

Governor General did not violate the constitution. I say that when this matter was a subject of debate, I was permitted by the Speaker in the Chair to go a great deal further than anything that I have said to-night.

Mr. WALLACE. If I might be allowed to say a word—when you first arose to call attention to a point of order, you called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the fact that he must not reflect upon the Governor General, and you sat down, Sir. Then, Sir, because a clamour arose on the other side of the House, you got up again and asked him to take it back.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I do not think that the hon. gentleman has a right to reflect upon the decision that I have just given.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have very little more to say, and I will conclude my remarks as soon as possible. But I want to say a few words with reference to the Yukon Railway, as it is mentioned in this Speech.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Chair having ruled that a certain expression is out of order, it is imperative that the gentleman who has used that expression, should withdraw it, else he cannot continue his speech, according to the rules of this House. It is also distinctly out of order to discuss the ruling of the Chair after it has been formally made.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what you are doing now.

Mr. CASEY. No after-discussion can affect that decision. I ask you whether the hon. gentleman is in order in proceeding with his speech after refusing to withdraw the expression which you have ruled to be out of order. I think the House will sustain me in raising that point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is very much to be regretted that the hon. leader of the Opposition will not withdraw the expression which he has just used concerning the Governor General. But I understand him to say now that the Government is responsible for the Governor General's action, and that the attack he has made was directed against the Government. Consequently, I understand him to withdraw any expression which is injurious to the Governor General himself.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Hear, hear. I pass away from that disagreeable subject with great pleasure. Before I sit down I want to—

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I want to have it understood from the hon. gentleman himself that he withdraws the expression complained of. Does he say that he withdraws it?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has just declared that he withdraws any expression

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

which was injurious to the Governor General.

Mr. CASEY. Has he said so?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. He has said so.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Now that the great constitutionalist on the other side of the House has been set right, I will proceed. I am a little surprised at reading the next paragraph in the Speech:

The action of the Imperial Government in denouncing the treaties with Germany and Belgium also affords much satisfactory evidence of their desire to facilitate your efforts to promote the closest possible relations between Canada and the remainder of the Empire.

Now, Sir, what does that mean? Can any person on the other side of the House tell me what is meant by "the remainder of the Empire"? It goes on to say: "and will, I trust, contribute materially to the development of the Imperial trade." Now, Sir, I believe that paragraph indicates a want of knowledge on the part of the Government of what has taken place and of what the denunciation of the Belgian and German treaties means. If the First Minister wrote that paragraph, I could understand it, because we know that, notwithstanding all the discussion that has taken place in reference to the German and Belgian treaties, the right hon. gentleman has never mastered the subject and does not know what those treaties involve. I hold in my hand a speech made by that hon. gentleman at Quebec on his return, wherein he said:

There can be no doubt of the advantages which Canada will gain from the denunciation of those treaties, the greatest, undoubtedly, being the increased fiscal independence for us as a nation. Those treaties were in the way of the fiscal arrangement which we could have made with the sister colonies, or even with foreign nations, because the moment any such arrangement has been made, Germany and Belgium would have to step forward and claim such arrangement without giving anything in return.

Now, I beg to inform my right hon. friend that he is entirely mistaken, that the German and Belgian treaties have no more to do with arrangements between Australia, or South Africa, and Canada, than they have with China. What prevented trade arrangements being entered into between Canada and the other colonies, especially Australasia, was this: that in the constitution of the Australian colonies, there was a provision that they could not make any differential fiscal arrangements without the assent of the Home Government, and consequently they could not even make arrangements between Victoria and New South Wales. Some time ago the constitution was so amended as to enable them to make interprovincial arrangements within Australasia; but the fact remained that no Australian colony could make trade arrangements with Canada. In consequence