

or unlawful treatment of American fishing vessels on the part of the Canadian authorities in which reparation was not promptly and satisfactorily obtained by the United States Consul General at Halifax."

This proves that the policy of the Government changed entirely, and that the bluster, and the brag, and the blow, and the cannons, and all that kind of thing which they indulged in in 1886 had ceased, and that in the year 1887 they became as quiet as lambs. There is no doubt in the mind of any man who has studied the question that Sir Charles Tupper when he went to Washington in 1887 agreed that there should be no more of those seizures and cruel harshness of which the Americans complained. President Cleveland says so in so many words in the extract which I have just read to the House. In 1887 with the Non-Inter-course Bill so staring us in the face the present Government did what they should have done in the previous year. We had a treaty agreed to in 1888 and we had attached to that treaty a *modus vivendi*. The Government did not wait until that treaty became the law of the land. They did not wait until the treaty was ratified by the Executive of the United States, but they came to this Parliament and asked us to ratify the treaty before it had been submitted to the Executive of the United States. I thought that was a great blunder at the time for they were binding not only the plenipotentiary of Her Majesty to agree to the treaty, but they were binding the Canadian people through their Parliament to that treaty. What did we find then when the treaty was brought down? We found that it conceded to the Americans 90 per cent. of the claims they had made. It was a treaty of concession from beginning to end, and this Government abandoned their policy which they declared to be absolutely essential for the protection of our fisheries and they conceded to the Americans the rights which they had been clamoring for and which the Canadian Government withheld from them in 1886. A more complete back down never was seen in the history of this country. That treaty was rejected by the United States Senate and so far as those clauses are concerned which relate to the delimitation in our waters, or so far as those clauses are concerned which make an offer on our part in return for some concession to be made on theirs, those clauses are not in force to-day. I submit to this House that, in so far as the Government agreed to put a new interpretation on the Treaty of 1818, and in so far as that new interpretation is embodied in the Treaty of 1888, that treaty having been ratified by this Parliament, we are bound by the interpretation put on the Treaty of 1818 in the Washington Treaty of last year. It binds us now; it will bind us for all time to come and if that is the case the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches to-day have agreed to an interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 which admits the American vessels to our waters and gives them rights which the Canadian Government declared in 1886 to the Imperial Government would be an entire surrender of our fishery interests. The policy of the Government is an arbitrary, capricious and unstatesmanlike policy from the beginning. In 1885 they gave up the fisheries for nothing. In 1886 they enforced Customs laws against the American fishermen with an unnecessary harshness and severity which drove the people to desperation. They told the Imperial Government that it was absolutely necessary that they should pursue this course because if they did not, it would be the giving up of all our rights. Yet in 1888, they agreed to a treaty and made this Parliament consent to it which surrendered every right which they said was necessary for the maintenance of those fisheries for ourselves. What is the state of affairs now. Formerly the Government exacted a formal entry and clearance from fishermen of the States temporarily seeking shelter in our ports, by an article of the Treaty of 1888 they abandoned that, and American fishermen by their own interpretation of that treaty can enter our harbors without making for-

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

mal entries and clearances. They can enter our harbors now for the purpose of obtaining provisions, for the purpose of obtaining whatever supplies they need for homeward voyages, and having obtained a license they can get permits at all times. There has been an abolition of the pilotage charges, and the right of transhipment and sale has been conceded to them as incidental to repairs. We were told in 1886 that if these concessions were surrendered it would be the abandonment of all our rights under the Treaty of 1818. The point I want to make is this: that whether they agreed to the *modus vivendi* or not our Government cannot go behind or beyond the interpretation of the Treaty of 1818 which they laid down in the Treaty of Washington of 1888. If that is so, let us see where exactly we are. This last treaty conceded almost everything to the United States, and in this connection we must remember the Message which President Cleveland sent to his Congress. In respect to that treaty he said:

"The history of events in the last two years shows that no feature of Canadian administration was more harassing and injurious than the compulsion upon our fishing vessels to make formal entry and clearance on every occasion of temporarily seeking shelter in Canadian ports and harbors.

"Such inconvenience is provided against in the proposed treaty, and this most frequent and just cause of complaint is removed.

"The articles permitting our fishermen to obtain provisions and the ordinary supplies of trading vessels on their homeward voyages and under which they are accorded the further and even more important privilege on all occasions of purchasing such casual or needful provisions and supplies as are ordinarily granted to trading vessels are of great importance and value.

"The licenses which are to be granted without charge and on application, in order to enable our fishermen to enjoy these privileges, are reasonable and proper checks in the hands of the local authorities to identify the recipients and prevent abuse, and can form no impediment to those who intend to use them fairly.

"The hospitality secured for our vessels in all cases of actual distress, with liberty to unload and sell and tranship their cargoes is full and liberal. These provisions will secure the substantial enjoyment of the treaty rights for our fishermen under the Treaty of 1818, for which contention has been steadily made in the correspondence of the Department of State, and our Minister at London, and by the American negotiators of the present treaty.

President Cleveland therefore contended—and I think he contended with great force—that the contentions made on behalf of the United States Government had been nearly all conceded in this treaty. I cannot see for the life of me how this Government in interpreting the Treaty of 1818 as they did can hereafter go behind or beyond the interpretation which they conceded in the Washington Treaty of 1888, and which they asked this Parliament to assent to and which this Parliament formally did assent to. The right hon. gentleman the Premier in the speech which he made the other day undertook to make several statements which I think were made without much reflection. And they certainly were inconsistent with the facts. The hon. gentleman in the opening part of his speech somewhat enthusiastically made some boasts which I think on reflection he will regret having made. He stated, to the surprise of this House, and I am sure it will be to the surprise of the country, that every contention the Government had ever made had been conceded by the Americans. I never heard a more audacious statement by any gentleman in the House or out of it. I could hardly believe my ears, and I waited until the official report of the hon. gentleman's remarks came out to see whether my ears had deceived me at the time. But I find they did not, and the hon. gentleman's organs are publishing that speech and declaring it to be a great, logical and statesmanlike speech.

Mr. HESSON. A good speech.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman may be a good judge, but I do not think it was. It was delivered, I was glad to see, with more than the usual physical vigor of the right hon. gentleman, and that we are all glad of; but I do not think it was marked by that statesmanlike prudence and caution which in a great matter, affecting the