

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). They are not before this Parliament.

Mr. TUPPER. They are being referred to this Parliament.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman just shows the importance of having these papers which I have again and again stated it was important we should have.

Mr. TUPPER. They are being printed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman shows more. He makes it clear that he was not willing to trust to the representations of the British Minister.

Mr. TUPPER. I did not say that.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman spoke himself and was present himself.

Mr. TUPPER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman took part in the discussion, and so the hon. gentleman acted throughout upon the assumption that Canada ought to have some person at Washington to speak for her, and that she ought not to trust solely to the British Minister there. That is what the hon. gentleman has said, and now he comes before us and says again: If you vote for the resolution, recognizing a permanent officer instead of a casual one, a casual visitor, instead of having in Washington a man who is there of right, speaking as a matter of right and not as a matter of forbearance or courtesy, that you will inflict upon this country a calamity, that you will do a great deal to sever the ties which unite Canada to the mother country, and that you will do this if you appoint a permanent official qualified for the discharge of his duties and responsible to Parliament of this country for the efficient and careful manner in which he does discharge his duty. But, says the hon. gentleman, I was there because it was important that I should be there. I was there to protect the interests of the country that I feared were in jeopardy if they were left to the British Minister alone, and so I am going to propose an amendment to the motion of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and I am going to try and vote down a proposition which gives practical and permanent effect to the course that I actually took myself less than 12 months ago.

Mr. TUPPER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to interrupt him for one moment, so that my argument may be better understood? The hon. gentleman has made my argument all the stronger if he will allow me to say so. I was showing that instead of meeting with any difficulty in the conference with the British Government as to how best we should arrange a direct representation of our views, and I pointed to the experience we have had especially of late, and naturally I referred to my own experience, and I found there, just as the hon. gentleman has better and more fully explained to the House, that no such difficulties were placed in the way. I found that although I had no diplomatic character or position on that occasion, going merely to consult with the British Minister; I went by the request of the British Government itself with their approval; and being there, although not in any diplomatic capacity nor as representative of the Government, I actually took part with the British Minister in all the discussions that took

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

place between him and the Secretary of State of the United States. I mentioned that to show the House that there was every reason to believe that the British Government would perhaps co-operate with us in this movement, and I suggested that the best way was to put the question to them first, before laying down here in a manner that might be misunderstood, a peremptory direction as to how that should be done.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman says that the British Government approved of his visit to Washington, authorized it, and let me read to the House the motion which the hon. gentleman has made for the purpose of giving effect to the experience he has had. The hon. gentleman says this:

"It is expedient that communications be opened with Her Majesty's Government in order to bring about such fuller representation of Canadian interests at Washington and at the capitals of other countries in which such other representations may be found desirable."

Mr. TUPPER. That is not all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is all I am reading at the present moment. Now, the hon. gentleman in this resolution submits nothing to the House for its approval. The hon. gentleman is still in the clouds. The motion of the hon. member for Simcoe is a definite proposition, and in voting for it the House knows for what it is voting. The House knows what policy will be pursued if that resolution is adopted. Does the House know what this amendment will result in? If the Government wish to take any action of this sort, they do not require a resolution of the House; it ought to be taken without asking the House. The business of the House is to pass an opinion upon the results at which the Government have arrived. But the hon. gentleman wants the House to assume the responsibility of taking a leap in the dark, and of approving of a course which may end in a way wholly different from what the House would have sanctioned if it had known beforehand what was determined upon by the Administration. The hon. gentleman says that there is more in this resolution. Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is more; and while the hon. gentleman, so far as I have read his resolution, takes a positive course, it is a shadowy and vague one; no one can tell how it will end. The hon. gentleman has qualified it that so it may mean nothing at all. The hon. gentleman certainly says more; he says not only "that may be found desirable," but "may be consistent with the proper relations which should exist between Great Britain and Canada." What are those proper relations? The hon. gentleman's colleague told us, when this matter was discussed a few days ago, that it was inconsistent with a dependency to undertake to establish diplomatic relations with a sovereign state like the United States. We might have a commercial agency; we might have a man who had no diplomatic character at all, to collect statistics and information with regard to the trade of the neighbouring republic; but if he undertook to discuss any diplomatic question, he would be entering the sacred enclosure confined to the mother country. So that what is apparently recognized as possible in the earlier portion of the hon. gentleman's resolution may be made altogether impossible by its concluding words. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman should have taken a more courageous course. He should have