

similar in its terms to what was known years ago as the Blain-Bond treaty—a treaty under which, I venture to say, the interests of Canada would be very much prejudiced if it should come into operation. I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman what is the view of his government with regard to that. We know that when the Blain-Bond treaty was proposed, there was a strong protest against it sent from Canada to the mother country, on account of which further negotiations were stayed for the time being. Has this government taken any similar steps with regard to the present treaty? If not, does it propose to take any such steps. I think that the government might very much better occupy itself at present in negotiating with Newfoundland for the purpose of rounding off the Dominion by securing the entrance of Newfoundland into our confederation than in idle negotiations with the United States. That colony has important trade relations with many parts of Canada—not only the maritime provinces, but Quebec and Ontario as well. I believe that an arrangement could be made between Canada and Newfoundland which would be for the benefit of both countries, and I would like to see the government beginning those negotiations; and as a preliminary, I think that the government might very well enter into negotiations with the imperial authorities for the purpose of obtaining some honourable settlement of the difficulty known as the French shore question. Canada is interested in that question almost as much as Newfoundland. Canada would be specially interested if Newfoundland would become part of our confederation, and I hope to see that island enter the Dominion before many years. We on this side will give the government our cordial support in any movement to that end, and I hope that this government will take the initiative for the purpose of having this difficulty removed so that the island may enter confederation unhampered by any such difficulty as now unfortunately prevails on its western coast. I do trust that my right hon. friend will be able to give us some information with regard to that particular question, and to assure the House that the government is alive to the advantages which would accrue both to Canada and to Newfoundland by that island becoming a part of this Dominion.

My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) has referred to the Alaskan boundary question. In common with every member of this House, I regret the position in which that matter stands at present. The attitude of this government upon it has been somewhat remarkable. Last year we submitted a motion for the purpose of bringing before the House and the country the papers relating to the abrogation of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty, and the government took the ground that Canada had no direct interest in the proposed canal across from

the Nicaraguan peninsula. My right hon. friend said that Canada had no direct interest in the abrogation of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty or in the construction of the Nicaraguan canal—that she had no more interest in that canal than she had in the treaty affecting the Suez canal or in any other treaty between Great Britain and a foreign power. I take issue with my right hon. friend. I say that Canada had a direct interest in the abrogation of that treaty. What interest has the United States in the Nicaraguan canal? She has the interest of her possessions on the Atlantic and Pacific and of the share which she expects to have in the future great trade with the Orient. I leave it to every hon. member whether Canada has not precisely the same interest in that Nicaraguan canal as has the United States. Our interests may be of a lesser degree, but we have great possessions on the Atlantic and the Pacific and we hope to get some share in the great trade of the Orient in the future. I know of no portion of the empire which has a greater interest in this canal and in the abrogation of the Bulwer-Clayton treaty than we have. The attitude taken by my right hon. friend was not that of Lord Lansdowne because in a dispatch to the British ambassador at Washington in 1901, Lord Lansdowne referred to the interests of Great Britain in this Nicaraguan canal and in the Clayton-Bulwer treaty by reason of her enormous possessions on the continent of America. The further language of Lord Lansdowne was quoted in the House last year. Lord Lansdowne said:

Shortly afterwards Lord Herschell intimated that the difficulties with regard to the question of the Alaskan boundary seemed insuperable and he feared it might be necessary to break off the negotiations of which he hitherto had the charge. Upon this Lord Salisbury informed Mr. White that he did not see how Her Majesty's government could sanction any convention for amending the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, as the opinion of this country would hardly support them in making a concession which would be wholly to the benefit of the United States, at a time when they appeared to be so little inclined to come to a satisfactory settlement in regard to the Alaskan frontier.

My hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) brought that to the attention of the government last year. And these are very significant words indeed. Apparently, at that time, the British government had taken a stand that it would not be a proper thing to abrogate the Clayton-Bulwer treaty without making some provision for the settlement of the Alaskan boundary. Now, I think it is due to the House and to the country that my right hon. friend should state frankly the influences, if there were influences, which led to that change of attitude on the part of the British government. And he should also, and more especially, tell the people of this country whether that change of at-