

don't think any one sees an improvement. My hon. friend who moved the address made no allusion to it, and we must all regret the absence of any expression of sympathy with the distress which is only too apparent throughout the length and breadth of the country. I apprehend if the members of Parliament who assembled yesterday had, before leaving their constituencies, consulted the electors wishes, they would have replied with a final shake of the hand, "Try and restore the prosperity of the country! Try and put an end to the stagnation which has lasted so long!" This is what three-fourths of the people would have said, yet there is not a word in the speech to show there is any disposition to try and change this state of things. I entirely concur in the expressions with regard to the management of the Indians. I think, without assuming anything that is not fairly due to Canada, we may safely congratulate ourselves on the course that has been pursued for many long years with the Indians in their affairs, a course which has endeared the Government of Great Britain, and the Government of this country as the successor of Great Britain, to the Indians, which has given us an influence over them which has always been exercised for their good. It has been an upright and honest course, and it is, as this speech describes it, a "humane, just and Christian policy." By a uniform system of good faith and honesty we have maintained the influence of the Crown among them. I have listened again and again to the descriptions given by officials who have passed over the continent, of their reception by the various tribes of Indians with whom they have come in contact. I have listened latterly to such a description given by the gallant officer who commands the militia of this country, and whose presence amongst the Indian tribes between here and the Rocky Mountains the year before last was of great use to the country, and satisfied him of the attachment of the Indians to the Crown, and of their perfect confidence in the upright way in which they had been dealt with. Though the Indian title to the lands has not been extinguished in British Columbia, where they have not been treated as the original proprietors of the country, here in Ontario, and between here and the Rocky Mountains, their lands have been purchased before surveys were made or any steps taken to civilize the country. Our success in their management is the envy of our neighbors. Only last week I read an article in the *New York World*, in which the state of Indian affairs in the United States was described,

and it terminated with the statement, "The only country on the continent which seems to be able to deal successfully with the Indian is Canada." This, from such a source, is a tribute paid to Canada's Indian policy which I was very glad indeed to read. The honorable gentleman who moved the address spoke with some degree of confidence—I think with an over-sanguine feeling—of the effect which might be produced by the Joint Stock Companies Act promised in the address. It is, no doubt, a desirable principle, and one which we should all like to see acted upon; but I think my honorable friend will find it is very difficult to keep persons applying for joint stock company powers within those acts. We have had, from time to time, in Canada, Joint Stock Companies' Acts, and some people have been willing to be incorporated under them, but a great many, though they might have done the same, applied for private acts, and whether they got them depended on the Committees of Parliament at the time, and the disposition of the Government towards those who were desirous of getting them. It was during last session or the session before that the question of a Vice-Admiralty Court for our inland waters was proposed in the other branch of the Legislature by a member of the Opposition there. Whether it is likely to be a benefit or not is a doubtful question. The increase of litigation which is likely to result from it may counter-balance some of its advantages. We have for a long time got on without this court for our inland waters, and though we have felt some inconvenience, I think such a measure is yet, at any rate, of doubtful utility. The chief advantages which are contended for it are that you are enabled to stop the vessel itself instead of having to proceed against its owner. For instance, in case of a collision in Canadian waters between a Canadian and an American vessel, the latter goes to her own coast, and you have no remedy, except by suit against the owner; but suppose the collision takes place in United States waters, the Canadian vessel can be stopped and held in security. The principal advantage of this Admiralty Court is that you can hold the vessel itself, which you cannot do in an ordinary court until after the suit is terminated and you have got a judgment. The other measures which are suggested are of very little consequence. The great omission from the speech is the one to which I have alluded, and which I exceedingly deplore. I will not resume my seat without expressing my regret at the loss of the presence of the honorable gentleman who was Minister of Agriculture here, and who