

the speaker was really illustrating his argument, and not a little selected fragment cut out for the purposes of special pleading. Mr. Whitney should have given a fair and honest example of the speaker's remarks, so that the House could have judged whether the latter was an offender or not. What he (Mr. Hardy) had said at the St. Thomas meeting was this:—

"They were an ambitious city, a great railway centre, and were becoming more so. They were to some extent also a manufacturing city, and were a growing and expanding people. What did they wish to do?"

That, observed Mr. Hardy, pausing in his reading of the quotation, was a fair question, and very proper language in regard to the progress of one of the growing cities of the west. He defied hon. gentlemen opposite to point out anything wrong in that. But he would proceed with the quotation:—

"Their opponents argued that two Governments should not be in power representing the same party at Ottawa and at Toronto. That was one of the fundamental planks upon which they went to the people. Applying this argument locally to West Elgin, the speaker showed that as they already had Conservative representation in the Dominion House, therefore they should send a Liberal to Toronto. This deduction was greeted with laughter and applause. Taking their own arguments and applying it to the voters before him, Mr. Hardy pointed to the benefits that would follow such a course."

That, continued Mr. Hardy, was not his language, but the deduction of the reporter. The report was given in half a column of a speech that would have filled six columns of *The Globe*. The reporter did not profess to attribute to the speaker the statement that benefits would follow, but merely gave his own version of that particular point. The report went on to say:

"At a time when the flood tide of business was rising, just as good times were upon them, just as the Government were beginning to feel the effects of good times, of increased business, of increased commerce, and growing enterprise throughout the Dominion, did they want to place so goodly a town in opposition at both centres of political influence?"

What promise is made there? What hope is held out? asked Mr. Hardy.

Mr. Connors—Tory argument.

Hon. Mr. Hardy—Exactly. Tory argument, presenting their own case only reversed. Is there any attempt at bribery there? I want them to put their finger on the bribery or appearance of bribery. I want to see whether the proposition we are asked to adopt is true or false. Name the bribery. I was holding out hopes, it is said. What hopes? We had nothing to offer St. Thomas; St. Thomas was asking nothing. There were no public works we could offer them, and no railways. Where, then, was the bribery? The hon. gentleman made more of this subject when he first introduced it to the House. I had not then the speech before me, as I have now. I have read every material and pertinent part of the speech, and I am willing to be judged by it. (Loud Ministerial applause.)

Mr. Ross' Caustic Speech.

Hon. Mr. Ross said he had been attacked for asking the people of Madoc to elect a supporter of the Government for North Hastings. Was it likely that he would ask them to return the Opposition candidate? Mr. Whitney had asserted that corrupt practices were suggested, because the speaker appealed to the people of North Hastings to elect a Government supporter, and went on to show what the Government policy was.

"Does the hon. gentleman expect," inquired Mr. Ross, "that a member of a Government will go to a constituency and not show what the Government has been doing, or what the policy of the Government is in regard to any question? Did he ever hear of the leader of a government or any member of it, particularly when its policy was attacked, not defending that policy, and not showing historically, if necessary, what that policy had been? (Ministerial cheers.) I was in a county where mining operations were being carried on. I could not have avoided discussing mining question, if I wished to discuss questions in which the people were interested. What could I say to the people of North Hastings, except that the Government of which I was a member had a progressive policy in regard to mining matters. If the Minister of Agriculture goes out into the country and tells the people that he has aided Farmers' Institutes and aided stock-breeders, is that bribery? If the Minister of Education tells the people, 'I have endeavored to educate your sons and daughters,' is that bribery? If a Minister is not to explain the policy of his Government, to say that their expenditure has been economical, or that their policy for improving the country was a good one, that would be putting a man in a position in which no Minister has ever been placed. (Ministerial cheers.) My hon. friend affects a great deal of virtue. How long has he become possessed of that? How long has he so completely washed himself of the association of the leaders of his own party at Ottawa, and become so transcendantly pure that he will try to discredit a Minister when he simply discusses the policy of his Government, and the policy on which that Government has been sustained for over twenty years? (Ministerial cheers.)

Mr. Whitney's Associates.

My hon. friend will go down to a gathering in some obscure place in the City of Toronto, where a pugilistic encounter is taking place between two colored men. (Ministerial laughter.) He will attend meetings with Sir Charles Tupper, the leader of the Opposition, who is known to be the political crackman of this country. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman sits within twenty feet of me after his association with Sir Charles Tupper. (Ministerial cheers.) Sir Charles Tupper, who went to Winnipeg and told the people, "If you want to build a railway to Hudson Bay at a cost of \$20,000,000 return my party to power." (Ministerial cheers.) The hon. gentleman sets himself up on an exalted pedestal, as