

are enjoying. I do not object to that, providing the money is properly expended, but when I look at the other item in the address to which the hon. gentleman did not refer, that the estimates would be laid before parliament, I noticed that there was an omission. A statement which is usually contained in the address from the Throne has been omitted, and that statement was that the estimates were prepared with a due regard to economy, and would be laid before parliament for their approval. I do not know but that the gentleman who prepared that address had in his mind's eye the declaration made by the Minister of Public Works, when he was accused and the government were accused of expending too lavishly the money of the country. 'Ah' he said, 'it is true we have been expending money, but wait till you see us next year.' The year has passed, and the elections have given them another lease of power, and when the estimates are brought down I suppose we shall come to the conclusion that the gentlemen opposite were serious in leaving out the stereotyped phrase that the estimates had been prepared with a due regard to economy. The hon. gentleman who moved the address very properly said that he did not give the government credit for all the prosperity and extension of trade which had taken place during the last decade, or the last five years. He was then playing the part of the gentleman who used to condemn the former government for having surpluses and when they used to boast of the trade increasing through the national policy which had been placed upon the statute-book, and a policy which we believe, and I believe still, did more to add to the progress of this country than anything else; we were then told we had nothing to do with it. All the world was prospering just as well as Canada. So it is to-day. While Canada has advanced marvellously in her trade in all portions of the country, she has been exceedingly lucky, if I may use the expression—fortunate would perhaps be better—in having, until last year, first-class harvests. If hon. gentlemen look at the figures of the United States they will see that their trade has increased, proportionately to ours, in a much greater degree than has that in Canada, but none of us attribute that to the

administrative ability of the United States statesmen. There are cycles of time, every ten or fifteen years as time rolls round, when trade booms, and at other times it becomes depressed. The hon. gentlemen were in exactly the same fortunate position when they came into power and the tide of trade began to turn, as it did with the Conservatives in 1878. They had been in power some years and times changed and depression of trade set in, not only in Canada but in every section of the world, and when the hon. gentlemen succeeded to power that trade turned again and trade boomed as the hon. gentleman from St. John has stated to the House, and I can only hope that it may continue. I have no hope that, for the sake of turning them out of power, we shall have such a depression of trade as existed in 1874, 1875 and 1876, and which existed in 1894-5-6. Every Canadian must rejoice at the prosperity which has taken place of late, and can only hope that it may continue. The measures referred to in the speech from the Throne, are very few in number. What they intend to do with the post office we are not told. The hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address would have done well if they had asked some information upon that very important point—so that they could have informed the House what they intend to do, and what the reference to the post office indicates. Are we to have an extension of the delivery system in the rural districts of the country, the same as it exists in England? If it be so, the deficit in that department I am quite sure will be much larger than it has ever been before, for the reason that the country is not sufficiently populated to justify a postal delivery in the rural sections of the country—at least that is the view which I hold upon that question—or whether they intend to extend the cent postage to cities, towns and villages. If you post a letter and it goes to the other side of the city you have to pay double that which you do for a drop letter to be taken out of the same post office. Or are we to have a repetition of the old Act which charged more for carrying a letter from Ottawa to Hull than for carrying a letter from Ottawa to Rat Portage in the one province? Are we to have