

credit should be given where credit was due, than that anybody should attempt to grasp the whole credit for Canada. But I have a higher authority than the Minister of Finance. I have the statement made on the floor of the House of Commons by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, who ought to know, as it was he who obtained the denunciation of the treaties. He narrates the facts, and there they stand on record to give the most emphatic and complete contradiction to every one of those statements which the hon. gentleman has put forward here, there, and everywhere, that Canada has done this thing. What does she say?

The Premiers of the self-governing colonies unanimously and earnestly recommend the denunciation at the earliest convenient time of any treaty now hampering the commercial relations between Great Britain and her colonies. This was the unanimous wish of all the self-governing colonies, and it was accompanied by a most important and significant resolution, which was this: "That, in the hope of improving the trade relations between the mother country and her colonies, the Premiers present undertake to confer with their colleagues with a view to seeing whether such a result would be properly secured by preference given by the colonies to the products of Great Britain." On receipt of these resolutions the Government decided to withdraw their adherence to the treaties.

I call attention to this statement, and it is an important one, because it is only justice to every man who had a part in a measure so important to this country and all the other colonies, that it ought to be recognized; and I do not think it will be necessary very soon to say anything more on that subject. But, as I said before, the hon. gentleman never appears to be able to maintain any single principle for any length of time. On the question of Imperial Federation, what did he say? At the St. Jean Baptiste Society here, on November 7, 1891, he said:

There are people in my country who say that an imperial federation, that is, a federation between England and her colonies, would be the best alternative for Canada. As far as the Monroe doctrine is applicable to Canada, I am in favour of the Monroe doctrine. I do not want any European interference in our affairs, and it would be suicidal on the part of Canada to engage herself in a federation that would force us to take part in all the wars that Great Britain, on account of her position, is obliged to undertake in all parts of the world. I consider that this fact alone suffices to turn the Dominion from any such idea.

On a very important public question, the question of a closer combination and federation between the mother country and this country, these were the views put on record by the hon. gentleman in a formal speech to people who were hanging on his words and treasuring them up as jewels beyond all price. Well, Sir, what did the same hon. gentleman say in England on the same question? I will not refer to Mr. Goldwin Smith's insinuation, that the social

environments of colonists across the water are apt to turn their heads sometimes; but I want to know what the hon. gentleman has to say to the statement he made to the St. Jean Baptiste Society, and the following statement which he made before the London Chamber of Commerce—I think, at the Hotel Metropole. The hon. gentleman will, no doubt, remember it, because he will remember the enthusiastic cheers which greeted his every utterance from the time he rose to his feet until the time he sat down. The hon. gentleman said:

At no distant date it was manifest to all that the parting of the ways would be reached by England and her colonies, and when the parting of the ways should have been reached the problem would be whether the colonies would be more closely united with the mother land or whether their relations should cease altogether. The colonies had a national pride, and no tie and no bond would be permanent in the colonies until it gave to its pride the greatest possible expression.

What did the hon. gentleman mean by that? Is that what he meant when he was talking to this St. Jean Baptiste Society?

In Canada they had unbounded faith in their own country. When she had reached the full development of her manhood nothing would satisfy but Imperial representation. He knew that this question was not free from difficulties, but it was the part of strong men to undertake difficulties.

Well, Sir, I dare say the House remembers the story of the man in days when people used to prepare a little for the bon-mots which they used at dinner parties. He said to a friend: "I am going to say a clever thing to-night." "What is that," asked his friend. "That I cannot tell you," he said; "but when there is a little lull in the conversation, just say: 'Samson was a strong man,' and see what will happen." At the dinner party his very obliging friend waited till there was a lull in the conversation, and from a seat at the end of the table he called out, "Samson was a strong man," but the other did not pay any attention. He called it out in a louder tone, and then his friend looked up and said: "No doubt he was, but you must be a deuced sight stronger to be able to drag him in here without either rhyme or reason." It will require a veritable Samson to accomplish what the hon. gentleman says. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the subject of colonial representation in the British Parliament has been discussed for years until at length it has ceased to be the subject of discussion, because every one who has examined it knows right well that the difficulties in the way are such as to render colonial representation in the Imperial Parliament absolutely impracticable. The hon. gentleman was not there in his individual capacity but as representing Canada. Where did he get the mandate to say to the people of England that Canada is prepared for a Parliamentary federation of the Empire—that she is prepared for Imperial confeder-

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.