

ment, because the illustrious individual at the head of this Government has put it plainly in his despatch, that we know and feel it is a one-sided arrangement. But it was worth while making this concession for the great purpose I have mentioned, and I am sure any man in this House, who will rise above party, above mere party feeling, and who desires to have extended negotiations with the United States, desires to have free fish, free fishing and a free interchange of products, so far as the two nations can agree—every man will feel that the Government have been acting prudently, wisely and in the interests of the country—that they have taken the proper time, at the proper moment, and just when there was a chance of succeeding. There was no chance of succeeding before, under the late Government, as I have explained. We have now some chance of succeeding, and is it not worth while to make this paltry concession, by which nobody suffers, because I have no hesitation in saying that the fishermen do not suffer, for if they did they would have complained for the last twelve years that the Americans fished in our waters. If we put our fleet on there, we might keep the Americans out, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will defend our fishing rights on our coasts if these negotiations fail. But it is worth while to suspend those strict rights when we have such a great prospect of succeeding. The hon. gentleman alludes to the 30th clause. The American Government have simply decided not to continue that privilege, and it will, of course, affect one or two places in Ontario. It was granted in a spirit of kindness more than anything else, in the Washington Treaty, and they have come to the conclusion that it shall come to an end. We cannot help that, and it would be unworthy to cry about it. They will not yield upon that point. The Americans think that there ought not to have been, originally, such a concession made by the Washington Treaty. They think it hurts their trade, and it certainly does affect their coasting laws which are very rigid and stringent, and I think very unjust. If we could coax them to give up their coasting laws, we would do so, but they have refused. This provision was inserted in the treaty to oblige certain interests, and, I may say, inserted on the strong personal pressure of myself, though the Americans saw that there was no gain by it. They have chosen to close that arrangement, and no remonstrances of ours will help it, although it interrupts the trade of some one or two lines on our upper waters, and it is unfortunate in that respect. Then, as to Newfoundland, I believe it is not necessary to enter into a long discussion of that subject. In Newfoundland they have behaved as you see—we have no right to speak so as to stir up any feeling—but they have behaved, I will say, in an eccentric manner. We have told them, as the House knows, that the House has already put duties on fish coming into our market, and Newfoundland fish among the rest. They have duties on our articles, but they say we should not put duties on theirs, because, although they put duties on ours, the trade from Canada to Newfoundland is very large, while the shipments from Newfoundland to Canada are very small. They say they cannot afford to give up their Customs revenue, and therefore they hope you will not reciprocate with regard to those duties. The hon. gentleman has discoursed about the deputation that came from Montreal. Well, I met that deputation and spoke to them, and the spokesman of that deputation was one of the strongest opponents the Government happen to have in that illustrious city. But there are certain shipments made to St. John's, Newfoundland, from Montreal. Vessels had arrived there with large cargoes, and all would have had to come back at considerable loss. And our statement to Newfoundland was just this: if we suspend it for a moment, it will have the effect of preventing these people from losing a great sum of money; but if we do that, you will have to send a commissioner to deal with that subject,

and if they do not deal with it satisfactorily, we will impose the duties strictly and sternly. We were merely giving a sprat to catch a mackerel; those two or three cargoes can go through without loss to our Canadian people, but you must send a commissioner, in order to come to such arrangements, or we will enforce the law. That is simply the case of the Government, and I appeal to the common sense and patriotism of both sides if, under my explanation—hampered, as it is, by my inability to bring down the whole correspondence—I say I shall be disappointed if both sides of the House do not say that whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Government elsewhere, they have acted, not only with earnestness and speed, but with considerable diplomatic skill, in bringing the matter into the position in which it now stands.

Mr. MILLS. Before the resolution is put, I wish to make a few observations on the question before the House. The First Minister says that he expected the confidence of the Opposition, as upon this question he prided himself on his great skill and success in conducting the negotiations and the correspondence which has taken place with regard to the matter. Well, it does not seem to me that the correspondence indicates any great skill or industry, or any remarkable judgment on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, in dealing with this question. We find from the correspondence that the intention of the American Government was brought immediately under the attention of the Administration. We find that Mr. Fry introduced, in the Senate of the United States, a resolution, with a view of repealing certain articles in the Washington Treaty, as early as the 10th January, 1883; and that immediately after, on the 16th January, the English Ambassador at Washington enclosed a copy of that resolution to the administrator of the Canadian Government. After the resolution was adopted a copy was sent to the Governor General of Canada, and the Governor General communicated with the Secretary of the Colonies, informing him of the despatch and its enclosure, which he had received from the English Ambassador at Washington. Lord Derby called the attention of the Canadian Government to the subject, and asked for an early communication; and it will be observed that the American Minister in England noticed the fact that the Earl of Granville had made no suggestion with reference to the subject of the fisheries and the abrogation of those articles of the Treaty of Washington; and the reason the Earl of Granville took no steps towards a renewal of the negotiations is clear from his communication to the Governor General of Canada. He was anxious to be fully informed of the intentions and views of the Canadian Government on this subject, before any negotiations were opened with the American Government. The reason the American Government proposed the abrogation of those particular articles was sufficiently indicated by Mr. Rice's speech. Mr. Rice is the chairman of the committee on foreign relations; as such he, to some extent, occupies the position of Minister of Foreign Affairs; the views which he expressed are to be taken as the views of the committee, and he there indicated his opinion that the fisheries of Canada were not worth to the United States the amount they were called upon to pay under the settlement of the Halifax commission, and notice was given for the termination of those treaty provisions, with the view of getting rid of the settlement effected by the Halifax commission, and opening the whole subject again. Now, the hon. Minister says that the views expressed by Mr. Rice are of no consequence. I think they are of very great consequence; they show us the motive which impelled the committee on foreign relations to bring this matter before Congress, and the motive which actuated Congress in deciding for an abrogation of these particular provisions of the treaty. There can be no doubt, then, that the Canadian Government were