

been concluded. Mr. Gladstone, also, on that occasion presented resolutions to the House before the speech had been answered. There was further, a discussion on the arrest of Mr. Parnell and others. The correspondence on the subject of that arrest was produced, and there was also a motion and discussion on Mr. Errington's mission to the Vatican. Now, all these proceedings in a single session show that the hon. gentleman opposite was entirely mistaken when he made the statements that he did in respect to the motion of the hon. member in the other House for certain papers. Then, my hon. friend in discussing that subject complained that the motion was irregular. The proceeding, if I correctly remember what he said, was unprecedented, and yet, my hon. friend said that the government were guilty of discourtesy because we did not bring down those papers which were called for in the other House, which my hon. friend said ought not to have been moved for. If he was correct in his first position, then it would have been improper to have brought down those papers or laid them on the table until the speech from the Throne was answered. But my hon. friend beside me told the hon. leader of the opposition why these papers were not submitted, not because we agreed with his view that the submission of these documents before the speech from the Throne had been answered would have been irregular, but because they had not been printed with the expedition that we desired. My hon. friend complained that a member of the House of Commons, a supporter of the administration, had resigned because a contingent had been sent to Africa, and that he had been again elected and was still a supporter of the administration. I need not here enter into a discussion of what the views of that hon. gentleman are. I may call the attention of the House to that later on in this discussion. I may say this, however, that many members no doubt are of opinion that before we assume the responsibilities of contributing in a military way towards the maintenance of the empire, the relation between Canada and the mother country in this regard ought to be settled—that our rights in that regard ought to be known, and these may have been the views of the hon. member to whom my hon. friend

Hon. Mr. MILLS.

referred. I might say this, however, that this in my opinion is an academic view. I think the course taken was the right, proper and constitutional course, and I shall not say anything further on that subject at this moment. Then my hon. friend referred to the progress of agriculture. He admitted that the country had progressed, that the farmers were more prosperous than they had been a few years ago, but the hon. gentleman says that this is not due to the government. There may be a difference of opinion on that subject. It may not be wholly due to the government. The government do not bring the rain or cultivate the soil, but if the government furnish the facilities for transportation—if they open up wider markets than previously existed, they hold out a motive for greater industry—they create stronger hopes, and the products of industry are increased in proportion. But, I remember the time when my hon. friend maintained that everything was due to the administration. My hon. friend was on this side of the House; he was then a member of the administration and although for a number of years the hon. leader of the Opposition claimed that great progress had been made in the country,—that the industrial resources had been rapidly developed—that all those improvements that had taken place were due to the wisdom and statesmanship of the administration, yet my hon. friend after a time found that the country was stationary. There was no increase in the population. The natural increase was neutralized by expatriations from the country. And that census showed a diminution in the value of real estate in every portion of the country. Let me say that there has been a change. My hon. friend does not deny that there is a change, that that change is for the better, that the people are more hopeful, that the immigration into the country is very much larger than formerly, and that property, instead of diminishing, is increasing in value. Then my hon. friend referred to the manufacture of binder-twine. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I am not going to detain the House by a discussion of the subject, as a more fitting opportunity will occur hereafter. The hon. gentleman said that I was roasted last year on the subject, and that the roasting I got had induced me to