

similar terms. In the light of these opinions, who can say that the great writers on the law of nations are agreed. The hon. gentleman says there is a definite rule, but they say there is not a definite rule, and that in the absence of public law, you are utterly at sea as to what your rights are in these land-locked bays. Passing away from the writers, we have but one other means of determining what are our rights, that is the practice of nations. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to deal with these matters, but I may be pardoned if I remind him that the practice of nations is reasonably definite and clear. We are not alone in our fishery troubles. The fisheries on the North Atlantic coast are not the only fisheries in which England has been interested. There are extensive fisheries on the eastern side of the British Islands, and there are fisheries in the North Sea, with reference to which England has a treaty with France, made in 1839. In determining with France what should be regarded as the maximum limit of jurisdictional bays, England in that treaty had agreed to the ten mile rule. In 1868 in a treaty with Germany with reference to the fisheries in the North German Ocean, she has also agreed to the ten mile rule. Then there is the Treaty of 1862, to which the hon. Minister of Finance alluded, in which the same rule was followed. I call the attention of the House to these facts, in order to show that while there is no consensus of opinion in the writers on international law, there is a uniformity in the practice of the great nations of Europe; and I do not see how our negotiators could have expected to obtain more than the ten mile rule; yet Article 3 closes all the small bays by the ten mile rule, and Article 4 closes all the large ones by individual delimitation. Hon. gentlemen claim that Canadian fishermen have under this treaty been deprived of their lawful fishing grounds, but the only possible ones are the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy. The hon. member for Northumberland stated the case fairly the other night when he stated that all parties are agreed that the Bay of Fundy is regarded as part of the high seas, partly because of the great width of the bay, and partly because the northern headland is in the United States. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) delivered a very interesting speech, a speech very highly prized by this House, not altogether because of its own inherent merits, but also because of the very spirited rejoinder which it provoked from the hon. Minister of Justice. I think, if the hon. member for Queen's would speak frankly to-night as to his feelings when the Minister of Justice had done with him, he would say, with Sir Andrew Aguecheek, "Plague on it! had I known him valiant and so cunning in fence, I would have seen him damned before I challenged him." The hon. senior member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) took a high patriotic ground that was delightful to see. We know the hon. gentleman and respect him highly, but the patriotic role is not his normal role; and when he said that, as a Canadian, he was prepared to make sacrifices for the sake of the Empire, I was astonished. He takes the ground that this treaty and the interests of Canada have been sacrificed by the exercise of Imperial pressure and the same position was taken, and more strongly taken, by the hon. member for Northumberland. But, I desire to impress this point on hon. members: that Great Britain, in negotiating this treaty for her Canadian people, has preserved to them the ten mile rule, and has held for them bays much wider than ten miles, while in negotiating with reference to the rights of her own English people in the German Ocean she has not gone so far or secured such great rights. She has held out more strongly and stubbornly to protect us than she has done to protect her people at home. Mr. Speaker, I must apologise for occupying the time of the House so long. I shall sit down by saying that I share in all sincerity the feelings of the hon. member for Halifax, when he said he was glad to see a cause of quarrel between

Mr. WELDON (Albert).

the two nations removed. I think we all express the hope that this treaty will be ratified, we cherish the belief that this treaty will be ratified by the Canadian Parliament, and I cherish the hope that this treaty, in which undoubtedly we have made concessions, will be ratified by the Americans. It is a treaty that undoubtedly comes long below what we argued for; it is undoubtedly a treaty of concession. We hope the Americans will ratify it, and thus remove the cause of ill-will which has been standing for many years. But if they should not ratify it, our labor would not be in vain. Here is a treaty endorsed by an overwhelming majority of the Canadian Parliament and people, and the responsibility of putting it through their Senate has been accepted by the American executive. It commands the support of one powerful party in the United States, and with that enormous weight of opinion at its back, whether it be rejected or accepted, it will establish the rule that will hereafter control the conduct of both nations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly think the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was quite justified in insinuating that I was desirous of stopping the discussion the other night. On the contrary, we were anxious to prolong it, and to give himself and other hon. gentlemen on that side, as well as ourselves, an opportunity of expressing their views. It was his own leaders who were most desirous of shutting off that discussion on that occasion, and depriving us of the pleasure of listening to the hon. gentleman. It appears to me there is really some little inconvenience in this present doctrine of dual sovereignty which appears to be exemplified on the other side of the House. No doubt there have been occasions in our own history, in the old relations between the two Canadas, when it was found convenient to have two heads to the Government; and, in older times, there were two consuls in Rome, but really on the present occasion it must be admitted this arrangement comes rather hard, particularly on what I may call, I hope without offence, the inferior members of the Ministry. These hon. gentlemen are, I am sure, desirous, as they ought to be, of keeping in accord with the powers that be; but, Sir, it is very hard indeed for even political Vicars of Bray to render proper obedience to the powers that be, when the powers that be do not know their own minds from week to week, and do not appear to agree with each other as they ought to do. Sir, I think that the First Minister in particular, ought to consider the feelings of his colleagues. He has been accused on various occasions of looking on most of his colleagues as his clerks rather than his colleagues. It is not for us to say how far that suspicion is correct, but I am bound to say that some of his proceedings of late do appear to give it a good deal of color. In the present instance, take the case of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who, I am sorry not to see in his place. How hard a case was his. He was called upon to reply to myself on a recent occasion; and after he replied, we find the Minister of Finance coming down and riding ruthlessly over all his arguments. Well, perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance may plead there was not much argument to ride over. Indeed, I virtually agree with him there; but that made it none the easier for the hon. the Minister of the Interior. Then there is the case of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice was called upon to back up his leader in response to the attack made on the Government by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and he rose equal to the occasion. He not only expounded the law on the occasion, but he declared, with his hand on his heart, that he would be a traitor to the best interests of his country if he advised, or the Government advised, that we should bend to the caprice and suit our policy to the dictation of any petty demagogue in the United States Congress. I submit that after those patriotic sentiments, it