

Without the right of buying bait, the Americans have gained very little by the treaty. No invention has been made enabling Americans to carry bait enough in their refrigerators for a whole fishing cruise, and the refusal to allow Canadians to sell bait will be as harmful to them as the refusal of the right to buy the same is to the Americans."

The name of Mr. Wiman, the champion of free trade and reciprocity, has been uttered during this debate. Now, we know what this gentleman's views are on the subject, as we see in an answer of his, of last February, in reply to a despatch from the *Mail*, asking his opinion on the treaty. From Washington he replied by wire as follows:—

"That the treaty, in so far as its clauses are known, is the best settlement of an ugly quarrel that could be made under the circumstances. Although, at first sight, it might appear as if the interests of Canada were sacrificed, it will turn out that the Dominion has gained more thereby than it has lost. The provisions of the new treaty will have the effect of broadening the relations between the two countries, and will eliminate an element of grievous discord and danger which has hitherto kept them asunder and threatened their peace."

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with saying, as Mr. Wiman has done, that the present treaty is the best possible settlement and the happiest solution of a vexed question that threatened real trouble. And the hon. the Minister of Finance will allow me to congratulate him heartily, in the name of the fishermen of Canada, whom I represent, for having taken up their cause with firmness of grasp, for having shielded them from the encroachments of the Americans, and for having furnished us with this treaty which, if it does not check strife for ever, will at least put us in the way of a final settlement.

Mr. ELLIS I feel it my duty to speak on this subject but I would not have addressed the House at all were it not that probably I differ from gentlemen on that side of the House as well as from my friends on this side on certain points. Several constructions have been put upon Mr. Bayard's letter, but the conclusion I come to with regard to that proposition to the Minister of Finance, was that, in Mr. Bayard's view, this country should become an independent country:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. \* \* \*

"On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country; and trust to do it worthily. The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain, which has been *questio vexata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is possible that the idea of commercial intercourse and commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity was in that, but it does appear to me looking at events which are transpiring now and with regard to which the House has not been taken into the confidence of the government, that it is the policy that this country should be independent and that Newfoundland should unite in that independence, a process which is now going on at the present moment. He then said:

"Great Britain being the only treaty-making party to deal with the United States, the envoys of that Government alone are authorised to speak in her behalf and create her obligations. I presume you will be personally constituted a plenipotentiary of Great Britain to arrange here with whomsoever may be selected to represent the United States terms of agreement for a *modus vivendi* to meet present emergencies and also a permanent plan to avoid all future disputes. It appears to me that as matters now stand the colony of Newfoundland ought to be represented and included, for a single arrangement should suffice to regulate all the joint and several interests involved. I should, therefore, be informed speedily through the proper channel as to the authorisation and appointment by the Imperial Government of such representatives."

But, Sir, I listened with great attention to the speech of the Minister of Finance, and I have read it over very carefully since, with regard to his remarks as to what Mr. Bayard meant by commercial union. Taking into account the

Mr. JONAS.

statement made by the hon. the Minister of Finance that he himself was disappointed when he got to Washington in regard to Mr. Bayard's views, it is impossible to get from the reference he made to that question any clear idea of what Mr. Bayard meant. It is true reference was made to the desire of Mr. Bayard that we should follow in some way the commercial arrangement of the United States, or that there should be some reciprocity. But it is impossible to get any idea of what the Minister meant by what he did say. He did say, however:

"I did not meet an American statesman who would not hold up both hands for commercial union with Canada. Why, Sir? Because he knows that it would give Canada to the United States; he knows that you would occupy the degrading position of having a neighboring country make your tariff and impose the taxes upon you."

Mr. Bayard most distinctly declared that he had no desire to affect in any way the political independence of Canada. He says:

"I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however indirectly, or by any intendment, however partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, not to affect the legislative independence of either country."

It is impossible that Mr. Bayard has made that statement in the letter, and that he could reconcile it with the statement which the hon. gentleman has made. However, that is a matter for Mr. Bayard and himself to settle. Mr. Bayard made a memorable statement in reference to the general subject, and I think I might quote his words:

"I feel we stand at 'the parting of the ways.' In one direction I can see a well assured, steady, healthful relationship, devoid of petty jealousies, and filled with the fruits of a prosperity arising out of a friendship cemented by mutual interests, and enduring because based upon justice; on the other a career of embittered rivalry, staining our long frontier with the hues of hostility, in which victory means the destruction of an adjacent prosperity without gain to the prevalent party—a mutual, physical and moral deterioration which ought to be abhorrent to patriots on both sides, and which I am sure, no two men will exert themselves more to prevent than the parties to this unofficial correspondence."

And at the close of the negotiations, Mr. Bayard said:

"As he had expressed himself before, he felt that as a result of the controversies of the two preceding years, the two countries stood at the parting of the ways, and it became necessary to determine whether their future should be in the direction of friendship and mutual convenience, or of unfriendliness and alienation. He hoped the work that had been done by the Conference would decide that question, and that the bonds of amity between the two countries would be strengthened by the ties of friendly and mutually beneficial intercourse."

There is no doubt whatever that the troubles which arose were troubles almost entirely of our own creation. The hon. Minister himself could not get beyond the treaty. He says:

"We offered to remove all causes of difference in connection with the fisheries, by an arrangement providing for greater freedom of commercial intercourse."

To this the American commissioners replied that they declined to take up that matter:

"Because the greater freedom of commercial intercourse so proposed would necessitate an adjustment of the present tariff of the United States by congressional action, which adjustment the American plenipotentiaries consider to be manifestly impracticable of accomplishment through the medium of a treaty under the circumstances now existing."

These circumstances were unquestionably the hostility excited by our acts, which compelled them in their own self-interest to insist on an arrangement on the lines of the treaty alone. So they declared that the proposed trade arrangement could not be accepted as constituting a suitable basis of negotiation concerning the rights and privileges claimed for American fishing vessels. They, therefore, insisted that the adjustment of differences must be had by agreeing to an interpretation or modification of the Treaty of 1818. Now, Sir, at the very outset of the proceedings we were hindered and hampered by the difficulties which we ourselves had created, and which excited such a feeling in the American mind against us that Congress itself had declared in so many words that we were seeking, by the restrictions which we were putting on American fishermen, to drive them into freer trade relations with us, and they