

cannon's mouth. The United States took advantage of the condition of Great Britain in the war with Napoleon, and made war on Canada from 1812 to 1815. This treaty came after Great Britain was free from the complications which had existed in Europe—free to impose terms on the United States which she did. As hon. gentlemen know, the United States fishermen are allowed to enter Canadian ports only for four purposes, for shelter, for wood, for water, and for repairs. Modifications have been made of our own motion by license from time to time, and of course that treaty has not always been enforced because it was held in abeyance during the years from 1850 to 1866. Also for a time while the fisheries clauses of the Washington treaty were in force, but at other times it has been enforced by Canada, not perhaps to the hilt, not to the full extent, because there has been a tendency rather to modify than to avail ourselves of the extreme rights conferred upon this country under that treaty. Perhaps I have spoken longer than I intended. There is very much more that might be said in answer to my hon. friend, I have no doubt that some of those gentlemen who listened to him will remind him of incidents in the history of the Conservative party which perhaps were not any more creditable than those which occurred in London.

Hon. Mr. McMULLEN—I fully expected that some hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would have thought it worth while to at least make some reply to the speech that has been delivered by the leader of the Senate. He has fairly well answered a number of the points that were presented by the leader of the opposition, and certainly we should give some extended consideration to the contents of the speech from the Throne. We are here for that purpose, and it is our duty to criticise as well as to command. I shall endeavour to give some little attention to the address that was delivered by the leader of the opposition. In the first place we can all agree upon one point—that is we rejoice unitedly upon the prosperity of the country. As true-hearted Canadians, whether we are Grits or Tories, we must certainly rejoice at the prosperous condition of things generally throughout this country. I am

Hon. Mr. SCOTT.

quite prepared to admit that Canada is not exceptional in this, because we know that prosperity prevails in other countries as well as in our own. We are glad to know that, but we are glad also to know that when prosperity does prevail we reap a fair share of it and that our country is progressing rapidly. Years ago if any person had spoken of a city such as Rossland or Cobalt in any of those places that are rapidly growing to be populous centres, he would virtually have been laughed at. Nobody every thought that in those rocky romantic districts, removed such a distance from civilization, we would have within a few years the very desirable development that has taken place. We rejoice to see it and hope earnestly that it will continue. We rejoice to know that an increased amount of valuable minerals is taken out of our mines every year, and by and by we hope to be able in that industry to compete with our neighbours to the south. We know how they have enriched their country by the development of their mining industry. In connection with this matter I regret to think that almost the entire output of our mines is exported to the United States. I should like to see smelters established in Canada and a large refinery for the development of our mineral wealth. I hope the day is not far distant when we will possess something of that kind. Last year we exported to the United States over \$28,000,000 worth of minerals in their raw state. Labour is expended upon those minerals in refining them, and in that way our neighbours make the product of our mines of greater value than the price paid for them. No doubt they yield a very large increase in value by the amount expended upon them for labour. I should like to see refineries established here in order that our ores may be smelted and our metals coined in Canada.

A good deal was said by the leader of the opposition on the subject of the tariff. I am glad to know that there is not such a vast difference between us all on that question. Years ago, when the Mackenzie government were in power, we had a tariff for revenue which was prudently and carefully administered. After the change of government, we had an excessive dose of protection. I do not say that protection,