

which had been suspended by the later treaty. In justice to Canadian rights we were compelled to seize their fishermen if they came into our waters and trespassed upon our fishing grounds. Well, at that time, as I say, the relations between the two countries were of the most unpleasant character, and Her Majesty's Government appointed three plenipotentiaries, of whom I had the honour to be one. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain was the leader of Her Majesty's representatives. We went to Washington, and after some two months of negotiations we succeeded in making a treaty, a treaty so favourable that the Parliament of Canada—although at the first blush hon. gentlemen opposite denounced it as very wrong and improper, as they always do anything that comes from the Conservative party—the House of Commons unanimously adopted it. That treaty was sent down by Mr. Cleveland to the Senate of the United States, with the declaration that it was a fair, honourable and just statement of the whole question, and he urged the Senate to adopt it. That treaty may be studied by any hon. gentleman in this House, and he will find that every single contention on the part of Canada as to our rights under the treaty of 1818, is conceded in it; and I will give better evidence, directly, than that as to its value. As we had great reason to doubt whether it would receive a two-thirds vote of the Senate, we followed that up by a *modus vivendi*, to go into operation pending the ratification of the treaty, or until by proclamation it was cancelled. That *modus vivendi* is in operation to-day; that *modus vivendi* is one that both President Cleveland had sanctioned, and that Mr. Harrison, who succeeded him as the Republican President, also declared in his inaugural address had caused all the friction to cease between the two nations. I did not hesitate to urge the adoption of that treaty upon the House of Commons, and was fortunate enough to obtain the unanimous sanction of this House to that treaty. But I say more. I put it to my right hon. friend again—he will perhaps say he is not in a position to answer me—but I say that I believe that he offered substantially the re-enactment of that treaty to the United States of America on the present occasion as a settlement of the Atlantic fisheries question. I have reasons for making this statement, because, as hon. gentlemen are aware, despite all efforts to maintain secrecy, a great deal will leak out, and it is impossible to prevent the press and certain parties from getting a good deal of this information.

Now, I come to the next step taken. My right hon. friend sent down to Washington the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to see if they could induce the United States to consider a reciprocal trade arrangement. Well, how did they come back? They

came back with the Dingley tariff, largely increasing the duties upon lumber, after the late Government had gone out of office, and with a more stringent alien labour law than existed before. I am not surprised that these gentlemen came back intensely disgusted with the reception they met with. Then, what was the next step in this drama? We then had the Minister of Finance coming to the front, and with a great shout of loyalty that was to echo and re-echo throughout the whole British Empire, he declared to this House, and to the people of Canada, that the Government of Canada had made up their minds, as the United States had given them the cold shoulder, and were not disposed to entertain any of their proposals—they had made up their minds to adopt the policy of giving a preference to British trade in their tariff. I won't go into all the history of that tariff, because it is too well known to require repetition. But we all know the very unfortunate blunders that the Minister of Finance and all his colleagues fell into on that occasion. Now, Sir, one of the very first elements of success in diplomacy is that the men who are negotiating with you should have some respect for you, that the people with whom you are called upon to negotiate these matters should believe that you know something of the subjects upon which you are talking. Well, when they found that the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister of Canada held up—and I explained before dinner that these gentlemen owed the National Policy to us, owed all the prosperity and progress that has taken place in Canada under their regime, to us who preceded them, more than that, I say they owe this loyalty cry to us, where would they have been if they could have carried out their policy of 1891? Would they have been in a position to pose as men determined to build up the British Empire if the Liberal-Conservative party of Canada had not been able to beat down their disloyal—I do not say intentionally disloyal—but I say their disloyal effort to break down British institutions in this country? What was that policy which the Liberal-Conservatives of Canada defeated at the polls? It was to adopt the tariff of the United States for Canada against the rest of the world, Britain included; it was that Canada should turn her back on England and discriminate against Great Britain. And when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) was asked: Suppose this involves discrimination against England, his answer was: We cannot help that, we are determined to have unrestricted reciprocity and free trade on this continent of North America, let England say or do what she likes. Sir, I stand here to-night to say that this loyalty cry of the Liberals which has stood them in good stead, and which has covered their breasts with decorations, was only available to them because we