

vessels of the United States may enter the harbors of Canada. There are other purposes that have grown up since for which they might fairly be allowed to enter without doing any injury to our fishermen, without in any way affecting them as competitors in the markets of the world. One of those is the occasional taking on board persons as mariners. In some cases where mariners were sick, where parties were disposed to leave the fishing vessels, where arrangements had been made for taking others on board, they were not allowed to ship seamen in ports of Nova Scotia, and the vessels were obliged to return to American ports and those who had engaged as fishermen or mariners on those vessels were compelled to take rail and go to some port in the United States before they could go on board and enter American service. The vessels that made complaint on this score were *William Keene*, *Pleiades* and *Margaret S. Smith*. Then there was a third class, such as the case of the *Neponset*. She was a schooner from Boston. On 27th August, 1886, she was anchored in Port Hawkesbury, Cape Breton, and immediately reported at the custom house. Being short of provisions her master asked the collector for permission to buy more food, but he was twice refused. He then expressed his intention of seeing the United States' consul at Port Hood three miles away. The custom house officer forbade his landing at that port to see the consul; but he did so in spite of the prohibition of the custom house officer. He saw the consul, and was informed that if he attempted to buy provisions in all probability his vessel would be seized. He asked permission, as he was sick, to return to his own country; that was refused, and he travelled through the woods to a station where he boarded a train in order that he might, contrary to the customs and police regulations of Canada in those matters, return to his own country for medical assistance. It is almost impossible to read these statements without feelings of indignation. It is a discredit to any Government to deal with fishermen of a neighboring country in so harsh and so cruel a way as those parties were dealt with under the vexatious regulations made. We know what the consequence has been. It has been, as the Minister of Finance has said, the union of 60,000,000 of people against this country. What is the testimony of the Minister of Finance on this subject? His hon. friends adopted their National Policy nine years ago. It has had nine years' operation on land, and it has been tried two years at sea, and we know the result. We have the testimony of the hon. gentleman himself. The hon. gentleman, in this discussion, said:

"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 political parties, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 60,000,000 lying to the South of us."

How was it those people were so united, irrespective of party, against this country? How was it that the two Houses of Congress, the press of the United States, the people of the United States entertained such feelings of hostility to this country? It was in consequence of the regulations those hon. gentlemen made and which they attempted to enforce. It was intended to force the United States to come to terms, it was attempted to deal otherwise than on principles of common sense with those who controlled the Government of the neighboring Republic. The Minister of Finance has changed his position. He was at one time hostile to the present policy, and that not long ago. The Finance Minister perhaps had as much as any hon. gentleman opposite to do with the framing of the policy that has resulted in these disasters. Since the hon. gentleman visited Washington his opinions have undergone a change, and he has come back entertaining views much more in accord with those of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

than we have for a long time heard expressed by those occupying the Treasury benches. We remember that a few years ago the Finance Minister declared himself a free trader. He told us he was not a one-sided free trader. He declared that in order to bring about free trade we must do the people of the United States the credit of imitating them, we must adopt their policy. We know that Sir Francis Hincks when he held the position occupied by the hon. gentleman, came down one afternoon with a certain policy set out in his Budget speech, and, at eight o'clock, after being subjected to the pressure of the hon. gentleman, receded from that position and adopted a policy quite different. The hon. gentleman approved it and defended it in this House. It was adopted; it continued twelve months and then met its death at the hands of its friends. The hon. gentleman at that time said: "Why, you see the very moment we propose to put a duty on coal the Congress of the United States removed their duty; you see what an extraordinary effect can be produced by imitating the United States in their fiscal regulations." It happened as was pointed out, that this action of the United States Congress was prior, in point of time, to the action of the Dominion Parliament, and could not, therefore, have been influenced by their actions, but although that was explained at the time it did not prevent the hon. gentleman from pursuing this argument. The hon. gentleman's visit to Washington has had a remarkably sobering effect, it has worked wonders in his political sentiments. He has come back entertaining wholly different views of the situation from those he entertained twelve months ago. The hon. gentleman, twelve months ago, was confident that if the United States adopted a non-intercourse Bill, if they carried out the policy to that effect, it would not, after all, do us great harm. It is true he deprecated the policy, but he told us some extraordinary advantages that we would derive if such a policy were adopted. I will read what the hon. gentleman said, so that it cannot be alleged that I have misrepresented him:

"Deeply as we would deplore so mad, so unjustifiable an act on the part of a great country like this great Republic of the United States, adopting such a barbarous policy as that of non-intercourse with a friendly power, we stand in the proud position of knowing that if that policy were adopted to-morrow, we have perfected our lines of communication, and have the most complete means of communication from the furthest and most remote section of our country down to the sea. As I said before this cloud, this only cloud has a silver lining. I would deeply deplore it; every member of the House, and every intelligent Canadian would deeply deplore any interruption of the commercial relations which exist between this country and the United States, but I cannot forget that, if the policy of non-intercourse were adopted, it would lead to the development of those channels of communication between ourselves, and that the commerce of Canada which to-day is building up New York—I am speaking of the through traffic—which to-day is building up Boston and Portland, would be carried through exclusively Canadian channels to Canadian ports, and would build up Montreal, Quebec, St. Andrews, St. John and Halifax with a rapidity which the people of this country can scarcely understand."

Now, Sir, I do not know whether the Grand Trunk Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canada Southern Railway would quite agree with the views of the hon. gentleman. I do not know what the traffic of those roads would in a large degree consist of if the policy of non-intercourse had been carried out. I do not know what traffic would have reached those cities of which the hon. gentleman speaks if there were to be no traffic from the United States passing through Canada. But, Sir, I am not going to stop to discuss that question, because it is only remotely connected with the subject in hand. The hon. gentleman went on to say that:

"That policy [referring to this policy of threatened retaliation] has only to be carried a very short step further to lead Her Majesty's Government to the conclusion that they would owe it to Canada and to themselves, as being the power under which Canada is happy to serve to meet that policy of non-intercourse by such a different mode of treating the grain from the United States of America and the grain grown in Canada, as would vivify the industries of this country, especially the farming industries of this country, to an extent which would make the most marvellous change of this Dominion."