech upon this question, favoured us with what he calls the three reasons for the victory of the Liberal party at the late general election. He said that the first reason was a fixed feeling that the fiscal policy of the late Government had failed to fulfil the expectations of the people; second, that the Government had been extravagant and corrupt; and, third, that instead of appealing to the better judgment of the people, we had appealed to sectional feelings. I shall, in a few minutes, add some further reasons of my own to account for the victory which the hon. gentleman and his party achieved, but, before doing so, I desire to refer to the three reasons which the hon. gentleman has given. So far as the first is concerned, that the fiscal policy of the late Government had failed to fulfil the expectations of the people, I desire to state before this House in the most positive manner from my own experience of the contest in the province of Quebec that such could not have been a reason for the success of the hon. gentleman opposite. The reason I give is this: That the success which the hon. gentleman obtained in the commercial centres of the province of Quebec was not obtained because of dissatisfaction with our fiscal policy, but because of the most distinct and positive pledge given, not only by the hon. gentleman himself, but by all his lieutenants and his assistants, publicly and privately, in season and out of season, day and night, that if he succeeded in being returned to power, the fiscal system of the country now existing would not be seriously disturbed or interfered with. How can the hon. gentleman, who day after day has been going around among the manufacturers and merchants of the city of

Montreal whispering in their ears that they need not be afraid of him; how can he now have the audacity to stand up here before this new Parliament of Canada, and ascribe to the fiscal policy and its unpopularity the reason why he succeeded in the election. Why, Sir, one of the first steps he had to take when the battle commenced, was to put the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Sir Richard Cartwright) in leash. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Sir Richard Cartwright), because of the experience which the people of Canada had of him from 1873 to 1878, was the bete noir of every merchant and manufacturer in the Dominion of Canada. If they had not been satisfied, if they had not been thoroughly convinced that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) would not be Minister of Finance, and would not be in control of the fiscal policy of any new administration that would be formed, then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) never could have succeeded in carrying the country or in carrying the commercial centres in the province of Quebec. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) was so effectually put in leash, that during this great struggle, when every public man in Canada but himself was on the platform and on the stump educating the people as to his particular views, that gentleman above all others, notwithstanding his great ability, was quietly enjoying the seclusion of his own private house and was not heard on a platform in the country. At the last moment, during the last two or three days of the contest, when it was thought safe to allow the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) to speak, he went out and spoke in three or four of the adjoining counties, and the result was that in every constituency in which he spoke my hon. friends on this side of the House obtained a victory. Not only that, Sir; not only were the elections carried on the popularity of the fiscal policy, by the party opposite adopting it, and by their promising not to disturb it; but since the election the hon. the leader of the Government and his friends, have sought to prevent a financial crash and a repetition in Canada of the unfortunate financial crisis which took place in the United States, by promising emphatically that they would not interfere with the protective features of the tariff, and that in anything they did, they would proceed cautiously and not precipitately. The Minister of Trade and Commerce, I think with considerable reason says, it can hardly be expected that the Government should be ready at the present moment with a general tariff scheme. I admit that. I admit it if that general tariff scheme is to be in the nature of a protective scheme, but if their scheme is to be the removal of every vestige of protection, as the hon. gentleman has promised, if it is to be a free trade scheme, or a scheme of a tariff for revenue only, then what is the necessity for time or