

the different ports to give that decision, or are they to come to the Minister of Marine, or the Minister of Finance, or the Minister of Customs? Why do not the hon. gentlemen, while this matter is fresh in the minds of the people, give the information to the country as to how this will affect the question when this treaty goes into effect? I say that every collector of customs along the coast of Nova Scotia, taking that Act and interpreting it for himself, will get into a difficulty, and will have to apply to the hon. gentlemen for an interpretation which they are best able to give. Can an American fisherman when he comes to Nova Scotia, take his license and get his supplies and go to the fishing ground? That is one question which I would like those hon. gentlemen to answer.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. If the hon. gentleman reads the clause, he will see that they cannot.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I want the hon. gentleman to interpret that clause for me. I am merely paying that deference to the opinion of the hon. gentleman which he is entitled to from the position which he occupied on that Commission. He is bound, I think, to give us the interpretation which he places upon that clause. Of course, we have heard what he has said, but those who have not had the benefit of listening to him will be even more at sea on this matter than I am. Suppose those American fishermen come here and require supplies, the Minister of Justice says they cannot get them, while the Minister of Marine says they can get salt and go on their voyage. I want that distinctly understood. Then, when they come to port with their cargoes, and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has referred to the privilege which is given to them of transshipping their cargoes, who is to be the judge? Are the collectors of the ports to be the judges whether they are entitled to transship their cargoes or not? The hon. gentleman knows that not one collector out of twenty along the coast of Nova Scotia, or, for that matter, in the whole of this Dominion, is capable of being a judge in regard to such a matter. To whom then are they to apply for the interpretation of this Act? If they were to apply to a harbor master or a port warden, or to some competent authority who would be able to understand the position of the vessels, and whether or not it was necessary for the vessel to obtain these supplies, I could understand it, but the hon. gentleman does not give us any information on that subject, in fact we have no explanation at all. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Finance have not answered the plain, practical question which was put by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), as to what the American fishermen can do. The American consul in Halifax said, in reference to these clauses, when I was speaking to him: I do not know how I am to interpret them; how do you interpret them? I said: When we are in Parliament, and meet the gentlemen who made this treaty, we shall receive from them the explanation, as far as our contention goes, as to the interpretation of the meaning of the treaty, and no doubt you will have your own orders from your own Government; but at this moment I am just as much in the dark as I was before, because now, if anyone were to ask me, if this discussion was to cease now, what the American fishermen can do and what they cannot do, I could not tell them from any explanation which has been given by hon. gentlemen on the other side. I say, therefore, that it is, in my judgment, absolutely necessary that these gentlemen should tell us exactly the bearing which these clauses have in reference to the privileges of the American fishermen in our ports. If this opportunity is passed over without further explanation, they will have to give that explanation when each case is presented for their consideration, and it would be far better for them to do it

Mr. JONES (Halifax).

while the matter is fresh in the mind of every hon. gentleman here.

Committee rose.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

JOSEPH GAUTHIER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of L'Assomption, introduced by the Hon. W. Laurier and Mr. Amyot.

FISHERIES TREATY.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 65) respecting a certain Treaty between Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MITCHELL. I was out of the House during a part of the time that the discussion was going on this afternoon, and just as I came in I heard an utterance from the Minister of Finance which I regretted very much indeed to hear. It was to the effect that if hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House felt that this was a bad treaty for Canada, they had not done their duty in allowing it to pass without putting it to a vote and endeavoring to defeat it, or something like that. I think I defined, the other night, pretty well, my attitude in relation to that treaty. I stated that I looked upon it as a complete give-away of the interests of Canada, but, notwithstanding that, knowing as I do the past transactions between England and this colony, where any conflict came up in regard to our rights as between the United States and this country, I felt, and I fear I shall always feel, that the interests of Canada are likely to be given away, except under severe pressure. The hon. Minister of Finance stated truly the other day the lamentable fact of the existence of a hostile feeling in the United States that has grown up in reference to ourselves. Now, while I believe that that hostile feeling has been mainly created, indeed I may say entirely created, by the want of tact and judgment in the administration of our fishery rights under the Treaty of 1818, I must say that if the existence of this ill-feeling which has been so lucidly described by the Minister does exist in the United States—and I regret to say that I believe it does, from what I see in their press, from the statements of their public men, and the facts recited in the correspondence and despatches of the Secretary of State and their representative at the Court of London—I say while I believe that state of things does exist, I must justify myself for not opposing this treaty, not because I think it is in the interest of Canada, so far as regards the material concessions on either side, but I justify my acceptance of it upon the ground that it is a means of leading to peace, and a settlement of a question which has long been a source of ill-feeling. Whatever may be the fate of the treaty in the United States Senate, England never can recede from that treaty made at Washington; she never can go back and claim the rights that we enjoyed before the unfortunate treaty was signed. Now, Sir, I say this in justification of myself, and to put my views on record in the *Hansard*, in order that they may go to the country. Whatever other gentlemen may do, they can answer for themselves; whatever motives may have influenced them, that is their business; for myself I want it placed on record that the reasons why I do not oppose this treaty are not that we have got the rights we were entitled to get under the Treaty of 1818, rights which were clearly