

asked. However, this is not the time to discuss that point—I merely call attention to what I think is a very objectionable course pursued frequently in the Senate. In answer to my hon. friend I am furnished with the following reply:—1. An investigation into the administration of affairs of the British Columbia Penitentiary was authorized by a Minute of His Excellency in Council on the 22nd May, 1894, and Mr. Justice Drake was thereupon authorized by commission to conduct such investigation. Mr. Fitzsimmons being concerned in some of the charges which led to the investigation, was, by direction of the late Minister of Justice, relieved of his duties pending the investigation. Afterwards, upon consideration of the evidence and the report of Mr. Justice Drake, Mr. Fitzsimmons was, by a Minute of His Excellency in Council of the 24th October last, retired from office without prejudice to consideration for re-employment in the penitentiary service. 2. Upon a further consideration of the evidence and report and the supplementary statements and explanations of Mr. Fitzsimmons, he was reinstated in his former office by Order in Council of the 25th March, 1895. I have no doubt that the papers to which the hon. gentleman has referred will be brought down and laid on the table of the House of Commons at a very early date. Whether they will be in type writing or in the hand writing of one of the clerks of the department, I cannot say. As the hon. gentleman knows, these papers when laid before the House of Commons are referred to the Printing Committee and the Printing Committee will decide whether they shall be printed or not.

The motion was agreed to.

THE ADDRESS.

DEBATE CONTINUED.

The Order of the Day having been called—

Resuming the further ajourned debate on the consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's Speech, on the opening of the Fifth Session of the Seventh Parliament.

Hon. Mr. KAULBACH said: I must thank you for the indulgence you afforded me yesterday, when my voice and my health did not fairly justify me in addressing the House on this important matter. I regret also that

I had not the proper papers before me by some mistake and was not able to follow the line of argument in consecutive order which I intended doing, and that, largely, what I did say came simply from memory. I also regret that I was led into this discussion on the National Policy. The House has had so much discussion on the National Policy year after year for the last fifteen or eighteen years, that really very little remains to be said upon the subject, and I regret that I did not confine myself, as some hon. gentlemen do, simply to a short commentary upon the various clauses of the address. But I was forced into the line I took chiefly by the leader of the opposition in this House, who started with the assertion that the National Policy was a dead failure, and based that assertion upon the lowering of the exports, upon the deficits and debt of the country. Now I consider that was rather a fallacious argument, and, therefore, I think proper to enter upon the subject. My hon. friend must be aware that that National Policy, adopted some fifteen years ago, has met with the approval of Canada in four or five general elections; it has been endorsed at every election, and the government of this country stands by that policy. That is their policy. It is the will of the people expressed through their electorate and though we may readjust it to meet the varying conditions of trade at home and abroad, it is the government's duty not to change it—the policy is clear. It is the raising of a revenue sufficient only to meet the exigencies of the country, to place it so that there will be raised no more than necessary for the ordinary needs of the government, and place it so that it will work in favour of protection to the industries of the country. My hon. friend talked about the failure of the National Policy, but I am at a loss to know how he can justify his remarks. When we look at the present condition of things, when we see now that our labouring classes are more largely employed, that wages are higher, and the necessities of life but one-half of what they cost under the Liberal government from 1873 to 1878, I fail to see how he considers that policy a failure. Their policy was simply to raise revenue regardless of consequences, regardless of how it might affect the industries of the country. My hon. friend must remember that in 1876, a committee was appointed to inquire into the depressed and paralyzed condition of