

and the mover I am sure that members on both sides will be happy to find that such valuable additions have been made to the debating talent of this Parliament.

Now, my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) has gone somewhat minutely, and more minutely than I care to follow him, into an interview which I gave some time ago to an American journalist. The only criticism—not the only but the principal criticism—which the hon. gentleman had to offer to that interview was, that I had been too candid and too sincere, and he said that it would never do for any kind of a diplomatist to carry his heart on his sleeve as I have done. If that meant anything, it simply meant that my hon. friend (Sir Charles Tupper) agrees with Talleyrand who said: that speech has been given to man to conceal his thoughts. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) is of that opinion evidently, and we know from his past record that he is as good as his word, and that he preaches both by precept and example. We remember very well that in the campaign of 1891, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) stated to the people of Canada that the Government of Canada received an invitation from Mr. Blaine the American Secretary of State, to a conference at Washington with a view of renewing the reciprocity treaty of 1854. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) made that statement on all the hustings of Canada and he invited the support of the Canadian people because of it. He told them, that if Parliament had been dissolved it was simply to answer the invitation which had been given by Mr. Blaine, then Secretary of State for the United States, asking co-operation and a conference to renew negotiations, in order to have a reconsideration of the treaty of 1854. Well, Sir, the truth was, as the hon. gentleman knows, that no such invitation had ever been given by Mr. Blaine. The hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) did not carry his heart on his sleeve. He was not candid with the people. He was not sincere with the people, but the hon. gentleman knows right well that a few months afterwards he had to eat humble pie in the office of Mr. Blaine in order to get an audience from him. These are not my lines, however. It may be a weakness of mine to carry my heart on my sleeve. It may be a weakness of mine to be candid, but I believe it to be the best diplomacy of all to be honest in speech and honest in action as well.

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) also rebuked me for what I said as to the control of the canals after they had been deepened. Was the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) sincere and candid, and did he carry his heart on his sleeve when he made that criticism? If he had been candid and sincere, and if he had carried his heart on his sleeve as he should have done, he might have said to the House, that when I made that statement to this

American journalist, I was simply carrying out the policy of the late Government, because, Sir, there is to-day a joint international commission, a commission appointed by the Canadian Government to act in conjunction with the American government, to examine that very question of the deepening of the canals and the control of the same. Here is an Order in Council which was passed by the late Government of Sir Mackenzie Bowell on the 30th of November, 1895:—

On a report dated 22nd November, 1895, from the Minister of Railways and Canals, submitting that by petition to Your Excellency in Council, the President and members of the International Deep Waterways Association have set forth that the Congress of the United States has enacted as follows:

The President of the United States is authorized to appoint, immediately after the passage of this Act, three persons who shall have power to meet and confer with any similar committee which may be appointed by the Government of Great Britain or of the Dominion of Canada, and who shall make inquiry and report whether it is feasible to build such canals as shall enable vessels engaged in ocean commerce to pass to and fro between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Ocean, with an adequate and controllable supply of water for continual use; where such canals can be most conveniently located, the probable cost of the same, with estimate in detail; and if any part of the same should be built in the territory of Canada, what regulations or treaty arrangements will be necessary between the United States and Great Britain to preserve the free use of such canal to the people of this country at all times.

And, Sir, upon that the Canadian Government appointed three commissioners—Mr. Howland, Mr. Keefer, and Mr. Monro, to confer with the American Commissioners in order to see what reports, regulations or treaty arrangements would be necessary between the United States and Great Britain to preserve the free use of such canals to the people of the United States at all times. I must say, however, of that interview, that I have nothing to take back from the statement I made that the relations of the two countries had not been satisfactory; for I am bound to say that under the treatment accorded to American fishermen in 1886, 1887 and 1888 by the late Canadian Government the relations of the two countries were brought to such a pitch that one time the two countries were actually upon the verge of commercial war. Commercial war, Sir. I have a high authority for that statement; and who is my authority? The hon. leader of the Opposition, who made that statement upon the floor of this very House in the session of 1888.

The hon. gentleman said that the Speech from the Throne afforded but a very meagre bill of fare; but it is in season, and I do not suppose that my hon. friend would have any stomach for a very heavy meal at this moment. Moreover, the circumstances are