

Behring's Sea. Here is a sea nearly 2,000 miles in length and more than 2,000 miles in width, of which they claim dominion to one-half; and at the very time when they are claiming dominion over a sea which, from point to point, is more than 2,000 miles across, they are denying to us our sovereignty and dominion over bays that are more than ten miles across, and that concession the hon. gentleman, by this treaty, has made. I do not pretend to say that the hon. gentleman, in conceding some of the pretensions with regard to commercial intercourse, has made provisions that are detrimental to the interests of this country. I think that these might well have been conceded, I think they ought to have been conceded without a treaty at all. I think it was unfortunate for this country that these questions were raised. It was the meddling oversight of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Customs that raised these questions. I do not say that the responsibility wholly rests with them, for I have no doubt whatever that in this matter they had the support and approval of their colleagues; but I say that the exasperation which the hon. gentleman says he has done so much to allay, the irritation which he says, and which we saw from the negotiations, stood in the way of all negotiations for a time, the exasperation and irritation which the hon. gentleman makes the justification of the unnecessary concession he has made, are due to the action of those hon. gentlemen with reference to their commercial policy upon our coasts. If the hon. gentleman had not adopted his fishing regulations, if he had not undertaken vexatiously to worry and annoy American fishermen, if the hon. gentleman had not made vexatious customs regulations, which the Minister of Justice said were absolutely necessary for the protection of our fisheries, but which the Minister of Finance, with his new experience, declares were wholly unnecessary, and may be safely conceded, and are conceded by this treaty. I say it is unfortunate they were raised at all, because by raising them, they had not only conceded what ought never to have been denied, but they have also conceded that which was absolutely necessary to the due protection of this country in case of difficulty and of danger. Sir, the hon. gentlemen, while professing to feel great interest in the fisheries, have done little or nothing to furnish adequate harbor accommodation and protection to the fishing vessels which are engaged in the deep sea fishery. We know that is where the real difficulty exists, and from this treaty we know, if we did not know before, that it is the deep-sea fisheries which the Americans regard as of the utmost consequence to them. The hon. gentleman has proposed negotiations for our inshore fisheries. Have the Americans accepted the offer of the hon. gentleman? They tell us that they are very valuable, they are growing more and more valuable from day to day. But that is not the opinion of the American fishermen, because they have refused to negotiate for them, they consider them of no consequence; what they regard of consequence are facilities for engaging in the deep sea fisheries, and the hon. gentleman has adopted a policy which has provoked retaliation and brought about concessions that will go a long way to put American fishermen in a better position for engaging in the deep-sea fisheries than they ever were before. What now does he propose to do? To equalise the condition of things and to improve the position of the deep sea fisheries of the Maritime Provinces? The hon. gentleman has proposed nothing, he has suggested nothing, he has left those fishermen to take care of themselves. He first exasperated, then he conceded to the American fishermen what was necessary to allay their exasperation. And so we are in the humiliating position of being called upon here to-night to ratify what these hon. gentlemen have done in sacrificing a large portion of the territories of this country, of our sovereignty over that territory, without at all being aware that those sacrifices and

concessions will satisfy the people of the United States. Why, Sir, it would at least have been dignified if the hon. gentleman had waited a short time to see whether the American people would approve of what has been done. The hon. gentleman knows that to-morrow his treaty will be postponed or rejected, and before it is postponed or rejected he wants to commit this House to this proposition so that it must be made the starting point in all future negotiations. The hon. gentleman feels that the position of the Government is one of humiliation and that the Parliament of this country ought to be made sharers in the discredit of the work that has been done.

Mr. WELDON (Albert). The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) at the close of the debate on the fisheries treaty on Friday night or Saturday morning when discussing with the Finance Minister the reasons why there had been a miscarriage of some arrangement for the closing of the debate during that sitting of the House, took occasion to administer a rebuke to those members of the House who were not sworn of the Privy Council or who had not special acquaintance with the fisheries question, because they had ventured, among the number being my hon. friend the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Kinney), the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) and the hon. member for Shelburne (General Laurie) to take part in this debate. There are eighty odd young members of this House, and I think it did not well become a Liberal leader to express this illiberal sentiment. Those of us who represent maritime constituencies, however young we are in Parliament and how ever unable we may be to debate those questions with older and stronger men, yet feel it to be our duty and our right to speak on these questions as well as we may. I must to-night in coming to the fishery question compliment the Minister of Marine who has for two and a-half years now held that portfolio on the happy termination of the long and arduous struggle in which he has been engaged. Last summer in the city of St. John, the right hon. the First Minister took occasion to pay a splendid compliment to his young colleague, in view of the courage and patience and the courtesy which he had shown in his most difficult duties during those two years, which more than, or certainly as much as, any two previous years since Confederation, called for the exercise of the very highest qualities in the administration of the department; and that compliment found an echo all through New Brunswick. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) opened his speech to-night by asking why it was that the Administration was in so great a hurry, why they were bound to close this debate, why they must come to a conclusion before we know what action had been taken by the American Senate. But here is a bargain, and if it is to be ultimately ratified by the Imperial Parliament, by the Dominion Parliament, by the Newfoundland Legislature and by the American Senate it will never be carried out if each one is waiting for the other, for some one must begin. We have had the present Bill on our Order Paper and we have commenced; and what could be more business-like and proper than that having begun we should conclude the matter? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says the treaty will be rejected, or he thinks the treaty will be rejected. He seems to share that feeling. Why will the Americans reject the treaty if it is on the part of Canada such a base and abject surrender, as the hon. gentleman says it is? There is scarcely an offensive adjective in the English language that the hon. gentleman has not applied to this treaty. The old ground has been travelled again. The hon. gentleman has repeated the old charges that we were harsh, exasperating, impolitic, irritating, in the administration of our laws for the last two years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The Minister of Marine says so.