f our brands ted States."

, 1892.

e of alarm, nake of flour as those who dent of the ction by the Peterboro, is C. B. Watts,

1, 1892.

both equally vell afford to t of all these e dignity of e of our very s the height tined or held. by us, and I of the letter s, that some the question,

ay, a monster from all the eputations to aging all the essful way of

ndland trade.

re exceedingly er the fishery ntering New-, are admitted barrel against res every year o difficulty in al terms with

rliament, and --(The North-

iprocity. Let ave what our 151

cousins absolutely need to carry on a fishery, and are not going to assist Canada, (after her meddlesome, unfriendly conduct) to get a treaty. We know our strength, and intend to use it for our own benefit.

"What a fluke we managed to keep out of confederation."

(There is more truth than poetry in this.)

Yours truly,

S. MUNN & CO.

## No. 158.

## 25th February, 1892.

W. A. MUNN, Esq.,

22 St. John Street, Montreal.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of the 24th instant. I am glad to observe that you are of the opinion matters can be satisfactorily and amicably arranged between Canada and Newfoundland.

I did not require the extracts you enclosed to convince me that it was in the interest of Canada and Newfoundland to maintain a friendly policy towards each other.

I have endeavoured to show you in previous communications that Canada has never acted otherwise than friendly, unless it be considered unfriendly to protect the interests of Canada when attacked by Newfoundland or any other country.

The Canadian government has endeavoured to explain to Newfoundland how impossible it would be to purchase friendly treatment from that colony by involving ourselves in a quarrel with France that does not, and has never concerned us.

You still think that Canada is trying to prevent the importation of Newfoundland fish. Place yourself in the position of a Canadian fisherman, however, and I think you would do as these fishermen are doing, viz., ask that so long as they are prohibited from entering the ports of Newfoundland to procure bait, no discrimination shall be made in the tariff of Canada in favour of Newfoundland tish.

I am not surprised that the millers of Canada desire markets in Newfoundland and elsewhere. It is the policy of the Canadian government, so far as is possible, to help all our manufacturers and producers to obtain markets elsewhere, but I fear you do not appreciate the cause of Canadian intervention in the Bond-Blaine treaty. By that treaty it was proposed to shut out our flour from Newfoundland, so far as a discriminatory duty could do it. The language of the treaty bears that interpretation, and our American cousins would have been quick to fasten that interpretation upon it.

You suppose that we have not endeavoured to reason with the Newfoundland government. The contrary is the case.

We sent a special delegate to discuss the subjects of common concern with them, and the high commissioner has done his best in that connection as well.

Your reference to the Ontario millers waiting for litigation to end in Newfoundland courts shows that you have not quite apprehended my reference to that subject. It has nothing to do with the Ontario millers. The litigation in the Newfoundland courts will be for the purpose of collecting back the fees collected from Canadian fishermen without warrant in law, by the government of that colony.

The judicial committee of the privy council is composed of judges who will settle the question in connection with the Bait Act on its legal merits only. No political or other consideration can enter into their deliberations.

You again suggest that we should show our friendly feeling towards Newfoundland. I would be glad to know in what way you think this should be done.

I regret extremely that during the session of parliament it will be impossible for me to visit Newfoundland. The Canadian government would be only too happy to receive a delegate from there.

Z