

answered before any documents are laid on the table, for two reasons: first, courtesy to the Crown, and, second, as an indication of the approval of the representatives of the people of the government of the day. That is the position he took, and I repeat that he always refused to accede to any request of the kind. Perhaps this precedent, to which some members of the government object very strongly, may be looked forward to in the future as a guide to what we should have, or what we may demand before we proceed with the consideration of the speech from the Throne. Let me again ask the leader of the House, why, if it were deemed advisable and expedient to postpone the consideration of the address from Thursday until the following Monday, in order that this correspondence should be placed in the hands of the members of the House of Commons, that that same courtesy has not been extended to us. If that correspondence was necessary to debate the address and consider it intelligently, in the House of Commons, is it not equally important that it should be supplied to this House in order that we might know how to discuss a matter involving such momentous consequences? It may possibly be that the government think that the Senate is not of sufficient importance, or even that it is not an integral part of the government of this country. They may be of the same impression as the Minister of Public Works, who said, in a speech recently delivered in Montreal, that while there are very able and talented men in the House of Commons, a large proportion of the senators are not worth the rope that would be sufficient to hang them. Or they may think that we are in the position in which Sir Richard Cartwright, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, placed us in his speech in the city of Toronto: When asked the question, 'What about the Senate?' he said, 'We will leave the Senate to Providence to get rid of that incubus.' My hon. friend beside me (Hon. Mr. Ferguson) suggests that even that is better than the hangman. However, judging from the youthful appearance of some of those who have been admitted to seats in the Senate to-day, I am of the impression that it will be a long time before Providence removes them from the Upper Chamber. To withhold necessary informa-

tion is an indignity to this House. We should have been treated as the House of Commons has been treated, and if we should be led astray in debating the question, the error may be attributed to the fact that we have not been supplied with necessary information. I leave it to the senators to judge whether the demand which I have made is relevant or improper under the circumstances. The hon. gentleman who moved the address spoke in eloquent terms of the loyalty of the people of Canada to the Crown, and of the progress which the country is making. He informed us of the great benefits which the farmers had derived from the information furnished them by the Minister of Agriculture, which he considered a means of opening up the markets of Europe for the products of our farms. Well, I am not prepared to say that the advance in our trade with the mother country has not been the result of that policy, but it is amusing to those who know something of the past to hear hon. gentlemen attribute all that benefit to the action of the present Minister of Agriculture. He has not taken one single step which was not first inaugurated by the late government. I commend him for the course that he has pursued. The policy which was laid down for cold storage, the opening up of the markets of Europe and furnishing information which would help the people of this country, has been followed up by the present government, but it was inaugurated and was being carried out to its fullest extent by the late government. In that particular connection with the trade of this country, I say absolutely and de facto that they did not depart and have not yet deviated to any great extent from the policy of the late government as regards the protection given the country, by Sir Leonard Tilley as long ago as 1869, up to the present time. My hon. friend opposite spoke about preferential trade and said that under it trade has increased. So it has, but the trade of the country under the policy that has been adopted, which is termed preferential trade, has increased to a much larger extent between the United States and this country than between England and Canada. And more than that, when hon. gentlemen speak of the reduction