

referred. I quite concur in what has been said in the way of congratulation to the two hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Address in reply to the Speech. The Government have been singularly fortunate in their choice of members for this purpose; and I think the Senate is to be congratulated upon the admission to its number of those two Senators. The hon. gentleman who moved the Address is a gentleman of whom I do not know as much as most members from the Upper Provinces, but few men in Canada are ignorant of his name and of his commercial standing. It has occurred to me that there was a peculiar fitness in the selection of the two gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address. The Government during the past nine years have, in my humble opinion, shown a regard, in the first instance, for the wealthy men—for the manufacturers and the capitalists—and second to that—second by a very considerable distance—for the great majority of the population. Now, the hon. member who moved the Address is perhaps as good a representative as could be selected of the first class. He is a capitalist, and is also probably the most extensive and the most fortunate manufacturer in the whole country. He is just one of those gentlemen who are most largely benefited by the fiscal policy of the Government. On the other hand, the hon. member who seconded the Address is a gentleman who represents the country at large. He is a farmer of an advanced kind, and his interests are the interests of the great bulk of the population. I think that the Government have shown a nice discrimination in selecting that hon. gentleman to second the Address and the hon. member who represents the capitalists to move it. There is this further reason for congratulation: Those hon. gentlemen have shown by the speeches they have made that in the matter of ability and eloquence they are important additions to this Chamber. I cannot understand how, if the Government continue to appoint gentlemen of the character and standing of those two members to this House, the newspapers, some of which are very fond of undertaking to belittle the Senate, can continue to do so. We are not elected as the members of the other House are, and in that way we are not representatives of

the people in the same sense as they are; but if the Government continue to call to this Chamber gentlemen like those who have moved and seconded the Address it cannot be said that the Senate is not fairly representative of the bulk of our population.

With respect to the first paragraph in His Excellency's speech, I quite concur in what has been said by the hon. gentlemen who have gone before me. One can fancy that, looking at the records of the last three representatives of Her Majesty, it might have been thought that the Imperial Government would have found it difficult to send a Governor General here to represent the Crown who could be looked upon as standing on the same level as those statesmen do; but we have, in addition to the fact that our present Governor General has been a member of the Imperial Government, the record of the house to which he belongs, a house which, since the days of the battle of Bosworth Field, has always had representatives standing high either in the military or in the political service of the mother country; and although His Excellency has been here but a very short time he has already made a record for himself which is quite sufficient to justify the choice of Her Majesty in selecting him as her representative in Canada.

The next paragraph of the Speech is one which expresses regret that the treaty concluded between Her Majesty and the President of the United States, with respect to the Fisheries, has not been sanctioned by the United States Senate. This is one of the points as to which I cannot concur with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down; and I regret that fact, but I cannot say that I regret the fact that the treaty has not been confirmed by the United States Senate. I felt last Session, when the treaty was under consideration here, and I feel still, that that treaty was an agreement under which we gave up a great deal and got practically nothing in return; and I am pleased that the bargain has not been ratified. Under that treaty, as I have said, we gave up a great deal and we got practically nothing back. Hon. gentlemen may ask: "If that is the case, why did not the United States Senate ratify it?" I think the answer is a very simple one, that in the present temper of the United States Senate they would be