than I

t at all

iat the

ontreal

aeting

hesus.

he real

vealth, iis late

ig you

n fond

 $\operatorname{ended}$ ,

deriek

ome of

ermisset me

eful to

got a

o more

at you

George

man I

ie, had

remier,

lemen,

in the

)ssuna,

lressed n they

ghter.)

iuada),

Diek or

r Mac-

enewed

sity of

leman,

remier.

n still.

attack there

he had

asures,

ch was

nfortu-

ech as

st with

apacity of the

vn that

ht, the

we an-

-when

And rves to n their

we perform our functions as an Opposition in arraigning their conduct, pointing out their shortcomings, and warning them of the unwisdom of their course. Mr. Mackenzie, instead of answering the attacks of the Opposition, instead of justifying the course of the Ministry, instead of vindicating the wisdom of their measures and the justice of their administration, turns about, as he did the other night, and personally attacks the members of the Opposition, tries to change the issue, tries to hark back on a defuuet Administration, tries to avoid the discussion of his measures, and to avoid the necessity of defending his course, by making gross attacks upon members of the Opposition, endeavoring  $\omega$  lead the House away from the consideration of his own course, his own demerits, to past issues that are now of no consequence to the country-of no consequence to any one. (Cheers.) We are out of office now; we are suffering the consesequences of any errors we may have committed. It is no answer to say that we were reckless, criminal or incapable; that we had shown ourselves unworthy of the confidence of the people. Supposing that it were as he says, is that any answer to a charge against him or his Administration? If we say, you have ruined our tea trade, you have destroyed our manufactures, you have shaken our credit, you have deprived our workmen of work, you have forced our factories to run on half or quarter time, is it any answer to say that Ministers before them were unworthy of the position they held? We are in Opposition, and there the Conservative Party must remain until recalled by the voice of the people, speaking through their representatives. I can only say, gentlemen, that judging from the facts which have been mentioned by your honoured guest, Mr. White, this evening, judging from the evidence we get every day, the time is not far distant when the people of Canada, rising in their might, will say to Mr. .---, let me say the Honorable Mr. Mackenzie (laughter), Sir, in your two short years of Government, you have committed more sins of omission and commission than were charged against John A. during the last twenty years. (Cheers.) I put it to you gentlemen, if you have read the cloquent speeches of my friend Dr. Tupper; I put it to you, if you read my impromptu speech on the occasion of the election of my friend Mr. J. B. Robinson, to say if there is one word in those speeches which was beyond the line of our right, if we did not confine ourselves to the discussion of the public affairs of this country, if we did not limit ourselves to legitimate remarks on the conduct of the Administration. Our views may be wrong, but I say this, if you read those speeches, you will not find one word without its warrant. We attacked no private character; we made no fling at private conduet; we never struck below the belt. (Enthusiastic cheers.) But before the people of this country, through the press of the country, we arraigned the conduct of the Administration for their management of affairs, for their legislation, and for no other fault. And, gentlemen, what said Mr. Mackenzie in response to these speeches? He alleged in his speech the other day that he was answering the remarks made by my honorable friend and myself. Was the tone worthy of the Premier of Canada, of a man standing up to defend his ecuduct, and prove that he was fit for the position that he holds, to show that he had been a faithful steward, to show the wisdom and justice of his administration, and the purity of his party? (Cries of oh! oh! big push, &c.) Mr. Mackenzie made the error that he always does, of mistaking coarseness for strength. (Cheers.) The Hon. Alex. Mackenzie is a countryman of my own; he is a hard-headed Scotchman. He makes clear, well reasoned, logical speeches, but the gods have not made him poetical. He wants imagination, and though his speeches are sound and sensible, and able, they are, I must say, upon the whole as dry as a limeburner's shoe. (Laughter and cheers.) The other day ho assumed a new character; he broke out in a new place (loud laughter), and for the first time in his life he favored his audience with a poetical quotation. Now, it rather surprised me when he, the Puritan Premier, had the whole range of British poetry to quote from, that he had preferred to quote that rakehelly old eavalier, Sam Butler. (Laughter.) Poetry is called "a garden of sweets," a "garland of roses," either raising the imagination by the sublimity of the ideas, or charming the fancy by the beauty of the sentiments of the poet. Now, let us call to our memory the quotation made by the Hon. Alexander Maokenzie, which, mind you, he especially applies to the Opposition. It is this:—

> "The Prince of Cambay's dally food Is asp and basilisk and toad, Which gives to him so strong a breath, He nightly stinks a queen to death."