

else, other than the conduct of the government, and the result was that we turned a majority against us of sixteen into a majority of about twenty in our favour. Whatever may have been the cause of the government's success in other sections, is a question I shall not deal with at the present moment. However, I think I can give a reason for it, as I can give a reason for the reaction in the province of Ontario. Be that as it may, we live in a country—and I thank God for it—in which we can differ in opinion with the greatest freedom in the world, we can think as we please upon trade questions and upon religious questions, and it is our duty as free men, living in a free country such as we live in, to learn to live and let live, respecting the opinions of every one who may differ from ourselves, so long as he does not attempt to control and influence us in our opinions. It is the duty of every one, however, to try and educate the populace, as I hope we may live long enough to do in connection with the maladministration of affairs by the hon. gentlemen. However, if the people of the country will allow them to continue in power as long as the Conservatives were in power, we must humbly submit, because the people have the right to select their representatives. They must be the judge of who should represent them, and the result is, we find the strongest protectionists in the country supporting the free trade government, and when you ask them why they do it, they will give you the strongest reason why. They will say, 'Oh, well, they are not going to interfere with our industry. They may condemn the giving of bonuses and then increase them.' Talk about how the people are ground down by manufacturers, as my hon. friend from St. John remarked; why, the government do not touch the tariff, but they increase the protection which the manufacturers had. They leave the duty where it was on the manufactured article and reduce considerably the duty on the raw material which enters into their manufacture. I do not object to that at all, so long as the raw material is not manufactured in Canada. They go further than we do in the matter of protection, and so long as they continue as they are doing, just so long will this country prosper.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I am sure that every one in this House listened with pleasure to the very interesting and beautiful address which was delivered by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Ellis) in moving the reply to the speech from the Throne, and to the very interesting and instructive speech that was made by the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Jones). I was going to congratulate—I hoped that I would have an opportunity of congratulating my hon. friend opposite, the leader of the opposition, on his great moderation in the discussion of this address, and my hon. friend exercised a great deal of restraint in the early portion of his speech, in fact until within the last few minutes of its conclusion—

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—When the hon. minister interrupted me.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—and then my hon. friend got into a somewhat intense strain and spoke of the government as being scarcely qualified for the discharge of their duties, and having stolen the clothes that belonged to their political opponents which they declared were quite unfit to be worn. I do not know whether my hon. friend intended this as a sort of good-humoured jest, or whether he was really serious in the observations which he addressed to the House. My hon. friend rather surprised me by repeating a somewhat old statement, a charge that was over and over again repudiated by Mr. Mackenzie, and which was also repudiated by Mr. Blake when both were members of the House of Commons. My hon. friend no doubt has forgotten the discussion that has taken place on more than one occasion with reference to those observations—that Mr. Mackenzie, who desired to acquire the North-west Territories, who had the most unbounded confidence in the resources of that country, who put forward every possible effort when he was leading the opposition to secure the possession of the territory, should, years after it was acquired, and after it had become a part of Canada, have declared it utterly unfit for settlement, and worthless, and recommended people to go to Kansas is a somewhat astounding matter. My hon. friend has referred to the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake. I remember Mr. Blake's observations. I remember very well the pamphlets