

inion. He follows, as has been already observed by the mover of the resolution, in the footsteps of some distinguished men. Lord Dufferin, Lord Lorne and Lord Landsdowne were men who stood amongst the first in the House of Peers in England, and they have continued, and will continue, I have no doubt, to show their appreciation of the Canadian people. One of them—it is due to him to recall his name—Lord Lorne, loses no opportunity to advert in favorable terms to Canada at the various meetings which take place from time to time where colonial interests are discussed. I am quite sure that His Excellency will follow those illustrious men's footsteps, and I am quite sure, from his association with us up to this time, that five years hence we will be all prepared to say that his career as Governor General of Canada was a great success.

Now, coming to the next part of the Address, which expresses regret that the Fisheries Treaty was not ratified by the Senate of the United States, to those gentlemen who are familiar with the debate which took place in this Chamber last year the rejection of that treaty was no surprise. I intimated in the remarks that I gave to this Chamber while the treaty was then under discussion at Washington that I did not think it at all likely to pass there, and I gave my reasons for it at great length. Subsequent events have confirmed the soundness of those views. The reasons I need not now refer to, but they were numerous, and hon. gentlemen who took an interest in that question will remember what they were.

It was not altogether due to its being on the eve of a great political crisis, because I am sorry to say now that the great political crisis has passed and gone another treaty, of very great importance to the two countries, has been rejected by the United States Senate by a majority of 34 to 15, not by any means a party vote. It is deeply to be regretted that there is that evidence of bitter feeling towards—I will not say Canada, because in regard to the later treaty it was more manifested against the mother country, because of the policy adopted towards one part of the Empire.

The next paragraph, I think, is an unfortunate one to be found in the Speech of His Excellency. It is a declaration on the part of Canada that she will maintain the

rights prescribed by the convention of 1818. When I saw that, I read it with very great regret. I think it is to be deplored that we should, in those defiant words, throw down the gauntlet to the United States, and say that we are going back to the barbarous treaty of 1818. We will not go back to it, and therefore it is unfortunate to put that paragraph in the Speech. Neither this Government, nor any other Government, would be sustained by the Imperial authorities in attempting to enforce the letter of that treaty. The condition of things has been so completely changed in the intervening period that it would be folly and madness to go back to that treaty; and as we do not intend to go back to it, and I am quite sure will not go back to it and enforce it to the letter, as is intended to be conveyed in this paragraph, it is unfortunate that the statement should be made there. It is, to say the least of it, not diplomatic. I should much rather the course which I suggested last year should be taken—that is, when they rejected the treaty at Washington we should continue to enforce the treaty that was made, from our own standpoint. There was nothing conceded on the other side but the question of delimitation. I should have liked that treaty better if it had been a larger treaty. I criticized it from the standpoint of gentlemen who alleged that we had got something from the United States. I saw nothing that they had given us, but still I should have been willing to accept a larger treaty than the one we adopted. It is worth while going back to that treaty. If gentlemen would look at the protocol, which is known as the *modus vivendi*, they will see that Sir Charles Tupper, Sir, now Lord Sackville West, and Mr. Chamberlain, advised that the irritation that the old treaty had naturally given rise to should be avoided, and that was the motive which prompted them to adopt the *modus vivendi*. Now it appears that this is to be abandoned. I should regret it, and I think the whole country will share my regret. It would be a great mistake on the part of any Administration to pursue such a policy. With regard to those paragraphs in which measures are promised affecting our commercial interests—relating to bills of exchange, cheques and bills of lading—we shall no doubt be glad to consider them. I am