

Root in writing to the imperial authorities in 1905 stated:—

I feel bound to urge that the government of Great Britain shall advise the government of Newfoundland that the provisions of the law which I have quoted are inconsistent with the rights of the United States under the treaty of 1818 and ought to be repealed, and that in the meantime and without any unavoidable delay the Governor in Council shall be requested by a proclamation which he is authorized to issue under the Act respecting foreign fishing vessels to suspend the operations of the Act.

A writer makes this comment:—

Lord Clarendon once commented in the House of Lords on the extraordinary tone of the President's message and the apparent studied neglect of that courtesy and deferential language which the governments of different countries are wont to observe when publicly treating on international questions, adding that if the British government accordingly did negotiate it would seem that it could only be upon the basis that England was unconditionally to surrender her pretensions to whatever might be claimed by the United States.

From Lord Bathurst's time down to Lord Salisbury's time, the Imperial government positively refused to give any concession to the claims of the United States, yet in the face of that long continued protest against these claims, we find the present Colonial Secretary, without apparently any reason, and in the face of the protest of Newfoundland, granting a *modus vivendi* to the United States and now submitting this question the rights of which have never been doubted by us to the Hague tribunal. I say that it is an indication of weakness, and that it is somewhat unfortunate that we are called upon to make allusion to the question without having that information before us which we could intelligently discuss the subject. I had intended to allude to various other clauses in the address, but having been tempted into remarks very much longer than I had anticipated, under the circumstances I hesitate further considering these matters. My hon. friends the mover and the seconder, set such an excellent example in delivering short speeches, though I am sure the House would have been gratified if they had continued much longer, that I hesitate to trespass further. I only desire to express the hope that these hon. gentlemen may be long spared to be useful members of this very important body.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—I am glad to find that there is one subject at any rate in which I can heartily concur with my hon. friend. I join with him in extending a welcome and in bearing testimony to the ability with which the mover and seconder of the address have discharged their duty on this occasion. Both are old friends and comrades of mine, and I can assure the House from personal experience that they will find them worthy members of this distinguished body, and I again concur in my hon. friend's desire that they may long continue to adorn the Senate, no matter what threats evil-disposed people may make against it in another Chamber. There is an old proverb which my hon. friend is familiar with, that threatened men live long, and I am inclined to think that that proverb will be verified in the case of the Senate, as it has been in the case of similar bodies elsewhere. I can understand to a large extent the reason why my hon. friend is rather disposed to jeer at the unmistakable evidences to which my hon. friends the mover and seconder called attention of the extreme prosperity that has attended the people of Canada during the present administration. I am not surprised that my hon. friend, and some of his friends in other places think that perhaps on the whole Providence has not bestowed its favours with the discrimination which might have been expected. For myself, it has been my lot to take both the bad times and the good times turn about, and I have an extremely distinct recollection of the way in which the predecessors of my hon. friend were in the habit of holding up the government of Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues to public reprobation, because under very exceptional circumstances they were not able to secure prosperity. They did their duty to the best of their ability on that occasion, but it is quite true that under the circumstances to which I have alluded that with three successive bad harvests and a universal world depression, they were not able entirely to preserve unbroken prosperity in Canada. I notice that when circumstances were reversed, however, and when the gentlemen who now lead the Opposition in the Commons were confronted with similar disasters they had very materially altered their view of the situation and had come to the conclusion that the