

by the countries who are parties to them. If that were not the case, how could Switzerland, that little State in the midst of Europe in arms, successfully make treaties? But we know that she does, and that Portugal does, and that those treaties with larger powers are entered upon and honestly carried out. We do not need the assistance of England to make our treaties or to have them kept after they are made. I will just trouble you with a statement of the enormous value of Canadian trade to the United States as compared with other countries in the world. There are only three countries in the world that have a larger trade with the United States than Canada, and those are England, Germany and France. We have a more valuable trade with the United States than that great Empire of Brazil or that fertile island of Cuba, both of which are her neighbors. We have double the trade of Italy, Belgium or the Netherlands; we have more than treble the trade of China, Mexico or Japan; we have more than four times the trade they have with Spain, more than five times their trade with Russia, more than six times their trade with the five republics of Central America in the aggregate, and ten times the trade with Chili and Portugal. And to say in that condition of affairs that we should look for an agent to come from Downing Street to make a fair treaty for us is not reasonable. A few years ago, when the present First Minister was in power, in 1868, two of his colleagues were in London, looking after, among other things, the San Juan difficulty. They were Sir George Cartier and Mr. William Macdougall, who were at that time representing the Government very ably; and, in a letter to Lord Granville, dated the 29th December, 1868, they gave expression to these sentiments:

"Our experience of past diplomacy in the settlement of boundaries in North America, in which the disposition on one side to concede, and on the other to encroach was always present and always resulted disastrously to Canada, admonishes us that a similar disposition, and similar results, may be feared in the future."

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman's colleagues nearly 20 years ago; and surely, Mr. Speaker, if they were right in their historical account of what had happened in the past diplomacy, they were right in what they were afraid would happen in the near future; for we know that San Juan Island was given away, we know since then the Fenian claims, in the Treaty of 1871, were abandoned, and I am not at all satisfied that if Canada had the negotiation of her own arrangements, about the fisheries with the United States, and was not interfered with one way or another, we might not have done better than we have. Now, Sir, as to this treaty itself, the concessions do seem to be all on one side. There is very little in the treaty at all. It is spread over a good deal of ground, it is like very thin butter spread over a large slice of bread. It looks very much as if the plenipotentiaries, after spending nearly three months, came to the conclusion that for the credit of themselves, every one of them, they must do something; that it would never do for them to go home without coming to some settlement, and so they patched up a little arrangement about the headlines; they made concessions to the Americans about entries in the customs ports, and they gave nothing on earth to Canada except a provision, in the 12th clause, that Canada is to have the same rights for her fishing vessels in American fishing grounds, as were conceded to the United States. But even that, the Minister of Finance in his speech, had to admit did not amount to anything at all; he was almost ashamed for it, and he apologised for it. So, while not desiring to oppose the treaty as it stands now, I think it is comparatively harmless, but I think it contains a great many provisions which should have been conceded by us without negotiations by the delegates at Washington. I am sorry to say that it does not contain free access to the United States' markets for fish for our people down by the sea, and that is one great desideratum that they all seem clamoring for. But apart from that, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. EDGAR.

having made a protest against the action of the Government in 1886, and against the negotiation of Canadian treaties by Downing-street diplomatists, I will vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). At this very late hour of the night, or rather early hour of the morning, I do not intend to detain the House very long. I would not trouble the House at this moment were it not for the importance of the treaty for the people whom I have the honor to represent. Ever since the negotiations between the United States and Canada the people of my county have been looking anxiously forward to this settlement, and so far as I have been able to learn the settlement which has been arrived at gives general satisfaction. A great deal has been said with regard to the treatment which the Americans have received at the hands of Canadian officials. Now, on this point, I desire to read the testimony of a captain belonging to the United States who was engaged in the fisheries. In a letter to the *Boston Herald*, dated 9th November, 1886, he says:

"So much has been written and printed about the experiences of American fishermen in Canadian waters, and the indignities put on them, I wish you would open your columns and give your readers an insight into the other side of the story. I sailed from Boston for North Bay on 16th June, not knowing just what the cutters would do or how the law would be interpreted. I neared the coast with fear and anxiety. The first land sighted was Whitehead, and immediately cries came from aloft: 'Cutter in sight ahead!' I rushed to the deck, found the vessel which proved to be the *Houlett*, commanded by Capt. Lorway, nearing us rapidly. At time of sighting the cutter we were standing alone inshore. She hoisted her flag to let us know what she was, and we immediately 'about ship' and put to sea to get out of her way, for fear we might be put on the prize list of the captures. We finally headed up for Port Mulgrave in Canso, expecting to receive rough usage from the authorities, but, to our surprise, found Collector Murray a perfect gentleman, willing to assist me as far as he could without encroaching on the Canadian laws. From there we put in at Port Hawkesbury and boarded the cutter *Conrad*, and asked the captain for instructions in regard to the three mile limit, and what privileges, if any, we had. I was answered, in a courteous and hearty way, that he did not have them aboard, but would go ashore in a few moments and get me a printed copy of the regulations, which he did, and assured us that if we followed them we would be unmolested; that he was there to see that the law was not violated, but not to cause unnecessary annoyance. After receiving instructions from the captain, thanks to him, I went to the custom house and entered my vessel, paying twenty-five cents. I found a very pleasant gentleman in the collector, who did all in his power to relieve my mind and make us comfortable.

"Souris was our next port of landing, where we also reported, and were well treated. From there we went to Malpeque, where we found another gentleman in the collector. We met the cutter *Houlett* at Cascumpec, and had several interviews with her commander, Captain Lorway, whom I found a quiet, just and gentlemanly officer. My vessel was one of the fleet ordered out of harbor by him. At that time it was as good a fish day as one could ask for, and the instructions were plain that at such times we had no right to remain in harbor. At no time is there much water to spare on the bar, and it is a common occurrence for vessels to ground in going in or out, and that some did touch was due to ignorance of the channel or carelessness on the part of captains. At the time the order was issued the weather was fair, but before all the fleet could work out through the channel, one of the sudden changes in weather, so much to be dreaded on such a coast, came, and the cutter rescinded the order and the fleet returned. It has been printed in a Boston paper that, owing to being forced to sea by the cutter's orders in bad weather, my schooner, the *Andrew Burnham*, fouled two Englishmen and narrowly escaped serious damage. If true it would look like a hardship. It was simply this: In getting under way, in a small and crowded space, finding I would not have room, I dropped our starboard anchor. That not holding, we let go the other, and it brought us up all right; not much in this to point to as an outrage or danger from stress of weather. I believe Captain Lorway to be a man who would carry out all the requirements of the Canadian laws, but I saw nothing in my experience in those waters that could be considered as being arbitrary, or taking a mean advantage of his official authority to annoy anyone. Captain Lorway has been a master of vessels for twenty-five years, is a man of high reputation as a seaman, and as good a judge of whether the weather is favorable for a vessel to go to sea as any man who walks a deck, and when he ordered the fleet to sea he went himself, and I know he would not order a vessel to leave harbor if there was any danger of loss of life or property. We reported at Cascumpec, and were treated the same as at all other ports we touched at. If our vessels would attend to reporting at the custom house, the same as they do in our ports, no trouble would be met with.

"If we had 'free fish' it would give the Canadians some recompense for what our fishermen want, viz., the right to go anywhere and everywhere, use their harbors, ship men, get provisions, land and mend our nets, buy salt and barrels, and ship our catch home by rail or steamer without expense or annoyance, the same as we have heretofore.