

He ridiculed the idea of the American waters containing a certain kind of bait which was essentially necessary, but could not be obtained by Canadian fishermen unless the treaty was accepted. He was not sufficiently acquainted with the fisheries to deal with the subject critically, but the fishermen had obtained bait in the past, and he thought they could still purchase it in the market as any other article of commerce. He had read that the New Brunswick Legislature was unanimously opposed to the treaty, as its effect, if passed, would be the destruction of their fisheries to a great extent.

The hon. gentleman had called attention to what might have happened if there had been no Canadian representative on the Commission at Washington. He (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) could not see the difference between judgment going by default, and the hon. gentleman being present and allowing a wrong judgment to be entered on record. He protested against the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald), that it was asserted at Washington that rejection of a second treaty might result in war, as he considered that the statement was made more as a threat in order to secure the acceptance of the treaty. He thought that there was not the slightest danger of any trouble arising out of the questions at issue between Canada and the United States. He considered the statement of the hon. gentleman that if certain things had happened he would not have signed the treaty, and made him personally responsible to Canada.

With respect to reciprocity in commercial matters, the British Commissioners appeared to have yielded as soon as requested by the American Commissioners. He thought the free navigation of the St. Lawrence had taken a strong weapon out of the hands of Canada, as also the giving up of the fisheries and both without a consideration. Judging from the past, he had no confidence in the Commission to be appointed to value the fisheries. All knew the loss this country sustained through the ignorance or inability of those who were appointed by the English Government to negotiate our boundaries—how the half of New Brunswick was swept away and given to the State of Maine. He was now pointing out what he believed would be the inevitable result of the negotiations. It was always perfectly safe for the American Government to make demands. As the hon. gentleman opposite had said, their hearts were set on obtaining access to the St. Lawrence, and therefore he gave it away.

Well, they would set their hearts on something else within a year; they were constantly setting their hearts and their envious eyes on some portion of our territory, and if gentlemen like the hon. gentlemen opposite were to be Commissioners, he feared they would obtain what they wanted in regard to the so called compensation for the fisheries. He acknowledged freely that there was a large body of public men in the United States who would scorn to adopt the meanness of that class who had urged the consequential damages, and who would scorn to take advantage of any other country in the way. But they knew that to a great extent the mob governed public opinion in that country; they knew that the elections of the President exercised such an influence on public

opinion that the authorities sometimes could not afford to do what was right for fear it should result adversely to themselves and their party. If he was not mistaken a member of the Imperial Government stated in the House of Lords that this was one of the reasons why the Fenian claims could not be insisted on.

He recollected in the discussion before the hon. gentleman left for Washington, that he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) insisted that the Fenian claims could not be considered under the order of reference. The Minister of Finance then maintained that that order did cover the claims, yet now it seemed to be admitted that they were not covered.

Hon. Sir FRANCIS HINCKS: The British Commissioners contended that they were.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE denied that this had been contended for, or at any rate the contention was very mild, for the resolution at the close admitted that the claims were worth very little, by the British Commissioners stating that they would not further urge the settlement of the claims, especially as they were of a constructive and inferential character. If they were of a constructive character he did not think it did much credit to the hon. gentleman representing Canada who had so constructed them. (*Laughter.*)

The hon. gentleman had stated that the action of the House on the tariff last year had prevented him from impressing on the Americans what they ought to do in regard to reciprocity, calling it a "fatal vote." It was very gratifying to see that the Minister of Finance had accepted that reversal of his policy by the House, that the Government endorsed it, and passed it on to its next stage, and yet the leader of the Government now cast reflections on the House and his colleagues for the adoption of this policy. The hon. gentleman said that this caused the difficulty at Washington, whereas they knew that that vote passed on the 22nd of March, whereas the American Commissioners made the offer to allow certain articles to go in free on the 25th of March.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said they did not know anything of the kind.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE maintained that the papers showed the date.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said the papers only showed that the last of a series of meetings was held on the 25th of March whereas the other was made at an early meeting.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said the excuse made by the hon. gentlemen was set aside by the dates, and every one must see the small effect that the legislation would have on the minds of the people of the United States. He had pointed out at the time that it was folly to suppose that the imposition of a tax of \$200,000 upon American products would frighten 40,000,000