

Report of the Commissioner, Dominion Police, under Revised Statutes of Canada, Chapter 184, section 5.—(Sir John Thompson.)

Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1888.—(Mr. Costigan.)

#### DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Speaker, before calling the Orders of the Day, I wish, with the consent of the House, to make the usual motion for the appointment of the *Hansard* Committee. The motion is as follows:—

That a Select Committee be appointed to supervise the Official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs. Baker, Béchard, Charlton, Colby, Davin, Desjardins, Ellis, Innes, Scriver, Somerville, Taylor, Tupper, Vanasse and Weldon (Albert).

The names are the same as those which have been on the committee for the last two years, with the exception of Mr. Royal. It is proposed to substitute Mr. Vanasse for Mr. Royal.

Mr. LAURIER. With regard to this motion, I wish to ask will the hon. gentleman tell the House that this is substantially the same committee as was appointed last year?

Mr. BOWELL. The names of the committee are precisely the same with the exception of the substitution of Mr. Vanasse for Mr. Royal, who is now Lieut. Governor of the North-West Territories.

Motion agreed to.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

EDWARD COCHRANE, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of East Northumberland, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Taylor.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

The House proceeded to the consideration of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the Session.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I have to ask from this House that indulgence and kindly consideration which have always been generously accorded to young and inexperienced members—an indulgence and a consideration the more needed in my case, because I cannot stand on the floor of this House without having pressed home upon me the recollection of the circumstances under which I came to have the honor to be here. When this House met a year ago another voice spoke as the representative of Cardwell, the voice of one whose public services were deemed by his constituency, by a generous and loyal people, to merit the election of myself as his successor in this House. Since Parliament prorogued we have speeded a parting Governor General and welcomed a coming one; and I am sure I but echo the sentiments of every gentleman in this House when I say that Lord Stanley, the present Governor General, since his advent to Canada, has manifested his appreciation of the importance of the Dominion, the magnificence of her resources, and the splendid opportunities afforded her of building up a powerful and prosperous country in alliance with Great Britain. He has done, Sir, more than that; he has shown himself to possess a hearty sympathy with the aspirations of the people of this Dominion; he has, in the speeches he has made throughout the country, urged them to cultivate a national sentiment, and to rally round the Dominion as the central power; and I think I can confidently express the conviction that when Lord Stanley, having served his term, comes to say farewell to this coun-

try, he will receive the unanimous testimony of the Canadian people to his earnest endeavors to co-operate with them in all that tends to promote the prosperity of the people of this country, the development of her material resources, and the maintenance of the constitutional ties which unite her Provinces. The first question touched upon in the Speech of His Excellency is one of very considerable importance, that of the fisheries. It must be a matter of regret to every gentleman in this House that the work of the Joint High Commission, which met at Washington a little over a year ago, has been rendered inoperative by the action of the Senate of the United States. Sir, since Parliament prorogued, since the very thorough discussion of that question which was had on the floor of this House, it has passed through several phases. It will be remembered that President Cleveland consented to the appointment of a Joint High Commission, and no doubt he had an accurate knowledge of the proceedings of that Commission from time to time; and in submitting to the Senate the treaty which was agreed upon, he used this language:

"The treaty meets my approval, because I believe that it supplies a satisfactory, practical and final adjustment upon a basis honorable and just to both parties, of the difficult and vexed question to which it relates."

Well, Sir, after a discussion continuing through some months, the Senate of the United States, by a strict party vote, rejected the convention, and two days afterwards President Cleveland sent down to Congress what is known as his retaliatory message. Everybody must regret most sincerely that that message was sent down, and I think I do not exaggerate when I say that the position taken by the President of the United States in that document was an illogical and inconsistent one, directly opposed to his whole anterior course in relation to the question. Sir, it seems to me I am justified in holding that that message was prompted by the exigencies of party politics in the United States, and that Canada was made, on the eve of a general election, the football of both parties, to be kicked about for the amusement of the Anglophobes in the United States. Now, Sir, may I be permitted for a moment to refer to that retaliatory message? It began by reiterating the President's approval of the convention that had been shortly before concluded between Great Britain and the United States. In it the President declared:

"I fully believe that this treaty just rejected by the Senate was well suited to the exigency, and that its provisions were adequate for our security in the future from vexatious incidents, and for the promotion of friendly neighborhood and intimacy without sacrificing in the least our national pride and dignity."

So that, you will observe, he repeated in express terms his approval of the treaty which had been concluded between the two nations. Then he went on to propound his retaliatory policy, the ostensible pretext for which was, to quote his language, that:

"In forbidding the transit of the catch of our fishermen over their territory in bond and free of duty, the Canadian authorities deprived us of the only facility dependent on their concession, and for which we could supply no substitute."

That is to say, the Canadian people were threatened with a measure of commercial non-intercourse, not because they had declined to treat, not because they had refused to accept a new convention covering the fisheries, but because the Republican majority in the Senate had rejected the work of the Joint High Commission. Canada did, it is true, and does yet, as I understand, deny the privilege of transhipment of catch, and what is her warrant for that course? The Treaty of 1818? Yes, no doubt; but not the British and Canadian interpretation of that instrument alone. There is yet another, and, perhaps, a higher justification of Canada's course, namely, the full and absolute recognition by the United States Government of the right of such refusal. The treaty concluded in February last year, the treaty to which President Cleveland gave his consent, upheld every material