

attention to some particular points which have been slightly discussed, and take exception to a few statements made by hon. members of the Opposition. As many references have been made, since the beginning of this Session, to the city which I have the honour to represent—specially by some hon. members of the Opposition, who have manifested a deep but fresh interest in the welfare of my constituents, for which, no doubt, they will feel grateful, I will, at the outset, as in duty bound, take up that point which is the most entitled to my immediate consideration. Sir, in his extreme desire to undervalue the beneficial effects of Protection on the country, the hon. leader of the Left stated, in his speech on the Address, that it was admitted even by Government papers that there was an unusual amount of distress in the city of Ottawa. In the first place, I do not know of a single Conservative paper which has admitted that there was an unusual amount of distress in this city; and, in the second place, I deny that the statement of the hon. gentleman is well founded. Furthermore, I contend that the distress which may now exist to a certain extent is far from being as wide spread as that which prevailed during the last two or three years of the previous Administration. The maintenance of a soup kitchen in our midst has been advanced as an argument against the National Policy, but hon. gentlemen opposite should not forget that that noble institution—the soup kitchen—is but a legacy of their own Government, that it was implanted in Ottawa during the late Government, that it flourished not only here, but in various cities of the Dominion in the same ratio that our most useful and important industries were then decaying and falling down one after the other. But, Sir, my hon. friends need not feel uneasy on this point, for another winter will most probably prove that owing to the revival of trade, the usefulness of the soup kitchen has gone. It is true that an assemblage of unemployed workingmen—which has been so often referred to on the other side of the House—took place a few weeks ago, but it could not be denied that it was far from being as large as the one which paid a visit to my hon. friend in the winter of 1877, and which, I dare say,

he has not yet forgotten. I could not give a better or more authoritative illustration of the distress that prevailed in Ottawa during the Administration of the hon. gentleman than by quoting a short extract from a speech delivered by the Liberal candidate, Mr. C. W. Bangs, one of my opponents during the last elections:—

“Last winter he (the Mayor) had gone to Mr. Mackenzie and laid before him the condition of the poor people of the city. Mr. Mackenzie replied that he would do all he could to assist the city, and had it not been for this he did not know what they would have done. Every morning, when he came down to the City Hall, he found from twenty to one hundred men seeking assistance—men who were willing to work, but who had families starving at home. Some of the men were not able to earn 25c. per day, but still he sent them up to Mr. Henderson, the superintendent of works. Mr. Henderson would come down and say: ‘Don’t send another crowd that can’t do anything.’ He replied: ‘These men are starving and may as well be supported by the Government as by the city.’”

Such was the glowing, the brilliant condition of things in Ottawa during the Mackenzie Government. Well, Sir, after such a statement uttered by a Liberal candidate—and which gives but a very imperfect idea, a very imperfect picture of the misery then desolating the capital, the House will easily perceive how little foundation there is in the assertion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition that there is an unusual amount of distress in the city of Ottawa. I will come now to another point which concerns to a very great extent my constituents, which concerns also to a great extent the inhabitants of the Ottawa Valley, nay, of the whole country. One of the main objections raised against the National Policy when it was at first propounded in this House; one of the main objections raised against the National Policy in the press and on the hustings, in the last political campaign; and one of the main objections raised against that policy in the last Session was, that a Protective Tariff would destroy, would ruin our lumber trade. That industry being one of the largest, if not the largest industry of the Dominion; that industry being the foremost industry of the Ottawa Valley, that industry employing every year 50,000 people, and involving as it does many millions of capital, such an objection, if sound, would have been calculated to impress unfavour-