

United States should not be allowed, under any circumstances, if it could possibly be avoided with honour, to come to a bloody arbitrament; but I may be excused as a Canadian in thinking that if this was so very much for the general good of humanity, it is a little hard that the expense should be borne by us solely. Nevertheless, I am not going to deny that the conduct of the British Government on this last occasion was in some important respects a material improvement on their conduct in 1887; I am not going to deny that it is more gratifying to our national self-love, that it is, on the whole, a more decorous way of doing business that we should be allowed to appoint an arbitrator and counsel than that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain or any other British potentate should be sent over here to knock the heads of Canadian Ministers together and tell them that Canada should not be allowed to embroil England and the United States for the sake of a few cod-fish. My hon. friend, before recess, alluded wittily to a certain famous scene from a certain famous French comedy, where a certain courteous cook invited his poultry to come together to consider with what sauce they would prefer to be eaten. Sir, I am going to push the parallel a little further. We were treated, I admit on this occasion a little more courteously than this most courteous cook treated his poultry, because we were allowed to send over two of the poultry themselves to assist in the composition of the sauce wherewith they were to be cooked. Now, Sir, if we have lost everything else it is a source of unfeigned pleasure to see that these two animals have been returned to us at any rate safe and sound. The elder bird, I am bound to say, looks even sleeker and snugger and more sanctimonious than of yore; while as for his pretty companion, he has come back to us with a ribbon tied around his neck to inform us of what we know pretty well without any special information from him, how thoroughly and completely the anser canadensis was first plucked and then cooked by the arbitrators, and what an excellent vehicle arbitration sauce was for assisting in its consumption. Now, Sir, let me tell the hon. gentleman that there is a right and a wrong in this matter, there is a true policy and a foolish policy for Canada to pursue. Sir, the hon. gentlemen have got to learn, and Canada has got to learn, that to bluster and to brag is not the way to ensure a triumph over a nation like the United States. Now, I have been a member of an Administration which in its time had occasion to conduct an arbitration with the United States, and the hon. gentleman would have done well to take example by the manner in which the Mackenzie Administration conducted their arbitration with the people of the United States. Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that there was such a thing as a Halifax Award? Has he forgotten the genuine success which attended the efforts of the Canadian negotiators on that occasion? I am not disposed

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

to deny that we had great advantages. As I understand it, our case on that occasion was not so strong and not so unanswerable as the case which these hon. gentlemen had in the matter of the Behring Sea award. But, sir, we had great advantages, and perhaps it was not the least of these advantages that upon that occasion Canada had engaged the services of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Davies, P.E.I.); and I remember, unless I am gravely mistaken, that the United States, on that occasion, had engaged the services of the hon. the Minister of Justice. Now, the fact of the matter was that on the occasion of the Halifax award, Canada was represented by two trained and capable statesmen, by Sir Alexander Galt and Sir Albert Smith; Canada on the last occasion was represented by—well, comparisons are odious, Mr. Speaker, and besides that, I do really not wish to say anything harsh. Moreover, I am convinced that the hon. gentlemen probably did their best, and, after all, the fault did not lay with them, but with the persons who placed them in a position for which they were not especially fitted by training and capacity. However, in deference to the prejudices of the Minister of Justice, I will apply the test to which he will not object, the arithmetical test, and the result is that in the case of the Halifax award the people of Canada came out five million dollars to the good; while in the case of this award at Paris the people of Canada will pay their own costs. Now, there is a lesson to be learned from this, and I commend it to the serious consideration, not merely of the hon. gentlemen, but of every Canadian from one end of this Dominion to the other. The lesson I deduce is this, the utter uselessness—and I say it with emphasis, I say it with knowledge—the utter uselessness on the part of the people of Canada of relying on English intervention in any shape or form. When Canada, as in the case of the Halifax award, was allowed to settle her dispute with the United States in her own way without the interference of Englishmen, Canada for the only time in the history of English negotiations with the United States, came out a substantial gainer. Sir, what we require to-day is to have the right to settle our disputes with the United States after our own fashion. We require to have our own accredited agent at Washington responsible to us alone, and reporting to us; and had we had that advantage, I tell the hon. gentleman we could not possibly have fared worse than we did in this case, and with any kind of discretion we would have come out vastly the gainer. Now, I think the hon. gentleman would do well to consider the propriety of improving this occasion in order to carry out the suggestion I was making. It is time to have a little plain speaking with Great Britain on our part. Sir, if, in any given case, the Government of Great Britain will come to us frankly and honestly and say to us: Imperial interests require a surrender