

diplomacy that can be named which is as near the border-line of belligerency as that of prohibiting intercourse and communication between the people of two countries.

Proclaim non-intercourse between father and son, families, friends, merchants, traders, railroad officers, between the United States and Canada, as a measure of retaliation because of injury done to the fisheries, or anything else, and how long can a position so strenuous, so dangerous, and so belligerent, be sustained? A greater power could not be put in the hands of Great Britain than merely to make a Proclamation in this country that the best means to prevent aggression on the fishing interests would be absolute non-intercourse, personal non-intercourse between the people of Canada and the United States. It could not be sustained for three months, perhaps not for three weeks, in the absence of actual hostilities.

He then proceeded to say that as far as the House of Representatives was concerned as claiming for themselves that they are the more immediate representatives of the people than the Senate, he denied it. They are not so in heart or in sentiment. They are not so in any other respect.

The Senate had done all that was necessary under the circumstances, and the Bill they had passed was sufficient, and gave sufficient power to the President. But the power which is demanded as the one supreme thing to be insisted upon is the power to proceed to the very last line of friendly action towards Great Britain, the power next to which only can come the loading of guns and the array of men under arms.

## No. 64.

*Sir L. West to the Marquis of Salisbury.*—(Received March 15.)

My Lord,

Washington, March 2, 1887.

WITH reference to my preceding despatch, I have the honour to inclose to your Lordship herewith copies of the Report of the House Conferees on the Retaliatory Bills, and of the Report of the debate thereupon.\*

It will be seen that the House maintains its attitude towards the Senate by refusing to accept the Bill of that body.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. SACKVILLE WEST.

## No. 65.

*Sir L. West to the Marquis of Salisbury.*—(Received March 16.)

My Lord,

Washington, March 3, 1887.

WITH reference to my despatch of the 2nd instant, I have the honour to inform your Lordship that the House of Representatives yesterday receded from their amendments to the Senate Retaliatory Bill by a vote of 149 to 134, and the Senate Bill was passed.

I have, &c.

(Signed) L. S. SACKVILLE WEST.

## No. 66.

*Sir J. Pouncefote to Sir R. Herbert.*

Sir,

Foreign Office, March 19, 1887.

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit to you, to be laid before Sir H. Holland, copies of despatches, as marked in the margin,† on the subject of the proposed Retaliatory Bills introduced into the United States' Legislative Chambers in connection with the North American Fisheries question.

I am to suggest that it may be advisable to ascertain the views of the Canadian Government as to the bearing of Article XXIX of the Treaty of Washington upon this subject.

I am, &c.

(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

\* Not printed.

† Nos. 59, 60, and 61.