

present occasion on this question, as we shall have an opportunity of discussing it more at length on a future occasion; but I ask again if we can expend a million under Governor General's warrants for the public service, what need of calling this House together at all? Is it anything but a farce to summon this Parliament from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to come together here in midsummer, to be told that they are brought here for the purpose of voting supplies, when all that is necessary is for the Government to obtain the signature of the Governor General to a warrant to furnish them with any amount of money for the public supplies that they may require? I have said already that I do not intend to press that matter further at the present moment, but I may say that this speech is rather remarkable for what is not in it than for what is in it. The hon. gentleman is unwilling to take the House into his confidence. He is very reticent indeed. He intends to take seven or eight months to ascertain what his policy is, to find out what he proposes to do and submit to Parliament.

I wish the hon. gentleman had been equally reticent and cautious in submitting his policy to a foreign country. I have spent many years on the floor of this House, but I confess I have never, on any occasion felt the unbounded amazement that I did when the hon. the First Minister declared in this House that the report read by my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Haggart), from the Toronto "Globe," was an authentic statement. In my judgment, it would have been better for the hon. gentleman to have taken his colleagues into his confidence. But no doubt he must have done so. I suppose he must have had their authority before he propounded the foreign policy of Canada in relation to a foreign country, and confided it to a newspaper of a foreign country. I believe, Sir, you would search the records of statesmanship in any country in vain to find any parallel for an act so utterly unjustifiable. Why, just imagine, the hon. gentleman is here, he has brought the Parliament of Canada together from one end of the Dominion to the other, and he tells us that he has nothing to say to us. All I want, he says, is money. He has no confidence to give us, he has no policy to propound or submit. Although he has had eighteen years on this side of the House to formulate a policy and arrive at an opinion of what is in the interests of this country, he has not a word to say to the assembled Parliament of his country as to what policy he proposes to pursue on any single question touching the interests of this great country. But what do we find in this interview? Why, I can only describe it—and I do not wish to use too strong a term—as an act of unmitigated folly. I cannot imagine in the interests of Canada any course which the First Minister of Can-

ada could pursue which is more calculated to defeat the very objects he himself has in view than to take into his confidence the reporter of an American newspaper, and make known to the world the policy of Canada through such a channel. Does not every one know that in diplomacy it is of the utmost importance to proceed cautiously? Does not every one know that in diplomacy you must follow in the most tactful and diplomatic manner, the views and sentiments of the parties with whom you are about to negotiate, and that to wear your heart on your sleeve and state to the seventy million people across the border what you propose to ask them to do, and under what great necessity you are to obtain what you ask, is simply to give your whole case away. If the hon. gentleman had sought how best to defeat any object he had in view with regard to questions of that kind, he could not have taken a more effective means of accomplishing his purpose. But I have a graver objection than that to make. I hold that it is in the last degree unpatriotic on the part of any Canadian to commit himself to the statement to which the hon. gentleman did commit himself regarding a great party in this country. The hon. gentleman has charged the Liberal-Conservative party with being hostile to the United States of America. He declares that the Liberal-Conservative party, which has been in power for the last eighteen years, has not treated the people of the United States in a proper and neighbourly manner. Why, Sir, the statement would be bad enough if it were true, but it is not true. I state most unhesitatingly that every historical fact which bears upon the question proves that there is not a tittle of foundation for this statement. Sir, the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada have, for the last eighteen years, on every occasion, done all that men could do, and all that a Government could do, to show the people of the United States that they were anxious to live upon the most neighbourly and friendly terms possible with the people of that country. I am aware that the hon. gentleman had the good fortune to obtain the support of the whole press of the United States in the late contest. I will not say that he obtained any other support, but, so far as the press of the United States is concerned, the hon. gentleman was able, by one means or another, to indoctrinate the people of that country with the impression that the Liberal party of Canada was more friendly to them than the Liberal-Conservative party, and that the American people were more likely to obtain the accomplishment of their own hopes and wishes from the Liberal party than from the Liberal-Conservative party. Not only is that not the case, not only have the Liberal-Conservative party, on every occasion, shown the utmost desire to maintain the most friendly possible relations with the United States,