

the Senate? Sir, my impression is that Mr. Chamberlain made a mistake in his utterances, and my impression is that the British Government made a mistake on the part of Canada in selecting Mr. Chamberlain for the position. Perhaps I might have said nothing about that were it not that my hon. friend, with a generous desire to speak friendly of the men with whom he has been associated, felt it necessary to give Mr. Chamberlain an amount of laudation and credit to which I have grave doubts about his being entitled. That is my justification for referring to him; and had the hon. gentleman not brought before this House Mr. Chamberlain's public services, his great ability, and his fitness for the position, and praised the Government who selected him, I should not have felt it necessary to refer to him in the way I have done. With regard to Sir Sackville West, I believe him to be a very respectable man. He also came in for a considerable degree of praise and laudation from the hon. gentleman. We know that in his association with other men, the great talents and abilities of our friend the hon. Minister of Finance command attention and respect. We know that Sir Sackville West is and has been all his life an employee in the diplomatic service of the British Government, and we know that his object is to serve the British Government. Serve Canada! What cares Sir Sackville West for Canada? What cares Mr. Joseph Chamberlain for Canada? What they desire to secure is the commendation of England and the English Government. That is the thing they have aimed at, and that is the thing they have obtained by this treaty, and it is the only thing. Sir, my hon. friend, in his speech of Tuesday last, gave an historical account of the fishery question for the past one hundred years. He pointed out what the arrangements were under the Treaty of 1783; then he came to the Treaty of Ghent; then he came to the convention of 1818; and he went on to tell us that the British Government had for the last forty years abandoned the view they had entertained as to the construction of the convention of 1818 for the previous forty years. The hon. gentleman noticed me shaking my head when he made that statement, because I knew it was not true. I do not mean to impute wilful misstatements to the hon. gentleman. I would be sorry to do that, and if anything I say would seem to have that bearing, I know he will believe that I

would not desire in the least to doubt his word, or suppose that he would make a statement to this House which he knew to be incorrect. But, Sir, I have been identified with this fishery question. Seven years of my life I spent in working it up. When I took it in hand the British Government was about to desert us; and for seven years my efforts were directed to trying to keep those men on the other side of the water, in the British Foreign Office and in the Colonial Office, up to their work, and preventing them from sacrificing and deserting Canada. Sir, I am making bold statements, but I will prove them before I sit down. The hon. gentleman next referred to the Treaty of 1854, effected by Lord Elgin, and he pointed out the great advantages which we had derived from that treaty, and I entirely agree with him. I believe that that treaty was the first entering wedge of free commercial intercourse between Canada and the United States. During the twelve years that that treaty lasted, to 1866, more real commercial progress and prosperity were developed in Canada, more farming industries were created, more mechanical employments were given to our people, than they had at any period up to that time. Sir, it was a matter of regret, not alone to the people of one section of this country—for we were then a number of isolated Provinces—Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, with separate Governments, Quebec and Ontario as old Canada united—but every province sharing in the benefits of that treaty, regretted its abrogation at the instance of the American Government. Sir, the hon. gentleman stated rightly that efforts were made by the several Governments to bring about a renewal of that treaty. Their efforts failed, I am sorry to say. Neither one party nor the other of the political parties in this country was to blame for that failure. It arose from the fact, as the hon. gentleman rightly stated, that an unfounded prejudice existed, whether rightly or wrongly, based on the belief that we had favored the southern portion of the United States in the internecine struggle which had been carried on in that country for six or seven years. Whether we did or not may be a matter of opinion, but my hon. friend's statement was correct, I have no doubt, that a very large portion of the people of this country sympathised with the North, because for one man who was found in the Southern army, six or seven or eight