

some other pretence of concurrent, paramount, enhanced, or mystical power. It may be that he will. He always desires to centralize, but let those who are lovers of the Federal Constitution, who admire the Federal principle, who believe that the well-being of this Confederation depends upon the large measures of local liberties reserved to the different Provinces, in this widely extended, different circumstanced, and sparsely populated Dominion. Let those who entertain these sentiments resist the proposition which the hon. gentleman himself, last Session, disclaimed, the proposition that we ought to endeavour to intrude upon this question, to touch it at all, except from the necessity which he alleged, but which has now been proved not to exist. The hon. member for Glengarry made a quotation, and he said I smiled when he made it. I did smile. I think *delenda est Carthago* was not a very apt quotation on a proposition for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I will venture to say to the hon. gentleman what occurred to my mind when he made his quotation. Whether unwittingly, I have no doubt, for I am sure he desires with the rest of us, the good of his country—whether all unwittingly by his undeviating support of all these measures to which I have been referring, by the course he has insisted on being pursued with the results I have indicated—he may not have been unintentionally but none the less assuredly, accomplishing his motto with the slight change *delenda est Canada*. The hon. member for Levis called, in the course of his address, for a consideration of the peculiar condition of the Province of Quebec. He pointed out its special condition, its special relations to the rest of the Dominion, and called for a liberal consideration of its special rights. I would say to the hon. gentleman that when he has adorned this Parliament a little longer, he will find that if there is one thing this Parliament is disposed not to do, it is to meddle with Quebec; and he will find any danger which Quebec runs, is because it is not always the case that the hon. members from that Province—and I have one of them now in my eye—who are or make themselves the special guardians of its rights in this Parliament, are equally careful of the application of the same principles which they would desire to see applied to their own Province when the question concerns some other Province. I would desire him to remember that it is by a firm and careful adherence and a uniform and undeviating application to all the Provinces of the same hon. gentleman's principles of respect for the Federal principle of respect for the local rights, and by resisting, as endangering the whole fabric, any attempted infringement upon them in any one Province, that the views of my hon. friend will ultimately prevail; and that, so long as we find jealousy in respect of those rights when they affect a particular Province, and indifference, or even a disposition to assist in their impairment, when only other Provinces are concerned, so long it is impossible to say that what the hon. gentleman wishes, namely, the maintenance on a sound and immutable basis of the Federal principle, has yet been attained. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we met last year for the first time, I adverted to the many changes which had taken place in the constitution of the Parliament from the time we met before. Since that time several changes, even in this brief interval, have taken place—some of them expected, some of them unexpected. To one or two only I wish to allude. The hon. gentleman opposite has been relieved of the disagreeable and embarrassing necessity of making an election. He finds himself free from the necessity of choosing between the two devoted constituencies which claimed his hand, and both of which would have been delighted to stick to him if the law of this country had permitted. But that spouse of his, so faithful while she adhered to him, has been unfaithful since, and another man sits for Lennox. I regret exceedingly, and I am sure the hon. gentleman regrets, what his

Mr. BLAKE.

Toronto organ, with a fine appreciation of the fitness of things, calls "the temporary triumph of vice over virtue," which resulted in this election. Other faces we miss, and other faces reappear amongst us. I shall allude to one only. We have lost John Pickard, a man firm in his political opinions, but who possessed the rare good fortune, I believe, of not having a single person on unfriendly terms with him in this House, who was a friend to everybody and to whom everybody was a friend, who had the singular happiness of evoking during his life those universal expressions of affection and sympathy which are too often suppressed until the heart they would have gladdened is cold in death. I feel that I speak the sentiments of every man on both sides of the House when I say that we mourn his loss. As I have said before, and as I said last Session, this new Parliament, changed as it was greatly then, changed as it is now, had before it a future, a future which it had to make; and I ventured to express the hope which I forced myself then to entertain that that future would be a bright one. That future has since become, in considerable measure, a past, and those hopes are dim. But, though much be taken, much remains. There is yet time, and even now, after the experiences of last Session, I will repeat the expression of the hope that we shall take heed to the lessons of the year, that we shall endeavour to repair the errors of the past, and, if we cannot now achieve all that might have been achieved, we shall yet endeavour to do for our country what may, under present circumstances, be done for its best.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, if I cannot agree in all that my hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, has stated in his interesting speech, I can agree with him in the opening sentences in which he paid a just, graceful, I may say an eloquent compliment, to the mover and seconder of the resolutions which are now before the House. These are not merely ceremonial compliments, on the present occasion at all events, because, from the speeches of both gentlemen, we can perceive what valuable members they are of this body. I can also agree with the hon. gentleman in his remarks as to the illustrious individual who represents Her Majesty in Canada, and to his two predecessors. It is not, perhaps, the best taste, or would not be the best taste, for an adviser of the Crown to pay compliments to the Governor General who accords the Ministry his political confidence; but I may be permitted to say with the hon. gentleman, and to believe, as I do, that, when the term of office of the present representative of the Sovereign is ended, he will enjoy not only the affection but the confidence of the people in as great a degree as his predecessors. The hon. gentleman has spoken at greater length than is usual on the opening of a Parliament, and in answer to a Speech from the Throne. It has become in England, and is becoming in this country, the practice to consider the Speech a formality—a necessary constitutional formality, but still a formality—and to address ourselves with as little discussion as possible to the business for which we are called. The hon. gentleman has, however, much to the instruction, much to the amusement of the House, addressed us for some considerable period, and he commenced by stating that the Speech was remarkable for its omissions. Now, a Speech from the Throne is made for the purpose of conveying to Parliament an idea of the important measures that are expected to be submitted for their consideration. It is not expected to enter into all subjects that are not to be considered, that will not be considered, and that cannot be considered, that have been settled, or are so far aside from the business of the day as not to call for the attention of Parliament during the then Session. I can congratulate my hon. friend on the style in which he has addressed the House. It is a new departure, a new appearance of my