

to England to be accredited to the different countries, especially France and Spain, purposely to open new markets there for Canada.

Mr. STEPHENSON. The substance for a shadow.

Mr. HOUDE. The hon. member asks me, why leave the reality for the shadow. I believe we are looking for the reality; I think that in our worthy representative in England we have only had the shadow for the reality. While I approved of that appointment and thought it was a step in the right direction, yet our representative has encountered so many difficulties that he has not had until now very great success—at least not as great success as we expected when we sent him across the Ocean. What do we ask by the resolution now before the House? We ask the power to negotiate commercial treaties with foreign countries. Well, I consider that step, Mr. Speaker, the crowning of the National Policy which we inaugurated three years ago, and I do not interpret it as a step in the direction of our complete independence of the Mother Country. I know there is in Canada a party, very few in number, who look after that complete independence; but shall we allow ourselves to be intimidated by the cries of those who say treason? No, Mr. Speaker. When responsible Government was asked for in this country, a party cried treason. Were they right? No, Mr. Speaker, they were wrong; experience has proved that when the Mother Country granted responsible Government to Canada, she only made closer the tie which united Canada to herself. And again, when the policy of the present Government—a policy which met with my sincere approval—was propounded, with such ability and talent and force by the present Government, we heard the party whose chief organ is the *Toronto Globe* cry treason, and try to make the people believe that if they adopted a policy of protection it would tend to our complete separation from the Mother Country. Well, we know that it had not that effect—that it will not have that effect; and I contend that the principle involved in the resolution of the hon. member for West Durham will not have that effect either. The hon. Prime Minister said that he was born a British subject, and that he hoped to die a British subject. I have no doubt that he will die a British subject, although I hope he will still live many long years, for the advantage of the country, and to see the benefits of the policy which he has helped to inaugurate. He said that in presenting that resolution, the hon. member for West Durham had an afterthought. I shall not defend the hon. member for West Durham, who is able to speak for himself; but I can say that my hon. friends the members for Laval and for Montreal East and myself have no afterthought; we go for the motion for what it contains only. I believe, Mr. Speaker, there is no danger of separation from the Mother Country, unless it be by the fault of England herself or by the fault of her statesmen. Some years ago, when Lord Lisgar was Governor General of this country, he tried to make us understand—and I suppose he was the mouthpiece of the then Government of England—that the Mother Country would be satisfied to let us go. Well, if the Mother Country has statesmen who do not wish Canada to be united closely to the Mother Country, it is not our fault; and I contend that those who seek for greater commercial liberties for Canada are just as loyal and attached to the Mother Country as those who believe differently. I should be very sorry, Mr. Speaker, if in the next general election, should I have the strength and health to solicit again the suffrages of my constituents, not to be among the supporters of the present Government; but it will be no fault of mine if I am not. They know, and the House knows, that I have been a firm and sincere supporter of that Government since I have been a member of this House; but apart from this particular question, upon which I am afraid the Government anticipate too

much, and try by the voice of the hon. Minister of Public Works to carry us too far, and to make us pronounce upon a question which is not now, and ought not to be, before the public—the question of complete independence—if apart from that question, I cannot be counted as one of the supporters of the Government, I will be very sorry, and as I have just said, it will not be my fault. I approve of the intelligent, patriotic policy of that Government, and I still trust to be able to continue to support them, although on this particular question of commercial treaties, it is my misfortune not to be able to be convinced by the arguments they have advanced.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no man in Canada, Sir, who holds party obligations stronger than I do, and no one in Canada who would sooner reject party obligations than lift a hand or a finger, by motion or otherwise, to disturb the relations that exist between Britain and her Colonies; and although something very like threats may be used occasionally in order to compel an argument that is otherwise devoid of force to be presented to some persons' minds in a forcible way, we must look at the facts in the case, and consider for ourselves whether the policy propounded by my hon. friend from Durham is one that would have a tendency in the direction I have indicated. I have lived long enough, Sir, in Canada, to know that it has been the policy of the Tory party, almost from the beginning of our history, whenever a movement was made tending to expand the liberties of the people, to cry out that there was danger of the connection with Great Britain. I have found from the earliest period of our parliamentary history that this has been the case; and I am surprised and pained to find that, at this advanced period of our history, leading statesmen in the country can still resort to that paltry policy. I listened, Sir, to-day, with the greatest possible care, to every word that fell from the hon. leader of the Government in his somewhat impetuous declamatory reply to the member for Durham. I can only say he failed entirely to convince me that there was the slightest danger of what he pretended to fear. The hon. gentleman usually makes a much better appearance in argument than he did to-day. What position are we in? The Minister of Public Works spoke with great contempt of the number of our population, our paltry four or five millions, and asked were they to be compared with the interests of the Dominion? Why, I believe, on the other hand that everything that extends the liberties of Canadians, everything that accords to Canada and her statesmen greater breadth of view in the management of their own affairs is more likely to conduce to the advancement of Imperial interests and greatness than any curbing policy that keeps us down to the grindstone. It has been the policy of English statesmen who have had the management of our affairs from the first to consider colonists as inferior to themselves. I can recall the words even of such men as Lord Grey, Lord Russell and of Lord Metcalfe, everyone of whom had placed on record their belief that full responsible Government was not well suited to colonists, and I have read the despatches of Lord Russell and Lord Glenelg to the Governor General frequently warning him not to extend the principle of responsible Government to Canadians further than so far as might be consistent with the maintenance of the colonial relation. I believe we are really as capable of managing our own political affairs as the House of Commons in England. Some years ago when visiting England, I happened one day to be in the company of a leading statesman. He asked me in reference to a bill that had been passed through our legislature, if I thought it was just to a certain interest. I told him I thought it was. He enquired, did I not think there were interests involved. I replied, No; but if there are, we have provided means whereby they can be brought before and dealt with