

facts should have lent himself to such a statement :

Some years ago, when considerable friction had been created by the North Atlantic fishery troubles, I took an opportunity to say that the question should be adjusted in a friendly manner, becoming an enlightened and friendly people, by the simple process to give and take, and I do not see now why an arrangement should not be made.

Why, Sir, does the hon. gentleman not know that long after 1871 the present distinguished ambassador in London, Mr. Bayard, addressed a letter to myself couched in the most friendly terms and intimating that he thought the time had arrived when we might deal satisfactorily with the Atlantic Fishery trouble. And what happened ? This happened—that the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Sir Lionel Sackville-West, now Lord Sackville, and myself were appointed plenipotentiaries by Her Majesty to negotiate the Treaty of Washington of 1888. The hon. gentleman knows that when the United States terminated the treaty of 1871—again by their own motion and in opposition to the desire of everybody in Canada that it should be continued—we had no alternative but to fall back upon the treaty of 1818. He knows also that, having been accustomed under the treaty of 1854 and under the treaty of 1871 to frequent our waters, great irritation was caused among the fishermen of the United States, and that the press of the United States, both Republican and Democratic teemed with abuse of Canada for the unfriendly course pursued by our Government for the protection of our undoubted rights under the treaty of 1818. The plenipotentiaries sat down around a table and discussed this question for three months, with the result that we reached a treaty which practically conceded every point of practice that Canada had pursued in regard to the United States. It was signed by the plenipotentiaries of both countries, and it was sent to the Senate by President Cleveland with the declaration that it was a fair and honourable settlement of the question and should be accepted by the Senate. And the hon. gentleman knows that the reason the treaty was not accepted was because the Republican party were in a position to prevent any settlement being reached, because it required a two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify the treaty. Now, Sir, that it is not all. When this treaty was passed the British plenipotentiaries submitted for the consideration of the representatives of the United States a *modus vivendi* to go into operation pending ratification of the treaty. Under that *modus vivendi* means were provided by which the American fishermen could at once enjoy to a large extent the advantages which the treaty afforded upon the payment of a tonnage fee. That *modus vivendi* is in operation to-day, and not only that, Sir, but President Cleve-

land publicly tendered his hearty thanks to the British Commissioners for submitting it, and his Republican successor, President Harrison, included in his inaugural address to Congress a statement of the fact that under that *modus vivendi* all friction had been removed between the two countries. Is that an indication of unfriendly action ? Here is an action of the Government of Canada outside the treaty which has virtually settled all that irritation on account of the Atlantic fisheries, and has received the hearty commendation of the Presidents of both the great parties in the United States, both of Mr. Cleveland and his successor ; but to read this, one would suppose that the only man in Canada who had ever taken any interest in removing this irritation, was the hon. the First Minister. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, knows that from 1888, from the time that treaty was signed by the plenipotentiaries of the two countries, and under that *modus vivendi*, down to this hour, there has never been a complaint on the part of the Government of the United States against Canada for anything in relation to that question. I think before the hon. gentleman opens his heart to a reporter of the press of a foreign country in a way that he will not do to Parliament, he should take the trouble to learn a little more of this question. Now, Sir, there is another question of considerable magnitude and one which, after the commission had reported, I suppose might be brought under the notice of the Parliament and people of Canada. Not so, Sir ; before any decision is reached on the part of any Canadian commission, or any joint commission, the hon. gentleman confides his policy to the press of a foreign country, and expresses his readiness to engage in the deepening of our canals to the extent of 21 feet. Why, Sir, it is enough to take away one's breath to find this economic Government prepared to undertake an expense, no person knows whether it will be fifty millions or one hundred millions, probably much nearer the latter sum, as our portion of it. But that is not all. He proposes not only to rush into this wild expenditure without any authority of Parliament, or any consultation in his own country, but he makes a proposal that the canals of Canada, that the great waterway of the St. Lawrence, to which the people of Canada attach the most vital importance, and upon which the life or death of Canada may some day depend—he proposes to confide that enormous waterway that nature has placed in the hands of Canada, to the joint control of this country and seventy millions of people in the United States of America. It is enough to take one's breath away to find the First Minister rushing into a declaration of policy of this kind, which is calculated, in my judgment, to create a great deal of difficulty by arousing hopes that may never be realized. But supposing that was his policy, there is no way by which he could