

understanding or not; but, at all events, the Government have indicated that they have not been fully represented by the commissioner, and the commissioner replied, that except on one point, he has carried out all the instructions of the Government. There is one matter that seems to me to be of more than ordinary importance: whatever may have been the cause of the difference between the Government and their ambassador, the Government have tamely submitted to be rebuked and lectured by their ambassador in a manner unknown to any civilized Government. I think it is not to be found anywhere in the history of any nation that a Government would tamely submit to be rebuked as this Government has been rebuked by Sir Charles Tupper, who has stated openly in the press of London that the Government either must ratify this treaty or resign. It is true we have no official correspondence on this point, and I am not aware that the Government have taken any steps to ascertain from Sir Charles Tupper whether the language attributed to him was uttered by him or not. In my judgment I conceive the duty of the Government under such circumstances would have been to call on Sir Charles Tupper by cable, in order to sustain the dignity of this House and of the country, and ask him whether he made use of such language or not. Of course, it is not my duty to interfere in this family quarrel, because I take it to be a family quarrel after all; but still, if the Government desired to uphold the dignity which belongs to the Government, they would not have tolerated such language as appears to have been used by Sir Charles Tupper. But it is a question for the Government and their ambassador to decide between themselves. As to the merits of the treaty, I have no suggestion to offer, since it is left in abeyance. I understand the hon. gentleman reserves to himself the right to ask the ratification of the treaty at a subsequent period if it be so decided, say next session. As to the treaty itself, I have no remarks further to offer than those I made on a former occasion. The treaty is a very unsatisfactory one, the Government have accepted it, and I think their duty under the circumstances was to have asked the House to ratify it; but the Government think it preferable to wait until another session, and so there is nothing to do but to wait until another session.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not aware that any exhibition of bad feeling has taken place between the Government and Sir Charles Tupper—at least, I am quite certain there has been no such exhibition on the part of the Government.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has shown no bad feeling at all.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has touched the kernel of the question when he has intimated a doubt as to whether Sir

Mr. LAURIER.

Charles Tupper used the language attributed to him. I am inclined to think that some ambitious and enterprising reporter has very largely added to and extended any remarks that may have been made. I certainly would not feel that any action should be taken until it was known whether the reporter was at fault or not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It might have been an ambitious and somewhat disappointed ambassador.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true. But I think the Ministry would have consulted the dignity of the Government of Canada by calling, as could easily have been done, our Lord High Commissioner and inquired whether the language attributed has or has not been used by him. Ample time has elapsed to enable the Government to have communicated with him, and as this language has been repeated from one end of Canada to the other with all imaginable particularity, I think the hon. gentleman and his colleagues should, for the sake of their own dignity, have required an explanation, or at least ascertained whether the statements were true or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Slow haste is the best haste in this matter.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, 1st April, 1893.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 a.m.

PRAYERS.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. SPROULE moved:

That the final report of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization for the current session be now adopted, in so far as the recommendation therein contained relates to the printing and distribution of the report itself, notwithstanding that it has not been recommended by the Printing Committee.

He said: I am obliged to make this motion, because the Printing Committee has not had a meeting since the report was submitted to the House, and, therefore, they could not deal with it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the rule will have to be suspended.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, as you say, Mr. Speaker, the rule would have to be suspended, but there is another feature of the case which, I think, the House ought to consider. If I recollect aright, the recommendation of the Committee gives a very large