

time. The battle has to be waged more than once before the principles we contend for are carried. This time we made that motion knowing that defeat was staring us in the face, at least so far as this House was concerned, but we are determined to proceed, determined to proceed even if it were defeated next year, and even if it were defeated year after year until this motion is carried, as it is sure to be carried some day. To make a *resumé* of the policy of the Opposition it is this: We will adopt this treaty because it is the best thing which can be obtained under the circumstances, because it puts an end to the state of things which had been created by the policy of gentlemen on the other side, and because it paves the way to obtain those trade relations which the whole people of Canada desire, although the Canadian Parliament may have voted it down for the present time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman denied the statements that the Americans had set up any claim to bait, and he quoted me as having said that the President sent a Message after the treaty was made. I did not say anything about the President. I said Mr. Bayard claimed it. If he refers to the papers he will see that Mr. Bayard claimed it in the strongest manner, and so did Mr. Phelps in his representation to the Government in England.

Mr. JONCAS. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after the masterly speeches delivered on the subject before us; after the eloquent pleas which we have heard from both sides of the House, in favor of the treaty which we are asked to ratify, or against the treaty, it were perhaps presumption in me to rise in the House and take part in the debate. But, Mr. Speaker, I represent, if not the only maritime county in the Province of Quebec, at least that which is most deeply interested in the satisfactory settlement of this fisheries question, and I should judge myself wanting in duty if I did not impart to this honorable House my views on the subject. I shall be brief, as the arguments in favor of the treaty have been already exhausted by those who have gone before me. Still, one thing struck me in the debate which I have listened to: that the hon. members on this side of the House, who engaged in the debate, took pains, as it were, not to touch the question itself which forms the very subject of discussion. They spoke of everything else except the Treaty. They went even so far as to touch on the war of secession, the Irish question, Home Rule, and even the Manitoba monopoly. But the point to which they seemed best pleased to revert was that of reciprocity and free trade. I shall not undertake to refer to these arguments—which, according to me, are not arguments at all—but I shall treat the subject from a practical and business point of view, leaving to more authoritative voices than mine the task of elucidating the legal and international standpoints, as has, indeed, been already done, with much ability, by the hon. the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend, the member for Albert (Mr. Weldon). Before going further, I wish to reply to a question just put by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). He asked the ground of the misunderstanding between the United States and Canada, and what it was that rendered necessary the appointment of a commission at Washington, which drafted the treaty that we are, at present, called upon to ratify. The hon. member for Quebec East seemed to say that the conduct of the Canadian Government was the cause of the difficulty. I dispute that point, Mr. Speaker, and say that if the hon. gentleman will recall the facts correctly, he will agree with me that the cause of the trouble was with the Americans who gave the Canadian Government notice of their intention not to renew the Treaty of Washington. And, Sir, the Government of this country afforded a striking proof of their goodwill and spirit of conciliation when, on the 30th June, 1885, they allowed American fishermen

Mr. LAURIER.

to go on with their fishing in Canadian waters for six months, in order that both nations might find time, either to appoint a commission or to adopt some means of reaching a satisfactory settlement of this question. But the Government of this country is charged with having been too severe in the application of the first clause of the Treaty of 1818. And while some of the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House inveigh against the severity displayed by the Government of Canada in applying that clause of the treaty, we witness at the same time the curious spectacle of other members of the House finding fault with the Government for not yielding sufficiently, and insisting that they should have made further concessions. I have just said that I would treat this topic from a business and practical standpoint. I hold that in view of the interests of Canada, the treaty, which we are called upon to ratify, is a success for Canada; the solution of a difficulty which might have resulted in serious contention, and was a standing peril for our national institutions, and the development and improvement of our commerce. I state that, despite all the political considerations which party spirit may inspire, there is not a genuine Canadian who is not disposed and prejudiced beforehand against everything that the Government can do, who will not co-operate with the Government in arriving at a final and satisfactory solution of this question. On so important a question, I maintain that the interests of a party must make way for views that are broader, more national, and especially more patriotic. If we would safely, and with knowledge, judge if the treaty which we are being asked to ratify is hurtful or helpful to the interests of Canada, we must go to the very root of the misunderstanding which existed between the United States and Canada, and which brought about the present treaty. That cause rested wholly on the different interpretation put on that article of the Treaty of 1818 by the Canadian and American Governments:

"Whereas difficulties have arisen on the rights claimed by the United States for their inhabitants to take, dry and dress fish on certain coasts, bays, harbors and inlets of Her British Majesty's possessions in North America, it is agreed between the high contracting parties that the inhabitants of the said United States shall possess forever, in common with Her Majesty's subjects, the right of taking fish of all sorts on the portion of the southern coast of Newfoundland, extending from Cape Ray to the Palm Islands, on the western and northern coasts of Newfoundland from Cape Ray aforesaid to the Quiperon Islands, on the shores of the Magdalen Islands, as well as on the coasts, bays, harbors and inlets of Mount Joly on the southern coast of Labrador to the Straits of Belle Isle inclusive, and thence following the north shore indefinitely, without injury, however, to the exclusive rights of the Hudson's Bay Company. American fishermen will also enjoy forever the liberty of drying and dressing the fish in each of the inhabited harbors, bays and inlets of the said southern coast of Newfoundland and the coast of Labrador. But so soon as these tracts shall be more or less settled, the said fishermen will no longer have that privilege, unless they received beforehand the authority of the inhabitants, owners or possessors of the soil. The United States renounce forever the right hitherto claimed or held by their inhabitants of taking, drying, and dressing fish, a three naval miles or less than three miles from any coasts, bays, inlets or harbors of Her British Majesty's American possessions, not comprised in the limits herein designated; provided, however, that the American fishermen be admitted into the interior of the bays or harbors to seek shelter, to repair damages, to buy wood, and to fetch water and for any object whatever. The whole under such restrictions as shall be deemed necessary to prevent them from taking and dressing fish with in those limits, or abusing in any way the privilege reserved to them by these presents."

Still, Mr. Speaker, despite the tenor of this article, which could give rise to no doubt, Americans pretended that, in virtue of certain commercial treaties concluded between the United States and England, after 1818, they had the right to enter our harbors to revictual, discharge their cargoes, and even to purchase bait. If we strip this question of all the technical, political, legal and international cobwebs in which it is shrouded, we reach this conclusion: That, while Americans hold that they have a right, as I just said, in virtue of certain treaties of commerce concluded, after 1818, to revictual in our ports and there purchase bait, we put before them the first article of the Treaty of