

have dinned into the ears of the Americans until some of them have been foolish enough to believe it, that the Liberal party were alone willing to make a fair and friendly settlement of the questions between the two countries. I say that this is not, in my judgment, the way to succeed in a diplomatic struggle, such as the hon. gentleman has been engaged in. Mr. Mills, the present Minister of Justice, said :

We should feel entirely satisfied that, before the treaty was ratified, we did not make a mistake, and that by one fell swoop we should not destroy the hopes and blast the prospects of this country.

And, holding up the treaty in his hand, he said :

Here was the hole through which America would get possession of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that our Mills ?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Our Mills—the present Minister of Justice. And this was how he spoke of the Treaty of Washington of 1871, and there is not a man in Canada to-day but would hold up both hands to have it enacted or to have had it remain in perpetuity as a settlement of the questions between the United States and Canada. That measure was received by the Liberal party with denunciation, though they now arrogate to themselves the credit for bringing about a renewal of friendly relations. When was there a rupture, with the Conservative party in power, of the friendly relation between the United States and Canada ? Mr. Mills continued :

He had not much confidence, judging by several previous treaties, in the ability of British statesmen, and the Oregon territory dispute would prevent him placing much reliance in the moderation and justice of American statesmen.

So much for the evidence I give as to the statement made by the right hon. gentleman, that it was necessary to bring the Liberal party into power in order to get fair and reasonable arrangements made with this country. Does the right hon. gentleman think I have not answered completely his statement and shown that, if there has been a strong attitude of hostility ever taken on the floor of Parliament toward the United States, it was taken when the Conservative Government were making a fair, friendly and excellent arrangement with the United States, and that arrangement was being denounced as a base surrender of the rights and interests of the people of Canada ?

Well, Sir, what happened then ? Why, Sir, we have the right hon. gentleman himself, notwithstanding all these fierce denunciations of the United States by his Liberal friends, by the leaders whom he followed, no sooner clothed with power than he rushes into the arms of a Chicago reporter, and unbosoms himself of the statement, that what he wants to do to prove his affection to the United States is to adopt this very treaty

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

that had been denounced in unmeasured terms by his friends and colleagues. But I will give the hon. gentleman's own words to prove what he said. I won't say, after the gentle hint that the Speaker has been good enough to give me, that it was untrue, but perhaps he will allow me to say it was inaccurate—I will prove from the mouth of the right hon. gentleman himself that his statement was inaccurate. On July 1st, 1897, at a dinner given in London, the right hon. gentleman says :

I am sorry to say that there are still too many causes of friction remaining between Great Britain and the United States. When I say that the people and the Government of England were not blameless—

He was referring to the civil war, and on that I altogether differ with him.

—yet for all the troubles—

Mark this. This is the language of the same gentleman who says now that the Liberal party are the only party to whom the United States can look for fair and friendly arrangements. He says :

—yet for all the troubles which have arisen since the civil war, the blame, in my estimation, rests not with England, but with the United States.

There I am giving the very best evidence of the inaccuracy of the statement made by the right hon. gentleman. But there is another question. I am asked by the organ of the Liberal party if there are not two Tupperts. They are good enough to remind me of the statements which I made in this House when I was asking this House to accept the treaty of 1888, negotiated at Washington. Now, what was that treaty ? That was not a treaty in which we were at the feet of the United States asking for arrangements. That treaty grew out of a proposal made by Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State for the United States, to myself, proposing that we should meet and discuss the question as to whether the Atlantic fisheries difficulty could not be disposed of. At that time, as the House knows, the relations between the United States of America and of Canada were in as serious and unpleasant a position as it was possible to imagine. Congress had passed a unanimous resolution, and the President had ratified it, authorizing a declaration of non-intercourse with Canada ; and there was not a paper on the Republican or the Democratic side of politics in the whole of the United States, so far as I am aware, that was not denouncing Canada from day to day for the most inhuman and unfriendly treatment of the fishermen of the United States. There was, however, no foundation for those denunciations, because the Government of the United States had itself abrogated the treaty of 1871, and we were then thrown back upon the treaty of 1818, which was then brought into operation, and