

Hon. Mr. McCALLUM—We should have that knowledge. We should have the papers on the table.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No, the hon. gentleman should not have it, because the hon. gentleman knows that in the political relations that exist between countries it is impossible to communicate that. My hon. friend knows that as well as I know it, and so, for the time being, my hon. friend has to permit that information to remain with the government.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—What other country has the right to interfere with what we are doing on our own land? Why cannot the information be given? Why should the other country interfere?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—My hon. friend asks what we are doing on our own land. Take the Lynn Canal. My opinion is the boundary should be drawn at its mouth, but it is in the hands of the United States people, and Skagway and Dyea are for the present United States ports. We supposed the furthest they would claim would be the summit of the pass at Chilcoot and White Pass, but we find the United States flag was raised at Lake Bennett, far north of these places. Our flag at the present time has taken its place, and the hon. gentleman knows that out of these matters correspondence may arise which could not be communicated to the public.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—I do not see why it should not be.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I venture to say my hon. friend is the only hon. gentleman in this House who thinks so.

Hon. Mr. KIRCHHOFFER—I am sure there are others who think so.

Hon. Mr. ALMON—There are fourteen Ministers in the Cabinet, and the greater part of them married men. How can they expect the secret to be kept from the world?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I think I have stated enough to show the hon. gentleman that there was urgency in undertaking this work, and undertaking it at a season when it was possible to push it with some vigour and hope of success. Another measure of the government is the Superannuation Act, which

my hon. friend opposite says has been grossly abused in the last six months. My hon. friend will remember that the statement was that it had been grossly abused for the past twelve years, and we think hon. gentlemen perhaps did not make the wisest use of that law. It will be very much as it was in England when the Conservatives, or Tories as they were then called, accused the Cromwellians of desiring a standing army, and the Cromwellians accused them of desiring the same thing also, so that they both began to dislike the idea of a standing army, and got rid of it. I suppose the hon. gentleman would sooner wipe it out than see the abuse continue.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I said that.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—My hon. friend has spoken in favour of manhood suffrage. I am not going into a discussion of manhood suffrage, nor the provisions of the Franchise Act. For eighteen years after this union was established we accepted and acted upon the franchise of the provinces, and, so far as I know, no difficulty arose, and no expenses were incurred by this parliament in the preparation of the voters' list, and no special complaint was made. Now, I am not going to defend the measure. It will be time enough for that when it is before the House. We promised that measure while we were in opposition. We advocated it for years. It was an issue when we went to the country, and the opinion of the country has been pronounced upon it; and whether the hon. gentleman thinks we kept faith with the country in regard to the tariff, we, at all events, undertake to keep faith with regard to that particular measure. Then, my hon. friend has referred to the question of the plebiscite, and says he considers it an abnegation of the principle of responsible government. I am devoted to the principle of responsible government, but I do not see that this is an abnegation. There are certain questions of a social character, and you may entertain views on them, and whether your views are practical, and whether it will be in the public interest to carry such a measure or not, will depend wholly upon the state of public opinion, and whatever you may think with regard to the propriety of prohibition, I think no one will maintain that a prohibitory