

can say "go, and he goeth; do this and he doeth it." The hon. gentleman to-night would rather be a door-keeper in the house of his lord than dwell in the tents of independence. Just imagine the difference between a motion in favour of the independence of Canada and a motion asking that a servant be appointed in the office of the British Minister at Washington to represent Canada! When the hon. member asks me what we propose by this amending resolution, I tell him we propose to see just what kind of a representative we can have at Washington to act in concert with Her Majesty's representative there, and clothed with sufficient powers by Her Majesty's Government. We have had suggested in this debate every kind of officer known in diplomatic usage. We have had an *attaché* proposed, and we on this side of the House have submitted that it is unwise to commit ourselves to that proposition. While, as the hon. member for Bothwell says, it is for Great Britain to say whether she shall be represented at Washington by one Minister or two; I think Great Britain would tell us it was unknown to diplomatic usage that she would be represented by servant and master too. It would be unwise to commit ourselves to the appointment of an officer who would be an inferior, and might be bound by reason of the confidential nature of his relation to his master, and therefore not in a position to report to us at all. A commercial agent was suggested, but that seemed unsatisfactory, as implying that he is only to attend to matters of commerce. A consular agent was also suggested, but it was admitted on all sides that such an officer as we desire should have greater powers than are given by diplomatic usage to officers of that class; and it is for the purpose of avoiding any expression which would limit the powers of this officer and narrow our expression of opinion by a name that we desire that the House should not be committed to any particular terms describing him; but that we should ask Her Majesty's permission to have a representative, with the right of introduction to and communication with the Government of the United States, and the right to speak for us, subordinate, of course, to the Minister there. Canada desires all these powers, and probably would not be satisfied with anything less if the country sends a representative there at all. That is why we propose a resolution in amendment in these general terms which will include the lesser terms; and hon. gentlemen opposite will surely not be unwilling to accept a resolution, which involves the less and involves something greater too. We want our officer to have the powers of access, and of speech, and of reporting to us whenever he deems necessary. But we were told by the Opposition when I last addressed the House that this was a matter of arrangement between this Government and the Government of Great Britain; and it is precisely to make such an arrangement, for large powers of that character, untrammelled by any designation of that particular officer, that we desire the resolution passed in these particular terms. With regard to the hon. gentleman's observations as to the falling off in the policy we propose to-night from that of dictating a fiscal arrangement for the whole Empire, I have to say this, and it is only a casual remark with reference to something which does not enter into the debate, that we are not afraid whenever Canada is affected by the fiscal policy of the Empire,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

to ask Parliament to speak upon it, and we do not care if, in so doing, we shall be accused of suggesting a policy for the Empire at large. We will stand by Canadian interests no matter when or where, or how widely they involve the interests of the Empire at large. We speak with the more confidence because we believe that we speak to those who will listen to any representation from us with regard to matters affecting the interests of Canada.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). As Spain did.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In what instance?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In denouncing the treaty.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. She did what appeared to be in her own interests, and we propose to do precisely the same; and when we seek to address Her Majesty's Government upon a question which affects the interests of Canada, we expect to hear from the other side the taunt that we are dictating the policy of the Empire, but we do not intend to be prevented from speaking freely for that reason. It is because we desire this freedom of speech that we desire that our representative at Washington, of whatever class Her Majesty's Government may make him, shall have free speech, full right to report to us, and access, both to the British Minister and the Government of the country to which he goes, more or less accredited; and it is because we fear that this may be trammelled and prevented by any restrictive terms in the resolution, that we propose this amendment, looking to representations at Washington or wherever our interests may be affected, and looking to the fullest representation consistent with the relations which ought to exist between Canada and the mother country. It is unnecessary, surely, that I should answer the hon. gentleman's observations as to what those relations ought to be. They ought to be precisely what they are now for the present at least; and for the future, whatever the development of this country may be, they ought to be of the most cordial character that can be devised to interlace the two countries together.

Mr. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition said he paused after this amendment was proposed, to hear what I had to say with regard to it, suggesting that possibly the House might like to hear what my views on the subject were. My only object in bringing this matter before the House was to draw its attention and that of the country, and more especially the attention of the Imperial Government to the position which Canada occupies in relation to the United States, to the very great interests that are at stake between this Dominion and the United States, and to the importance that we should have representation in some form or another at the capital of that country; and, not having heard the amendment before, not knowing what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries desired to move, I desired to fully understand its purport and its object before I committed myself either in opposition to or in support of it. Now it has been explained by the leader of the House that the object of the Government in making this amendment is to widen instead of to narrow the resolution which I had the honour to propose. I stated that I was not wedded either to the language of this resolution, although