

stitution provides, and how in the last six years the country has been governed, and hon. gentlemen will find, when the proper time arrives, what the result will be no matter how much they try to 'hive.'

The other measures I shall not discuss at present, further than to say this, that it seems a most extraordinary thing that before the government could get a French Canadian gentleman to fill the vacancy created by the resignation or dismissal of Mr. Tarte, he must have important patronage placed at his disposal. The government of the country upon broad patriotic principles does not seem to have actuated them in any way. Mr. Préfontaine said: Unless you add to my department the patronage which I think it should have, and which I insist upon having, or give me the Public Works as it was under Tarte, I will not join you. We have the announcement in the address that this principle is to be recognized. In what way? Only to give him patronage and power to spend money in connection with harbours, docks and other matters connected with marine. Why not allow the Minister of Customs to have the control and building of the customs houses? Why not allow the Inland Revenue Department to have the same rights, and if the change is to be made it certainly ought to be made in connection with the Militia Department, where they have the largest armouries to construct, and know more about it from the fact that they are immediately engaged in providing for the training of the forces, and then my hon. friend beside me suggests, why should not the Postmaster General have control of all the post offices, and by that means you will have the Minister of Public Works with very little to do, and holding an honorary position.

I have spoken much longer than I intended, and I ask the pardon of the House if I refer to one little matter in which my own name was mentioned and brought into the discussion in the Lower House. I believe that it is not permissible to discuss what takes place in the other chamber. I base my remarks, therefore, upon what I see in the newspapers, and I suppose that that is a fair subject of the discussion. I notice that the question was asked the premier, or complaint made, why he did not enter into negotiations with Newfoundland in re-

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.

ference to the admission of that colony into the confederation, and his answer to that was that the fine opportunity was lost by the refusal of Sir Mackenzie Bowell's government to accept the terms offered. I may be excused if in referring to the official report I place it fairly before the House in order that there may be no misunderstanding, so far as the government of which I was at the head at the time is concerned. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

My hon. friend has desired to have the correspondence with the governments of Newfoundland or Great Britain with regard to the new treaty negotiated by Newfoundland with the United States. I shall be glad to bring down any correspondence in the possession of this government, but with regard to the attitude we have taken on the subject, I may say that the question is one that has long engaged our attention and that we have obtained, as the result of our efforts, the assurance that if Newfoundland be allowed by Great Britain to negotiate a treaty with the government of the United States, there shall be no discrimination in it against Canada and that the same treatment given to the American republic shall be given to the Canadian confederation.

That is a correct position for the Canadian government to take. The Sir John Macdonald government was condemned very strongly for interfering with Newfoundland at the time that Mr. Bond negotiated a treaty with Mr. Blaine, upon the ground that, being an independent, self-governed colony, we had no right to interfere with any arrangements which it might make with a foreign power, by which its trade was to be increased and the island profited thereby. Our position was that the fishery question was identically one for the British provinces, that it was impossible to separate them and that it was the duty of the government to stop anything that they might do which would interfere with our trade; and I am glad to know that at that time the Bond-Blaine treaty was prevented from being ratified by the British government. The hon. premier goes on to say:

My hon. friend also urged that the time is opportune to re-open negotiations with Newfoundland with a view to its entrance into confederation. Let me say that the government of the Hon. Sir Mackenzie Bowell lost a fine opportunity of settling that question. At all events there were then negotiations far advanced, and I believe that had a little more generous disposition been shown by Canada to Newfoundland, the question would have been settled there and then.

Mark this contradictory statement immediately following what I have read. Then he proceeds: