

the earliest date, after the conclusion of this debate, at which those papers can be brought down. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman who is principally responsible, I presume, for the language which has been placed in His Excellency's mouth, paid a recent visit to England, with a view of giving, no doubt, a wholly unnecessary proof of the futility of the arrangements under which he succeeded in having a High Commissioner appointed in order that the Minister might not be obliged to visit England. I say, with that view, because I cannot conceive any other purpose which the hon. gentleman could possibly have had in going to England at the time, and under the circumstances in which he did go. He went there in the middle of a general election, which was quite certain to be followed by a ministerial crisis—at a time when it was perfectly impossible to do business with Ministers, and as I apprehend, and as his courteous answers to those who have discussed the subject with him would indicate, he did not in fact do any business. He might have talked to an under-secretary a little bit, but as to doing business with Ministers it is quite clear that he did not do much. I am glad, however, that he went over, under the circumstances. But it is true that he could not do anything further; it is true that, although public business was not accomplished, although he went where he was not wanted, and left the place where he was wanted, yet fresh honors were heaped upon his blushing brow—he joined the Turners—like another statesman on this side of the continent who also joined the Turners—our well known friend, Hans Breitmann. Well, in the course of these proceedings he made some speeches. In one of those interesting speeches delivered by the Premier when he was on the other side of the water, speeches which we always read with interest, he said that, whatever other people did, he would not make the mistake of praising his country to Englishmen, and he proceeded, having thus vouched for the absolute sobriety of the phrase that he was about to indulge in, to state: first, that we were five millions now and soon would be ten millions; next, that every acre of the Dominion was in a beautiful clime, without any impediment whatever to cultivation—that every acre of this immense area, I cannot remember, I do not know that I could repeat the number of acres, is in a beautiful climate without any impediment to cultivation. That goes even up to the North Pole. He said also in communicating to us information which we are always glad to receive, that we are forming a navy—that we are forming a navy and will assist the mother country in enforcing the peace of the world. If we are forming a navy we should like to know it. We do not want to hear that announcement made in the St. George's Club or in the Turner's Hall, but to hear it in the halls of Parliament, and therefore, if we are forming a navy intended to assist the Mother Country in keeping the peace of the world, the people of Canada ought to have heard the announcement first from the First Minister in his place here. Then, speaking of Canada, he declared that we are ready to join the Mother Country in an offensive and defensive league; to sacrifice ourselves, to risk our last man and last shilling in defence of the Empire and the flag.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE. That depends on how many shillings you have got. The hon. gentleman said that Canada was prepared to join the Mother Country in an offensive and defensive league. For my part, I will say frankly, I have hitherto declared it, and I now declare it, that I decline to accept active responsibility for the execution of a policy which I had no share in moulding. I admit that, perhaps, we do not want a share in moulding that policy, and perhaps we could not get a voice if we did want it; but if we have not got a voice and

Mr. BLAKE.

will not take a voice in moulding the foreign policy of the Empire, I think we should not come under liabilities beyond what our own immediate and direct interests and the peace and protection of our own country demand, and that we should not be called upon to expend our blood and treasure in carrying out Jingo schemes whether of Tory or Liberal politicians on the other side of the water. Take almost the last occasion—not indeed the last one, because they come so quickly these English wars—in which we would have been called upon to take an active share—the Soudan war. We sympathised, of course, with the Mother Country in her struggle and trial, we sympathised with the brave soldiers who fought the battles, and we read with deep interest the incidents of the war; but I doubt very much that the great majority of the Canadians agreed in the Soudan policy, agreed in the Egyptian policy of the English Government, or, in fact, agreed that England ought to have interfered there. If we had had a voice in the Imperial foreign policy, that voice would, I believe, have been raised in favor of an entirely different policy; and I give you that as one instance, though a small one. Something was said about Canadian assistance, but the Ministry did not propose—and wisely, as it seems to me—did not propose to come forward and assist the Mother Country, and I presume, on the ground that so long as we had not a share in moulding that policy, we ought not to be called on actively to execute it. The defence of Canada is an entirely different matter. The hon. gentleman said in his speech that we are in no danger whatever from the United States, and, of course, it is very gratifying to learn from the hon. gentleman that such is the case, and I am glad to share his belief. But he entered into *la haute politique*. He was called upon to declare what our warlike relations with France were likely to be, and he calmed the apprehensions of certain intelligent and well-informed Englishmen who had discussed the matter with him, by telling them that there really was no danger to Canada from France. Why? Not because there was no danger of France seeking to get Canada from us; but because, if there was trouble from active spirits in France, the United States would protect us. We were safe in the hands of the United States, which would not tolerate France on this continent, through it was willing to let things go on as they are. I think myself, and this House will think, that when our First Minister and Plenipotentiary and acting High Commissioner and Chief Superintendent of Indian Affairs and of the Mounted Police and President of the Council enters into the region of *la haute politique* and gives an account of our foreign relations and of the results of his diplomacy, I really think we should have the declaration here. We should not be called on to learn it from reports in the London newspapers. Until I read the hon. gentleman's speech, I had not the remotest idea that this country was under any danger from France whatever, still less that it was a danger which could only be averted by the friendly and determined action of the United States towards us and against France, because they were determined to allow no nation but England to have any footing on the North American Continent. The hon. gentleman has engaged in England in some very great oratorical *tours de force* in those various speeches to which I have alluded; and in that respect also, although Hans Breitmann's performances were physical and not mental, he imitated his prototype, for you recollect when the poet relates the history of the great event, which also was celebrated by a banquet, he says:

"Hans Breitmann choined de Turners,
Nofember in de fall,
And dey dif't a boost in bender,
All in de Turner hall.