

It is, therefore, fatal to the fishery interests that they should be allowed to enter for supplies and bait. It appears to me the broad construction of those two sections will enable them to do that which my hon. friend says will be fatal to our interests. That broad construction is the construction American fishermen will contend for—that is, the construction they will give it, and that broad construction is the construction the American people will endorse. My own impression is that is the construction we will finally have to accept. The hon. gentleman says, truly enough, and it would be a very fair argument in answer to their contention, that the transshipment of their fish and the purchase of supplies and bait is provided for in another part of the treaty. Of course it is, but it is provided for in this part of the treaty too, under the circumstances mentioned in the section. The question is, who is to declare when those circumstances exist and when they do not exist? An American captain comes in and says: I have lost my outfit from casualty. There is nobody to dispute it. You must accept it and when you do he has the right to buy a new outfit, and the outfit if it embraces salt must necessarily embrace bait. If that is so we are giving away, by this section, everything he wants, and the latter part of the other section which gave him the right to transship and purchase bait when they admit our fish duty free, will never be brought into operation, because practically he will have the right under the section we are now considering, if that construction I am submitting to the House is adopted, and I believe it will be. My own impression is, and I have heard it stated by some gentlemen, that the American Senate will not ratify this treaty. Personally, I do not think that would be an unmixed evil. I, for one, do not fear we will have a repetition of the disastrous state of affairs we had in 1886. We are not going to have that any more. There will be no enforcement by this Government of the obnoxious customs laws, whether this treaty goes into operation or not. There is no doubt about that. The language used by the Finance Minister, and acquiesced in by the members of the Government, puts that beyond doubt. We will have our rights under the old treaty and they will be maintained with a firm hand, and not with the technical exactness in which the Minister of Fisheries in 1886 tried to carry them out. In 1887 a new state of matters was introduced, and I do not think that the Americans complained very much of their treatment in that year. I rose for the purpose, as far as possible, of getting light myself upon the meaning of those sections, and if anything I could say would add to the information of others, I thought it well to speak, as I believed it desirable that this House should understand the matter thoroughly.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman was making the treaty I could understand his action in this matter, but we are not doing that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was trying to arrive at the meaning of this section, and I think it is very important.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I will draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the course he has taken is the course that would be taken by the deadliest enemy of the Canadian fishermen.

An hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes; and I will show it. We are not now making a treaty, Sir. The treaty is made and we are not deciding whether we will accept this treaty. That the House has already unanimously decided, and the hon. gentleman himself, after discussing this treaty, closed his remarks by saying he intended to vote for it. I say that we are not making a treaty, and as we are not deciding whether we will accept the treaty, for that has been done

and done unanimously by this House, I say that every word the hon. gentleman is using in the criticism which he has offered to the House, he knows is impotent to change a line in that treaty, but he knows that all the weight and influence that his position in this House, his position as a member of the legal profession, will give him, will be quoted hereafter in opposition to the rights of Canadian fishermen and in support of the claims of American fishermen. I cannot understand a man, who professes to be the friend of our fishermen, taking this course. If his object, Sir, is to aid me, if his object is to aid Canada in getting this treaty adopted by the American Senate, then his conduct is intelligible; but from any other standpoint I say that I am astounded that a gentleman of the legal profession, a man having the knowledge of public affairs that the hon. gentleman has, should take up the time of the House, as he has, after the House has solemnly decided by a unanimous vote to ratify this treaty, when he knows he cannot change a line in it. I am astonished at the hon. gentleman standing on his feet here and for this length of time endeavoring to make a case for the United States fishermen against the Canadian fishermen, and throwing all the weight and influence of his legal opinion, whatever that may amount to, into the scale of the American fishermen against the Canadian fishermen.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not know what I have done to merit this extraordinary scolding at the hands of the hon. gentleman. When I first addressed the House I ventured to ask information on those most important clauses which the hon. gentleman has incorporated in this treaty, clauses which were susceptible of a broad meaning, the result of which would be to surrender our fisheries entirely to the United States. I venture respectfully to ask the hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice who accompanied him to Washington, and who was a party to the construction of this treaty, I ventured to ask them what was the understanding come to by the plenipotentiaries at Washington as to the meaning of those words, and I was answered with a flippancy altogether unfair and unjust. I was not answered, in fact, at all. I was not told whether the construction I said those clauses were susceptible of was the proper construction or not in the opinion of the hon. gentlemen, or whether it was the construction generally adopted by the plenipotentiaries at Washington. The hon. gentleman did not tell me then and when I ventured to exercise my undoubted right in this House, before I voted for the passage of that treaty, and asked what it really meant, I am sat upon by the hon. gentleman and lectured as if I had done something wrong. What does the hon. gentleman mean? Does he ask us to accept every word and clause of this treaty in ignorance of its real meaning; does he want the fishermen to believe that they have conceded nothing when it may turn out they have conceded all? Does the hon. gentleman want me to vote blindly for a clause of this treaty which the Minister of Justice has said admits American fishermen to our ports and bays, carrying off our fisheries from us? What does the hon. gentleman take me for? I am here, Sir, solely and earnestly looking for information which I believe to be of the greatest importance, before this House adopts this treaty. I am asking it, too, at a time when the treaty is before the United States Senate. I say it is unworthy of this Parliament, and unworthy of the hon. gentleman, to seek to smuggle through a treaty under the assumption that it contains a secret meaning which he wishes to hide from the American people. I thought the day had gone by for any underhand dealings between the two great nations. I thought we were going to deal frankly and honestly with our friends to the south of us. I say it is in the highest interests of peace for this assembly of Canada and the Senate of the United States, if they adopt that treaty, to thoroughly understand what its real meaning