

different views from those in other sections of the country, to oppose prohibition. That is a question that may be discussed hereafter, and probably we might leave that entirely for the other House to deal with, but here is a fact: every single province in the Dominion has pronounced in favour of prohibition, except one, and because you have not a majority in the whole of the provinces, the temperance people, whom my hon. friend says are so satisfied with the "best of governments" that ever existed, have to—I do not desire to use strong language—abandon all hope of legislation. However, the prohibitionists have shown that they are not satisfied with the action of the government. I may be permitted, before I sit down, to refer again to the Washington Commission. It escaped my mind at the time. My hon. friend expressed great delight at the result, so far as we know it. He was delighted, as a Canadian, a loyal British subject, at the position taken by the commissioners, as I understood him, upon that question which led to the postponement of further consideration of the Alaskan boundary. On that question, if we understand it, the United States commissioners demanded that even if they submitted the question to arbitration as to where the boundary between the two countries really was, those portions of the country in which there are settlements and which the United States have had possession of for a long time, should still remain United States territory.

Hon. Mr. MILLS—I think you may drop the words "for a long time."

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL—My hon. friend makes the case stronger. Does any one who has watched the course of events, or has paid the slightest attention to the debates in the House of Commons for the last session, and who knows the position taken by the Premier on that question, wonder for a moment that the United States commissioners took that position? The Premier made the declaration in the House of Commons when debating this question last session, that those portions of the country which had been settled and held by the United States would still be retained by them, and that he would not withdraw the expression when solemnly asked to do so by Sir Charles Tupper, for fear it would be taken advantage

of. He positively refused. The principle was laid down that because the United States had possession, because they had made a settlement, we should not even claim it as British territory. Is it to be wondered then, that the United States commissioners should say: "Well, you have admitted this fact decidedly in your speeches in the House, and certainly you should have no hesitation in making that restriction in any reference to the commission." When you look back to the history of this country—when you trace the utterances of the leaders of the Liberal party and more particularly of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, his chief and others, in their declarations throughout the country, of their willingness to concede almost anything that the United States would ask of them in order to get that panacea for all the ills and evils that they said afflicted this country, unrestricted reciprocity, is it any wonder, when the United States have those expressions lying before them, that they should demand from our commissioners that which no British commissioner would think of surrendering? I am glad my hon. friend from Quinté division, descended, as I know he is, from good U. E. Loyalist stock, resents any such propositions, from whatever party they emanate. It would be presumption in any of us to attempt to discuss this question intelligently without knowing really what the terms are and what the points are upon which the commission have come to any decision. May I ask the hon. Minister of Justice if it is true that the Canadian commissioners, headed by the Premier of this country, have consented to leave the interpretation of the treaty of 1818 affecting the fisheries, a question on which no one doubts our rights, to arbitration to ascertain whether that should be permitted to continue to exist? Are the United States people to take the Premier's declaration at Chicago, where he said that the old treaty was barbarous in its character, that it was entered into at a time so different from the present, that while it might be applicable at that time and quite correct, it was not applicable or correct at this date? Is it possible that a treaty which leaves no possible doubt as to the rights of Canada to those fisheries, should be left to arbitration to-day, to tell us what it means? If that concession is made, it is a concession to which no Canadian should submit and should