

Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman threatened the Government of the United States and the people of the United States not merely with a retaliatory policy on the part of Canada but with a retaliatory policy on the part of the United Kingdom. Was the hon. gentleman authorised to make that threat? Had he any communication from the Government of Lord Salisbury intimating to him that if the United States adopted a policy of non-intercourse—a policy of discrimination such as they here shadowed out they would adopt—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman will read the passage that preceded that which he has read, he will see it does not stand in the light he has placed it at all. I gave my reason.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, he gave his reason but he told the House and the country that if the United States adopted such a policy that the Government of the United Kingdom would retaliate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I did not, and the hon. gentleman will see I did not when he reads the whole passage.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read enough to show—

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. You garbled the passage in such a way as to make it say what I did not say.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman has said what is not a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I have read what I have here. If the hon. gentleman sends out and gets the *Hansard* I am ready to read it. I say that neither the beginning, the end, nor the middle nor any other part of the speech can alter the statement he has made here and I would like to know whether His Excellency the Governor General received any communication from the other side of the water in reference to this matter. I would like to know on what authority the hon. gentleman threatened the great Republic to the South with the indignation and wrath of the Government of the United Kingdom. The hon. gentleman was fond of using high sounding phrases and he may have thought after his return from the United Kingdom that he had something to do with the Government of that great country as well as with the Government of Canada. I will venture to say that the hon. gentleman had no authority to make that statement. I venture to say he had no authority to hold out such a hope or to make such a threat. We know the views the hon. gentleman has expressed in that passage are views as foreign as any well can be to those held by any political man of standing on either side of politics in the United Kingdom. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman has told us the consequence of the policy that he and his colleagues have pursued. What did he find the state of things at Washington? He said in this debate:

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a Non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press—Republican and Democratic—of the States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people numbering 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

That is the statement of the case as it now stands, and I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast what he said twelve months ago with what he said here last week. I ask the hon. gentleman to contrast the policy he shadowed out twelve months ago with the policy he is supporting to-day. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on his progress. I congratulate him on the progress which he has forced his chief and those associated with him to make in connection with that question. Sir, the Minister of Finance last year professed to stand by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; to-day, Sir, in that paragraph which I have read the hon. gentleman stands by neither of his colleagues, but he stands by Mr. Phelps. Mr. Phelps

said the policy of Canada in reference to her fishery and custom house regulations was barbarous, harsh, inhospitable, contrary to common law, contrary to common justice, and that it produced such a state of irritation on the other side that however anxious the President and his colleagues might be to carry out negotiations with Canada, the state of exasperation was such that it was quite impossible such negotiations could be successfully entered into. That was the exasperation produced twelve months ago by the course pursued by the Government. What does the Finance Minister now say on this question? Let me read the observations which the hon. gentleman made in his speech. He says:

"But what would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States loaded with mackerel or fish of any other description were driven by stress of weather and perhaps in a sinking condition compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if instead of allowing her to tranship her cargo or sell it on paying duty and go to a marine yard for repairs: We said no, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada under the Treaty of 1818?"

That, Sir, is the question put by the hon. gentleman. I ask whether any hon. gentleman on this side of the House has pronounced a more severe censure on the colleagues of the Minister of Finance than the hon. gentleman has himself pronounced. This is the very thing that was complained of in the case of the *Eliza A. Thomas*. The Minister of Marine justifies himself by saying: Such are the provisions of the Treaty of 1818, and the Minister of Finance justifies the provisions made in the treaty that is submitted to us for consideration by saying: That those are fair and proper provisions and that to have acted on different principles would have been harsh and ungenerous and would be contrary to the principle of natural justice. Sir, it did not require a treaty to enable the people of this country to act on the principle of natural justice. We did not require to bind ourselves by a formal document that we might act on the principles of humanity and common sense. We did not require to bind ourselves by a treaty to say to the American people that if a vessel is wrecked on our shores, her cargo may be saved, her fish may be put on board another ship or on board a railway car and sent to the neighboring Republic. That was possible without a treaty quite as well as with a treaty, and it was in consequence of the inhuman and the impotent regulations made by the hon. gentlemen opposite that this state of things was brought about. Sir, there is this very extraordinary thing connected with those negotiations. Article 10 of the treaty provides that the fishermen of the United States may enter our harbors, that they may do so under certain conditions to tranship their fish, that they may do so to purchase certain supplies that they may do so without reporting every time if it were half a dozen times a day to the customs. And what did the Minister of Justice say in defence of these strict regulations in the memorandum which he prepared? Why, Sir, he said this:

"It is impossible to enforce the fishery laws for the protection of our fisheries without a strict enforcement of these customs regulations."

That is what the hon. gentleman said last year. The hon. Minister of Finance in this treaty says it is not necessary. He says these concessions may be safely made. He says it is possible to protect our fisheries efficiently, and prevent them being poached upon by the fishermen of the United States without any of those strict regulations which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for their protection. Well, Sir, who is right; the Minister of Justice in his memorandum, or the Minister of Finance in article 10 of the treaty? Now, Sir, I am inclined to think that the strict regulations were not so necessary as the Minister of Justice supposed. I am inclined to think that the Government had other objects in view than the protection of those regulations. The Government, find-