

the Government of the United Kingdom what they ought to do; they recommended them to denounce the treaties that at present subsist with all civilized states with a view of making radical alterations in the policy of the Empire. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman is less imperious in this resolution. In this resolution he says in effect: I do not know whether we need a commercial agent, or a diplomatic agent, at Washington; I do not know whether we need one anywhere else or not; but I am going to the Colonial Secretary for the purpose of finding out really if we do need one, and if we do, for what purpose he is needed, and whether his duties could be reconciled with our relations at the present time with the mother country. A more ridiculous position it would be impossible for any Parliament to place itself in than the Parliament of Canada would be placed in if that resolution were at the present time adopted. The hon. gentleman has told us that you could not have a diplomatic agent at Washington, because such an agent would not be recognized by the American Government, and as my hon. friend beside me has pointed out, as a matter of convenience, it is desirable that this officer should be an *attaché* of the British embassy. But what his duties shall be there, whether he shall be the party who is to communicate with the American Government, or whether it shall be his chief that shall communicate with the American Government with regard to the affairs of Canada, is a matter to be determined by the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada. There is no rule better settled in international law than this, that every Sovereign State shall speak to every other Sovereign State through whatever agency it may itself determine upon. It is not for the United States to dictate to us or to the Government of the United Kingdom whether it shall communicate to the Government at Washington through one or through two diplomatic servants. The Government of the United Kingdom may communicate through one or through two such officers. If an Ambassador Extraordinary is appointed you have two agents, both of whom are authorized to speak, one of whom will speak generally, the other, who is authorized to speak on a particular subject, will speak on that particular matter. If the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Canada come to an understanding that upon all matters affecting the people of Canada and the territory of Canada, the representative specially appointed by Canada, with the assent of the Imperial authorities, shall be the organ of communication, it is not for the American Government to object. It is as open to the Government of the United Kingdom to say that the Canadian *Chargé d'Affaires* shall be the officer through whom communication shall be had, as it is to say at this moment that the present British Minister shall be the sole mouthpiece. It is a matter between Canada and the United Kingdom, and between Canada and the United Kingdom alone. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said that the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) condemned the proposition which was submitted to this House at an earlier period of the session. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I do not know whether the hon. mem-

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

ber for North Simcoe condemned it, but I said I was sure he would have condemned it. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he thought I said anything in regard to the expression of the hon. member for North Simcoe. I gave my reasons for constructing the views of the hon. member for North Simcoe, stating that he was an ardent advocate of imperial federation, and I knew he would be opposed to the views of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says he knew; but the hon. member for North Simcoe expressly declined the other day to give an opinion on that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that statement is not quite correct. I certainly intended to say, and I think I did say, that although I was not present at the discussion which took place on the hon. gentleman's resolution with regard to the treaty-making power, I had no fault to find at all with the result at which the House had arrived. I think that is what I said; it is certainly what I intended to say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will turn up the discussion, he will find he said more than that. Perhaps he has had more light since the House discussed that question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at all. I think you will find those words in my speech.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, and I think I will find also the words to which I have referred. If on examination I am not borne out in the statement I have made as to what the hon. gentleman said, I shall be quite ready to retract what I have stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will excuse me. I find these are the words I used:

"The House this session has already considered the question which was mooted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) with respect to the power of making treaties, and a very interesting discussion—I had not the good fortune to be present, but I have read the debate since—occurred on that occasion, in which the views entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite and those entertained by hon. members supporting the Government were very fully and prominently brought forward. I do not in the least desire to quarrel with the conclusion at which the House then arrived."

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I know the hon. gentleman made that statement. I think it was in his second speech he made the observation in which he stated that he declined to express an opinion on that subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I deny altogether the inference drawn by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman's inference is really the inference drawn half a century ago with respect to the establishment of responsible government by the party to which he belonged. It was contended by the leaders of the party over and over again that it would be impossible to reconcile the principles of responsible government with the duties of the Governor as an Imperial officer, and that the responsible government of a colony meant separation of the colony from the parent state. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he accepts the situation; a half century's experience contradicts the contention of those who preceded him as leaders of the Tory party. But the hon. gentleman now says that if you apply exactly the same principles to the external relations of the colony which you apply to its internal affairs, that will lead to separation. I