

with regard to the integrity of the Empire. I might say that, in my opinion, the present occasion is, in many respects, a great occasion. There are periods in our history in which the public sentiment of the country undergoes a sudden transformation. It moves on for a series of years in conformity with the new departure until some further step in national progress becomes necessary and forces itself upon the attention of the community. There can be little doubt in the minds of thoughtful Canadians that since the year of the diamond jubilee, since a large number of persons from all parts of the empire were congregated together in London, the empire has taken a new departure—that old things are passing away and that a new phase of Imperial life is presenting itself to the community for its consideration. The times, under these circumstances, demand from the people a feeling of patriotic devotion, and it seems to me, hon. gentlemen, that my hon. friend opposite in criticising the policy of the administration and the conduct of the government in respect to some important matters to which I shall refer later, did not fully appreciate the present position of affairs. Instead of taking a broad and patriotic view of the situation, my hon. friend took a very strong party view and one which seemed to me, however suitable it might have been a few years ago, was out of keeping with the present condition of affairs. My hon. friend also complained of want of courtesy to this House in the conduct of the administration, not specially with reference to anything that had been done generally, but with respect to some incidents or events that transpired in the other House of which we are not supposed to take cognizance here. (My hon. friend said that a motion had been made for papers in the House of Commons before the reply to the Speech from the Throne had been adopted. He also questioned the right of the hon. member to make the motion. He said that the adjournment had been promised in the midst of a debate which, in his opinion, was irregular, and the remark was that it had been done before the speech was answered. Now let me call the attention of the House to the rule in this matter. In the first place, upon the assembling of parliament in any session, a re-

port of the judges, if there have been controverted elections, is presented usually before the speech from the Throne is answered. If the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery has received reports of returns of elections that have transpired since the close of the previous session, it is his duty to submit them to parliament, and they are presented before the speech from the Throne is answered. Then it is the invariable practice in both Houses to introduce a bill and move that it be read the first time, and that is done for the purpose of vindicating the right of each House to independent authority in respect to all business that comes before them. There is seldom more than one bill presented pro forma, but when hon. gentlemen consider the reason for taking that step they will see that the assertion of a right, which is intended by the submission of a bill of that kind, is one without limitation, and it would be in the power of the House to take into consideration any matter which was urgent—any matter which was important, even though the speech from the Throne had not been answered. Now, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the practice in England in this regard. It is sometimes the practice in England to put questions before there is an answer to the speech from the Throne, and these questions are answered by the member of the government having charge of the matter to which the question relates. It is the practice sometimes to move an address for papers precisely as was done in the case of which the hon. gentleman complains, and very often motions are made for papers, and those papers are sometimes brought down before the answer to the speech is concluded. When the debate is prolonged upon the speech from the Throne, public bills have been introduced and discussed on a motion for leave before the address has been agreed to. Hon. gentlemen will remember that in the session of 1882, there was a discussion on Mr. Bradlaugh's taking of the oath at the bar of the House. That discussion was interrupted. The proceedings on the debate in answer to the speech from the Throne were suspended, and a division took place. There was a division upon the motion made in that case, although the debate on the address had not