

the boundary between the Dominion and Alaska. I hope that all the documents relating to this question will be produced without reserve. It has been said that instead of a judicial decision such as our government desired, the award has been the result of diplomatic necessity. It is said also that the British ambassador proceeded with undue haste. One thing is certain, the Canadian commissioners refused to sign the award. I hope that within a few days we will be furnished with the true reasons for their refusal and their dissatisfaction, which dissatisfaction has spread through all the provinces of Canada, for that award has been far from giving satisfaction to the Canadian public. If it is true that the interests of Canada have been sacrificed for diplomatic reasons which do not directly concern us, let us hope that such incidents will not be repeated in the future.

Hon. gentlemen, I believe I have commented on the principal points of the speech of His Excellency. The speech is brief; let us hope that the same may be said of the present session. That is the view that His Excellency has expressed, and let us try to justify it in presenting him our thanks.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—It is a matter of very great regret to myself and my friends around me on this side of the House, as I am sure it is to hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, that our esteemed leader, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, has been prevented by very urgent private business from being present with us to-day. I have a telegram from him stating that such is the fact, and expressing a desire that the debate should be proceeded with. We regret exceedingly that he is not present with us, but we have the great satisfaction of knowing that he is in the best of health, and that we will have his presence here day by day during this session, God permitting, as we have had in previous years, giving his untiring industry and conscientious attention to the public business of the country. I am sure that is a feeling in which hon. gentlemen opposite me will concur. I have great pleasure in joining in the gratification expressed by the seconder of the address that the health of the Premier has also improved, and I am sure it is a matter of gratification for both sides of

Hon. Mr. TESSIER.

the House that such is the case. It is generally considered the duty and the pleasure of the gentleman who rises, as I do just now, after the address has been presented to the House, to refer to the manner in which the gentlemen who have been entrusted by the government with the duty of presenting their programme to the Senate at the opening of the session have discharged their duty. It was not a matter of surprise to me to find that the hon. gentleman from Toronto performed that duty with a great deal of skill and ability. I am not able to offer criticism of any kind with regard to the speech of my hon. friend who seconded the motion. He spoke in a beautiful language with which I am not acquainted, but from my knowledge of the hon. gentleman I have not the slightest doubt that his task was also performed with skill and with prudence. My hon. friend from Toronto, in taking up the first paragraph of the speech, referred in terms of satisfaction to the prosperity which Canada enjoys at the present moment, a feeling in which we will all agree. But he was not content with merely expressing that satisfaction and he went on very ingeniously to point out that the prosperity came in simultaneously with the advent of the Laurier government to power—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Hear, Hear.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—And he proceeded in a very quiet, and, as I thought, not very effective way to connect that prosperity in some way with the doings of this administration. As he intimated, prosperity in Canada had commenced simultaneously with the advent of the Laurier government to power. I expected, if he really believed that the government had done anything towards bringing about that prosperity, that he would have pointed out effectively in what way that work had been done and how the government had influenced that prosperity. The first reference was to the effective immigration policy which had been inaugurated by the present government. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with my hon. friend in his reasoning that the government is entitled to credit for the increase of immigration, if that was what he intended to imply. For my own part