

ment as it is to us on this side of the House, namely, that the policy pursued by the Canadian Government in 1886 made its determination to enforce the fishery rights of Canada known to every American fisherman. They knew, by the seizure of the *David J. Adams* in 1886, that we did not intend to permit American vessels to purchase bait in our ports. They knew, by the seizure of the *Doughty* in 1886, that we did not intend to permit the shipping of men on American fishing vessels in our ports. They knew by all these other seizures—as they have been called, though they were really mere arrests—that they must report at our Customs when they entered our harbors. In 1887 they did report at our Customs, they did not ship their men in our harbors, and they did not attempt to buy bait in our ports; and that was simply because the police surveillance in 1886 had been effectual, and not because any instruction was withdrawn, or a line or a dot of our policy was changed in 1887. We were told also that part of the hidden history of these negotiations was that, when Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington in 1887, he made the promise that there should be no more seizures in 1887. I know something of his mind in regard to that matter; and I say, unhesitatingly, that that is without the slightest foundation. Even if he had so far forgotten himself as to say so, he had no authority whatever from the Government of Canada to that effect. In any case he could not have been so foolish as to make any such promise at the very outset of the negotiations. Then we were told that we backed down on account of the Retaliation Act being introduced, and that it was that which made us take back all the policy of "brag and bluster." While everyone would have regretted the enforcement of the Retaliation Act, so far from that having been a reason for our backing down, we went to Washington after a statement in writing by Grover Cleveland that it would be injurious to the great commercial interests of the United States to put that Act in force, and that he would not do so, had been published. We were told again that every contention was given up on the part of Canada and that the statement made by the First Minister as to the contentions of Canada having been maintained was so extraordinary that the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) could not believe his ears and waited until he could read it. I venture to say that that statement will be borne out by everyone who reads the controversy and who reads the treaty. Everyone knows what were the leading points of discussion between the two countries. Let him look at the treaty, and he will see how they were adjusted. They were settled in a way which was not dishonorable to the United States, but in a manner which adopted the contentions of Canada in regard to every one of them. The United States had asserted that their fishermen had the right to come into our ports for every one of the four objects mentioned in the original treaty, without entering at the Customs. They contended that they had the right to tranship their cargoes, to buy bait and supplies, and to enter our ports for all purposes that were not immediately connected with fishing. By the Treaty of 1888, did we admit that their contention was correct, and that they should have these privileges for all time to come? No; but, as was well expressed by a leading Senator in the United States, when you read the controversy which took place before the Treaty of 1888, you find all these matters referred to as matters of right, and when you read the treaty you find they are matters of purchase. It is one thing to say: "This is our property, and no one shall deprive us of it;" and it is another thing to say that, for the sake of good neighborhood, and to settle the question on terms not injurious to our fishermen, and in order to give us a fair market for our fish: "These rights which we have said belong to us we will sell for a reasonable price to you." And because it was provided that the United States would not any more contend that these things were theirs, but

would buy them, the hon. gentleman says we gave away everything which we had contended for; and it is because of this that the statement of the Premier was well made, that while these privileges are not, within reasonable limits, denied any longer to the fishermen of the United States, they are no longer held by them as a matter of right, as they claimed them to be before the Treaty of 1888. As regards the question of enforcement of the Customs laws, as regards the question of how far it is safe to allow them to use our ports without complying with the Customs laws, you will see that we do not give them the unlimited right of coming into our harbors without complying with the Customs laws; and even if my report bears the strong construction which the hon. member for Queen's said to-night it does, you will find they limit themselves in the use of our ports, even for the purposes of the Treaty of 1818, and that even when they come in for any of the four purposes for which they have a right under the Treaty of 1818, they must report at the Customs if they stay longer than a certain time, and under all circumstances if they have any communication with the shore. If the American fishermen or the American Government had conceded that in 1886 there would have been no necessity for making the seizures which we made, but when the negotiators came together and found that these terms could be made by them and accepted by us, there was an end of the controversy. The rights of American fishermen received a fair limitation—and a limitation which is not inconsistent with the full enjoyment that was necessary to them—of the privileges which were secured by the Treaty of 1818. Another extraordinary statement was made by the hon. member for Queen's—and I have his words this time exactly before me—that Sir Charles Tupper stated that he could not hold by any of the contentions which had been made by the junior ministers; and he further said, in the course of the debate last Session, in introducing the treaty to the House, that he would have been criminal if he had tried to maintain their contentions. I need not tell the House that not one word of this statement was ever uttered by Sir Charles Tupper on the floor of this House or elsewhere. What Sir Charles Tupper did say on that occasion was: that it was impossible for him to sustain the full contentions which had been made by his colleagues; and, indeed, that was a matter which went without saying. He went to Washington, not for the purpose of settling our right as a regular tribunal would settle it, but for the purpose of making a bargain; and whoever heard of two parties being able to make a bargain when both of them stuck to the strongest contention as to the rights which he possessed? Sir Charles Tupper did say:

"I need not inform the House that, in diplomatic intercourse, it is customary, it is right, for the representative of a government to state the strongest and most advanced grounds that they possibly can sustain in relation to every question, and I would not like, I confess, to be tried before the House—"

The hon. member for Queen's interpreted it as "tried before the House on our reports as to what the law was." No; he was speaking of having his treaty tried before the House, as maintaining the strictest right we had contended for.—

"—to be tried before the House by the ground taken by my hon. friends the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries."

Then the hon. member, finding that that was as far as he could safely go in his quotation, said: "Then the contentions made in other parts of the report went to the winds." Did they? If the hon. gentleman had had the courage to read on he would have found that Sir Chas. Tupper said:

"The ground they took was quite right; they were authorised by the strict terms of the treaty in taking the strong ground they did; they would have failed in their duty to this House and to this country, if, called upon to deal with this question as a matter of diplomatic intercourse and discussion between the Governments of the United States and