

sition to every piece of legislation that was brought in by the Government, no matter how beneficial it might be to the people.

The statement was decidedly "inclusive." "Continued opposition to every piece of legislation" did not leave much of a loophole. Now turn to another Government organ—the *Colonist*—of the 30th of March, and on the last page this would be found: "Hon. Mr. Davie complimented the hon. member for Westminster City for doing the Government the justice of supporting it in an admittedly good measure, and for having given valuable assistance in connection with the bill." And again, in the *Colonist* of the 13th March, Mr. Davie is reported as saying of an important Act of a former session of this Parliament that it "passed the House without division, unanimously." Mr. Brown said he was perfectly indifferent alike to praise or blame from this source, but it was worth while to make these quotations just to show how these good folks contradicted themselves. Before leaving the subject, he might point out the difference in this matter between the parties. The Opposition criticized the public acts and utterances of the Government, giving details, and pointing out the objectionable things, while the Government and their organs merely abused their opponents personally, or made unsupported general statements—the difference was very significant. His feeling for the organs was only one of pity; they had sold themselves for a mere mess of pottage, and now, with the spoon rattling upon the bottom of the dish, and the last spoonful in sight, their desperation and despair were pitiful to behold. (Laughter and applause.)

It had been charged, continued Mr. Brown, that he had done nothing for the city. In the opinion of the men who made that charge, the opposing of bad measures and the promotion of good ones was "nothing." If a man was not a successful grabber, he was of no account. Well, he had not been very successful as a grabber—he admitted that, but, all the same, he thought the city had not been so very badly left, all things considered. He had never failed to urge any proper claim either for the city as a whole, or for any constituent, where his help had been sought. There was an inside history to this business

which it was not worth while to go into now, as he was out of politics, but he might say that he had very early found that argument and reason were very blunt weapons, indeed, down at James Bay. To go back to his first session, the Government had promised to himself and to the City Solicitor, to pass the celebrated "Enabling Bill," but certain influences had induced them to change their view—so they deliberately broke that promise, and excused themselves on the ground that he, Mr. Brown, had refused to oblige them by betraying his constituents and selling his vote on the Cool Mines Regulation Bill. However, he and his associates had put brains against brute force in the matter of the essence of the Enabling Bill, and "got there" without any thanks to the Government. He would not attempt to go into detail in the matter, but he had certainly had the satisfaction of seeing certain things done for the city which he had urged, and, if he had had to stand by and see some things which had been refused to him granted on the request of various deputations, he had at least the satisfaction of feeling that his constituents supported him in refusing to pay the base price demanded for some of such concessions. (Loud applause.)

As he had always been proud to be able to speak of his constituency as a "Provincial" one—that was, one composed of voters who thought more of the rights of the whole Province and its people than of any little selfish advantage, and who thought much more of their rights as freemen than of the grab game, he felt that the giving of an account of his stewardship should to a great extent resolve itself into a statement of the things which had led to his conviction that this was not a straight Government, and that, therefore, he should oppose it. He had alluded to some of these already. In their school and municipal legislation, and in dealing with many of the schemes embodied in private bills, the Government had shown that their attitude of mind was one of contempt for and distrust of the people. It was quite evident, too, that they had their pets, and that one company might ask in vain for privileges which would be readily granted to another. It was true that, in 1891, he had been able to