

friend and his former colleagues had the direction of public affairs, I know right well that my hon. friend does not expect me to claim any credit for this, but I am perfectly sure that if my hon. friend were in my place and the condition of things had improved so much for the better, that, however disposed he may be to thank Providence in his heart, he would in his utterances be disposed to take a very considerable portion of the credit to himself. My hon. friend, therefore, ought not to be surprised that the government does claim, to some extent at all events, the merit of having contributed as far as governments can, to the change which has taken place for the better. There is another thing which my hon. friend will not be disposed to dispute, and that is that there is abroad in this country to-day a spirit of self-reliance, a disposition on the part of the population to rely upon their own exertions and their own energies and to look less to others for the prosperity which they trust lies before them, than in any other period of the history of this country.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Why do you not lower the tariff?

Hon. Mr. MILLS—My hon. friend asks why do we not lower the tariff. What has that to do with this question?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Self-reliance.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—The people are exhibiting self reliance, and the tariff, I may say to my hon. friend, will be lowered, though I do not think my hon. friend will be pleased to see it lowered, because my hon. friend wants a grievance. He wants something of which to complain. He wants to direct his criticisms against the administration, and that opportunity would not be afforded him if the Government moved faster than they are moving at the present time. Therefore, my hon. friend would be in greater distress than he has known since he has been in Parliament, because the principal ground of his complaint would be taken away. Let me say this: that not only does the country exhibit great self reliance by the energies that the population are putting forth, by the enterprises in which they are engaging, by the objects in which they are investing their capital in order to create fortunes for themselves, but there is also growing up

between Canada and the parent State a stronger feeling of unity, a stronger desire to become one and indivisible than existed in former periods of the history of this country.

Hon. Mr. ALLAN—Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—The Dominion of Canada, perhaps, is something like a boy growing up to manhood? He in time takes an interest in the fortunes of his father. He learns that he may contribute something towards the increase of that fortune and he desires to become a partner, not merely governing the local territory of which he is in charge, but sharing in those larger enterprises and those international enterprises in which, if he grows, he will have a permanent interest. An so to that extent he will be disposed to cast, in a larger degree, his fortunes with the old gentleman than he was inclined to do before; and so there is a disposition on the part of the people of this country to say "we have a great regard to our father John Bull and we wish permanently to unite our fortunes with his." My hon. friend has also adversely criticised the government with regard to a number of matters. He has spoken of the negotiations with the United States and has asked—not with a great deal of persistency, and I am obliged to him for it—information with regard to those negotiations. My hon. friend knows there were a number of questions of difference that had arisen between this country and the United States. There were questions of difference with regard to their rights in our Atlantic waters in respect to the fisheries. There were differences arising from the unrestrained destruction of fish in the inland fisheries on the borders of the two countries, creating dissatisfaction with us, because we were making regulations for the preservation of the fish, while before the eyes of our fishermen destruction was going on without restraint upon the United States side of the boundary. Then there were differences with regard to pelagic sealing which had been arranged to some extent by the convention of Paris, and which had been settled in the main in favour of our contention, but they were maintaining that from the manner in which pelagic sealing was being carried on, even under the Paris regulations, the herd of seals in the Pribylof Islands was being destroyed, and it was necessary that some convention should be