

be recollected that those rights are a most valuable heritage of the maritime provinces, that they are looked upon with extreme jealousy, and it is only men who do not understand the conditions under which the Treaty of 1818, was signed and executed who talk about those rights as having been acquired in a barbarous age. They are rights which will bear the strictest criticism and defence at the present day, and they are the only means we possess to bring about a fair settlement of any international question affecting the maritime provinces with the United States; they are the only lever we have to use, and therefore, should be made the most of. With regard to the license system which now prevails, I wish to express an opinion: I think the time has arrived when we should cease to grant licenses to United States fishermen. After the rejection by the Senate of the United States of the treaty negotiated by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper, acting on behalf of Canada, we agreed to prolong for a year or two the privilege of granting licenses to United States fishermen, with the expectation that the United States would come to some reasonable settlement and would grant some equivalent for the great privileges which they ask to participate in with the fishermen of the maritime provinces. We see no indication of any desire or intention on their part to do anything of that kind; on the contrary, we see indications of unfriendliness and worse than unfriendliness, because no person who has any acquaintance whatever with the rights of navigation which this country possesses by treaty on the rivers of Alaska, can regard in any other light the recent action of the Senate of the United States than a gross violation of our treaty rights. Any one who has studied the question and understands the unassailable rights that we possess for commercial purposes over those rivers, could hardly imagine that a civilized nation would adopt such legislation as the 13th clause of the bill which has recently passed the Senate of that country. If such legislation had emanated from some semi-civilized South American republic we might regard it with some indifference, and I have no sympathy with those gentlemen who stand up here and speak of the United States as a country which should be treated with friendliness by us, because on every occasion our neighbours show an aggressive spirit, discreditable to so

great a nation as they undoubtedly are. I hope, however, that if it ever does come to be the duty of this government to make any negotiations relative to our fisheries, they will recollect that they will be held to strict account for the slightest surrender that may be made without a thorough equivalent for anything we give up. These fishing rights are prized by the people of the maritime provinces—prized in a way that you gentlemen who come from the interior of the country cannot understand, and it might be the worst blow struck at the integrity of the Dominion if any sacrifice of those rights were attempted by the government, because I am sure, if those rights were given away to a foreign country without a full equivalent it would create great dissatisfaction among a large class of people.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—I studiously avoided, in the questions that I put, discussing the merits or demerits of the resolution passed by the Congress of the United States, and I did so for the very reason that my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Miller) gave for not bringing the matter before the Senate; that is, that the subject had been thoroughly thrashed out in the Lower chamber. What I desired to ascertain was whether Mr. Farrer—that point was not discussed in the House of Commons—was the accredited agent, acting on behalf of any member of the Canadian government in Washington when he appeared before the Committee on Public Lands and made the statement which has been published. My hon. friend the leader of the House did not answer fully my question. He said that the Canadian government has no agent in Washington. I did not require to be told that; I know that the Canadian government has no agent in Washington in the common acceptance of the term. I know also that Sir Julian Pauncefote represents England, and not Canada, except when his attention is called to matters affecting this country. I know also during the administration of all governments they it had been the habit to send gentlemen to Washington to bring under the notice of the British minister, and through him, to the notice of the government of the United States, certain matters which effect this country. I understand all that, so that the hon. gentleman's answer, that the government have no agent in Washington, is literally true. Every one in Canada knows