

generous minds could have defended the positions we took in regard to the vessels of a friendly power. It is in the nature of things that we should pursue different ways, we should remember that England is and has been a model to the world, and should say nothing harsh about her. If this treaty stands in any jeopardy in the Senate of the United States, it is entirely due to ourselves. No doubt the Government is very anxious to carry the treaty. But you may understand the feeling in the United States as to the treaty, or as to any treaty, under the circumstances. I think the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that in the past two years 2,200 American vessels had been boarded by our cruisers in our waters. If anything could be calculated to excite the antagonism of a people, it must be that sort of conduct. You may have a right to do it, but to exercise that right must necessarily excite the greatest hostility. You had all these complaints made. I think there were fifty vessels involved in one set of complaints, and seventy in another which were made to the Government of this country by the people of the United States as to the way in which we treated those vessels, and claims to the number of 150 or 200 were sent in. All this must have the effect of putting the people of the United States and the Senate of that country in a very unpleasant condition with regard to us. The Minister of Finance, in bringing down his statement, gave us no information as to the position of the claims for damages against us, but I understand, from a published letter of Mr. Bayard, that he is allowing them to stand over as against claims made for damages in the Behring Sea. With regard to the detention of vessels, I do not know how many there are, but I assume that these vessels are to be released. Now, Sir, if these vessels are to be released, it seems to me a very strong acknowledgment that, at any rate, our case was a doubtful one. With reference to the general question of the purchase of bait, referred to by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Eisenhauer) the other night, with regard to the purchase of ice and supplies, and wood and coal, and the transshipment of cargoes and crews, I think it would be better for the Government to make an open arrangement with the United States with respect to all these things. It is an utter absurdity in these times to say that we shall not sell bait. There are two sides to the question. Men who are engaged in collecting bait along the coast, whose business it is to sell bait, want to sell it. An hon. member said the other night that the effect of allowing bait to be sold would be to make it dear. Well, people who have bait to sell would like to have it made dear. Then, with regard to ice. When the Treaty of 1818 was made no such thing as ice was used. Why should not men along the coast be allowed to sell ice to any fisherman that comes along? Why should they not be allowed to ship their crews? The hon. gentleman told us, as if it was something wonderful, that we were not to allow transshipment of crews, as if it was some great gain. It is absurd to make men who live in the towns along the coast in Nova Scotia travel by railway to the United States ports for the purpose of entering on board a fishing vessel. So with regard to the transshipment of cargo. Why should not cargoes be transhipped when there are on our coast railways to do the business? Now, I noticed in a paper the other day that there are 8,000 men in the New England deep-sea fisheries, and 60 to 75 per cent. of them are natives of the Lower Provinces. Is it not an absurdity to compel these men to go by railway to New England ports to join a fishing vessel, and then not allow them to be discharged at the port where the voyage ends? What will be the effect of this? The United States, a year or two ago, passed a Bill called the Labor Contract Act. Our men, instead of paying railway fares, now ship as passengers on board passenger vessels, and sail to the United States port at which they are about to engage on fishing vessels, and

where they are to stop on their voyage. The United States authorities have stopped them, have arrested these men. The other day in Boston a large number of natives of Yarmouth and Shelburne were arrested for violation of the Labor Contract Act, and they are subject to fine and imprisonment, because they go into that country under a contract to go fishing. The policy, therefore, in this respect, is one that bears harder upon ourselves than upon American fishermen. The whole object of the Treaty of 1818, and all its restrictions, have passed away. There were two objects in that treaty. One was the determination on the part of the British people of that day, backed by the leaders of the colonial people, to suppress democracy. It was supposed that we would be able to grow a power in the colonies which would check the power of the United States. Another idea was that the fisheries would become the nursery of seamen for the English navy, with which to check the power of the United States and of France. Well, Sir, England herself has become more democratic than the colony, and as to our fishermen, they never have shipped on board a British man-of-war. I do not know whether they have higher or lower aspirations, but at any rate the whole object of that treaty has failed. Therefore, it is better for the Government to take up this whole matter with a strong hand and open out the whole question. It is better not to make any restrictions at all, but to open them as a matter of trade, and say to the United States: We are willing to make the best trade we can with you, under the circumstances. We recognise fully that it is better to have freedom of trade, better to enter into a liberal arrangement with regard to the people of the United States as being beneficial to our own people and to ourselves. Now, Sir, with regard to the contention that the treaty gives us anything, it is perfectly absurd. No one has shown where we get any advantage. The hon. member for Queen's, P.R.I., the other night went over the ground thoroughly, and from his point of view he showed exactly what the position is. The hon. Minister of Justice tuned up his fiddle and played us a very pretty little jig, at which all of us could laugh, whether we were on the Government side or not; but he really did not meet the arguments of the hon. member for Queen's as to what the treaty takes away from us. The main ground upon which this treaty can be defended, the ground upon which I support it, is that it is friendly to the United States. It is a treaty of peace. What we surrender may not be very great. It is absolutely necessary for us to live on the most friendly terms with the United States; it is a most desirable thing that all the arrangements between the two countries, and all the relations between them, shall be of the most harmonious character, so as to prevent trouble and discord among the two peoples. We are constantly, in winter and summer, the recipients of favors from the people along the coast. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I support this treaty because of its friendliness to the United States, because it sweeps away restrictions which are unnecessary, which are of no benefit to ourselves, and when removed may be of great benefit to that people and to ourselves in the way of peace, both for this country and the Empire at large. Now, Sir, I must cordially congratulate the Minister of Finance upon his treaty. I do not want to express in as strong terms as I would like to, the appreciation I feel of the work he has done. Words of mine, which would seem to me to be only words of just praise for the work he has done, might seem to the House, perhaps—to this side at any rate—words of extravagant eulogy; therefore I will not use them. But I do say that he has done a great work for Canada, he has done a great work for England, and he has done considerable good work for the United States in this House, and I trust that, in whatever way his reward may come, it will be satisfactory to him. But, Sir, it is well to note that in what he has done, he has bowled over the most important members of the Cabinet. He has swept