

read the letter and the despatches of Mr. Bayard, you will find that the Americans claimed that they had a right to transship under the treaty between the two nations, and they claimed that this was not only a hardship but an irregularity, that we should refuse them the right to transship their fish, having adopted the bonding system. Now, under the treaty, they give up that system, and they ask us, and we give them the right to transship their fish so soon as we have the right to sell our fish to them. In fact, this is a treaty of mutual concession. It is a fair treaty and a just treaty, a treaty which is honorable to both parties. The hon. gentleman says, why did you make such extreme pretensions if you were not going to carry them out? Are there any of these pretensions that the hon. gentlemen do not say now are legal? Do hon. gentlemen opposite say we were not justified in making these pretensions? Is not the charge now made that we have given away our just pretensions? Then, if that be so, we cannot be charged with acting with brag and bluster in making those pretensions which the hon. gentlemen opposite are obliged to admit were justifiable by the law of nations and by the treaties themselves. You will remember that there was a special reason why the pretensions or these claims of right, because they are not only pretensions but they are claims of right, were made. They were made at the initiation of this correspondence, at the initiation of these attempts to bring on negotiations and carry them to a successful result. At the time those negotiations were commenced, it was supposed by Canada, and it was in fact supposed by the United States as well, that the question of the fisheries would arise, and certainly when Canada was asserting all her rights, she asserted these extreme pretensions that the hon. gentleman speaks of, because it was supposed that the Americans would ask for the right to the inshore fisheries. We supposed, when negotiations were commenced, that, as in 1854, and as in 1871, the right to fish within the three mile limit would be asked for by the Americans. How we were to be compensated, whether by an extension of trade or by a money payment, was in the future of uncertainty, but we supposed that would be one of the demands which the Americans would make. In that case, it was necessary for us to hold out the utmost of our claims against the possibility of their desiring to get the three mile inshore fisheries, and to insist that these inshore fisheries should be protected under the strict terms of the convention of 1818. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke about the humiliation of our giving away the territorial rights of Canada for money in 1871. I remember very well when that treaty was discussed in this House.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I said nothing about giving away territorial rights in 1871. I simply spoke in reference to the territorial rights under the treaty which is now under consideration. I spoke of certain sacrifices which were made by the Treaty of 1871, but I said nothing whatever about the territorial rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman spoke about his objections to giving away the inshore fisheries for money.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I did not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I am much mistaken. Perhaps this is caused by the recollection of the fierce attacks which were made upon me in 1872 by the hon. gentleman and those who surround him, when I was called Judas Iscariot, when I was told that I had sold the territorial rights of Canada for thirty pieces of silver. I do not know whether some hon. gentlemen did not say that I was Benedict Arnold. At any rate I remember that the hon. gentleman's leader, who, I regret to see, is not now in his place, Mr. Mackenzie, declared that he looked with

loathing upon that portion of the treaty which provided for an arbitration under which the Americans were to pay a money consideration for the difference between the value of our fisheries and theirs. That idea was rung all through the country, and I had some fear for my personal safety when I returned from Washington, because of the sacrifice which I had made of the honor of Canada, according to the statements of these gentlemen; but, after we went out of power, and those hon. gentlemen came in, their views changed, they carried to successful completion that arrangement, and the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is now no more (Sir Albert Smith) got his title for carrying to successful completion the sacrifice which they said I had been guilty of. That hon. gentleman got that honor for the work which was done, in fact, by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). The whole treaty at present is, as I have stated, honorable to both sides. There are mutual concessions on both sides. In the first place, in reference to the headlands, there is a reasonable arrangement, because all civilized nations have accepted the same limitation. Then, as respects bait, we have agreed to give bait to the American fishermen, if they allow our fish in. Of course, we give them all other supplies. We have allowed them to come into our ports and purchase supplies, also for their homeward voyage. That is a kindly and a humane thing to do, that, if a fishing vessel has exhausted its supplies, it should be allowed to come into our ports and purchase its supplies; and, on the other hand, we gain for our traders and merchants the sale of those supplies. It is the same thing in regard to transshipment. It is of great advantage to the fishermen to be able to transship their catch by our railways, instead of being compelled to go far away from their fishing ground. On the other hand, our railways get the advantage of that transshipment, and a very considerable item it was in the receipts of the Intercolonial Railway before it was stopped. So, Sir, you can go on with every one of the items of this treaty, and you will find that it is governed by a spirit of mutual concession, by a spirit of give and take. It is honorable to both nations, it is honorable to all parties, and above all things, it is beneficial to all parties, as it puts an end to all this irritation, it puts an end to all these quarrels and it makes us good neighbors instead of bad neighbors; and my hon. friend and the plenipotentiaries who acted with him, and the majority of this House, I am sure, will see, and justly see, the blessings that will be given to peacemakers.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not rise with the intention of adding to this already lengthy discussion. I frankly admit that upon this question I have not made such a study as would enable me to discuss it adequately. I rise simply for the purpose of stating for the fourth or fifth time, since it is not yet understood on the other side, what is the policy of the Opposition upon this question. Sir, in the course of a long parliamentary career the hon. leader of the Government has had to meet many different accusations. He has just told us that he has been compared to Judas Iscariot, he has just told us that he has been accused of being another Benedict Arnold. There is one thing, however, which the right hon. gentleman has never been charged with—he has never been charged with dulness of intellect; and I am surprised, knowing his qualities as we see them exemplified in this House, that, after having heard the speeches which have been delivered on this side of the House on this question, he does not yet understand the policy of the Opposition in regard to it. Sir, it has already been explained by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), by my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Jones), by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and lastly, by my hon. friend from Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), and I tell him