

has been saying anything so absurd as that.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT said that as far as differential duties in favor of England were concerned, there could be no possible objection, but he had drawn the inference, from what his honorable friend had said, that Canada should be entitled to pass a law for the imposition of differential duties as against England.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said the honorable gentleman must have misunderstood him if he thought he was in favor of differential duties against Great Britain. What he wished to be understood as advocating was that when the United States were imposing heavy duties on everything that passed from Canada into that country, in order to meet them, it was wrong that we should have to impose the same duties on British and Colonial goods as on goods coming from the United States into Canada. It was to bring about a remedy to this, so that we could impose differential duties against the United States favorable to the Mother Country and sister Colonies, that he had called attention to the sub-section in relation to differential duties in the Instructions.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said he thought it was unfortunate that the honorable Secretary of State had, on rising to address the House, indulged in such uncalled for observations as he had made, and lecture honorable gentlemen on giving expression to their opinions. The Secretary of State should be the last man in the Senate to question any member's accuracy. During the ten years he (Mr. M.) had been a member of this House, he had always been careful of his statements, and seldom had had them contradicted, and he did not think the Hon. Secretary of State could say the same of himself. He had said that differential duties was not specifically dealt with, although there might be a passing reference to it in the correspondence.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—In the first instance, the honorable gentleman had stated he read the correspondence cursorily, and he did not notice it, and I said, as I read it, the question of differential duties was included in the ninth clause.

Hon. Mr. MILLER said the honorable Secretary of State, in direct contradiction to the honorable gentleman, stated the Minister of Justice was charged with no particular instructions on that question, showing that the Government attached no particular importance to it. Before passing from this question he wished to make an observation with respect to the manner in which the honorable Secretary of State had alluded to

the honorable Minister of Justice. In an extraordinary manner he had told this House the Minister of Justice stood so high in the country, that anything he said or did was not to be questioned. Did any one ever hear such language before in this House, and that regarding a Minister of a Reform Cabinet? It would not do to talk about responsible Government after that assertion. If that was not high Toryism in its very worst aspect, he did not know what responsible Government was. Did anybody ever hear of such a doctrine, that because a Minister of the Crown says so and so it was not to be disputed. He would tell the honorable gentleman no matter how high the position of the Minister of Justice, or how great his abilities, which no one would admit more readily than he did, it was a preposterous position to take in this House to say that the Minister of Justice should not be contradicted. He hoped the honorable Secretary of State would mend his manner of reference in the future. He was not here to defend the conduct of the late Government with reference to the Washington Treaty. There were honorable gentlemen present who were well able to do that if there was anything said on the opposite side of the House that required it; but he was prepared to sustain his position that the present Government were largely to blame for the delay of the arbitration and the settlement of the fisheries question. If that settlement was unsatisfactory, it would be in consequence of the public utterances of the Prime Minister, of Senator Brown's visit to Washington, and the statements of the *Globe* newspaper. These three sources had endeavored to belittle the value of the award due to this Dominion under the arbitration provided for by the treaty, and such a policy was of incalculable damage to our interests by depreciating our rights before the world, thereby preventing our claims from receiving that consideration to which they were entitled. The honorable gentleman assumed that the Government had made a great mistake in giving up the fisheries before the settlement of the damages. Coming from Nova Scotia, which was, perhaps, more interested in the fisheries than the whole of the rest of the Dominion, their exports being something like seven or eight millions of dollars annually, and living among the people who pursued that branch of industry, he was in a position to tell the honorable gentleman that the Maritime Provinces would have looked upon it as an egregious blunder if the course which he talked of had been pursued. If that policy had been