

confederation of Canada and the construction of a great inter-oceanic line of railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, has made Canada a nation and we might as well recognize the fact." Those measures which statesmen of the first rank in England treat as of the most vital importance to the mother country, never pass the lips of the right hon. gentleman, I believe, from the day he set his foot on the shores of Great Britain and France down to the time he left. What about the Treaty of Washington? Had we no national status when the Imperial Government sent as one of the joint High Commissioners to Washington Sir John Macdonald to deal with the fisheries question and to protect Canadian interests. And when it was provided that that treaty, which settled all those great questions between the United States and Great Britain at that time, could not come into effect except by the Parliament of Canada giving its ratification thereto, was there no national significance in that arrangement? The right hon. gentleman knows there was. I need not refer to the occasion on which I had the honour, as one of Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries, nominated by Canada, but representing Great Britain as fully as did the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain to visit Washington, where after three months we succeeded in negotiating a treaty that received the unanimous consent of the Parliament of Canada and was only defeated by a party vote in the Senate of the United States, but which treaty and the *modus vivendi* established under it had been the means of settling all questions touching the Atlantic fisheries in a satisfactory manner and so as to remove all friction. Had Canada no nationality when Her Majesty's Government, for the first time in the history of a colony in the Empire, decided to take a Canadian, a person nominated by Canada, and appoint him to the position of plenipotentiary representing Her Majesty's Government and charge him with the duty of negotiating a treaty between France and Canada? Was there no national characteristic in that act? The right hon. gentleman talked a good deal in Paris regarding improved trade relations, but I do not think he mentioned the fact that the Government which preceded the present Administration had negotiated with the present foreign Minister of Finance, M. Hanotaux, a brilliant and able statesman, commanding confidence not only in his own country but in other countries, and that a treaty was negotiated between that statesman and myself. I think I know why the right hon. gentleman did not refer to that treaty: it was because on that question, as on every other, so far as I am aware, he has been on both sides. He voted against it, and when his following was going the other way he changed his vote and supported it. That was Talleyrand's idea of diplomacy. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

Wilfrid Laurier) say to the position I occupied in Paris in 1893, when for the first time in the history of Canada, or in the history of any part of the British Empire outside the British Islands, a representative of Canada took his seat at a great International Conference on equal terms with the representatives of Russia and of Germany, and the representatives of the other twenty-four powers who joined in that conference? Was that, or was it not, a recognition of the national position of Canada? It was; and the hon. gentleman knows that compared with that, the denunciation of the Belgium and German treaties is utterly insignificant. Thus, at Brussels, at St. Petersburg, at Vienna, and in London, Canada was represented by a person named by the Government of Canada, and took his place on equal terms with the other representatives of other nations. What does the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) say to the international arbitration on the Behring Sea question in Paris, when on the nomination of the Government of Canada, Her Majesty's Government selected a Canadian to act as agent of the Imperial Government, and selected the late Sir John Thompson to sit alongside Judge Hannen as a representative of the British Government. Was not that a great international function? Were we a mere blotch on the map then? The hon. gentleman could not dare to have intimated any such thing to the statesmen whom he met in Paris, because they knew differently. It is a libel upon the fair name of Canada and the position she occupies to make such a bombastic speech as the Premier did in Montreal, wherein he said: We were a blotch on the map. It appears to the hon. gentleman that it was simply the denunciation of the treaties with Belgium and Germany that made Canada a nation. But the hon. gentleman must have forgotten a speech he made a few weeks before his visit to Montreal. Let me read it to see if he really did think that Canada was a mere blotch on the map. This speech was made on the 19th of June, and as the treaties were not denounced until the 30th of July, therefore Canada was still a blotch on the map. Sitting alongside of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at the Imperial Institute did the right hon. gentleman speak about Canada as he did at Montreal? Oh, no; he said then:

Sir, the colonies were born to become nations. In my own country, and perhaps also in England, it has been observed that Canada has a population which in some instances exceeds, in many other instances rivals the population of independent nations, and it has been said that perhaps the time might come when Canada might become a nation in itself. My answer to that is simply this:

You can imagine, Sir, and I can imagine, and I imagine with pride, the manner in which my right hon. friend would draw