

may remedy the grievances complained of, and result in bringing to the farmer the full value of his crops.

Other measures of importance are likely to come up for discussion and adoption, and we trust will meet with that consideration at the hands of the honourable members of this House that their importance demands.

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—It gives me very considerable pleasure to welcome to our body certain old-young acquaintances of mine—old in former days, young as members of this honourable body—and I make no doubt whatever that my hon. friend opposite will find these gentlemen who have recently been added to our number a very valuable acquisition to his somewhat depleted ranks. I do not grudge them to him in the least. I have always been of the opinion that it was rather a mistake that one of the two parties in this country should be represented somewhat weakly in this Chamber. We had our experience in old times; my hon. friend may have his experience now. As to the mode in which these hon. gentlemen have discharged their duties, I have no complaint whatever to make. They have, even in the hour of victory, been moderate and temperate. Whether they have always been as moderate or temperate, or whether they would be as moderate or temperate if the proportions between the two parties were reversed, I will not undertake to say, but in the present instance I have no complaint whatever to make as to the mode in which they have discharged their duties.

As to the document itself which we are called upon to discuss to-day, I am not prepared to speak quite as favourably. To my mind it resembles very much the description given of a certain patent by a certain eminent jurist, which was to the effect that everything which was good in the patent was not new, and that everything which was new in the patent was not good. That would be a pretty accurate description, if it is not disloyal to say so, of the speech which has been put in His Excellency's mouth and thus delivered from the Throne. I am sorry to say that there are two or three things in it which

are new, on which I shall be obliged to offer some criticism; but as regards the main part of it I am bound to say that there is not much in it to criticise. What it is chiefly remarkable for is the omission to make any reference whatever to a question which was very recently discussed in the country and for some time preceding the election, which has been before us for a couple of years, and which has been made the subject of many motions in the House of Commons, and led to a very decided division of opinion between two large sections of supporters of the present government. If there was any question on which we have a right to know, and on which the people of Canada have a right to know, what the opinions of the government are, it is the question of the naval policy which was inaugurated by the late government. It is a mere subterfuge, and in my opinion a cowardly subterfuge, for those gentlemen to say, after having had this question before them for two years or more, that they are not able now to state whether they acquiesce in the policy which was placed on the statute book by the late government or not. Possibly before the end of the debate in another place is arrived at we may obtain some more light on the subject; but I observe that my hon. friends up to the present moment have been most religiously silent as to that question on which it is well known that before they took office the members of the present government were exceedingly divided in opinion.

There is another matter to which I might allude and it is this: unless my memory is wholly at fault I think my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in former days was wont to complain that the Senate was badly treated because in this Chamber we had only one member of the government holding a portfolio. The complaint cannot exactly be applied to him as I understand he does not hold a portfolio and I am bound to say that having regard to my hon. friend's party experience and general capacity, I pay him no compliment at all in stating that he is fully the equal if not the superior of any of his colleagues with whom he is now associated who are now provided with portfolios and I hope