

that to be correct, but what I want to know is this—has Mr. Farrer been sent there even in an unofficial capacity by any member of the government.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I said no.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—My hon. friend will find, when the report of his speech is printed, that he did not answer that question. The only answer that he gave was that they had no agent, and then he went on to discuss the merits of this resolution passed by Congress and to assure the House that the rights of Canada, whatever they may be, will be upheld wherever the British flag floats on this continent. If I were to discuss the resolution to which my friend called the attention of the Senate, I should agree with him. I am only speaking from a layman's standpoint. I have not the advantage of a legal education that the hon. gentleman has, but in reading the treaty and particularly the terms of the treaty of 1871, under which the right of navigating the Yukon and other rivers was conceded to us, I can say that I came to the same conclusion that my hon. friend has enunciated here to-night. He will excuse me if I press him for a positive answer to my question whether Mr. Farrer, whose history we all know, is in Washington on behalf of the government, or at the instance of any member of the government, if so, who sends him and who pays his expenses there. That every gentleman going to Washington has a right to express his views we all know, but we know how intimate Mr. Farrer is with members of the present government, that confidential relations exist between them, and we also know from statements, he made there that he assured the authorities at Washington that he had reason to believe the Canadian government were prepared to make certain concessions, and on the strength of those assurances Mr. Hansborough made his speech to the Senate. If the Yukon bill ever gets to this House, and we come to discuss the question, I shall be prepared to express my opinion, as a layman, as to the rights of this country, and I think I shall not find myself in a very different position on that subject from that of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I supposed that I had been sufficiently explicit in the statement I made to the House. The hon. gentleman

asked whether Mr. Farrer was the agent of the Canadian government at Washington, or whether he had been sent there to act in that capacity, and I said to my hon. friend that we had no agent at Washington except the regular and properly constituted agent, the British Ambassador at Washington. I thought that that was a sufficient negative to the question, which my hon. friend put. I so intended it. I supposed that my hon. friend would so understand it. And I say now that Mr. Farrer is not in Washington and has not been in Washington as the agent of the Canadian government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Or on behalf of the Canadian government?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Or on behalf of the Canadian government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—Very well, that will do.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—Nor was he authorized to speak for us, nor do I suppose that Mr. Farrer has said anything which would have led the hon. gentleman to suppose that he professed to speak in the name or on behalf of the Canadian government.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—You have not read the telegram.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—No, I have not, but I have listened to the telegram read by my friend.

#### VACANCIES IN THE SENATE AND DEATH OF SENATORS.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—There is another matter to which I propose to refer. It was the complaint of the hon. gentlemen opposite for a great many years that vacancies in the Senate were not filled up as rapidly as they should be. I hope the hon. gentlemen is not going to fall into what he then termed were the errors and crimes of commission and omission on the part of their predecessors. In the province in which I live, there is one vacancy. I should like to ask the hon. gentlemen when that will be filled. There is also the vacancy in Prince Edward Island, caused by the lamentable death of one of our colleagues, to which I think no reference has been made. With the permission of the Senate, I think it is only