

of the other. That we have subsidized steamers for that trade, but that while we are carrying on these trade relations, it would be snapping the tie that binds Canada to England if we were to deal directly with Brazil on our own behalf. I cannot see how it would sever Canada from the United Kingdom to appoint a representative to Brazil any more than it would if the Government of Great Britain appointed an Agent to act on our behalf. Is it not absurd to say, while we are carrying on an extensive trade with Brazil and are negotiating with the view of promoting that trade, that no one from Canada should go there to enquire into the natural products of the country and to ascertain how far these trade relations could be promoted and the trade augmented? We have no representative there now. The English Ambassador at Rio Janeiro and the English Consul at every port is interested in looking after the trade between Brazil and the United Kingdom; they are not to make any enquiry into the trade between Canada and Brazil; that is not a matter which interests them; they are not to receive any reward or promotion, or any recognition for what they may do on our behalf; we are not represented in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and we have no power to bring to bear on their condition. Therefore it is not our interests that specially concern them; their interests point in a wholly different direction. They are acting properly and wisely; they are doing an essential service to the Government that appoints them; but they are not doing a service for us. We, Sir, must act on our own behalf if we are ever to promote our own commercial relations, or to secure to ourselves that share of the commerce of the world which our population and our wealth entitle us to expect. The hon. gentleman has told us that it is inconsistent with our position of dependence. Let me suppose that Sir Alexander Galt were sent by the Queen upon the advice of the Government of Canada as Plenipotentiary extraordinary to the Empire of Brazil for the purpose of reporting upon the prospects of establishing more intimate commercial relations between the two countries—would that in any way affect our relations with the United Kingdom or tend to sever the tie? On the contrary, if the Government of the United Kingdom offered us facilities for carrying on those enquiries, if it seconded our efforts, and we in consequence secured a more extensive commerce with Brazil, would it not, on the contrary, tend to strengthen the tie that binds us to England rather than to sever it? I can see no difference whatever between negotiating on our own behalf and being negotiated successfully for by the representative of the Government of Great Britain. That we are more likely to succeed, acting on our own behalf than by entrusting our business to others who have no special interest in the success of such negotiations, I have no doubt. I do not believe that if Sir Alexander Galt was commissioned by Her Majesty, at the instance of the Government here, to go to Brazil to negotiate a commercial treaty, that he would be asked: Where do you come from; are you a native of Canada?—and that if he were to say he was, that they would reply: We cannot negotiate with you—you have Her Majesty's commission, which shows that you are authorized to negotiate only for that portion of her Empire, called the Dominion, and therefore, we will not treat with you. It is preposterous to suppose that any such objection would be made. The hon. gentleman has said that the Government here has a National Policy, that they expected there would be over-production in consequence, and were anxious to secure commercial relations with foreign States, in order that a market might be found for the excess of our products. We have always had an excess in certain lines—in lumber, fish and agricultural products, for which we have needed a foreign market; and we have for years required the right to negotiate treaties with Foreign States in order that

greater outlets for our trade might be found. If our foreign trade depended upon the surplus products flowing from the miscalled National Policy, I am inclined to think that it would be a long time before it would be necessary to submit to the House a motion like that of the hon. member for West Durham. The right hon. gentleman also referred to the case of Mexico, and spoke of the great inconvenience that exists at present in consequence of Great Britain having withdrawn her Ambassador from the Mexican capital, and he stated it was owing to the non-fulfilment of certain treaty obligations on the part of Mexico. That is not correct, I believe. The Mexican Government appropriated the property of English residents, it despoiled them of their rights, and refused to compensate or give any satisfaction, and the English Government withdrew its Ambassador, and broke off negotiations with the Mexican Government. The hon. gentleman has also said: Supposing you had power to negotiate treaties, how would you enforce your rights? If we make a treaty, it will be a voluntary compact between a foreign State and Canada; we shall have an interest in the treaty which we believe to our advantage, and the foreign State will be similarly placed and will act in good faith for the same reason; and it is absurd to suppose that each party, seeking to advance its own welfare, would put impediments in the way of the carrying out of engagements beneficial to both. The hon. gentleman has also expressed the fear that commercial independence, so to speak, or the power rather to enter into commercial relations with foreign States, would lead to the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom. The proposition of my hon. friend is that the Government of the United Kingdom shall have a veto, to be exercised in cases similar to its exercise upon our legislation. We do not ask for anything more, and believe that so far from the change asked for, tending to sever the ties that bind us to the United Kingdom, it would be the very means of promoting and strengthening those relations. You cannot govern the boy of seventeen or eighteen as you would the boy of five, or apply to him the same rules, or subject him to the same absolute commands. No more can you deal with a people of 5,000,000, who have extensive commercial interests, in the way in which you would deal with a new colony with no commercial relations whatever. If this country is going to continue an integral part of the Empire, the Government of the country must change, and be adjusted to the altered circumstance of the people of this country. Just as we required the right of self-government, for the purpose of dealing with our own domestic affairs, to the exclusion of Imperial interference, so now we require to extend the principle to our foreign commercial relations. They exist; we best understand them; we alone are specially interested in them, and we have the same right to deal with those interests, to protect and promote them as the people of the United Kingdom have to deal with theirs, and make such foreign engagements as those interests demand. So far, then, from the power asked for by this resolution, tending to the early severance of Canada from the Mother Country, I believe it will tend to prolong the existing relations which, certainly at an earlier day, would be terminated, if it was found that our foreign interests, which are daily becoming more important, were not regulated and directed by the mind of this country. It is rather extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should be so much afraid of the separation of Canada from the United Kingdom, when, during the elections of 1878 his organ—a newspaper published by the hon. member for Welland, acting under his direction, speaking his sentiments, and inspired by him, declared that if it was found the connection between Canada and the Mother Country was incompatible with the National Policy, it was so much more the worse for the connection. Those hon. gentlemen were ready to sever the connection be-