

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman is quite right.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). Has the Government arrived at any policy on that question?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No, they have not.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). They have not come to any conclusion in regard to giving them the advantage of the *modus vivendi* even if the treaty is rejected by the United States Senate.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That has not been considered. We simply propose to take power to do it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Under what possible combination of circumstances would the hon. gentleman think it desirable to continue the *modus vivendi*, provided the treaty were absolutely rejected by the United States Senate? The hon. gentleman evidently has considered the question, because he retained to himself powers to maintain the *modus vivendi*.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. The hon. gentleman will see that the spirit running through the whole of this treaty is to avoid difficulty as far as possible, and it will be quite possible even in the event of rejection of the treaty by the Senate to anticipate its adoption at a very early day; and if under those circumstances there was reason to suspect after the presidential election that the question would stand in a different position, it would be very desirable to have the means to avoid any friction in the matter.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). If the treaty were rejected by the Senate it would be practically dead.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Technically perhaps not. I am in hope, first, that that will not occur; and, second, even if it did, the hon. gentleman will see that if the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, having practically come to an agreement, found at an early day that the position was favorable to having the subject dealt with in a different way, that difficulty could be got over without much trouble.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman to take these powers is a reasonable one, and I do not think the hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will object to it. If we were on the rejection of the treaty by the United States to drop the *modus vivendi*, it would be sure to revive those troubles which the hon. gentleman hopes are pretty well allayed, and I, therefore, think this is a reasonable proposition.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the treaty is rejected, it is at an end and a dead letter, so far as it is a treaty between the two countries, and if the hon. gentleman will reflect for a moment he will see that if these rights are continued for a certain period they must be continued for all time.

Mr. MITCHELL. No. We have reserved scarcely anything by the treaty.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, oh!

Mr. MITCHELL. That is the contention I have made all through, and that is the conclusion I have arrived at. As the American people must see that they have gained everything by this treaty, it matters to us very little whether they enjoyed those privileges for the full two years provided by the *modus vivendi* or not. One thing is clear, that we would never be able to enforce our rights subsequently without the British Government behind us, and then it would arouse irritation and bad feeling. But I do not agree with the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), who contends that if the Americans exercise these privileges for two years, they will have them for all time; but if they enjoyed them during two years under this arrange-

ment, the privilege might be continued under a new treaty based upon the same lines.

Mr. WELDON (St. John). This section immediately becomes law.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Yes.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope there will be no address from this House containing congratulations to Mr. Chamberlain and his other colleague, Sir Sackville West, for the great success they have had in giving away the interests of Canada.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I may say in reply to my hon. friend that I shall feel that Her Majesty's plenipotentiaries have had everything that they could possibly expect when this House by a unanimous vote has ratified their proceedings.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I have one statement to make. It does seem to me obvious that the last section of the Act which we have just passed by this House is really going further than the plenipotentiaries offered in their proposition for a *modus vivendi*. That *modus vivendi* of the British plenipotentiaries set out the following:—

"The treaty having been signed the British plenipotentiaries desire to state that they have been considering the position which will be created by the immediate commencement of the fishing season before the treaty can possibly be ratified by the Senate of the United States, by the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Newfoundland. In the absence of such ratification the old conditions which have given rise to so much friction and irritation might be revived, and might interfere with the unprejudiced consideration of the treaty by the legislative bodies concerned. Under these circumstances and with the further object of affording evidence of their anxious desire to promote good feeling, and to remove all possible subjects of controversy, the British plenipotentiaries are ready to make the following temporary arrangement for a period not exceeding two years in order to afford a *modus vivendi* pending the ratification of the treaty."

This was to provide for a state of affairs pending the ratification of the treaty, but there was no proposition, as I understand it, made by the British plenipotentiaries providing that the *modus vivendi* should remain in force in the event of the Senate absolutely rejecting the treaty. The hon. gentleman now has taken power, and if it should be rejected, from what has fallen from him it is perfectly plain that the Government intends to act upon this, that whether the treaty is ratified or rejected the *modus vivendi* remains in force for two years.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). I understand it was only intended in the event of the treaty being held over.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That was what was intended, but we are going further now.

Committee rose and reported.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is not that a little too rapid? You taunted us with the fact that we had unanimously adopted this Bill.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will not taunt us again if we let it go?

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. No.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INCREASE IN SALARY OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER moved second reading of Bill (No. 87) to amend the "Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act," chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. He said: Mr. Speaker, the first clause of this Bill provides that the salary of the Auditor General shall be increased to \$4,000