

In giving up our fisheries we acquire from the United States advantages of very considerable moment. In the first place they do not pretend that the fishing rights which they give us are equal in value to those which we give to them. An arbitration accordingly is arranged by which the difference between the respective concessions may be ascertained and paid to this country. I have no doubt in my own mind that that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be able to make out a very strong case with respect to the value of these fisheries. Then there is the bonding system which is of great value to both countries, and if it had not been continued by the Treaty, Canada would have been seriously inconvenienced. Irrespective of these advantages the feelings of the people of this country changed very much on account of the knowledge that great importance was attached by the Parliament and people of England to a solution of the difficulties between Great Britain and the United States. We felt that the people of England were actuated in a great measure by the consideration that no part of Her Majesty's Empire had a deeper interest in the peaceable adjustment of the difficulties than Canada herself. We knew that the people of England were making some sacrifices of national pride which Englishmen feel as much as any other people when they agreed to accept the Treaty for the sake of peace, and above all for the sake of this part of the Empire, (applause.) Then, there grew up in this country a desire that we should reciprocate the sentiments displayed by Great Britain and make any reasonable sacrifice in order to carry out a Treaty which was matured in the interests of the whole Empire. Since these transactions took place we have had remarkable evidence of the importance attached to the preservation of the Treaty both by Great Britain and the United States. The history of the indirect or consequential claims is pretty well known to us all, and we have witnessed the earnest desire of the people and of the statesmen of both countries that the ill-considered advancement of these claims should not be allowed to break up the Treaty. We have seen the anxiety of the Government of England whilst refusing absolutely to admit that these claims could be considered by the Geneva tribunal to arrive at some arrangement by which they could be withdrawn without offence to the sensitiveness of the people of the United States. We have seen also the forbearance which the Opposition in England has shewn during the whole

course of the negotiations which we believe are now drawing to a satisfactory close. All parties have acted calmly and patiently, and there has been a sacrifice of some national pride on both sides. It has undoubtedly been very difficult for the United States to recede from the position which the case submitted on their behalf had taken up with reference to the consequential damages, and so on the part of both these nations, sacrifices have been made with the sole object of giving this Treaty effect, and as to the course that Great Britain has taken, I think it beyond doubt, that it has been very much actuated by regard to the position which she occupies on this continent. I am quite sure that this House fully understands the magnitude of the interests involved in the satisfactory adjustment of all differences between the United States and England and I hope honorable gentlemen will unanimously agree to pass this bill, the second reading of which I now beg leave to move.

Hon. Mr. J. E. L'ELLIER DE ST. JUST.—I must say at the outset that I feel rather embarrassed in rising to address the House on a question which has already been so fully discussed, but I believe we should not allow the present occasion to pass without expressing our opinion on a subject of so much importance. I regret that I cannot accept as correct the views expressed by the Hon. Postmaster General. I certainly join in the expression to which he gave utterance of the necessity of securing by the best mode in our power a lasting and honorable peace between the two great nations who might have been embroiled in war by the Alabama difficulty. I am not, however, prepared to admit that war would arise were the fishery portions of the Treaty to be omitted. If there were such danger no Canadian would hesitate to give his assent to this part of the Treaty. In my opinion, this portion of the Treaty does not interfere with the peaceable solution of the difficulties on other questions between the two great powers who are parties to the measure. The real question at issue was not one of our own—it arose entirely out of the policy adopted in England at the time of the American civil war. The people of the United States felt deeply aggrieved at the depredations caused by the Alabama and other cruisers. They were first laughed down when they made a demand for redress, but subsequently the Johnson Treaty was agreed upon. At that time the question of the fisheries was not taken into consideration. When the Johnson Treaty was passed, and we re-