

recognised for many years in the correspondence and despatches between the Governments of England and the United States, but it is because I see in it a prospect of peace and more cordial relations with our neighbors. We never can go back to our old rights. If that treaty is rejected by the Senate of the United States, will England attempt to enforce the headland system for us, after what has been done at Washington? Will she attempt to enforce exclusion from bays along our coasts, after what has been done at Washington? No, Sir; we have got to confine ourselves and our pretensions in the future to the points and delimitations specified in the Treaty of Washington. Therefore, while I do not approve the treaty, while I cannot give it my cordial support on its merits, I say that the one great point in the whole matter in its favor is, that by it we may hope to secure peace with our neighbors the Americans, and that peace may lead to an extension of commercial intercourse between the two countries. Could it accomplish that I feel that it will have accomplished a very great deal. And that is the one point in its favor, and the only point. I do not know what provoked my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to make the retort I heard as I came in, but I feel I must make this statement to the House before I withdraw my opposition to the treaty; I do so purely upon the ground of endeavoring to establish a friendly feeling with our neighbors on the other side of the border, and in the hope that once these friendly relations are restored, relations that never should have been ruptured, once they are restored this treaty may lead to more extended commercial intercourse, and to that greater prosperity which existed from 1854 to 1866.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I agree with the sentiments which have just been expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) with regard to the unfortunate existence of unfriendly feelings in the United States towards Canada. I must say that I think they are in great measure due to the course pursued by the Government in this very matter, who first tried a spirit of reconciliation, and then turned round and used those harsh measures which, I must say, might have resulted much more seriously than they have done. Speaking for the Maritime Provinces, I think the people accept this treaty somewhat in the same spirit of the hon. member for Northumberland, for the purpose of getting rid of that feeling of irritation, and in a desire to attain to more friendly relations between the two countries; and also, I believe, with the object—certainly that is the desire in the Maritime Provinces—of securing more extended commercial relations. Therefore, I am glad that a treaty has been made. I do not think it is necessary, at this stage of the debate, to go into particulars. I regret not having had an opportunity of being present while the debate was going on. I may say, however, that under the circumstances, I think it is about as good a treaty as could be made, considering the peculiar circumstances in the United States, and the unfavorable time when the negotiations were entered into. I think if our Government had been more anxious, they could have chosen a more favorable time, and perhaps have got a better treaty. But we have this treaty now before us. While it is true that we cannot alter it, that treaty is now between the two great powers of Great Britain and the United States—yet we have a right to discuss it, and to obtain explanations in regard to it; more especially since we are responsible for putting the Act of Parliament upon the Statute-book. As representatives of the people we have the right to examine, to criticise, and to require explanations. I have carefully read the treaty. I think there are some portions of it that might have been rendered more clear in its language, and I fear it may eventually lead to complications and difficulties. That portion of the treaty which is embodied in the 7th section contains a great difficulty, to my mind. I cannot construe it as to

obtain any clear view with regard to it. With regard to the 6th section, and the word "outfit," there is no doubt in my mind, taking the whole text of the treaty, that it must include bait; and when we find in the other sections that they have a right to purchase provisions, supplies and outfits, we see that a construction has there been given to the word "outfit" in other portions of the treaty which will include bait. But be that as it may, I believe it will be a benefit to our people as much as to the United States, because I think the more trade we can get the better it will be for our people, and it will tend to more closer commercial relations. With regard to the 7th section, I was not present when the Minister of Justice gave his explanation, but I must say that if the construction is confined to the homeward voyage I cannot understand the meaning of the latter portion at all, because we must construe that along with the rest of the treaty. We find that a license may be granted when the vessel is on a homeward voyage. So far that is very clear. The vessel on a homeward voyage, may, upon application, get a license to purchase in established ports of entry, the necessary supplies it may require. Having obtained a license an American fishing vessel shall be authorised:

"To purchase in established ports of entry of the aforesaid coasts of Canada, for the homeward voyage, such provisions and supplies as are ordinarily sold to trading vessels."

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, casual or needful supplies.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). I must say it is a difficult matter, and I think it is one that we should discuss and see clearly what it involves. The section continues:

"And any such vessel having obtained a license in the manner aforesaid, shall also be accorded upon all occasions such facilities for the purchase of casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels."

If I construe that as a lawyer, and I do so with diffidence where I find other legal gentlemen may take a different view, it is that if a vessel gets a license she will be entitled to get on all occasions those supplies. I think it is a matter of regret that this should not be made clear, because I believe, I may say I am confident from my own personal acquaintance with some of the gentlemen connected with the treaty on the American side, that the spirit in which the treaty was approached was a most friendly one towards Great Britain and Canada, and the consideration was entered upon with a view of getting rid of the difficulties that have existed since 1818 in the construction of the treaty and the headland question. It seems to me that the language should have been a little more clearly definite, and we are fairly entitled to explanations. We can reject the Bill, but we cannot alter the treaty, which, however, cannot go into effect unless assented to by the Parliament of Canada; but when we come to discuss the provisions of the Bill we are responsible, as representatives of the people, for the language of the statute; and I say that in enacting these provisions we should do it in language that will prevent difficulty, remembering that this is an international question, not one between individuals but between two great countries, the Imperial power and ourselves on one hand and the adjoining republic on the other. I repeat that I entirely endorse the views of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) that we should not oppose this treaty. I believe in the spirit which has actuated the framers of the treaty, and I hope, whatever the results may be, nothing may arise under it to disturb the friendly relations between the two countries, but that all action under it may be of such a character as to restore friendly feelings. I have very strong opinions on this subject, because it is one of very great importance to my constituents. In our hour of distress and trouble, when we met with as great a calamity as any city could meet with