

away, as with a sponge on a blackboard, the declarations of the Premier himself; he has wiped out the arbitrary regulations of the Minister of Customs, or at any rate, their application to the fishing vessels; he has swept away the pleadings of the Minister of Justice; and, with the breath of his nostrils he has extinguished the false lights put up along the shore by the Minister of Marine, which were luring the Ship of State to destruction. Therefore he is to be congratulated. I do not know whether he likes this kind of congratulations, but they are such as I give, and I give them most heartily. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the treaty will be ratified here. I venture to hope that, as in this Parliament, so in the Senate of the United States, the able men composing that great deliberative body, will accept this treaty, not alone for its practical benefits, but as an acknowledgment of our determination to do justice, too long delayed, as an olive branch of peace, as an evidence of our desire to continue, and to expand, and to make perpetual, the friendly relations between England and her oldest child in America, and to cement more closely and more firmly the friendly relationship of Canada to the United States.

Mr. LANDRY. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. Upon his rising to address the House I made up my mind that coming from New Brunswick and knowing him to be possessed of the intelligence that he does possess, knowing that he is as well informed on public questions as he is, the arguments he would use to this House might possibly require some answer to constituencies of New Brunswick, if not to any other constituency, and I listened with the object of replying to the arguments he might offer. But, to my great astonishment, when he finished he himself had answered his own speech. During remarks occupying fifteen or twenty minutes he condemned the treaty in every possible way, and he pointed out to this House all the concessions made, he pointed out their nature, in what respects they had been made and I expected him to find fault with the surrender of all those rights and privileges which we enjoyed and which had by this treaty been surrendered to the United States; but upon concluding he congratulated the Minister of Finance upon having made such an excellent treaty, upon having rendered such great service to the country and the people of Canada, but he did not forget to say also that he had rendered equally great service to the people of the United States. I cannot say that the hon. gentleman spoke very differently from other hon. members who have spoken on the other side of the House. It is true they have made some semblance of finding fault with the treaty; but upon the whole not one hon. gentleman has said he would oppose it by his vote. They have found fault more particularly in regard to what brought about the treaty; and yet what would they have done? they admitted by their argument that the treaty was brought about because of the regulations enforced by the Government since the abrogation of the last treaty. They say, or in effect they say, that the reason this treaty was brought about was because of the position taken in regard to those regulations, and most of them admit that we had a right to put them in force, that they were strictly within our right to pass, although they think the Government did not act discretely in enforcing them. I would answer them in this way; had the Government acted as hon. gentlemen opposite desired them to have acted for the last two or three years, we would not have had to-day this treaty of which they speak so highly. If we had allowed the United States vessels to have free use of our fisheries, if we had never opened our mouths to find fault with those who came within our waters and poach on our fisheries for years, obliging the Government to protest against those acts, as they did, no treaty would have been negotiated.

Mr. ELLIS.

and we would not have had this great blessing regarding which gentlemen opposite have congratulated the Government so frankly and so honestly. I, therefore, believe if we have a treaty to-night it is simply because when the other treaty came to an end the Government, understanding the interests of the Canadian people, endeavored to put in force that which it is not disputed we had a right to put in force. The only question respecting which I can to some extent agree with hon. gentlemen opposite when they spoke of having made a surrender, and I cannot help giving expression to my opinion in this House, was that so far as I interpret what is given by us under this treaty, although the matters may not be very valuable in view of the interests of peace, good government and relationship which we hope will always exist between this country and the United States, and I say those matters were not a great deal to surrender to secure those objects—yet if there was anything surrendered I believe it was surrendered by us and not by the United States. It is true the United States have given up a great deal of their contention, that they contended for a great deal which they did not get; but according to my interpretation, they were imaginary rights whereas ours were real rights under the treaty, rights which under the interpretation of a proper tribunal would have been found to exist under the treaty. But not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has pointed out what we have lost by the surrender made. The hon. gentleman who last spoke pointed out thirteen or fourteen different things we had surrendered, but he did not point out that this country had lost anything by it, he did not show that we had made a surrender that injured our interests and in proportion benefited the people of the United States. On the contrary, he told us that he was not prepared to say it would be any loss to us. The only ground upon which he calculates the treaty might be an injury, was simply in view of the contentions made by us previous to the negotiations; but if we take the hon. gentleman's own contentions made before he spoke to-night in this House, we will see that his contentions were somewhat hostile to the contentions made by the Government. What did he say in the paper over which he has control. He said:

"There is a doubt whether an American fishing vessel has the right under the Treaty of 1818 to enter our harbors and buy bait. But an arrangement made 70 years ago will not work now. The Government of Canada in reviving a treaty 70 years old have done a thing which they will not be able to stand by, and which will make this country ridiculous in the eyes of the world."

That was his opinion in 1886.

Mr. ELLIS. That is my opinion now.

Mr. LANDRY. Then what does the hon. gentleman find fault with? He was only grieved because it did not occur sooner. If it had occurred sooner, there would have been no occasion for the treaty. He told us that the circumstances that brought about the Treaty of 1818 disappeared, and therefore, it was necessary to have another treaty. There was an absolute necessity, according to the hon. gentleman, for having a new treaty, because the reasons that led to the Treaty of 1818 had disappeared. If there were such reasons, was the Government wrong in negotiating a treaty? Certainly not. The next question is whether the treaty is one that we can approve. Not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite has endeavored to point out that it is not one that we should approve. They all say we should approve it, and no vote will be taken respecting it. I admit that at the beginning of the debate if hon. gentlemen opposite had taken the stand that the treaty should not be accepted, as it was a base surrender of rights which it was our duty to guard and maintain and not surrender—and I take it that the Parliament of Canada still has it in its own hands, notwithstanding the negotiation that has taken place, the duty of determining whether the treaty shall be passed, and that