

Mr. Herbert to Mr. Hammond.—(Received August 9.)

Sir, *Downing Street, August 8, 1873.*
 WITH reference to your letter of the 7th of July respecting the selection of Mr. Rothery as Agent to attend the Fishery Commission appointed to meet at Halifax, and to the correspondence which has passed on the subject of the Newfoundland fisheries, I am directed by the Earl of Kimberley to transmit to you, to be laid before Earl Granville, a copy of a letter from Mr. Bennett, the Chief Minister of the Colony who is now in this country, and of a despatch transmitting copy of this letter, which Lord Kimberley proposes, with Earl Granville's concurrence, to address to Governor Hill.

Lord Granville will observe that Mr. Bennett supplies some general information as to the value of the Newfoundland fisheries, and Lord Kimberley would suggest that a copy of the letter and also of the inclosed telegram from Mr. Bennett should be sent to Mr. Rothery for his information.

I am, &c.
 (Signed) ROBERT G. W. HERBERT.

Inclosure 1 in No. 306.

Mr. Bennett to Mr. Holland.

My dear Sir, *4, Arlington Villas, Clifton, July 28, 1873.*
 SINCE writing you last I have received the following telegram from Mr. Archibald, Her Majesty's Consul at New York:

"Seal oil was free under Reciprocity Treaty, entered as product of the fisheries; skins were never dutiable."

On reference here to the American tariff, now before me, of 1861, I find, under the head of "skins,"—"fish skins for saddlers, &c., 20 per cent. *ad valorem*."

The term "saddlers" applies, I assume, to a Newfoundland seal, called "saddlebacks."

In the tariff of 1871, I find, under the head of "skins,"—"fish skins 20 per cent. *ad valorem*."

There appears to be some discrepancy in regard to the duty between Mr. Archibald's telegram and the American tariff.

I am sensible that the seal, strictly speaking, is an amphibious animal, and not a fish, but, commercially speaking, and according to usage, it is invariably called a fish, and the oil produced from it is termed and sold as a fish oil, and the American tariff of 1861 recognizes it as such.

In reference to the Commission which is about to sit at Halifax, for the purpose of estimating the value of the fishery rights respectively conceded by the United States and the North American Colonies, I don't think that I can state the case more forcibly than is given me in the language of a friend, resident in Newfoundland, of high position, who has written me upon the subject as follows:—

"As a Commission is to sit next month at Halifax, for the purpose of estimating the value of the fishery rights respectively conceded by the United States and the North American Colonies, I think this Colony should be represented by a person resident here, who should be qualified to plead our rights by a familiar knowledge of the subject; I do not believe that a person non-resident can have the requisite local knowledge to enable him to get justice for us.

"The Americans will be represented by clever men, and will on this occasion endeavour to get the best of the bargain, as they have hitherto done, in every point connected with the Washington Treaty, and whoever is intrusted with our case should be supplied with ample and correct information.

"I propose to draw your attention to the three branches of fishery most important to us, and hope that I may give some hints which may assist our delegate.

"First of all is our cod fishery. It is considered by us as an in-shore fishery; our annual catch is from 1,000,000 to 1,300,000 quintals a year, which are taken and cured by 37,000 persons, and of which probably not 5,000 quintals are taken outside the three miles limit, therefore the Americans are now to be permitted to have free access to 'new ground,' yielding enormous returns. The value of this fishery is not less annually than 5,000,000 dollars, which, without increase in the catch, would yield 60,000,000 in twelve years. What are the quantity and values of the American in-shore fishery? The answer