

it would be seen that they had followed a course at once friendly to their neighbours and dignified to themselves. The right hon. gentleman had told them that there was nothing particularly new in the programme, which he admitted to be a very good one on the whole, and which he had promised to support.

Although he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) was obliged to him for the support thus promised, and while he would accept with great pleasure any suggestion for the improvement of any measure which the Government might submit to the House, he must say that the right hon. gentleman was mistaken when he claimed the paternity of the Election Bill. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had a very vivid recollection of the opposition the right hon. gentleman gave this Bill fourteen years ago in Parliament. He had a very strong recollection of the opposition offered to most of the provisions of this Bill in the Parliament before last, and although the right hon. gentleman had introduced Election Bills, they were introduced, as was the ballot resolution last year, in opposition to the right hon. gentleman's own views. In fact, he had only yielded to them ultimately as an expression of the public opinion of the country. That expression was chiefly promoted by hon. gentlemen now sitting upon the Government side of the House.

When the Government introduced a measure of this kind, they did so, not as the offspring of the right hon. gentleman, but as the fruit of their own labours, and chiefly in opposition to the right hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was the head. (*Cheers.*) Still, he accepted the statement of the right hon. gentleman as to his ultimate conversion to the views of gentlemen upon this side of the House, and although that conversion was rather tardy, and only came when the measure was sure of acceptance, he was glad the gentlemen led by the right hon. gentleman were prepared to accede to the proposal of this side of the House.

In reference to the question of representation in Parliament, he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) ought first to have congratulated his hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Moss) and his hon. friend from Arthabaska (Mr. Laurier) but he would now say that during the time he had sat in Parliament and listened to similar speeches, he did not recollect an occasion when he had heard the gentlemen acquit themselves so well as they had upon this occasion. (*Cheers.*) Although both gentlemen sit, as a matter of course, on the Ministerial side of the House—at least, so far as the Ministerial benches of the House could hold them—everyone, he was sure, would be pleased to welcome such an addition to the debating power of the House. (*Hear, hear.*) He was glad the remarks of both gentlemen were of such a character as to elicit the approval of the leader of the Opposition.

The right hon. gentleman had, however, been pleased to take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto on the question of the ballot. One statement of the right hon. gentleman was, he believed, incorrect: the rioting in England during the recent election was not in connection with, or in consequences of, the ballot; not at all indeed, in connection with the polling, except in one trifling instance; but mere rioting promoted by the excitement attending upon the election in some excitable districts. There could

be no doubt but the ballot would protect the freedom of electors, and that was what was desired.

He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had not hesitated to state formerly that taking the two systems and comparing them, he would prefer open voting, but, as he has stated last session, he believed that in a populous country, containing large manufacturing establishments, where there was a population which might be subjected to undue pressure from employers, from large landed proprietors, or from any other quarter, it was necessary that the ballot should be put into operation in order to afford the voter the necessary protection. For our large agricultural districts it did not matter as a general rule, he thought, whether they had the ballot or not, and it would probably produce in those districts no material difference. It was now an established fact, however, and it only remained for this House to adopt such wise provisions as to make it efficacious for producing the results which were expected of it.

He was glad the right hon. gentleman had not adopted any course of opposition on the present occasion. In doing so he had followed the course which was adopted by this side of the House when in Opposition, that was that unless there was something requiring immediate and marked attention the Address should pass as a matter of course. He thanked the right hon. gentleman for his moderation and forbearance in taking that course, and of the promise he had made to give all the measures of the Government a fair dispassionate consideration when they come before the House. (*Cheers.*) He wished to say one word with regard to the first statement of the right hon. gentleman. He would not say much about the fault-finding, but the right hon. gentleman had rather put words into his (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's) mouth. It was true the right hon. gentleman had accused him of fault-finding, and he had replied that it was his business to find fault with the measures of the Government, but he did not say that it was his only business, and the House knew that it was not the only business which occupied him when leader of the Opposition.

The right hon. gentleman objected to his announcing the policy of the Government before going to the people. He thought that in a speech made by the right hon. gentleman he had seen objection taken to their want of enunciation of policy. (*Hear, hear.*) At any rate he was sure that the whole Opposition press was greatly exercised over the want of that announcement till his (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's) address to the electors of Lambton was published, and if the right hon. gentleman was really opposed to the declaration of policy by Ministers on the eve of an election he was opposed equally to all his supporters in this country. It had been objected that they did not declare their policy with sufficient distinctness or in sufficient detail. He might be satisfied with citing the opinion of Mr. Gladstone upon this subject; but whether Mr. Gladstone had done it or not, he took a different view of the policy of such a course. He thought it was absolutely necessary that a new Government going to the country without having had any opportunity of meeting Parliament and announcing their policy, the country would have reason to complain if they did not do so.

To be sure the right hon. gentleman wanted them to announce their policy in this House at a time when they could not appear in