

upon the improbability of a large trade with Australia and indicated that we could increase our trade with the United States by simply throwing down the wall, while he had just expressed dissatisfaction at finding that so large a proportion of our increased trade was with the United States. The hon. gentleman made a statement with regard to the condition of business in the United States, with which I think very few hon. members will agree. The hon. gentleman accounted, amidst the cheers of his friends, for the extraordinary depression in the United States by declaring that it was due altogether to protection. I should like to know by what public man in the United States, on either side of politics, that statement is endorsed. On the one side we see, banded together in a determination to change the tariff laws of the country, a set of men who say that relief is due to the masses of the people from undue protection, and, scorning the idea of free trade, struggling hand in hand and shoulder to shoulder, month after month, for the enactment of a tariff two or three stories higher than any tariff Canada ever had. We see the halls of Congress filled to overflowing with deputations from every part of the great Union protesting against the reduction of the tariff, even to that extent, and we hear of delegates from the various industries and from the workmen of that country swarming in the lobbies and halls of the Capitol at Washington, outnumbering the members of Congress two to one, and we learn that the walls and pavements ring with the sounds of the wheels bringing in petitions against a measure of that kind. We know that the industries of that country are paralyzed, not because there had been protection there, but because there is an effort to reduce that protection. I must pass on to make a few observations—and they will be but few, because the subject-matter may come up again and I hope will be discussed by some of my colleagues, perhaps this evening—with regard to what the hon. gentleman said as to the award at Paris and its effect upon this country. The hon. member, unwittingly, I am sure, represented me as having come home in a state of jubilation and triumph and brag after the sittings of the tribunal at Paris. If the hon. gentleman understood that, Sir, from anything I said in public, I should like him to read it to this House. If he understood it from any interview I gave to any representative of the press, he profoundly misunderstood my meaning and my expression. When I came back to this country, I found the subject but little understood, with a feeling of alarm prevalent as to the severity of the regulations which had been adopted. I made the statement, in the only press interviews which I remember to have given, that I thought Canadians had reason to be satisfied with the result, but I made the statement at the same time that

I had dissented from the regulations which had been adopted, because I thought them, in some respects, too severe, and, in some respects, inadequate for the purpose for which they were framed. Therefore, Sir, there was no deception on my part, there could be no reasonable misconception, no supposition on the part of the public that I was rejoicing or bragging over the result. But the view which I took of the affair, Sir, was this: That we had been brought before an international tribunal, not for the purpose of seeing what additional concession could be made to Canada, there was nothing for Canada to gain in the matter, but there was an opportunity for her to be completely shorn, at the instance of the United States, of rights which we believed she possessed, and which she had exercised for a number of years. It was satisfactory to me, above all things, that Canada had been proved to be right in the contentions which had been put forward on her behalf,—it was a matter of profound satisfaction to me, and I thought it would be to my fellow-countrymen, to learn that, while Canada had taken a position which induced the United States to seize her vessels, to imprison her seamen and send them in custody to remote shores, in escaping from which some of them met their death, these wrongs had been put a stop to, and that our rights denied in that way had been upheld by the tribunal to which an appeal for justice had been made. It was a matter of profound satisfaction to me, and I believed it would be to my countrymen, that, after we had brought this great Empire to the very verge of war, it had been proved that we were far within our rights, and that the blame of the quarrel was not upon us, but upon the other side. Now, my attitude and position with regard to the regulations was this: I believed that the regulations which I favoured in the conference of the arbitrators would have been more effectual for the preservation of seal life, and would have been somewhat less severe upon our own seal fishermen. I entertain that opinion still, but it was not for me to expect that my individual opinions upon this subject were to prevail over all others. And, Sir, I think first of all we should look to the fact that the questions referred to the tribunal, the principal questions to be decided there, were by no means the suitability of the regulations, but the questions of right. The hon. member has stated that if we look into the history of the subject we shall find that the real bone of contention was as to the right to restrict pelagic sealing. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the contention of the United States, but it was precisely that contention which was overthrown in the proceedings of that tribunal; and why the hon. gentleman should present here the United States side of this question and not the Canadian side, I should be at a loss to understand if I had not seen parallels to it in previous debates in this