

House. They readily agreed to put them in possession of the papers, and this would show that they were in possession of information; but they were not now compelled to give any verbal information to that House. If the Government had refused these papers, then the hon. member for Kingston might complain with justice, but when the address was allowed, the Government could not be said to shirk from giving all the information in their power. He thought it would be better for the hon. gentleman to criticise the action of the Government when he had the papers in his possession.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL thought it was very unsatisfactory to proceed in that way in a debate of such importance, and to wait till the papers were laid upon the Table. He proposed then that they should adjourn till that time. It might be more convenient to postpone the debate till they had a full statement of what the Government had done.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said his hon. friend might think it better to take that course, but it was not usual to talk upon the question till the papers were before the House. If the hon. gentleman thought fit to make such a motion, he could not prevent him. If his hon. friend was not ready to answer the proposition made by the hon. member for Toronto, it was his own fault, and not that of the Minister of Agriculture. If then he (Mr. Campbell) was ready, they were, if he were not, they were not.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU did not understand how they could adjourn the debate and move the address.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL said that the inconvenience of going on was very great; (hear, hear, from the Government benches)—perhaps the hon. gentleman would allow him to finish—the inconvenience, he would repeat, of going on was very great, because there was no statement from the Government as to what had been done. The hon. gentleman who had made this explanation and who was Plenipotentiary to Her Majesty had no doubt done the duty entrusted him by the Government. But they were placed in a peculiar position. What has the

Government done? The hon. gentleman had doubtless made his report to England. Let the House be informed as to the particulars, or let them adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. BUREAU thought his hon. friend was in favor of an unusual course. The best plan would be, he thought, to follow the ordinary practice of Parliament, and go on with the debate now. Let the address pass. The papers would come down, and then the hon. gentleman could bring up his debate in any way he chose. During the whole course of his Parliamentary experience, he never knew of an address to the Crown, on which such large interest depended, being refused, and he apprehended his hon. friend would not insist on such a course as that.

Hon. Mr. CAMPBELL did not wish to oppose the address, but was anxious to see the papers. What he wanted to understand was, the position occupied by the Government and by the hon. gentleman. Something of that position might have been understood from the account which the hon. gentleman gave of the origin of this effort to procure reciprocity. So far as one could judge from the narrative of the hon. gentleman, this did not so much result from the Government, as from his (Mr. Brown's) sudden inspiration in the course of his conversation with Mr. Rothray.

HON. MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman is mistaken, I know nothing at all of the course taken previous to that time.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL—It only showed how right he was in asking information as to the course pursued by the Government; these explanations, if they were before them, would enable them to understand the position better than they now did. If the hon. gentleman had taken the course which he ought to have taken, he would have explained to the House the instructions he had received. His (Mr. Campbell's) idea was, that the Hon. Mr. Brown and Mr. Rothery met at Toronto, and Mr. Rothery informing him what he was about to do, Hon. Mr. Brown remarked, that the giving up of the fisheries for a money consideration, would be distasteful to the people of Canada, and