

member of this House against the expenditure of the Senate as being entirely beyond what the necessities of the case require.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish also to enter my protest against any hon. member of this House describing an English artist as a foreigner. I was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman from East York describe two or three times over a resident and inhabitant of the Mother Country as a foreigner.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will not discuss the matter with the hon. member; but, speaking of portraits, I desire to make a remark which I omitted. Some time ago, when the Speaker of the Upper House was obliged to retire for a time, it became necessary to go through the form of appointing a Speaker by Commission. A gentleman was appointed *pro tem*, until the presiding Speaker was able to resume his duties, and one of his first acts was to get his portrait painted. I do not think he was long enough in office to get his portrait completed; but it was completed within a year afterwards. This is a matter they have no right to do, surely. I will allow the hon. gentleman to take his portrait away with him if he wishes. There is no reason, because he was favored by being chosen by the Government to act two or three weeks when the Speaker was sick, that he should have his portrait painted. You, Sir, as Chairman of the Committee, will have somewhat of a claim to have your portrait painted, and I dare say it would give just as much satisfaction on the walls as does the mass of rubbish which covers them. I would sell the whole lot for \$5; I would put them anywhere; they are a nuisance, and darken our corridors; and besides, who cares for them? Half of these men who have been Speakers, and have had their portraits painted, were not, in any sense, leading public men; some of them were, no doubt, and some of the portraits are of historical interest, but they are very few indeed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman had not the fear of the hon. member for West Durham before his eyes when he called portraits by Canadian artists rubbish, and declared he would sell them at \$5 apiece. That is his idea of the value of Canadian art and Canadian artists. The hon. member has objected to a gentleman who occupied the position of Speaker for a short time, a venerable Senator whose portrait is valuable from his long experience in public life, and the high position he held in his own Province—having his portrait painted. The hon. gentleman objected to this portrait being painted, because he was so short a time Speaker. We have hanging on our walls the portrait of a Speaker who had no right to be Speaker at all; who had no right to be in this House; and there is a solemn decision that he had no right to be in this House, and no right to be Speaker. But we have got the portrait.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We have the further fact, and the hon. gentleman forgot to mention it, that the gentleman referred to was elected twice, and the hon. gentleman failed to oppose his election. I did not say that, as works of art, these pictures on our walls were rubbish. They may be good works of art for anything I know—I am not a great judge of that kind of art, and they may be excellent specimens of artistic painting—but they are no use hanging round our walls. We may have a high opinion of some pictures, and yet may not desire to have them in our drawing rooms. All I object to is filling up our corridors with portraits of men, year after year, in this way. As to the other portrait referred to, what I objected to was, that we were getting two Speakers' portraits painted for one term, and that is certainly not according to our usual practice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is amusing to see the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) becoming excited at Englishmen being termed foreigners. That same gentleman and all who act with him, are continually speaking of a

large body of English manufacturers under that name, and in endeavoring to exclude their products from this country. And more than that, the supporters and defenders of the Government announced, as their policy, and made it a Statute law of the land, that when the Americans made certain reductions in the Tariff we would make the same reductions, while we made no provision in our law with respect to England which takes all our products free.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman has made an explicit statement as to fact. He has said that I am in the habit of describing Englishmen as foreigners. I want to know when I ever described Englishmen as foreigners. I wish him to prove his charge. I have never done so, and it would be impossible for me to do so. So far as the Conservative party is concerned with the matter to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I can only say that nothing ever gave me greater pleasure in my life than to hear the applause which greeted the Finance Minister when he first introduced this policy, and when he declared it protected England as against other countries. The applause which greeted that sentiment from this side of the House, showed whether the statement of the hon. gentleman was true or not. But I can understand very well that the hon. gentleman should feel aggrieved, and should feel sore on this matter of the National Policy, and I know very well that his party treat the people of this country worse than foreigners, for they wish to hand over our manufactures body and bones to foreigners, to the people of the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who told you so?

Mr. McNEILL. Their whole policy has been that from first to last. That is the system on which they produced their whole theory of the management of the finances, and their whole system with respect to the policy of this country is one which would hand over the manufacturers of this country to the Americans. It is notorious that our manufactures were being killed out by the Americans before the hon. Finance Minister and the Government came to the rescue, and to-day our manufactures are being built up under that fostering National Policy. Hon. gentlemen are now endeavoring, day by day, and hour by hour, to destroy the policy which has been so beneficial to this country and to every young country which has adopted it. The hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, that it is impossible for any country to prosper in manufacturing to any considerable extent unless it adopts a policy of Protection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McNEILL. It is a very simple thing for some hon. members to laugh. I ask the hon. gentleman to mention the name of any such country.

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to order. I beg to ask to what item these observations refer.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the point. The question before the Committee has reference to the expenditure of the Senate.

Mr. McNEILL. The point to which I was addressing myself was the accusation with respect to my calling Englishmen foreigners, and I will now address myself to the point if you say it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is foreign to the discussion.

Mr. CHARLTON. This discussion has assumed a rather wide range. The hon. First Minister remarked, some little time ago, with reference to the speech of my hon. friend from West Middlesex, that had he been in England, no doubt Mr. Playfair would have called him to order, but then that gentleman would likely have called the right hon. gentleman to order himself, as well as the hon. Minister of Railways, and the speaker who has just spoken. I may be permitted, as all these hon. gentlemen have taken so much