

go home and brag, at any rate. Why did they not? If anything had been decided in their favour, they might well have done so. But I beg to assure the hon. gentleman again that he is mistaken in supposing that in anything I have said, there was any spirit of brag or boasting whatever. I professed satisfaction, for the reasons I have stated, and I have professed elsewhere great satisfaction at the upholding, in the most solemn way and before all the nations, of the doctrine for which we in this House have contended, for which we have contended in our correspondence with the Imperial Government, and for which no people in this country have so zealously contended as my hon. friend and those who sit beside him, namely, for the right of Canada to have a ruling voice in negotiations which affect her interests. I expressed a feeling of satisfaction that Her Majesty's Government had so fully recognized that right of Canada, of a great colony—and I suppose the same right would be conceded to any colony—that she had not only appointed one of the tribunal a Canadian Minister, but that she had given the conduct of the case to my colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and had furnished him, out of her zeal and good-will for the cause of Canada, with the ablest counsel that the bar of the mother country could furnish, to stand side by side in the struggle for our rights with one of the ablest Canadian counsel who could be brought there to present our case. I expressed satisfaction at this circumstance; but so far from indulging in any spirit of boasting on the subject, I say now once for all that nothing was further from my own view, and it would have been exceedingly ill-placed that I should have had any boasting or bragging as far as my part in the transaction was concerned. The part which I had to perform was not to fulfil the duties of a counsel or an advocate there, but to do my duty as well as I could to both the contending parties, to see that the rights of my country in so far as they could be put before a tribunal of that kind by one of its members were upheld by myself. But the great protection which Canada had was not in the circumstance that I was a member of the tribunal. It was, in the first place, in the conduct of the case by those who had the conduct of it at our bar, first amongst whom was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and it was in the high sense of justice which pervaded that tribunal and every member of it, whether he came from the United States or any of the other countries which were represented at that tribunal; and I merely enumerated in the interview, which seems to have given the leader of the Opposition the impression of a boasting spirit, the causes of the satisfaction which I felt, and which I undertook to express at the earliest possible opportunity after my arrival in Canada. I still think the award, taken on the whole, both on the ques-

tions of right and on the question of regulations, ought, under the circumstances, to be satisfactory to the people of Canada—not satisfactory in the sense that they cannot be improved, not in the sense that they are all one would desire, but that, under the circumstances prevailing at the time, under the great desire which was evinced by the United States for the preservation of the race, under the circumstances that the question had a great deal of novelty about it, and a great deal of obscurity, under all these circumstances of difficulty we have reason to be satisfied that this country has come so little harmed out of the contest. But when my hon. friend stated to the House what he believed to be the harm that was done, I venture to say to him that he has been entirely misinformed on that subject or I have been grossly misinformed. The hon. gentleman is under the impression that the sealing industry of Canada is a thing of the past, that the fishing schooners have been dismantled and offered for sale at auction. I am under the impression that to-night a larger fleet of Canadian sealers from British Columbia, as large a fleet at all events, as was ever engaged in the seal fishery, are out on the ocean in pursuit of the seal, and I think he will find that he has been misled by the bald statement which appeared in the press, that under a feeling of irritation at the regulations which had been enacted, owners of the fleet sought to obtain compensation from the Imperial Government to the extent of the value of all their vessels and equipments, in consequence of their claim which they then made that the sealing industry would not be as profitable as it had been in the past. An allusion was made, Sir, to the mission to Australia in terms which seemed to me to show once more a desire to be dissatisfied on the part of my hon. friend. I do not think there is anything extravagant or unreasonable in our sending the Minister of Trade and Commerce to visit our fellow-colonists in Australia for the purpose of seeing what increase of trade could be secured between the two countries. The hon. gentleman says we could have a greater trade than that by throwing down the tariff wall. He goes on the old fallacy, which we have had put forward in this country for ten years, that all we have to do is to pass a statute and we will have reciprocity with the United States. By all means, if the regulation of the trade with a foreign country is in the hands of this Parliament, let us pass a statute and have reciprocity right away; let us have the bill introduced on Monday. But if it be that there are two tariff walls, and while we let down our own we are simply letting in the products of another country to compete with our own, letting in the labourers of another country to do the work our labourers are doing here, and the products of another country to destroy the market for the products of our own