

stood how the Government stood in reference to the treaty. In the debate immediately after the speech from the throne, language was used by the Right Hon. Premier indicating that the negotiations for a treaty were in such a state as would make it extremely inconvenient if the House were to press by any remarks in reference to it, and he hoped they would not do so. Language not precisely so distinct was held in this House by the Honorable Minister of Agriculture. All of a sudden his hon. friend made a full explanation—the difficulties vanished, and appeared indeed to have been only imaginary. The position of the hon. gentleman who made the explanations was rather a peculiar one. He was immediately responsible to the Queen and Her Majesty's Government for what had happened at Washington, yet the explanations he had given to the House, for which they were extremely indebted to him, were as from a private member of Parliament. Involving such large interests as did this treaty, it should be treated, as it was treated by the hon. gentleman yesterday, with great urbanity; they ought to understand the position of Government in this matter, what instructions they had given, and what were their plans. He would also like to know how it was that they had first the expression of the Premier and the Honorable Minister of Agriculture depreciating all discussion, from which they were in a moment asked to depart, without any additional explanation from the Government, and he thought they were entitled to understand their position very distinctly.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that the reason why he had called upon them to speak to the question was that at the commencement of Parliament no decision had been come to by the Senate in reference to the proposal which had been made by the Commission, and it was only after that decision that the hon. member had moved for the papers. He moved as a member of that House, and he had every right to bring before the House and the country his views on the question. If they had not been precluded by the fact that at that time the proposal was being submitted to the Senate of the

United States, this question would have been discussed before. The situation was now changed. Then the negotiations were opened, now they were not. He had just received the decision of the Senate, who declined to form the treaty with Canada. The hon. gentleman was now, therefore, at perfect liberty to express his views on the question.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL did not think that these reasons were sufficient. Very different language had been held at the beginning of the Session, and simply because the United States Senate had come to a decision since Parliament had opened, they had been called upon to speak to the treaty. For his own part he did not know that any decision had been arrived at either before or since the opening of Parliament. The question, he believed, had been before a Committee, but what was done by that Committee was a matter of profound secrecy. He did not understand how he (Mr. Letellier) had been able to learn so thoroughly the decision of that Committee, nor why he should have given this as the reason for their departure from the original views held by the Government. He thought that the House was entitled to have some account of the origin of the embassy and of the instructions which had been given. They were entitled to know from some one responsible to the country what had been done, they ought not to be put off by an explanation given by a private member of that House. This was an important—a State matter, and it was not right that a discussion of this kind should go on without any authoritative information as to the position the Government had taken in the matter. Was the Government the instrument of his hon. friend, or what was their position? They were certainly entitled to know the instructions given, so that they might understand how the treaty originated, and what really was the position of the Government relative to this matter.

Hon. Mr. LETELLIER said that an hon. member of this side of the House had moved for these papers, and the Government did not intend to prevent the papers from being laid before this