

may feel that his observations have been well received in this House.

Having said this much with regard to the distinguished members of this House who moved and seconded the Address, I wish now to make a few observations on the speech itself. The first paragraph expresses regret that the harvest was not as universally abundant as in other seasons, except in one of the Provinces, yet it is said to be plenteous, whatever that may mean. The grievances of the agriculturalists are beginning to crop up, and it might have been more truthful for the Government to have placed in the mouth of His Excellency some observations on the happy and contented position of the sugar refiners, the cotton lords, and the iron manufacturers. It would have been quite in keeping with the condition of things to have congratulated the country on their success and to have regretted, perhaps, if truth were to be the prevailing element in the Speech, that it tended to press rather unduly and severely upon the farmer who is taxed in order that they may have large dividends. The position of the farmer is becoming a very serious one in this country, and I rather think that his education on the National Policy in the next two or three years is likely to develop very rapidly. The National Policy has been very like this fishery question, something that could not be approached—it has been a sort of golden calf that we were all expected to worship. I have this morning seen the Fisheries Treaty, for the first time, in one of our local papers. I read it before coming to the Chamber to-day. I knew that it was to receive those fulsome laudations that have been accorded to it by the gentlemen who have spoken. I was very much amused with the observations of the hon. member from De la Durantaye when he dilated on the peace it was to assure us—on the prospect that it was to remove all the difficulties that have arisen between Canada and the United States growing out of the great difficulty of construing the Treaty of 1818. He assumes that all those difficulties have been removed. I fail to see where any of them have disappeared. There is the same room for friction so long as we have this three-mile limit, and this right to refuse

permission for American fishermen to enter our ports under circumstances that the comity of nations would amply justify. So long as those questions remain unsettled, so long will there be this friction, intensified, no doubt, by the incongruous document concocted at Washington. Let us go through this document: it has been heralded as an extraordinary production, giving to this country peace—peace at any price. After reading it I arrived at this conclusion, that I should much rather Canada had said to the United States: “We will give all you ask in that treaty cheerfully: we do not desire to have it taken from us under the vain presumption that it is a treaty between high contracting parties. Whatever is done has been done and filtered through English power.” Do you suppose for a moment that the gentlemen who have been lauded here to-day—Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. Thompson and Mr. Foster—had anything to do with the making of that treaty? Mr. Chamberlain came to this country to negotiate a treaty. He came in obedience to British sentiment, in obedience to the desire of British statesmen, that those causes of contention and trouble that had been cropping up from year to year between the two countries should be removed. He came here with a desire that the trade relations between the two countries should continue, and that Canada should go under if necessary in order that peace should prevail. I say it would have been far more chivalrous and far more in accordance with the sentiments of the people of this country if all that has been conceded in that treaty had been given by us voluntarily, and we had said to the Americans: “We want to trade with you, and if you wish to put this construction on the treaty, do not go through the form and farce of submitting it to plenipotentiaries over whom we have no control.” I will just boil down the treaty, taking out all the grand words and phrases and eloquent sentences, and give you the simple heart of the treaty: what does it amount to? It was to supersede the Treaty of 1812 and remove all cause of complaint. There were to be concessions on all sides. Let us see