

dicially. But assuming it to be, as I take it to be, more in the nature of a nominal fee, intended to secure a recognition of our rights by those who take out the licenses, although it is disputed that it has that effect, we would not be acting wisely, if we refused to recognize licenses issued by Newfoundland, perhaps at half-price, or on different conditions; and I take it that it is not desirable just now, in view of the negotiations which I understand are pending, to introduce a clause which might possibly tend to alienate further from us the good-will of the people of Newfoundland, which we all desire to hold. This might be considered somewhat in the nature of a challenge; and seeing that the feeling is already strained almost to the extent of breaking, it is not desirable that anything should be done to increase the tension. Therefore, I ask the hon. gentleman not to press this important change without giving us time to consider it.

Mr. TUPPER. Of course there will be time to consider it before the Bill is proceeded with finally. Certainly, the hon. gentleman labours under a misapprehension with regard to the motive of the Government in introducing these words. There is not the slightest desire to insert them from any hostile spirit. There is not a hostile spirit existing on the part of the Government of Canada towards Newfoundland, in that sense or in any other.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is thought to be.

Mr. TUPPER. There is not, unless the maintenance of the rights of Canada is thought to be hostility; and we are endeavouring, as the papers will show, to resume the friendly relations between the countries which existed when there was no misunderstanding. But this measure in no way concerns that important subject, and the only object in suggesting these words is to prevent the privileges, which hon. gentlemen opposite have described as so important and valuable, being possessed by United States fishermen without their paying even that nominal sum—without their paying one single, solitary dollar. If these hon. gentlemen who have been discussing the subject made one point clear, it is that we were not sufficiently valuing the great privileges on our coast, and that for this small fee we were granting tremendous concessions and perhaps injuring our rights under the Convention of 1818.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Giving up, as you called it, in 1888, the whole question.

Mr. TUPPER. What I want to prevent is a United States vessel going to Newfoundland and obtaining free license, which our vessels cannot obtain, and then coming back and enjoying on our coasts the same privilege. We never came to Parliament with a proposition like that. What we say to Newfoundland is: If you will co-operate with us, we will carry out the original plan, but if you will not—and you certainly do not if you grant to the United States these privileges for nothing and refuse them to Canadian vessels—it will be impossible for us to recognize those free licenses which may be granted in the colony of Newfoundland. We must put words of this import into clause two, or we would be giving privileges to United States vessels without a farthing in return.

Mr. LAURIER. I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the amendment to stand and give the

House time to consider it. For my part, it seems to me by this amendment we are going to check the very object of the Bill. This measure is one of conciliation. Hon. gentlemen opposite press this Bill as a measure of conciliation. They are aware of the feeling of irritation which arose in the United States through our applying customs regulations to American fishermen, under our interpretation of the Convention of 1818. In consequence of this irritation, the Treaty of 1888 was, unfortunately, not negotiated, but the British Commissioners were so much impressed by the feeling of irritation in the United States, that they at once offered, pending the negotiation of the treaty, to undertake that the Canadian Government would not only not go back to the system adopted against American fishermen of subjecting them to vexatious customs regulations, but that for a nominal consideration American fishermen would get all the privileges they demanded. Licenses were then issued by the Newfoundland and the Canadian Governments allowing American fishermen all the privileges denied them by the Treaty of 1818, and if an American fisherman took a license from the Newfoundland Government he could enjoy these privileges on the coasts of Canada, and a similar concession was allowed by the Newfoundland Government. Now the hon. gentleman is going to depart from this. He stipulates that if the licenses issue by the Newfoundland Government are not exactly on a par with our own regulations, they will not be recognized in our country.

Mr. TUPPER. The licenses which the American fishermen will obtain from the Newfoundland Government, on their face and terms, grants only privileges in the ports of Newfoundland. They are entirely different from the licenses granted under the *modus vivendi*, as they limit vessels to the ports of Newfoundland, so that the Americans can have no reason to urge that they are misled.

Mr. LAURIER. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but it only shows the necessity for further argument. Let him give his amendment as a notice, so that we may have time to consider it before it is adopted.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall be happy to meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion. We will go through the clauses and let the Bill remain in committee.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has said that the licenses granted by the Newfoundland Government were being granted without fee.

Mr. TUPPER. So I understand.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is it by statute that these licenses are issued?

Mr. TUPPER. Simply on the terms of an Order in Council, free licenses are granted to vessels of Newfoundland and the United States on equal terms. There is a bond given that certain provisions of the Bait Act will be recognized.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Does the hon. gentleman state that those licenses are being issued to the American fishermen this year free?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Because my information is different.

Mr. TUPPER. I shall put the hon. gentleman in possession of the information I have. I move that the following clause be added to the Bill:—