

the country against the doctrine of acquiescence when we require a license : but, Sir, I repeat again that the hon. gentleman does not require a license, and will not undertake to enforce this law against vessels coming in bays, say ten miles wide, and keeping more than three miles from the coast. Unless you are prepared to do that in the case of every land-locked bay on the coast of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, your measure accomplishes nothing except to give to the United States a very large privilege for a mere trifle and by doing so you admit that these powers are not necessary for the purpose of police. It is true, Sir, that under this measure a license may be issued which will permit the parties to come within the three miles, but when an American vessel is in the centre of one of the large bays, carrying on fishing operations four or five miles from the coast, will the hon. gentleman undertake to enforce the law against that ship which has no license? The hon. gentleman will not venture to do it, and in not venturing to do it he is not venturing to do anything to uphold the authority of this country as against the pretensions of the United States. It seems to me, Sir, that this measure is one which is calculated to weaken the rights of Canada in this matter of the fisheries. If a *modus vivendi* is established it ought to be established for a particular purpose. When this was first proposed it was defended on the grounds that negotiations were pending, and that it was necessary to conciliate and to allow the Americans this liberty until the negotiations could be consummated. Now there are no negotiations pending. There is no step taken towards the settlement of the difficulty between us, and yet the liberty of supplies for fishing is to be granted, and a *modus vivendi* is to be established which is to lead to nothing. The hon. gentleman will see, further, that the *modus vivendi* that has recently been established between Great Britain and the States is a *modus vivendi* looking towards pending negotiations. A treaty has been agreed to, a board of arbitration has been established to which disputed rights are referred, and these parties are about to engage in the negotiations with a view to a settlement of the matter in dispute. This *modus vivendi* is a means contributing to an end in that case, but in this case the *modus vivendi* leads to nothing; it is the end itself. It is not created or established with a view to accomplish some other purpose. There are no negotiations pending, no treaty to be consummated, and it is simply a backing down from the position hitherto taken. It is an admission that you have a right which you dare not defend, and which you are proposing to confer upon the Americans for a mere trifle, which on their part concedes nothing to you of the pretensions which you have hitherto put forward. You are in exactly the same position, so far as that is concerned, as if you had conceded to the American Government their claims altogether. Your license is a license which they recognize only within the waters which they have not disputed to be yours, and which concedes nothing to you with regard to those waters which they say are a part of the high seas. It seems to me, Sir, that our position is every year becoming weaker and weaker. The hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, by undertaking to establish a permanent regulation under which these licenses may be annually issued, are withdrawing the subject from Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

the attention of Parliament with a view to its being lost sight of altogether.

On section 2,

Mr. TUPPER. I propose to insert at the end of the first line these words: "On like terms and conditions as those issued under the provisions of this Act." These words were not in the previous Bill, when we were acting in unison with the colony of Newfoundland; but without them if the policy at present prevailing in Newfoundland continues, American vessels might obtain these privileges there for nothing, and we might find ourselves allowing United States vessels to enter Canadian ports on licenses issued in Newfoundland for which no consideration was given. To guard against that I propose to add these words.

Mr. LAURIER. As I understand, this amendment is to provide that if licenses are issued in Newfoundland free of cost, they shall not be accepted in our ports.

Mr. TUPPER. No, that was never the intention. We co-operated in a plan embodied in this Act; but since Newfoundland decided not to co-operate with us in this policy, it has issued licenses free to United States vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. And you do not propose to accept them?

Mr. TUPPER. No, we would not recognize licenses issued free to United States vessels.

Mr. LAURIER. That is a new departure.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Yes, it is a new departure and an important one, and possibly a very unfortunate one, and I would suggest to the hon. gentleman whether it is desirable to proceed with that amendment just now. Our relations with Newfoundland are of such a strained character at present that they should receive at a very early day the consideration of this House, and I may say that it is my purpose at a very early day to invite the attention of the House to that subject, with a view of seeing whether some *modus* may not be discovered by which the former friendly and amicable relations between us may be resumed. I do not propose to discuss the matter now. The hon. gentleman wished it for public reasons to remain in abeyance, and I do not wish to precipitate a discussion that might be injurious to the public interest. But if I do not receive an assurance that it is so, I will, at a very early day, invite the attention of the House to a consideration of those relations. As a matter of fact, the fee which we charge for these licenses is little more than nominal.

Mr. TUPPER. It amounts to about \$100 on an ordinary vessel, and sometimes to \$200.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It amounted last year to \$10,000 for the whole of the fisheries, and that is a nominal sum for the privileges which we have conceded. I hope there is not a gentleman on either side of this House who would call \$10,000 a value for those concessions. I understand that they are given from other motives and for other reasons altogether. I know that when we came to value these privileges a few years ago, we valued them more in hundreds of thousands of dollars than in tens of thousands, and I would be very sorry to let it go forth that the sum which we charge for them is held to be remuneration for them in any sense or way. It might hereafter come up against us preju-