

every part of the country new manufacturing industries are being established and old ones extended, lifted out of the slough of despond, and now becoming centres of industry, employing a population, which otherwise, in my language to the Manchester people, must have gone off in sheer despair to the United States. The hon. gentleman has spoken about the Indian supplies, and I regret that he should speak about rumors of extravagance, rumors of distributions of silks and wax candles. That is going a little too far. The hon. gentleman must see that such rumors must be founded on a very weak basis. That there have been large expenditures, owing to very inadequate means of transport, and very inadequate means of checks on subordinates, as hon. gentlemen opposite have found, I am free to admit. There has been one case, certainly, of wanton extravagance in the conduct of an officer, which was most unexpected in one of his standing and experience, and he has been removed from office. With that exception, I am not aware that the distributing officers have not performed their duty. It is unwise to allude to rumors unless the allusion is followed by a distinct statement of facts, with the evidence connected with those facts. I may have, perhaps, trespassed on the rule I laid down that we should get through as soon as possible with the Speech from the Throne in order that we should get at work. I will again congratulate my hon. friend on his very able speech, but I will say however, that I think he ought to take rather a leaf out of the hon. the Finance Minister's book. My hon. friend has stated he was very much obliged to the Finance Minister for having visited his constituency, for having visited its factories and made speeches which proved good advertisements. Could not the hon. gentleman also make some speeches which would be an advertisement for the good of the country, instead of making speeches for the purpose of keeping people out of the country, or sending people away who are in the country by showing them the superior advantages of every other country but his own. Let him follow the example that he praises in his hon. friend. If it is good for my hon. friend the Finance Minister, it is good for the hon. gentleman to give the same assistance to the country of his nativity which is proud of him and in which he has not displayed the confidence which I think he ought to have done as a public man. The hon. gentleman, in his opening remarks, spoke about the election in North Oxford. He said he was happy to tell us that Mr. Sutherland is a Reformer, and read a statement of Mr. Sutherland's that he is a Reformer and that his father was a Reformer before him. That may be true. I have no doubt it is true; but I say that in this House and this country there are many men who can say that they are Reformers and that their fathers were Reformers before them, and who have confidence in the policy of the present Government. But, Mr. Speaker, I have no reason to doubt that, in the mere party sense of the word, Mr. Sutherland is an opponent of the Government and a supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite. But there are Reformers and Reformers, and it is a significant circumstance that such an old Grit constituency as the North Riding is, should throw over the candidate selected and ordered by the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, the man of all work, Mr. Patullo, the agent of the Reform party and its organizer—in order to choose a man who had less previous connection with the official leaders of the party. But the hon. gentleman not only asserts that Mr. Sutherland is as good as Mr. Patullo, and I have no doubt a little better, but he says that there was a moral victory or something of that kind in West Toronto, that my hon. friend (Mr. Beaty) has no cause to boast of his triumph there. I think he has a great deal to boast of. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) and the other leaders of the Opposition went there in order to defeat him. All the guns of the Opposition were there to aid in defeating the hon. member for West Toronto, while I like a coward, and some other members of the Government, went off to England. He was elected, notwithstanding the able

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

speech of my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman thought he was going to have more than a moral victory, and I think he told the people of Toronto that he had travelled over 800 miles in order to join with them in the great victory they were going to achieve. I am sorry my hon. friend's retirement at the seaside was interrupted so needlessly. It was a great sacrifice on his part, and all I can say is, that I condone with my hon. friend that he made the sacrifice and did not get the victory.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word before you put the motion. I have no intention of extending the discussion, because I am quite certain that hon. gentlemen opposite and we on this side are satisfied that it should stop where it is. But the hon. leader of the Government accused the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake) of violating the practice that was established many years ago in this country of allowing the Address to pass *pro forma*, leaving the matters of which it treated to be discussed afterwards when specific subjects were brought up. Now, Sir, during the last year of my incumbence Parliament met on the 11th of February, and the hon. gentleman himself (Sir John A. Macdonald) led an opposition of eight days to that Address. There are 346 pages of *Hansard* taken up almost entirely by hon. gentlemen then in Opposition, now on the Ministerial side, and yet the hon. gentleman, with that forgetfulness which characterizes him sometimes, now reproaches the leader on this side of the House with violating the practice which he says was established many years ago. Why, Sir, I was quite astonished when I heard the hon. gentleman's speech. I appealed to him on that occasion, but his answer was that though the speech itself was as innocuous in its wording and neutral in its character as any speech could be, yet the member for Norfolk had introduced some subjects in his speech, and therefore we must go on with the discussion. Now, Sir, I think the speech of the hon. member for Durham did not touch in detail any subject which is likely to be discussed before us. It dealt with general principles, and although the hon. gentleman may object to it, as a speech on the Address it was perfectly legitimate. Nay, Sir, it would have been legitimate if we had gone into a discussion for days, because the Speech challenges contradiction, the Speech affirms what it ought not to affirm—that "it will be satisfactory to know that the existing tariff has not only promoted the manufactures and other products of the country," and so on. Now, I maintain that it did nothing of the kind, and I maintain that it would have been the privilege of the leader of the Opposition to enter into a detailed argument to show that this was a misstatement of the facts—to go into a formal and exhaustive discussion to show the injury the tariff has done to the manufactures of the country as well as the great industry of farming. Farming is an industry as much as making shoes or any other industry, and the farmers are entitled to protection from the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. We do not propose to go into that, but I merely call attention to this to show that the Speech is not worded so as to invite that form of discussion which the hon. gentleman thinks should have been adopted, and which, I think, was adopted. The hon. First Minister complains because a ministerial paper printed some garbled extracts from the speech of the hon. member for Durham, and placed a portrait of the hon. member at the head of the Speech to prevent emigrants from coming into the country. The First Minister should get out a counter fly-sheet, and put his portrait at the head of it so as to attract emigrants into the country. That would be a just method of retaliation, and no one who had seen the portraits side by side could hesitate for a moment. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend from Durham wished to have a sort of plebiscite or vote of the people before some great *coup d'état* which be expected. Nothing of the sort was said or implied; but it was implied that the public out of doors, of whom we