

Divine aid in the consideration of important public question. With these remarks, I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of my hon. friend.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Before the motion is adopted, it is usual to make a few observations from this side of the House. Before I proceed to make any comments on the Speech from the Throne, I wish to offer my compliments to the hon. mover and seconder of the Address for the very able manner in which they have performed their task. Both hon. gentlemen prefaced their remarks to this Chamber with the very modest assurance that they were quite unaccustomed to be placed in such an important position. I felt, as my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Tassé) proceeded with his very eloquent speech, that the apology was quite unnecessary. It is evident that he has been in the habit of addressing other assemblies than the one in which he is to-day. We know very well that he sat in another place for some years, and while there was distinguished for the very able speeches that he made on many occasions. As the hon. gentleman proceeded I thought, however, that the most entertaining parts of his speech were those that did not refer to anything in the Address. In fact, at one time I thought he had picked up the wrong notes, because I had heard from the platform recently sentiments very similar to those expressed by him to-day, and I thought it was quite out of the ordinary usage in moving the Address. It is very singular, too, although both gentlemen were fulsome in lauding the Government and speaking of the success of the Administration, that both of them hail from Provinces where those sentiments are not in accord with the views of the people as expressed in the recent election. A majority of the delegates of the people recently elected in Quebec and Prince Edward Island entertained very different opinions from those to which we have listened here to-day. I heartily concur in one part of the address of the hon. gentleman who moved the answer to the Speech. I refer to his congratulations, and the congratulations of this House, which he offered to you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the Chair of the Senate. We all share in his belief that you will fill that position with honour and dignity. It is quite true, sir, that you are not an old parlia-

mentarian, and it is with regret that I say that at first you failed to take that interest which we would all like you to manifest in the proceedings of the House; but a time came when, through the illness of the leader of the House, it became your duty to lead this Chamber, and we all felt that you did so with tact and ability, and earned for yourself the consideration of the House in the discharge of that duty. But whilst speaking on this subject of a change in the Chair of the House, I do not think it would be quite proper that we should pass from it without my reminding the Senate that up to yesterday the gentleman who filled that position for the last four years had done so with marked ability and satisfaction to this Chamber. That gentleman was remarkable for calm judgment, and his suavity of manner could not be excelled. At all times his decisions on points of order which arose on questions from time to time gave the greatest satisfaction. It is quite fitting, on the present occasion, that we should express to that gentleman our entire approval of the manner in which he discharged his duties. We are very prone to talk about English precedents: in some things it would be very much better if we followed them more closely than we do. In England, when gentlemen are found to fill the Chair satisfactorily, a change in the Speakership, even in the popular branch, does not take place with a change of Government, and in the Upper Chamber the same rule is followed. Here, political exigencies take a man out of the Chair when, by his industry and ability, he has fitted himself to discharge the duties with satisfaction to himself and to the House. My hon. friend on my right (Mr. Miller) is an illustration of the disadvantage of our practice. Such changes are not in harmony with that British practice which we are so fond of invoking. Having said so much, I come to the Speech from the Throne. I confess—and it is the popular opinion—that it is not only a very barren and meagre speech, but it is scarcely such an Address as a statesman would wish to put in the mouth of His Excellency. It starts with a reference to a change in the trade relations with the country to the south of us, and here one is forcibly reminded of the causes which have brought this new Parliament together. When we separated last spring no one had the