

has stated to us when he spoke the other day when he said: That when we appear at a commission or a convention or a public assembly of any kind our weight and our influence is measured by the power that is behind us, and I sitting at that commission in Washington as the representative of the greatest Empire in the world, felt that my statements and words carried with them a weight which I could not have assumed nor could have carried had I been simply a representative of Canada. Perhaps in some cases the hon. gentleman might be right. It is an advantage when we appear in a representative character to have power and influence behind us, to have a moral and material weight that can carry out our wishes or that can enforce our wishes with power if it is necessary, or with that moral weight which it is always desirable to have. But, Sir, when that moral power and that moral weight is simply a name, as it has been for forty years past, then, Sir, I think it is of little use to a man sent to represent the interests of a country like Canada, and it is not a fact to be proud of. That is the position which I assume, and before I sit down I think I will satisfy my hon. friend, and the gentlemen who sit beside him, as well as the gentlemen on this side of the House, that I am right. In making that statement I am making a statement which the records of the last forty years will sustain; and, Sir, when I come to that part of my speech, or rather my explanation, because I will not call it a speech, I will ask the forbearance of this House if I have to delay for some time, perhaps it may be too long, in reading authorities with regard to the statement I am making that the record of the last forty years has been a British desertion of the interests of her brightest and greatest colony. My hon. friend devoted a great part of his time to laudation of the gentlemen with whom he was associated. With that I will not pretend to find much fault, but I will say this with relation to Mr. Chamberlain, of whom the hon. gentleman said: No man in England could have been selected more fit to represent England and to secure the interests of Canada at Washington than the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain. That Mr. Chamberlain is an able and a clever man no one will deny. That he occupies a prominent position in the political life of England is true, that he may have rendered services to the country of his birth and of his occupation is also true, but, Sir, when he was selected

to come out and to represent Canadian interests—or rather nominally English interests, but practically Canadian interests—at Washington, I differ with my hon. friend when he says that the selection was a good one, and that no more fitting man could have been selected to occupy that position. Sir, surely Mr. Chamberlain showed before he left England that he wanted and lacked that discretion which a statesman should possess. At a public meeting, shortly before he left England, he boasted of the position he was going to occupy and said that he was going out and that he would conclude a treaty, and he particularly referred to the Canadian claims which had been made and which could not and ought not to be sustained. Sir, what would you think of a juryman going on a jury to try a man for his life, who told us before he went on that jury that he knew the man was guilty. Suppose you appointed a person as arbitrator, what would you think of a man stating before he went on there that he was going to give a verdict against you. That is the position of Mr. Chamberlain. But there is another objection to Mr. Chamberlain and I think it is a subject of regret, because of it, that he was appointed. We know, Sir, that there is a very powerful section of the British Empire who have a great cause of grievance against the Government of that country. We know in Ireland where the people have been striving and struggling, whether rightly or wrongly—I believe rightly myself whatever difference of opinion there may be about that—I say rightly or wrongly they have been struggling for privileges which have been denied them, and Mr. Chamberlain has been one of those men who have taken a strong part against the national aspirations of the Irish people. Sir, when we look at the United States and find the composite character of its population, when we find the large number of seven or eight millions, if not more, of Irishmen and their descendants who are in that country and wherever Irishmen are you find them occupying prominent positions in the executive of the country, in the legislative halls and in the administration of the public affairs. Will anyone tell me if we desire to get that treaty passed—if it is a desirable treaty to pass—that the fact that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was appointed to come out to endeavor to secure the treaty was calculated to recommend him to that important and influential class of people in America who have something to say about the passage of this treaty before