

ation? What did the hon. gentleman mean? I know that he attempted to qualify his statement on another occasion by saying that of course such representation must not involve the giving up of any part of our autonomy. But my right hon. friend will excuse me when I say that that is absolute nonsense and absolute contradiction of terms. There can be no representation in the Parliament of Greater Britain by the colonies except such a confederation is formed as exists in Canada to-day. And then all these great questions that now devolve for settlement on the Federal Parliament of Canada would necessarily devolve upon that Imperial confederation; and the people of Canada, before they can become a party to an Imperial Parliament, embracing the colonies, held at St. Stephens, four thousand miles away from where we are now sitting, must come to the conclusion that the Dominion Parliament will occupy, as regards the Imperial Parliament, the position that Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island occupy in relation to this Parliament. Is there a man with a head on his shoulders within the domain of Canada who would entertain such a proposition for a single moment, even if practical? But it is utterly impracticable, and when the hon. gentleman declared a policy in direct opposition to the language he used when speaking on the same subject in Canada, he showed that he entirely forgot himself in the midst of the Jubilee celebration. The hon. gentleman brought this subject of Imperial federation up again and again. He regretted that he could not hope to live to see its fruition, but that he hoped some other French Canadian would live to teach freedom to this Parliament of Greater Britain in days after he was gone. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman entirely forgot himself. I am happy to say that I am very near the conclusions of these criticisms.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I have no doubt that it is almost as unpleasant to hon. gentlemen opposite to listen as it is for me to speak, but, Mr. Speaker, I have a duty to perform, and when a gentleman, who has been clothed with the great power and responsibility of representing this country in England, did not discharge that duty as he should have done, I should fail in the performance of my duty if I did not rise to comment on his extraordinary course. Here is another case in point of the same change of front, to which I have felt it my bounden duty to call the hon. gentleman's attention so many times. He said, at the same meeting of the St. Jean Baptiste Society, held on 7th November, 1891—not so long ago:

It has also been said that we should establish a line of steamers between England and her possessions, by virtue of which trade could be cultivated between Canada and the British Empire

to the exclusion of the rest of the world. I have only to say, with regard to such an idea, that it is absolutely absurd.

Those were the right hon. gentleman's views on the fast line.

For my part, I prefer the Yankee dollar to the British shilling, especially when the dollar is so near and the shilling is so far away.

Put that speech of the hon. gentleman alongside the brilliant and eloquent eulogy of the fast line service which he gave the other day in Toronto, and you will see, Mr. Speaker, that I am not beyond the mark when I say that I have searched the records in vain to find the hon. gentleman speaking twice on the same subject without speaking each time in a different voice. That change of face policy, no matter in what direction the face is turned, is a dangerous one. The man who is capable of holding to a policy, who, having carefully examined it, boldly avows it and stands by it, is the only man who can reasonably expect that an intelligent people will long continue to follow him. I am doing, I trust, a great service to my right hon. friend when I call his attention to the fact that the record he has so far made is one that renders it absolutely impossible for any intelligent man to place the slightest confidence in anything he may say at any time and at any place. What did he say in Quebec, the other day, on the same subject of the fast line? He said:

There was, gentlemen, one question which agitated for a long time public opinion in this country, and especially in the city of Quebec. That was the question of the fast line. You have heard it spoken of for a long time. You know that promises were not wanting, but that nothing was done.

Was that true? Will any man in this House who knows anything of the question dare to tell me that nothing was done by the late Government? Why, we took this question of the fast line up. Parliament devoted one hundred thousand pounds per year to it for ten years. It was found that the promoters could not do anything, and Parliament, at the suggestion of myself, after communication with the Duke of Devonshire, increased the subsidy to \$750,000. A year was expended by a very energetic man, Mr. Huddart, who has the contract between Australia and Vancouver. I had been instructed by the Government to give Mr. Huddart all the aid I could, and did so. I saw the great shipping companies, I saw the great naval construction armament company, of which the Duke of Devonshire was chairman, and Lord Brassby a director, I saw a large number of gentlemen deeply interested, who would have given anything to take up the question of a fast line between Great Britain and Canada, but they all said it was absolutely impossible to finance the scheme upon a subsidy of that kind. What, then, did we do? The hon. gentleman said that nothing was