

whose votes
as they want-
courted with
in answer to
en, really in
modation in
y limited, and
can." I am
friend from

constitutional
myself, but I
as deeply as
lle). In fact, I
as he. One of
t poet that if
books he will
o studious is
ience, and to
ys a happy
or my friend
en I see him
vily on his
rom that seat
y an all-wise
and feeling
ughter.) I
in such a
uch learning,
e gets off his
f profound
t here like a
o learn from
watch and
ong time to
re he gets to

at you are

rofoundly as
friend that
rd to get at
here to-day
t my hon.
pen in hand
not discover
myself what
y was like an
ysical dubi-
lay an egg

) you sym-

aker, there

can be no question, in my opinion, as to the prosperity of the country. I will not take time at this late hour to go into comparisons; but I have been visiting some of the constituencies. I was in South Perth, which used to be represented by Mr. Trow, whom personally—and I told him so—I am sorry not to see here, though on other grounds I did not wish him to be elected—

Mr. Mills (Bothwell). Explain that metaphysical distinction.

Mr. Davin I went into the Township of Blanchard, and afterwards when I met Mr. Trow, I think at St. Mary's, I asked the people: How on earth can these men say that this country is not prosperous, when in this very township there is not a farmhouse which has not the rank of a villa or a mansion, on which \$500 or \$600 or possibly \$1,000 has been spent in ornamentation? Yet these poor farmers, who are ground to earth, bled livid or pallid—I believe bled white is the language of the member for South Oxford—in that very township gave, I think, 52 more votes for the Conservative candidate than they had done in the previous election.

Mr. Landerkin. How many times did you speak there?

Mr. Davin. Three times. Now, it is the same everywhere; and I say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they want to see their party grow smaller and smaller they will continue the course which they have pursued for some years past; but if they want to make an Opposition which will be powerful and effective, they will change their tactics. Now, the prosperity of this country is a fact, notwithstanding the hon. member for South Oxford. I am sorry for that hon. member, although mercy is for the merciful. I doubt very much if there is much mercy in the hon. gentleman's composition. I doubt very much if he would have very much pity for political opponents if their ranks were reduced as the ranks of his friends are; and he is one of the causes of that reduction. He is the embodiment of this cry against the prosperity of the country, and the embodiment of the disloyalty in the cry of unrestricted reciprocity which was so apparent in the

last part of the speech of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). Why, the hon. gentleman is so discounted by that policy to-day if his party could they would get rid of him; but they cannot do it. The country does not want him. The most they could do in the recent bye-elections was to keep him off the platform. What is the career of that hon. gentleman? He has gone about the country barking at its prosperity, barking at the Conservative party and the National Policy. He had a kind of political rabies which made him, so to speak, bite the Conservative party. Indeed, the event reminds me of Goldsmith's ballad or the mad dog. The mad dog bit a man, and the neighbors were all very anxious about the man, fearing that he would take hydrophobia and die. All the anxiety was directed to the man and none to the dog, but the event showed how much it was misdirected, because Goldsmith tells us that the man recovered from the bite—it was the dog that died. (Laughter and cheers.) Now, I am obliged to the hon. member for Queen's, for admitting that we had a good harvest in the North-West. That shows that the hon. gentlemen opposite are making progress. But he asks what credit have the Government for it?

Mr. Landerkin. They ploughed it all.

Mr. Davin. I grant you that the Government did not plough and the Government did not sow; but if the Conservative Government and the Government of Sir John Macdonald, of which this Government is the continuation, had not built the Canadian Pacific Railway, as the hon. member for South Oxford would not have them, as the hon. member for Bothwell and their late leader, Mr. Blake, would not have them, where would be that magnificent harvest of which the hon. gentleman now admits the existence? If he admits the existence of that harvest, what does it mean? Do the millions which come in from that harvest confine themselves to the North-West? Is it not the nature of money to spread itself as a river or lake, and touch all shores of the community? And yet the hon. gentleman asks what credit have the Government for it? I will tell him who has the credit.