

Quebec. The representatives of those bodies stated before the committee of the House that if they had in the other provinces the same sort of legislation that exists in Ontario or Quebec, they would not ask for this insolvency law. Since the prorogation of Parliament last year the province of New Brunswick has passed an Act almost identical with that of Ontario. A similar measure was introduced in the legislature of Nova Scotia last session and was defeated more by chance than otherwise in the legislative council during the closing hours of the session. I have no doubt, but that the measure will be passed at the next session of the local legislature; and there does not seem to be any reason to devote our energies during the warm weather to going all over that matter again. There are other things that I might refer to but I think I have said enough already. I can only say, with respect to the closing paragraph of His Excellency's speech, that the Queen's representative may feel sure that the members of the opposition will bring to the deliberations of parliament at least as strong a love for their country, and just as earnest a desire to do that which is best for the country as the supporters of the administration.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD (B. C.)—I do not intend to refer to all the paragraphs in the address, but I wish to say a few words on two or three of the subjects dealt with by His Excellency. Although it has been customary for the leader of the House and the leader of the opposition to monopolize the expression of their approval of the speeches delivered by the mover and the seconder of the address yet, on this occasion, I wish to depart from that custom, and express my admiration for the speech of the hon. gentlemen from Pictou, which was couched in the most perfect and appropriate language, and also the pleasure with which I listened to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island. In addition to the eloquence which they displayed, there is another phase of their speeches to which I wish to call attention. The speech from the throne generally concludes with an invocation for divine guidance in the proceedings of Parliament, and very often that paragraph is passed over lightly by movers and seconders; but on this occasion both of these hon. gentlemen referred to that paragraph in the most reverential and solemn manner. In days such

as we live in, it is gratifying to find some who have convictions and who have the courage of their convictions. I do not intend to follow every paragraph of the speech of His Excellency. On the trade question I will simply place one or two economical facts before the hon. the leader of the opposition who has made extraordinary statements on the subject. It is well known that food and products of all kinds have not been so cheap for the last forty years in Canada, the United States and England as during the last year. It is also known that there are more hungry, idle, unemployed people in these countries at present than there have been for years. What benefit is it to the farm labourer in England if foreign and colonial wheat, beef, cheese and butter are cheap if he cannot earn a day's wages? What benefit is it to the Manchester cotton spinner and weaver if imported American cottons are cheap if his own factory gives him work and wages for three days only out of six? What benefit is it to the iron workers of Sheffield, Newcastle, Birmingham, and Glasgow if foreign iron is cheap if they are working on half time? The hon. gentleman from Ottawa says: lower the duty and you will increase the revenue, but he failed to show how that could be done. England is held up by that gentleman and others as having the model financial and commercial system of the world. Does she lower her taxation when increased revenue is required? Just the contrary: she at once raises her income tax—and this very year it is higher than it has been, excepting when war was going on. Any one who tries to show that the policy pursued there could be adopted here, is very much at fault in his political economy. The conditions of the two countries are entirely different. England has a large accumulation of wealth, with abundance of cheap labour, cheap coal and iron, and large fleets of ships on every sea carrying her products hither and thither. This country is young, comparatively without capital, labour is dearer, coal and iron are dearer—there can be no comparison between the two countries. The hon. gentleman from Shell River in his efforts in behalf of free trade, has made a very strong case for the National Policy. He has shown that one hundred millions of dollars annually are paid out in wages by manufacturers. Is not that large sum, spent amongst the