

hon. friend. Why, in days of old, even in the last Session, he assumed the tone of a grave statesman, of a sedate politician, or rather a stern political economist. Now he has taken quite a new rôle, broken out in a new place, as the saying is, and instead of a speech on the various subjects of importance, he has treated us to a good deal of very pleasant *badinage*. I could not at first understand the reason for all this jocosity. I could not understand why the hon. gentleman had taken a new tone, had adopted a new rôle; but, as the speech went on, I began to understand it, when I heard him bring out, in the first place, the suggestion that there was a short crop; then that the Speech showed that there was overtrading; then that there was discontent in the North-West; then that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba had expressed his discontent; then, still further, that the speech showed some indications that there might possibly be a failure in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and, Sir, more than all, when the hon. gentleman alluded with such gusto to the fact that there perhaps might be a series of bankruptcies in the country. He revelled in the idea, Mr. Speaker. Oh! with what unction he brought out the fact that there was a proposal in the *Mail* to establish a soup kitchen to help the starving poor. The hon. gentleman got what he has been wishing for, he got what his party has been praying for, the hon. gentleman got the country at last to the only position in which by any possibility he or his party can get into power. He thinks the country will get into a wretched position and then, when it is in such a position—and he revels in the misfortunes which his press had predicted, which his press had desired, and which it exults in—then he thinks there will be some chance for the hon. gentleman opposite. The jocosity, the smiles, the *badinage*, the little pleasantries of the hon. gentleman are quite understood, and I have no doubt will be appreciated by this House, and by the country. The hon. gentleman was a little erratic in his taking up the various topics of the Speech. He did not follow them paragraph by paragraph, and I must to some extent follow him. I had not the opportunity that the hon. gentleman had of preparing these elaborate sarcasms, of making quotations of one hon. member from this side in November, another in October, and another in August. I have not an opportunity of preparing any impromptues like the hon. gentleman, so that I have to follow him in the way that he has taken. He alludes to British Columbia. He does not say that he objects to all that he has heard, or that he knows of the settlement made by the Government, the provisional settlement made with that Province. He is glad of course—he professes gladness—that all sorts of causes of quarrel, or discussion between the Province of British Columbia, and the Dominion have ended. I do not know that I am able to answer my hon. friend. We have lost a good many, as the hon. gentleman says, in this House. We have lost the only man that could answer him—my friend Mr. Bunster. He took care of British Columbia in his day, and he threw back the taunts and sarcasms of the hon. member when he chose to attack British Columbia. I, in my feeble way, must assume the position of Mr. Bunster. The hon. gentleman does not object, as I understand it, to any of the terms of settlement, so far as they have appeared in the public press; and he quoted a speech of the Minister of Justice, my colleague, stating that the particular arrangement of building the Island Railway was the payment of a debt due to Victoria because they elected me. Well, the hon. gentleman says very truly, that honest men pay their debts, but they pay their debts with their own money. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the people of British Columbia, at all events, think that the Dominion owes them a great debt for returning me to be head of the Government instead of handing it over to the hon. gentleman; and I have no doubt that not only British Columbia, but the whole

Dominion will accept, also, by a large majority, the belief that really Victoria did confer a benefit upon the Dominion by enabling me to appear here in my present condition as Minister of the Crown. The hon. gentleman took occasion—it was quite proper for him to do so, there is no reason why he should not—to allude to the parties who are, it is said, going to build the Island Railway, and he spoke about Mr. Huntington, and other American magnates who are coming in to build that road. Well, I believe I have the same sources of information as the hon. gentleman, and perhaps a little more. I believe that there are some American magnates coming in, and that Mr. Dansmuir, who is a Canadian millionaire, a British subject by birth, and one of the most enterprising men of the whole Dominion, is going to join them. I am very glad that such is the credit of Canada all over, and such is the credit of that particular portion of Canada which is called British Columbia, that we can at last, under the present Government, get American magnates to come in and invest their money. But, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that those same American magnates, during the reign of the hon. gentleman opposite, would not have come in; not a shilling, not a cent, not a nickle would they put into any Canadian fund of any kind so long as the Government, its revenues, its future, and its present, were under the paternal guidance of hon. gentlemen opposite. An hon. friend near me says I must remember that the debt was created by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was an obligation created by hon. gentlemen opposite; a promise made by them, an engagement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, which we are now carrying out. I do not choose to dwell upon that, because if we cannot put everything into the Queen's Speech, neither can we put everything into the debate on the Address, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's eloquent exertions to do so. But, Sir, that is the fact: that this same Island Railway, this same obligation, was created by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. The hon. gentleman then alluded to the paragraph relating to the North-West; that some legislation would be required in consequence of the rapid development of that portion of Her Majesty's Dominions; and he took occasion to say that there was a great omission in the Speech when there was no notice taken of the discontent that, he says, exists there. He specially quoted with the greatest pleasure—he had it carefully in his drawer, there it was pasted, with the industry, with the care that would do honor to my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert)—there he had it, Mr. Norquay's speech, and he says, Here is the evidence of discontent; here is the evidence of the want of policy; here is the evidence of the misgovernment of that country. Why, Mr. Norquay is coming down—I believe he has come down—to ask for better terms. I remember the time when Nova Scotia came to ask for better terms, when it was represented to this House, and to the Parliament at that time, that Nova Scotia was discontented, that Nova Scotia was recalcitrant, that she was about to secede. There was an imminent danger of that, we were told. Yet, I think the hon. gentleman excelled himself in Opposition—and the hon. gentleman is powerful in Opposition—when, notwithstanding that discontent, notwithstanding the dissatisfaction that existed in Nova Scotia, notwithstanding the great danger there was from the beginning that she would secede, that hon. gentleman opposed strongly, ably and vigorously, the granting of better terms. Why, of course, Mr. Norquay comes down here. He is not coming, to use a very celebrated expression, to cry "stinking fish." He exaggerates, if possible, or, rather, he presses as strongly as he can, all the various reasons why better terms should be granted. I have no doubt that we will consider them. We will not treat the application for better terms in the same manner the hon. gentleman did that of Nova Scotia. We will give it every consideration—not frightened by threats,