

the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who seconded the Address, while he highly approved of those two clauses, said our manufactures are flourishing, that our manufactures are, comparatively speaking, in a most successful position, and that those manufactures have been developed by the Australian Exhibition and will be developed by the forthcoming Exhibition at Paris. Much as I would like to have our manufactures develop in France and Australia, I would much prefer that they should have been fully developed at home; that we should have a home trade, a system of home manufactures and encouragement to home manufactures, which is twice blessed—which blesseth him that gives and him that receives—the giver and the receiver alike being in our own country. Why the hon. gentleman will not admit, apparently, that our manufactures are undersold in their own market by those of the neighbouring country whose misery and wretchedness he deplors, and whom he speaks of in a rather depreciatory way when comparing the commercial and manufacturing condition of the United States with that of Canada, and, strange to say, while the United States is in such a state of depression, while there is such misery there in consequence of the protective system—a system which the hon. gentleman advocated, I am told, with wonderful ability on the floor of the House, and within three years too—while he deplors the miseries of the position of United States manufactures, and, while he compares with exultation the flourishing state of our manufactures, he loses sight of the fact that the whole of the manufacturing population of England is at this moment awakening to a feeling of alarm at being undersold in their own markets by American manufacturers. The hon. gentleman is always offering a challenge to bring on a discussion on the trade question; but I think we must postpone that till by and bye, for the hon. gentlemen will have many opportunities during the present Session of vindicating his present opinions, if they continue to the end of the Session, or maintaining the opinions which he so ably advocated three Sessions ago. We most all concur in

the language of the address with regard to the misfortune which happened to the city of St. John—a wonderful misfortune, a dreadful misfortune. A great woe passed over one of our commercial cities, and, while I would compliment the Government for their promptitude in coming forward in the manner they did, still I believe the country would have sustained them, and the Opposition in this House would have sustained them, had their aid not only been immediate but twice as liberal. With regard to the treaties with the Indians, of course we cannot judge of them until the papers are laid before the House. I am glad, however, to know that they no more onerous, or scarcely as onerous, as previous treaties. If it is so—and the House has no reason to think otherwise—of course we shall congratulate ourselves and the country must join in the congratulations and felicitations contained in the Address on that happy result having been arrived at. But with respect to the next paragraph, the eighth paragraph, regarding a number of Indians having come into this country, I think I must ask the hon. the Premier to make an alteration in its terms by amending it slightly, for I think it commits us in a manner to which I do not think the House will willingly commit itself. The paragraph reads:—

“That we learn, with much interest, that early in last summer, a large body of Indians under Sitting Bull, from the United States, crossed into British Territory, to escape from United States troops, and have since remained on the Canadian side; and that the United States Government made a friendly but unsuccessful attempt to induce these Indians to return to their reservations. And that we agree with His Excellency, in hoping that such arrangements may yet be made as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement, and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure.”

For my part I would be infinitely more pleased if arrangements could be speedily made to effect their peaceful removal, rather than their permanent and peaceful settlement.

MR. MILLS: It is so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is quite the contrary. The Indians