

Quebec never was more prosperous, that the farming interests in Quebec never were more prosperous than they were in the past year of 1889. My hon. friend also supposes that the same fatal hallucination has blinded the eyes of my hon. friend from Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Prior). He is a man of business, a shrewd man of business, he knows what he is talking about, and he says that the people in the Province of British Columbia, and especially his own constituency, were never so prosperous before as they were this past year. Yet my hon. friend ventures to say that they are mistaken, and that we are mistaken, and that the majority of the people of this country are mistaken, and that we are a miserable, desponding, ruined, depressed and retrograding country. That is the style of the speech of my hon. friend. As long as my hon. friend entertains those opinions, and those whom he leads entertains them, he will, I regret to say, remain at your left, Mr. Speaker, and will not come to the position to which his great abilities entitle him, of leading the majority of the people of Canada and their representatives on the right of your chair. There is a difference of opinion between my hon. friend and the majority of the people of Canada. We know that when in a lunatic asylum somebody asked an inmate how he came to be there? "Oh, said he, "I am here as a consequence of a difference of opinion: all the world think I am mad, and I think all the world mad, and the majority carried it." So it is with my hon. friend. The majority of the people of Canada will declare that the hallucinations, the delusions, are on that side of the House and not on this; but it is a misfortune to my hon. friend's party; it is a sort of blindness which has come upon them for their sins, by which they have become prophets of evil, in their press, on the stump, on the platform, everywhere, and now in Parliament. We find that their *raison d'être*, the basis and foundation for their party, is that Canada is ruined, and will remain ruined, and will be more ruined every day, until there is a change of parties and my hon. friend comes on this side. I am afraid the people of Canada will prefer to be ruined under us, than to be prosperous after the fashion of my hon. friends on the other side. You know the story of Lord Palmerston, when a wine merchant sent him some special Greek wine, which, he said, was admirably adapted for gouty patients, to cure gout. Lord Palmerston tasted the wine and said "I would rather have the gout." So the people of Canada would rather have Canada, with all her misfortunes, real or imaginary, governed by the Liberal Conservative party, even when led by your humble servant, than have it directed by all the abilities, all the force and all the patriotism of my hon. friend opposite. My hon. friend seemed rather disappointed at the statement of the mover and the seconder of the Address, that the people in the West were loyal. He seemed to be rather surprised at that statement, as they have been so badly used—look at the way, said he, in which the people in the North-West have been used and the people in British Columbia, and yet they are loyal. My hon. friend was quite surprised at that, and I remarked that there was not one single response or cheer to the statement of the hon. member from Victoria in reference to the loyalty of the North-West—from the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

objects to the want of matter, apparently, in the Speech from the Throne. I think it is a very practical speech, and I think it would puzzle the hon. gentleman to have suggested new subjects for discussion during the present Session, excepting the one with which he wound up his speech. Although he commenced with a criticism of the Speech and the Address in answer to it, he found it was rather hard work; it was up-hill work, and so he fluttered off into a discussion of free trade, unrestricted reciprocity and Imperial federation. He says, among other things, that the Government have become so indolent and apathetic that they are not able to carry on the ordinary administration of affairs; and what is the reason he gives to prove his statement? That there has not been a collector of customs appointed for Toronto. If he had been able to state that, in consequence of the non-appointment of a collector of customs in Toronto, the business of the country had been neglected, there might have been something in the charge; but, in the meantime, as an economist, and hon. members in Opposition are always economists, I think he might have congratulated the country upon the saving of the salary of a collector of customs in Toronto for two years. Then he says we had not the energy to fill the vacancies in the Senate. The hon. gentleman, as a public man, as the leader of a party, ought not to attribute bad motives when only good motives exist. Could he not imagine that a good motive was the reason why those positions were not filled? The hon. gentleman might have thought that we were of opinion that there were too many Tories in the upper House, that we were looking to the possibility that the great ability and energy of the hon. gentleman might put him at the head of affairs, and he might have supposed that we were keeping a certain number of vacancies in that House to enable him, after he succeeded in attaining power, to fill the four vacancies in the Senate, so that the complaint which has been made that the Senate has too much of one complexion would be removed. I shall not now enter into a discussion or reply to the hon. gentleman's remarks as to the vacillation of which he accuses us in regard to the duties on fruits and sawlogs and the regulations in regard to coasting. Those questions will come up during the present Session in a more legitimate form, and it would be a waste of time to discuss them now; but I assure my hon. friend that, in our opinion, we have a good answer and we have good reasons to give for every one of those actions which the hon. gentleman is pleased to call vacillations. The hon. gentleman says he gives us credit for one thing. We made some steps towards reciprocity with the United States, but he ventures to say that we have been stealing the clothes of his party. Mr. Speaker, we would make a great mistake if we took the clothes of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are well clad now, and we do not want to wear any Opposition rags. I am an older public man than the hon. gentleman, and can look back a little further, and I think he will find that all the successful exertions towards reciprocity, after those which were made by Sir Francis Hincks and his party, have been made by the Conservative party. The hon. gentleman says that the National Policy has been a failure. The country does not think so. There is no evidence that the country thinks so. Every