land, and he virtually told us that the people of the United States were pirates and marauders on the high seas. I do not quite agree with him in such an assertion. We had, as we always held all the rights of law on our side, and in all of them we have been sustained, it is true, but still there was a serious as well as a large subtle, and I might say a sentimental contention on the other side, and I am surprised that my hon. friend should imagine that a complicated case, such as it was, could be so easily disposed of, requiring no more capacity to determine than what two and two make. We got our rights by arbitration, and we maintain our right to float our flag, the British flag, as British subjects on the high seas—rights which were threatened to be taken ruthlessly from us when our vessels were captured and our people imprisoned. The regulations were a matter of minor importance. It may be that they are not such regulations as we conceive to be in the least in the interests of Canada and we hear that our neighbours are equally dissatisfied, but they were made by able and impartial men and are intended to protect the seals as much from the citizens of the United States as from our own people. My hon. friend from Halifax says that by these regulations we will be thrown out of the sealing industry altogether. If so the citizens of the United States must be thrown out also. The only place where they have the advantage over us is on the islands, and if the Government of the United States really wish to protect their seals, their police force united with our force will see that the regulations are observed on the islands, and that the annual slaughter of seals is kept within limits agreed on between the United States and the seal company. I do not think the Government of the United States would pursue such a suicidal policy after all the trouble and expense they have incurred, and even straining after rights that they did not possess, as to destroy the sealing industry by an indiscriminate slaughter on their own islands, protected by the 60-mile zone or girdle. But there is one thing certain to us, that these regulations apply only to citizens of the British empire and of the United States, and our sealers may go under a foreign flag and pursue pelagic sealing with impunity. We have not the control of them outside of the three-mile limit, and I think it would be a good policy on the part of the

United States and Canada to get all other nations to join with them in the arrangement for the protection of the seals, especially Russia and Japan. Even if those countries joined with us, it is a question whether we can so effectively police and guard the seal fisheries as to enforce the regulations ; it might perhaps involve a greater expense than the seal pelts are worth. At all events, it is an industry in which British Columbia is deeply interested, and one also in which the people of the United States are interested. We from Lunenburg have sent some of our best vessels and fishermen to pursue that industry, and it is yet believed to be a profitable business. When my hon. friend from Halifax speaks about the whole thing being given up, he assumes to know more than the people who are engaged in the industry. The seal fishermen that have engaged in that industry continue in that industry and are prosecuting it since the regulations were framed. They evidently do not think that sealing has been destroyed. If they thought so, they would not have this winter bought vessels in Nova Scotia and invested capital to fit them out for the enterprise. They are practical men, know their own business and mind it, and they are satisfied that the industry is not destroyed. My hon. friend referred to the stand taken by the English Government in the Mason and Slidell case sixty years ago, and he told us that if England were to-day what she was at that time she would soon have terminated this dispute in war. Well, we were very nearly brought to war on this question—we were verging upon it as England was compelled to uphold Canada's rights as British subjects when this arbitration was agreed to. I may say that I do not wish to see war with the United States, and I am glad to know that on this, as in all other matters of international dispute, we can have a peaceful settlement by means of arbitration. Why should it be otherwise, situated as we are alongside of a nation who are of our own kindred and blood? We should be sorry to have war with our neighbours, and it should never be contemplated except as a *dernier ressort.* Canada would have everything, at least very much, to lose by such a conflict. Therefore, I am glad that this dispute has been amicably settled, and that an example has been set to all the nations of the world, showing them that the most unyielding questions and claims of nations may be settled by arbitra-