

into a very perilous predicament; it is equally clear that in 1847 we escaped from the peril by the skin of our teeth, almost from a mere accident, what the hon. Minister of Justice says to the contrary notwithstanding; and I take issue with him entirely as to the manner in which he spoke of the intervention of Mr. Erastus Wiman. I know perhaps not all that the Minister knows, but I know a good deal of what took place on that occasion, and I say that Mr. Erastus Wiman rendered an important service to Canada, and that the hon. gentleman has no right to attempt to underrate or belittle the services that gentleman rendered, or the language that was used by Sir Charles Tupper in recognition of them; and I am very sure that if Sir Charles Tupper were on the floor of this House to-day, he would not endorse the statement just made by the hon. Minister of Justice. I should like to know if the hon. gentleman will say, if they are at liberty to say it, that they have no unofficial communication with Mr. Erastus Wiman at this hour.

Mr. MITCHELL. They are not bound to criminate themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps not; and as this matter is being discussed on strictly legal and technical grounds I will not press that question. Now I say, knowing these things, knowing the relations in which we stood, knowing the narrow escape we had, seeing, as we do, that the Government appear to have forgotten the lessons which were taught them, seeing that they do not appear (although I am willing to hope that they are coming to a better mood under pressure) at any rate until very recently, to have at all appreciated the danger they escaped, it would be an act of criminal folly on our part if we were to allow this Session to pass without putting ourselves, at any rate, right before the country, and pointing out the proper policy which, in the interest of Canada, should be pursued. I desire to say for my own part that although I have not pretended to any technical or minute acquaintance with the subject of the fisheries, which I had very limited opportunity of mastering in detail, I say that I myself hold the wisdom of the former course taken by the Government to be most dubious. Probably enough they were legally and technically correct; I do not dispute that, but what I do say is that, on the other hand, the Americans were perfectly right in pointing out that the whole conditions were changed. You cannot ignore this. If we touched the American frontier only at the one point where our fisheries exist, if we had nothing to say to them in other matters, we might then consider this question wholly apart, we might put entirely out of view all the communications which the Americans have granted us across our frontier, through their territory, in a great variety of ways. But I say we cannot do that, and so the whole position has to be dealt with. We must face the question that we are concerned with the Americans in five hundred different ways besides the mere question of the fisheries. I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman into the question as to how far it may or may not be consistent with the preservation of our treaties to accord to Americans the right to transshipment in bond or the right to purchase bait or allow them certain privileges as to entrance to our harbors. If I understood the hon. gentleman's position it amounted to this: that it was almost impossible to grant the Americans the privileges they desire without great peril to our inshore fisheries; but I find that, in the treaty of 1888, we have agreed to concede to the Americans for a comparatively small sum of money those identical privileges, if they chose to take out a license under the *modus vivendi*, which in the despatches he alleges with considerable show of reason, perhaps, could not be granted without great peril to the preservation of our fisheries. That I understood to be the hon. gentleman's position, that I understand to be the result of the treaty. If I am mistaken in this, I would be

glad to be corrected. That I understood the hon. gentleman to have repeated before and to have repeated to-night. Now, we are all prepared to protect our territorial limits to the best of our ability; we are all prepared to protect our inshore fisheries within those limits that properly belong to us. In all other respects, looking at the whole situation, bearing in mind the peril which has been incurred by the policy which the hon. gentleman has persisted in carrying out; looking at the enormous importance of the interests which have sprung up between Canada and the United States, especially within the last twenty or thirty years; looking at the use we make of their soil and territories and the privilege of transshipping—taking these into consideration, we say the time has come for a broad and liberal policy in every respect in dealing with the United States. But if we choose to stand on our strict legal rights, how are we or the British Government either to blame the United States if they elect to stand on their extreme legal rights, with great injury to both. There is not the slightest doubt, if the United States chose to put in force their Non-Intercourse Bill, they will injure as many Americans as Canadians, but that would not make our position anything better but rather much the worse. If hon. gentlemen do not do that, what we have to look forward to is this: we will have a repetition of the sorry farce which was played out in 1887. First, we will see a policy (or at least there was great danger of seeing a policy pursued) which will lead to much ill-blood between ourselves and the United States. Then things would have grown serious, then there would have been danger of collision, then England would have stepped in as she did before, and some English commissioner, or another Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, would have been sent to take the Canadian Minister by the ear and administer a double dose of humble pie. Canada would have been degraded and humiliated. We would have been forced in the long run to make all the concessions which we now propose to make freely and voluntarily, with this result; that we would get no thanks at all. Such is the certain issue, and no one knows it better than the right hon. gentleman, because it is a game that hon. gentleman has played before to his own profit, though not the profit of the people of Canada. Yet knowing that, the hon. gentleman will persist in playing this dangerous game. It seems to be absurd for the hon. gentleman and his friends to talk as if they really and sincerely desired to aid in cultivating friendly relations with the people of the United States. They must be judged by their acts. Was it to show their extreme friendliness to the people of the United States that, a year ago, they attempted to repudiate their own statutory offer to admit certain articles free if the United States did the same? Was it to give the United States a better opinion of the good faith and honor of Canada that, after Sir Charles Tupper had practically taken his colleagues by the throat and compelled them to undo their own work and eat their own words on the floor of this House—was it for the purpose of inspiring the Americans with a high idea of the honor and faith of the Government of Canada, that the Minister of Customs, backed by the Government, resorted to that most petty and contemptible evasion of the plain terms of the meaning of the statutory Act, when he imposed, not a duty on the fruit, but a duty on the packages in which the fruit was conveyed. What am I to say of the desire to promote good relations which lead to the insane folly of hon. gentlemen opposite in the matter of the export duty on logs? But the other day, as if of express purpose to challenge the ill-will of the United States, they increased the duty on saw logs, running the risk of disturbing a trade that is counted by tens of millions. They know they will have to abandon this absurd impost; and I venture again to say that long before this House rises, we will find that what they did then they will be