

that the wagon in question was made in Brantford because, Mr. Speaker, in Brantford are made the most durable farm wagons that are produced in this country. I do not think that there is a wagon of any other manufacture that could be used in the manner described and then be sold second hand for \$90. I felt it was a compliment to my constituency, and I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman make the allusion. But I would have liked him to have gone on and stated the origin of the wagon to which he referred. With reference to the price of the horses he later answered his own question. He stated that only \$35 could be realized, as I understood it, for two teams of good draught horses—good young horses—and a little later he said that they had to pay 5 cents here for apples that were much cheaper in the Annapolis valley. Now if he had taken the horses in question to the market where they were in demand, he would have obtained a better price for them, or if he had gone to the place where the apples were produced he would have got the apples cheap, at the price at which they are grown in Nova Scotia.

I think that the mistake that has been made, perhaps, in the minds of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite is in painting the part of Canada from which they come—that is the three prairie provinces—in too dark, too gloomy, too unattractive colors. Those of us who have not had the pleasure of visiting that part of the country, and have to judge of it only by their description, would not, I think, form a very pleasurable picture of it or of its attractions. In fact, if we compare that description with the one that was given of the Yukon we find the latter of an altogether different character. Although we were told that the temperature was sometimes minus 60, yet the whole tenor of the address of the gentleman from that part of Canada was cheerful and optimistic, as compared with the utterances of those who live in the more fertile parts of the prairie provinces. I should like a more cheerful spirit inculcated by those who wish to see the country filled up with immigrants.

I must congratulate the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Forke) on the fact that he has been elected to the leadership of the Progressive party. During the time he has been in this House I feel sure that hon. gentleman has received the confidence, and has justly earned it of every member in the Chamber. He certainly has the universal respect of this House, and I am sure will always

enjoy the respect of gentlemen on this side. But there is one little suggestion that I would make, if I may, to that hon. gentleman. In his criticism of the Speech from the Throne he alluded to the omissions from it, and said it was notable for what it did not contain, and I observe that many of those who saw fit to criticise the Speech took the same ground. While I have not examined the Hansards extending back to confederation I believe, and I am assured upon the best authority, that there have been very few Speeches from the Throne since that time of which exactly the same remark has not been made—that they are very notable for the omissions from them rather than for what they contain. It is a remark that is hoary in its age, but I do not know that it would indicate any particular originality in the gentleman who makes it.

Then when the hon. member went on to express condemnation, because there is no allusion in the Speech to a still further reduction of the tariff, and expressed the desire of his party that there should be a still further reduction of the tariff, I would like to say this: I am, of course, but a new man in this House, and I can only judge of things as they appear to me, but it does seem to me that when the hon. member was elevated to the leadership of the Progressive party that elevation brought certain responsibilities with it that do not belong altogether to the position of a private member of the House. I mean in this way, Sir, that when he undertook to say that a certain section of the revenue of this country, amounting to \$88,000,000, should be removed it was his place, as a statesman, to suggest to the Finance Minister some way in which that loss of revenue could be made up. But there was no suggestion as to what should take the place of those taxes that would be taken off by removing the tariff; and we know, as everybody knows—I believe the gentleman who has just taken his seat, the hon. member for West York (Sir Henry Drayton) knows—that the great difficulty of government to-day is to raise enough revenue to meet the requirements of the country—that instead of removing taxes—because the tariff is, of course, a tax—the difficulty is to raise enough money to meet the national requirements. They are large; we have heard them explained from all points of view. It is difficult to take them up now without consuming a great deal of time; but we have heard the various speakers allude to the existing charges, the interest on the debt, and the necessity of raising more money; and therefore it seems to me that