

it, but, when he did so before, his hon. friend wished to make him believe that his (Mr. Masson's) memory was at fault. But he remembered the occasion particularly, because when the statement was made, he made the remark that his hon. friend was going too far, that he was pledging Parliament two Sessions. This was what struck him at the time, and made him remember the fact now.

MR. LAURIER said he had appealed to the testimony of his hon. friend because he thought there could be no doubt about it. His memory was not in accord with that of his hon. friend (Mr. Masson), but, although they were at variance, his hon. friend did not impugn his statement, and he did not impugn that of his hon. friend. Still, they were at variance, and one might be at fault. It seemed to him that it was quite natural that, having been sworn in only on the previous day, he could not state what would be the policy of the Government.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I heard the hon. Minister use exactly the same words as those remembered by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson).

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Barthe) not to press the Bill at present. It is contrary to our usual practice to introduce a Bill before the Speech is answered.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the motion which was always made, was to protect the right of the House to introduce Bills if they chose, but even then it was considered not exactly respectful to the Crown, and therefore the motion for the second reading was not made. He would suggest that the hon. gentleman should allow his motion to stand until after the Address. It would be considered that the motion was not made, and that it was still on the paper.

Motion, with leave of the House, *withdrawn.*

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session.

MR. DE St. GEORGES: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to propose that a humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne; and at the outset, I hasten to solicit the indulgence of the House, convinced as I am, that the task which has devolved upon me, is much beyond my power. I am about to have the honour to serve the House with a bill of fare, which certainly should give satisfaction to the most exacting; but which, nevertheless, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will not fail, as usual, to find very meagre. I remember that last year, the hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald) made us this compliment, but that did not, meanwhile, prevent three long months, and sittings prolonged at times until the morning being required, though the Government used all possible diligence to forward the despatch of business, before we passed through all the programme that was submitted to us. As His Excellency has very appropriately remarked this year, nothing beyond the ordinary affairs of Parliament requires the convocation of Parliament; the country at present being in a most satisfactory condition. It is true that we have suffered and still suffer from commercial depression, but this is a misfortune common to-day to all civilized countries, and, after all, we can say that we have suffered here less from it than any other country, no matter where situated, and that Canada occupies a relatively prosperous condition. The commercial position of the country has improved during the past few months, and our revenues have increased. The second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne informs us that, when Parliament will be convened anew, His Excellency Lord Dufferin will have ceased to be here the representative of the British Crown. This news, I am sure, will give rise, everywhere in our midst, to a lively sentiment of regret, and the Canadian people, without distinction of nationality or of religion, will look upon the departure of His Excellency as a misfortune. Lord Dufferin, whose presence each city, each town and each locality in the Dominion, has disputed since his arrival amongst us, has