

position of being humble suppliants at the feet of the people of the United States. Our representatives requesting as a favour that which we ought to demand as a right. And, Sir, demanding our right, we had the right to receive a prompt and considerate answer from the United States. I do not believe, Sir, that the interests of Great Britain and of the United States are ever likely to resume their former conditions; not, that having experience of the past six months we have anything to hope for or anything to expect in the nature of frank and generous treatment from the United States, but I believe that now that the people of the United States have made such a new departure in their system of government, that the interests of Great Britain and of the United States will very often run on parallel lines, and will draw those two countries together in a manner that probably no other circumstance could have done. But I must say, so far as I am concerned, that notwithstanding the course which Great Britain has pursued in a most eventful period of the career of that great republic, I entirely despair of their being influenced by that to give any more favourable consideration to the people of Canada than they have given in the past.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

### After Recess.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I regret the absence of the Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). The Prime Minister will be here in a moment, I have sent for him.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I regret his absence, because I have now reached a part of my remarks that make it very desirable that he should be present. I have referred to the failure of the negotiations and the fact that at the end of six months waiting impatiently for the result, we learned that an adjournment of the commission had taken place until the 2nd day of August next. I cannot but express my deep regret that there should have been such an adjournment. I think it was due to Canada, and I think it was due to the great interests with which the representatives of Canada on that occasion were charged by Her Majesty, that they should have declined to make any adjournment. Of course we are bound to accept the official statement made by the head of the commission representing the United States, and by the Prime Minister of Canada for Lord Herschell who was unfortunately prevented by illness from being present; but when the reasons were disclosed, when the position was stated to the country, as it was officially stated in that state paper authorized by Mr. Fairbanks on the one side and Sir Wilfrid Laurier on the other, I could not but feel that a serious mistake had been

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

made on the part of the representatives of the Crown. In view of the fact that the United States of America adopted a course which the hon. the mover of the Address has to-day on the floor of Parliament, as the mouthpiece of the Executive of this country, stated, was a dishonourable course, a course not justified by the comity of nations; it is my opinion that the interests of Canada required, not that there should be an adjournment until the 2nd day of August, but that there should be a suspension of these negotiations. I regret that any such course became necessary, but when a great country like the United States of America took a position which demands from the mover of the Address the terms "dishonourable conduct," I cannot but say, that I regret very much that there should have been any question of an adjournment. I do not myself believe that there is any intention on the part of the representatives of Her Majesty; I do not believe that there is any intention to meet on the 2nd day of August. I do not believe that there is any expectation on the part of these hon. gentlemen that they will meet on the 2nd day of August next. Why should they? The statement is made—I do not know on what authority—by the hon. member for East Prince (Mr. Bell), that an arrangement was all but reached in regard to a number of questions touching the interests of Canada, but that the representatives of Canada took the ground that there should be no arrangement made of any kind on any of these questions unless they were all arranged. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that if the representatives of Canada took such a ground, it was most unfortunate. I do not see why it was necessary to take the position that every question must be settled. Suppose that a few questions interesting to Canada could be disposed of as was intimated, why should they not be disposed of without reference to any question on which it was not possible to come to a conclusion?

Now, Sir, my right hon. friend the leader of the Government will correct me, if I am wrong in saying that I understand the terms of that adjournment to be, that the commission will meet on the second day of August, provided that in the meantime, by diplomatic intercourse, the Governments of Great Britain and of the United States solve this question of the boundary of Alaska. I assume, from the terms in which the statement is made, that the adjournment is for the very purpose of enabling the respective governments to deal diplomatically with that subject; and I assume that it is not the intention to meet, if that question remains in the position that the United States practically say: Gentlemen, we do not intend to settle this question—for they might just as well say so in so many words, as to use the terms that they have used. What do they say? They say: We will not have any arbitration at all on the question of the boundary of Alaska, unless you agree, be-