

some solution of the difficulties until a treaty could be submitted to both Parliaments and to the Congress of the United States. And that *modus vivendi*, in its preamble, recites the reasons why the English plenipotentiaries submitted it to the Americans:

"The treaty having been signed the British Plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland.

"In the absence of such ratification, the old conditions which have given rise to much friction and irritation might be revived and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned.

"Under these circumstances, and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years, in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

Their anxious desire was to promote good feeling and to remove all possible causes of controversy. That is the object we have in proposing that the *modus vivendi* should be continued the coming season. The hon. gentleman knows a new party is coming into power in the United States, he knows that it will become his bounden duty to approach that new party and to negotiate with them for the settlement of difficulties, and he knows that it is impossible such negotiation can be successfully carried on unless the public minds of both countries are in a better condition than they were in when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington in 1887. He knows that it will be impossible to carry on any negotiations unless a kinder feeling exists between the two countries than existed then. When I heard the hon. gentleman denounce the *modus vivendi* the other night, one would suppose it was something dreadful. His object was to make those who had not studied the question, believe that the Opposition were prepared to give up all Canada's rights in her fisheries, and that our proposition involved national humiliation, and he called on his friends to resist any such humiliating effort. He said:

"Now the hon. gentleman says that we ought to eat humble pie, that we ought to go down on our knees to the Americans whether they will give us a treaty or not, whether they will pass a non-intercourse act or not, whether they will allow us to enter their country or not, and whether or not they pass a law keeping out Canadians from the United States as they have kept out Chinamen. Notwithstanding all this we must, forsooth, say to the people of the United States: 'You may come into our waters, you may do just as you please, you can have the right to fish in our waters.'—"

Why the hon. gentleman ought to have known that the *modus vivendi* does not surrender to the United States any territorial right of Canada at all. It does not propose to surrender to them the right to fish in our waters at all, and all this wonderful surrender which the hon. gentleman's vivid imagination pictured is a mere creature of fiction and does not exist in reality at all. What does the *modus vivendi* provide? It provides for the recognition by the United States of our right to prevent transhipping fish and purchasing supplies or bait and shipping men. It provides that if they pay a certain sum per ton, American fishermen may enjoy these rights. It provides that on payment of \$1.50 a ton, the American fishermen have the right to go into our waters to tranship fish, to purchase fishing supplies, and to ship their men. That is all; and the hon. gentleman denounces this as something approaching national humiliation. He says:

"This resolution will, I believe, meet with the condemnation of this House, as it will meet with the condemnation of this country. I believe and I know that the people of Canada will resent anything like humiliation to their status or national honor."

Why, who prepared this *modus vivendi* and who is responsible for it? It is a proposition emanating from his own plenipotentiary, his own appointee; and if it involves national dishonor, then the national honor of Canada was humiliated during the year 1888 when it was in operation. If

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

the repetition of it in 1889 means national humiliation, then we were subjected to national humiliation last year. The hon. gentleman went on to make use of an argument which I was surprised at, an *ad captandum* argument, and I dare say it may have captured some gentleman not acquainted with the fishery question. What did he say? He said: Look what would happen if you proclaimed the *modus vivendi*? We will issue our licenses, and then the United States will, possibly, bring their Non-intercourse Bill into force. They will have the right to come into our waters, to tranship their fish, and purchase supplies, and we will not be able to sell them a herring. But, Sir, the main object of the *modus vivendi* was to prevent the Non-intercourse Bill coming into force at all. The hon. gentleman knows that at any moment the Non-intercourse Bill may be brought into force, and that the most serious consequences which can be inflicted upon Canada will follow. I will not picture those consequences. They were pictured in terrifying language by the hon. gentleman's Minister last year. If the *modus vivendi* does not come into force, you will, probably, he said, have a state of facts brought about which may bring the Non-intercourse Bill into force. It is to prevent that we propose the *modus vivendi* should continue for another year. Our object is to do what we can, consistent with national honor, to maintain friendly feeling between the two countries. We do not want to see the Non-intercourse Bill put into force, we want to extend the boundaries of our trade, and make it as free as we can, consistent with our political autonomy. We believe in our hearts, honestly and fairly, that the best mode of preventing the Non-intercourse Bill being brought into operation would be to maintain the *modus vivendi*. If it is maintained, the Non-intercourse Bill cannot be put into force. If any hon. gentleman will look at the preamble, he will find that the President of the United States is only vested with power to bring the Bill into force when we improperly and harshly enforce against American fishing vessels the rights we believe they have in our waters. The Non-intercourse Bill declares:

"Whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews, so arriving at or being in such British waters, or ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied any of the privileges therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews, of the most favored nation, or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either of all such cases it shall be lawful, and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States in his discretion, by proclamation to that effect, to deny vessels, their masters and crews, of the British dominions of North America, any entrance into the waters, ports, or places of, or within the United States (with such exceptions in regard to vessels in distress, stress of weather, or needing supplies as to the President shall seem proper), whether such vessels shall come directly from said dominions on such destined voyage or by way of some port or place in such destined voyage elsewhere; and, also, to deny entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish, or any other product of said dominions, or other goods coming from said dominions to the United States."

Now we are face to face with that Act. That Act may be brought into force any day. It may be brought into force as, and when we act towards United States fishing vessels as we did in 1886, and I warn the hon. gentleman that, if that Non-intercourse Bill is brought into force through his action, he will be held responsible by the people of this country. He is entering upon a course which is fraught with danger. If he does not continue that *modus vivendi*, if he does not continue to deal with the people of the United States, and to endeavor to solve on an amicable basis the fishery difficulties which exist between the two countries, he will incur a responsibility greater than any he has ever incurred in the course of his long political career. There could be no evil which could arise to the people of the Maritime Provinces so great as to be cut off from intercourse with the people of the south. What? That none of our vessels should be allowed to trade with them, or to enter