

ermen of both on equal terms, and the markets for the fish of the two countries made equally free.

I may just in passing refer to that unfortunate mistake of my right hon. friend in supposing that the treaty of 1871 contained any such provision. It was not a question of give and take. It was not a question of free markets for fish in return for free fishing, but a question of the fisheries of the two countries being mutually enjoyed by the fishermen of both and of an international tribunal ascertaining how much should be paid by the one country to the other—which entirely changed the whole complexion of that arrangement. That international tribunal met at Halifax, and by its award the United States were compelled to pay \$5,500,000 to Canada and Newfoundland for the use of their fisheries, over and above the value of their own, and the admission of our fish free during twelve years, or something like \$500,000 a year. Therefore the position taken by my hon. friend was entirely a mistaken one, and one that, I do not hesitate to say, met him at the threshold of this commission. When he had ascertained the true position and was asked by the United States: Do you adhere to your proposal which you stated to a Chicago reporter you were prepared to make, namely, a proposal of give and take, and give up your inshore fisheries in return for free admission of fish in the markets of the United States, my right hon. friend was obliged to say no.

You have to pay \$5,500,000 for the use of our fisheries, over and above the advantage of the free import of our fish into your country, and I cannot agree to anything of the kind—and that closed that question. And I am as satisfied that that took place as if I had heard the conversation between the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Well, Sir, that treaty was submitted, and I now come to the evidence upon which I stated, that while the great Liberal-Conservative party have always been in favour of the most friendly, cordial, social and commercial relations with the United States, and have proved it again and again, hon. gentlemen opposite are the men who, on the floor of this House, denounced in unmeasured terms efforts that were calculated to bring about that harmonious settlement of the questions at issue. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, then the leader of the Opposition, in 1872, when the treaty was considered, said:

We believed, however, that there was a limit beyond which we ought not to go. He did not believe that national health, national glory and national pride were always to be purchased by making sacrifices to what is justly called the peace-at-any-price party. It was manifest that if we on this continent, hemmed in as we are by the people of the United States, whose political policy had been singularly aggressive—

That was the language, Sir, of these gentle-

men, who are so devoted in their friendship to the United States.

—yielded up to so-called peace every advantage we possessed within our territory, it would soon become a question of how far it would be possible to pursue that policy and retain any trace of national life and public spirit.

I wish that the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was on the floor of this Parliament to-day to stand up and maintain, in the face of hon. gentlemen opposite the position he took on that occasion. For, although the treaty was one which should have received the approval of this House, there is not a word in that quotation that does not come home to every gentleman in this House as one that a self-respecting people would be expected to support. Mr. Mackenzie again said:

He felt that on no consideration ought we to yield our honour at the shrine of mammon, that on no consideration ought we to have bartered away our heritage for this questionable equivalent of money.

I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has not been engaged in these negotiations, the close consideration of what amount of money should be paid by the United States for bartering away one of the most sacred rights of British subjects? Enough has leaked out to let us know that it was a question whether one of our most important national assets, and one of the dearest rights a British subject can enjoy, the right of going about on the high seas, following a legitimate calling, should not be bartered away for money—putting a price, as the hon. Mr. Mackenzie said, upon one of the dearest rights of the people of this country. Now I wish to call attention to what the Hon. Mr. Blake said:

As to there being now a critical state of relations between the two countries, there would be the same then—the same hectoring, the same blustering, and bragging, if only for the purpose of retaining the fishing privileges.

I wonder if my right hon. friend and his associates have not been enduring of late a good deal of that hectoring, of that blustering and bragging which Mr. Blake describes here as the mode in which the statesmen of that great republic are apt to press their claims. Mr. Young, who was then a leading member of this House, and a member of the Opposition, representing an Ontario constituency, said:

The whole thing was a shameful sacrifice of Canada's interest, and this was generally admitted, and the member for West Durham had fully proved it. This was no reason why the treaty should be ratified. He had seldom heard more paltry reasons than those urged by the Government in pressing the acceptance of the treaty. Where would these sacrifices end? They would never end so far as the United States were concerned and as long as Canada was on the map.

These are the sentiments of that party who have boasted again and again, and