

from this the member for Durham would see that the exclusion of the Americans was not quite as efficient as we imagined.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked whether they were within the headlands.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he could not speak as to that; but the question was altogether a captious one, for it was well known that the headland limit had not been enforced for years. He maintained that the member for Durham West gave us the whole argument when he spoke of bounties being necessary to enable the Americans to compete with the Canadian fishermen. If however, the hon. member would read the proceedings of Congress, he would find that the question of bounties had been scouted from the very first, and that it was admitted on all hands that a system of bounties was utterly impossible; but further, the highest system of bounty would be \$400 to a vessel, while the relief would amount to \$1,200; and therefore the bounty could not, under any circumstances, do away with the advantages on the side of Canadian fishermen. He again referred to what he termed the unpatriotic action of members last year.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON thought the hon. gentleman was out of order in reflecting on the action of the House.

Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was not out of order, for the action of the House was always open to appeal.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he was quite satisfied to find the hon. gentleman acknowledge that a reference to his former action was a reflection.

Hon. Mr. HOLTON said, however that might be, the hon. gentleman assumed the responsibility of that action.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said that was under compulsion. If hon. gentleman would read a statement recently made by the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means of the United States they would see that it would be impracticable for the United States to adopt a policy that would counteract the advantages derived by Canadian fishermen. He would now ask hon. gentlemen to turn their attention to the effect of the Treaty on the shipping interest of the country. The member for Halifax (Mr. Power) had told them that he went to visit a fishery in which he was concerned, when the Treaty of 1884 was in force, and found that, out of the forty or fifty vessels, scarcely one was American; but that on another occasion, after the abrogation of that treaty, among an equal number of vessels, scarcely one was Canadian.

It must be remembered that our marine amounted to a million tons, and the House would see that, whether in connection with the fishery or the ship-building interest, the value of the Treaty could not be over-rated. He would now refer to the state of public opinion in Nova Scotia. When the Treaty first became known the Nova Scotia Government put a very strong resolution in their journals. Since then the Treaty

had been promulgated to the world, and had been read by every fisherman in the Province, and now the same House had been in session for over two months, and there had not been one word of disapproval of the Treaty. He believed that the feeling in Nova Scotia was that Parliament could not inflict greater wrong on them, and could not paralyze their industries more than by refusing to ratify the Treaty, which promoted and protected the great national industries without injuring a single interest, or being counterbalanced by a single drawback; and that a refusal would also tend to prevent the obtaining of reciprocity in the future.

He was not so well prepared to speak as to New Brunswick; but the same thing took place there. The New Brunswick Legislature at first strongly opposed the Treaty, but though they had now been six or eight weeks in session, there was not a single hostile resolution on their records. As to Prince Edward Island, the Treaty was as good as accepted.

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE asked whether they had repealed the former resolutions.

Hon. Mr. TUPPER said he would not detain the House further, and regretted that he had trespassed so long at so late a stage of the discussion; but the question was one in which not only the interests of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the whole Dominion were concerned, but also the interests of the Empire, and he would not have done justice to himself if he had not given utterance to his views. The hon. gentleman took his seat amid loud cheers.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said he was obliged to ask the indulgence of the House at this late hour, while he referred to the arguments of the hon. gentleman who had just sat down (Hon. Mr. Tupper). He would say, in the first place, that he desired to approach the consideration of this subject in a manner worthy of its importance. He would further say that he came to the House in full expectation of being able to sustain the Government in the course they had taken in the earlier part of these negotiations, when it was made known through official and semi-official sources what was the course the Government were taking. He shared the views they then expressed, and up to the present time he had seen no reason to change his opinion. The hon. gentleman who had preceded him, as well as others on that side of the House, had sought to convey the impression that the adoption of this Treaty was in the interests of permanently peaceful relations between the United States and the Empire.

He might refer by way of illustration to the celebrated Tichborne trial. The claimant brought witnesses to prove his pretensions; but when he was put in the witness box himself, his case broke down. So it was in the case of the Ministers. When their own statements were placed in evidence against their present arguments, it might be held their case had broken down. The argument that the Treaty was in the interest of