The Charlottetown Herald.

NEW SERIES. CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, MAY 23, 1888 VOL. XVII. NO. 30

The Charlottetown Herald

—IS ISSUED—

EVERY WEDNESDAY

—BY—

The Herald Printing Company,

FROM THEIR OFFICE:

Corner of Queen and Richmond Streets,

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND.

Subscription: One Year, in Advance, $1.00

ADVERTISING AT MODERATE RATES.

Contracts made for Monthly, Quarterly, Half-yearly, or Yearly Advertisements, on application.

Remittances may be made by Draft, P. O. Order, or Registered Letter.

All Correspondence should be addressed to

The Herald Printing Company, Charlottetown.

Calendar for May, 1888.

MOON'S CHANGES.

Last Quarter 2nd day, 7h., 24.6m., p. m., N.
New Moon 10th day, 9h., 11.0m., p. m., N.W.
First Quarter 18th day, 7h., 52.6m., p.m., S.
Full Moon 25th day, 6h., 27.6m., a. m., N. W.

D M	Day of Week	Sun Rises	Sun Sets	The Moon. Rises	The Moon. Sets	High Water Ch'town
		h. m.	h. m.	morn	m'rn	aft'rn
1	Tues	4 50	7 2	0 18	3 21	3 29
2	Wed	49	4	1 3	10 34	4 42
3	Thur	48	6	1 47	11 34	4 55
4	Fri	47	7	2 14	aft 42	5 12
5	Sat	45	8	2 42	1 47	7 16
6	Sun	44	9	3 7	2 47	8 9
7	Mon	43	11	3 26	3 51	8 51
8	Tues	41	12	3 53	4 47	9 27
9	Wed	39	13	4 17	5 48	10 1
10	Thur	38	14	4 42	6 49	10 34
11	Fri	37	15	5 5	7 53	11 6
12	Sat	35	16	5 41	8 56	11 40
13	Sun	34	18	6 19	9 48	morn
14	Mon	33	19	7 2	10 38	0 15
15	Tues	32	21	7 53	11 34	0 52
16	Wed	31	21	8 50	m'rn	1 33
17	Thur	30	22	9 53	0 18	2 19
18	Fri	29	24	11 0	0 58	3 12
19	Sat	28	25	aft 10	1 33	4 20
20	Sun	26	26	1 28	2 4	5 39
21	Mon	25	27	2 37	2 34	6 57
22	Tues	24	27	3 54	3 3	8 9
23	Wed	23	28	5 15	3 33	8 58
24	Thur	22	29	6 32	4 6	9 45
25	Fri	21	31	7 49	4 43	10 28
26	Sat	21	32	9 0	5 26	11 12
27	Sun	20	33	10 4	6 17	11 59
28	Mon	20	34	10 57	7 15	aft 42
29	Tues	19	35	11 42	8 18	1 29
30	Wed	18	36	morn	9 22	2 17
31	Thur	4 18	7 37	9 16	10 40	3 8

DR. KELLY,

PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,

Office: Upper Queen Street,

Four doors above Apothecaries Hall,

Charlottetown, March 28, 1888—3m

ROBERT BRIDGES,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL DEALER

In Fresh & Salt Meats,

PORK PACKER.

Cash paid for Pork, Live Stock, &c.

OLD STAND, HILLSBOROUGH STREET.

February 29, 1888—3m

Notice.

ALL persons indebted to the HERALD Printing Company are hereby required to pay the amounts so due by them forthwith, otherwise legal proceedings will be immediately instituted to recover the same.

January 19, 1887.

Credit Foncier Franco Canadien

LOANS on Mortgage for periods not exceeding 10 years without sinking fund, and from 10 to 50 years with sinking fund.

The borrower is privileged to pay off his loan in whole or in part at any time.

Circulars giving detailed information can be obtained on application at the offices of Messrs. Sullivan & McNeill, Solicitors Charlottetown.

W. W. SULLIVAN,
Agent for the Company.

Jan. 2 1885

Fruit and Confectionery.

B. BALDERSTON has a full supply of the purest and best

CONFECTIONERY.

Manufactured on the premises every day. Customers can rely on their Candies being fresh and pure.

We want every country dealer to call on us and see if he cannot save money by getting his Confectionery from us.

Choice Fruits in their Season.

Best GROCERIES at Low Prices.

Colgate's Soaps & Perfumery.

B. BALDERSTON.

Charlottetown, July 27, 1887.

SULLIVAN & McNEILL,

ATTORNEYS-AT-LAW,

Solicitors in Chancery,

NOTARIES PUBLIC, &c.

OFFICES — O'Halloran's Building Great George Street, Charlottetown.

☞ Money to Loan.

W. W. SULLIVAN, Q.C. | CHAS. B. MACNEILL.

jan. 17, 1884

CARSLAKE'S

GRAND DERBY SWEEP

$25,000.00

1st horse (in duplicate) $3,000 each prize, $6,000
2nd " " $2,000 " $4,000
3rd " " $1,000 " $2,000
Other starters (divided equally) $8,000
in duplicate $4,000
Non-starters (divided equally) $4,500 in duplicate $9,000
5,000 Tickets at $5 each.
Drawing May 25th. Race May 30th, 1888.
Ten per cent. deducted from all prizes.
Address,
GEORGE CARSLAKE, Prop.,
Mansion House, Montreal.
Jan. 18, 1888—4m

CASTORIA

for Infants and Children.

"Castoria is so well adapted to children that I recommend it as superior to any prescription known to me." H. A. ARCHER, M.D., 111 So. Oxford St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Castoria cures Colic, Constipation, Sour Stomach, Diarrhœa, Eructation, Kills Worms, gives sleep, and promotes digestion, without injurious medication.

THE CENTAUR COMPANY, 77 Murray Street, N. Y.

PUTTNER'S

HAS obtained a widespread popularity as a cure for COUGHS, INFLUENZA, CATARRH,

EMULSION

SCROFULA, SKIN DISEASE, NERVOUS, PROSTRATION, CONSUMPTION, IMPOVERISHED BLOOD,

OF COD LIVER OIL

And the many diseases of the Throat, Lungs, Blood and Brain.

WITH HYPOPHOSPHITES.

Puttner's Emulsion

Is made from the purest material, is very palatable, and can be taken and retained by the most delicate.

BROWN BROS. & CO.,

March 21, 1888. Chemists, Halifax, N. S.

FOR THE NEXT FEW WEEKS,

Previous to Stock-Taking,

—We offer the balance of our—

Winter Goods,

Such as Ulster Cloths, Dress Goods, Tweeds, Overcoatings, Shawls, Scarfs, Gents' Underwear, Cardigans, Jersey Jackets, Skirts, Gloves and Mitts, Fur and Cloth Caps, Overshoes, Millinery, &c., &c.,

At PRICES TO CLEAR.

Come & Get Bargains.

REUBEN TUPLIN & CO

Kensington, Feb. 29, 1888.

Prince Edward Island Railway.

1887-8. WINTER ARRANGEMENT. 1887-8.

On and after Thursday, December 1st, 1887, Trains will run as follows:—

TRAINS FOR THE WEST.

STATIONS.	No. 1.	No. 3.
	A. M.	P. M.
Charlottetown.....dp.	7 15	1 00
Royalty Junction.....	7 34	2 12
North Wiltshire.....	8 17	3 05
Hunter River.....	8 30	3 20
Bradalbane.....	9 00	3 57
Emerald Junction.....	9 09	4 07
Freetown.....	9 23	4 22
Kensington.....	9 40	4 45
Summerside.....ar.	10 10	5 20
Summerside.....dp.	P. M. 12 40	
Miscouche.....	1 00	
Wellington.....	1 27	
Port Hill.....	2 08	
O'Leary.....	3 23	
Bloomfield.....	3 45	
Alberton.....	4 30	
Tignish.....ar.	5 15	

STATIONS.	No. 2.	No. 4.
	A. M.	
Tignish.....dp.	6 00	
Alberton.....	6 55	
Bloomfield.....	7 30	
O'Leary.....	7 54	
Port Hill.....	9 07	
Wellington.....	9 49	
Miscouche.....	10 15	
Summerside.....ar.	10 55	
Summerside.....dp.	11 25	A. M.
	P. M.	6 20
Kensington.....	12 05	7 05
Freetown.....	12 23	7 28
Emerald Junction.....	12 33	7 43
Bradalbane.....	12 45	7 53
Hunter River.....	1 15	8 20
North Wiltshire.....	1 29	8 35
Royalty Junction.....	2 12	9 27
Charlottetown.....ar.	2 30	10 00

STATIONS.	No. 9.
	P. M.
Emerald Junction....dp.	4 10
Cape Traverse.....ar.	5 00

STATIONS.	No. 10.
	A. M.
Cape Traverse.....dp.	6 45
Emerald Junction....ar.	7 35

TRAINS FOR THE EAST.

STATIONS.	No. 5.	No. 7.
	P. M.	
Charlottetown.....dp	2 20	
Royalty Junct'n.....	2 50	
Sedford.....	3 28	
Mt. Stewart Junc. ar	3 55	
Mt. Stewart Junc. dp	4 10	
Cardigan.....	5 25	
Georgetown.....ar	5 45	
Mt. Stewart Junc.....dp		P. M. 4 05
Morell.....		4 45
St. Peter's.....		5 12
Bear River.....		5 47
Souris.....ar		6 40

TRAINS FROM THE EAST.

STATIONS.	No. 6.	No. 8.
	A. M.	
Georgetown.....dp	7 15	
Cardigan.....	7 39	
Mount Stewart Jun ar	8 50	
Mount Stewart Jun dp	9 00	
Bedford.....	9 33	
Royalty Junct'n.....	10 05	
Charlottetown.....ar	10 25	
Souris.....dp		A. M. 6 20
Bear River.....		7 03
St. Peter's.....		7 46
Morell.....		8 17
Mount Stewart Junc. ar		8 55

Trains are run by Eastern Standard Time.

JAMES COLEMAN,
Superintendent.

Railway Office, Charlottetown Nov. 29, 1887—6

Executors' Notice.

THE undersigned, Executors of the last Will and Testament of OWEN CONNOLLY, late of Charlottetown, Merchant, deceased, hereby notify all parties indebted to the said Estate of the said Owen Connolly to make immediate payment of their respective debts to them at the premises on Queen Street, in Charlottetown, formerly occupied by the said Owen Connolly; and all persons having accounts or claims against the said Owen Connolly, or his Estate, are hereby notified to present the same, duly attested, to the undersigned at the said premises, on Queen Street, within Twelve Months from this date.

Dated at Charlottetown this Seventh day of January, 1888.

ANDREW A. McDONALD,
WILLIAM W. SULLIVAN,
FREDERICK PETERS,
} Executors

January 9, 1888—4f

ROYAL YEAST

Is Canada's Favorite Bread-maker. 19 years in the market without a complaint of any kind. The only yeast which has stood the test of time and never made sour, unwholesome bread.

All Grocers sell it.

E. W. GILLETT, Toronto, Ont. & Chicago, Ill.

JOHN S. MACDONALD,

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW.

OFFICE:

Newson's Building, Opposite New Post Office.

Charlottetown, Oct. 7, 1886—1y

SENATOR HOWLAN'S SPEECH

Following is the speech delivered in the Dominion Senate by Hon. Senator Howlan, on the Fishery Treaty, on April 27:—

Hon. Mr. Howlan—I certainly must congratulate the hon. gentleman who has resumed his seat on the temperate manner in which he has discussed the question before the House, but after listening closely and attentively to his speech from beginning to end it brings to my mind the couplet from Hudebras:

"I do not like you Dr. Fell,
The reason why I cannot tell."

We have before us a question of the greatest magnitude that has arisen since the organization of this Parliament—nothing more or less than a difficulty that has existed for a century between about one hundred millions of people speaking the English language. If there was nothing more done during the present session than the adoption of this Treaty, it is something that Parliament may be proud of. In approaching a question like this it was necessary that some able men should be appointed who thoroughly understood the matters to be settled. It was not to be assumed that any settlement like this would be reached without difficulty arising on both sides and without concessions being made. It would be almost out of the question. Why an arbitration at all if certain points were not given up on both sides? Here we have the result of the labors of two of the best men who could have been selected from amongst us, one of them the Minister of Justice, an able lawyer, who was counsel for the American Government during the Halifax negotiations, and was, therefore, thoroughly conversant with their views on the subject. He, perhaps more than any other man in Canada, was fully cognizant of all the points arising out of the contentions which have been raised from time to time, and enunciated by the American Government. We had also Sir Charles Tupper, one of the cleverest men in public life in this country, who for many years led the Government of Nova Scotia, and was cognizant with all the questions relating to the fisheries, which necessarily came under his purview while he was a member of the Government there, and since then as a member of the Dominion Government. There was also the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, an able British statesman. I am perhaps as strong a Home Ruler as any gentleman in this House, and love my native country, and would go as far to serve her as any gentleman, yet I fail to see in any way how the Irish in the the United States have any bearing on this question, *quo ad* Mr. Chamberlain. It is a fact that will not be disputed by any person who is at all cognizant with the views of the Irish people, that there are no truer friends to those who are kind to them. Then why should the Irish people of the United States have unfriendly feelings towards Canada? Canada has not been unkind towards Ireland. In this very Chamber we have passed resolutions of sympathy with Ireland and have also sent them large sums of money, and I ask why should the Irish people of the United States wish to revenge themselves upon Canada, for any wrongs which they may consider Ireland has sustained at the hands of the British Government? Simply because Mr. Chamberlain was appointed a plenipotentiary by a government over which the people of Canada have no control? I dismiss the remark of the hon. gentleman from Ottawa as unworthy of notice. Not only has this question occupied the attention of the people of the United States and England and Canada, but it has also engaged the attention of the French who had occupied beforehand the fisheries that we speak of in regard to the Maritime Provinces. During the occupation of Acadia by the French it is a well known fact that above everything else they valued the fisheries of New France. It must be known to those who pay attention to the early history of Canada that the great castle of Fontainbleu was built on the proceeds of permits to fish in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. We know that the town of Louisburg was built and fortified for the purpose of protecting the fisheries that then belonged to France; and we know that after the "unpleasantness" which took place between England and the revolted colonies forming the United States, it was not English troops who were the means of re-taking Louisburg for the second time, but American troops, or colonial troops, as they were called then, from Newburyport, under General Pepperall, and it was one of the reasons why the Americans thought they had secured a right to these fisheries. After the War of Independence it is a well known fact that the great Edmund Burk and others of that day admitted that the colonies had been harshly treated, and that perhaps after a time, after they recovered their senses, they would come back to their allegiance to the British flag, and a certain portion of the public men of Great Britain were in favor of treating the people of the United States not altogether as aliens, but with a certain degree of indulgence. We know that during these troublesome times some who were termed United Empire Loyalists came from Maine and Massachusetts, and many of them settled in Nova Scotia. Those who came from the State of Maine and those who remained at home were not for ever in a state of enmity towards each other, as was stated by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa, who thought that there was no intercourse between them. It is a well known fact that a considerable trade existed between Nova Scotia and the ports in Maine and Massachusetts, and that a packet sailed regularly from New York to Halifax. When the treaty of 1783 was made, not exactly as stated by the hon. gentleman from Amherst, American fishermen were only permitted to land in certain places, while those places were unoccupied; but as soon as they were occupied the permit ceased. And he states that if the Treaty was to be framed to-day with the present condition of affairs, with the great growth of the American nation, it would be out of the question to have such a treaty as that of 1818. Such a statement as that shows that the hon. gentleman paid very little attention to the question, and to use a nautical phrase, he is entirely at sea on this question. The British Government asked the American Government to make a statement of what they wanted, and it was upon that statement, as made by the American Government, that the Treaty of 1818 was framed. Why was it framed in such terms? Why did the Americans not ask for more than they did in 1818? Why do they ask for more now? The question is easily answered. In 1818 the Americans had as many miles of sea coast as we had, north of Hatteras, and they had virgin fisheries like ours; but they have destroyed those fisheries until they are completely run out. If at that time their own fisheries had been as they now are they would have asked for access to our fisheries. But, no; their own fisheries were as good as ours, and they did not want them. If hon. gentlemen take the plan that was before the plenipotentiaries, they will find that the fishing banks off Nova Scotia and the bay which gives rise to the fishing on those banks are, after all, the most important portion of the question the Commissioners had to consider. A good deal has been said about the sale of bait, and the inshore fisheries, and an endeavor has been made to show that if an American vessel is allowed to come in and purchase ordinary supplies for a trading vessel that therefore she is going to purchase ordinary fishing supplies. But what does the treaty say with regard to that particular point? It states that fishing vessels shall have the right to go in for such supplies as trading vessels require, and for no others. The treaty of 1818 was thoroughly understood by the late Daniel Webster. The broad views he entertained with regard to that particular time are well known, and he never complained in any of his utterances or writings of the constructions put upon the treaty by the British authorities, for the simple reason that the treaty was framed, arranged, systematized, and dictated almost by the friends of the United States. That was the reason, and the only one, that the treaty was made as it is. Well, we have gone on from that time to the present date, and if you take up the report of the Fishing Bureau of the State of Massachusetts—that gives a report of all fish imported into the United States coasts and the fish caught on the provincial coasts—you will find according to those figures for ten years, that so far as mackerel is concerned, it is a very unimportant item. It being now near 6 o'clock, and I have some further remarks to make, I would ask that the Speaker leave the chair until recess.

AFTER RECESS.

Hon. Mr. Howlan—When the Speaker left the chair I was about reading to the House the exports and imports of fish in the United States, so as to give some idea of of what the matter in dispute was as regards value between both nations. I have here the report of the Boston Fish Bureau for January, 1888, and they give there the catch of all fish imported, those which are foreign caught as well as those which are home caught. I will read first the return with regard to mackerel, beginning with the year 1878:

New England catch of mackerel for ten years, comparing the North Bay with the shore catch, as reported to the Boston Fish Bureau:

	Shore.	Bay.	Total.
1878	134,545	61,923	196,468
1879	209,803	10,796	220,599
1880	342,373	7,301	349,674
1881	291,178	470	391,657
1882	378,963	.....	378,863
1883	198,019	28,666	226,685
1884	458,439	19,637	478,076
1885	302,271	27,672	329,943
1886	16,915	63,083	79,998
1887	70,814	17,568	88,382
Total brls.	2,503,229	237,116	2,740,345

An extraordinary fact in connection with the mackerel catch for the last 30 years is this, that whenever there has been a difficulty between the two countries the mackerel seemed to have been well informed on the subject, because they kept on the inside of the limit of the inshore waters. It was the case in 1853–4 at the time of the first treaty; it was the case again in 1870–1 and again in 1886–7—the mackerel left the American coast and came to ours.

Hon. Mr. Dever—I suppose they will leave our coast now that the Americans are coming down.

Hon. Mr. Howlan—I will now call attention to the other great item of our fisheries and that which is the most important to our people, the question of bait. To understand the bait question thoroughly, it will be necessary for hon. gentlemen to rememember that off the Nova Scotia coast within a measurable distance, are the St. Peter's Bank and the Green Bank which are nearer than the Banks of Newfoundland. An American vessel leaving a New England port can carry bait sufficient to go on the ground, but the bait will not last in a fresh condition sufficiently long to enable her to fill up and go home to port; but if she could buy bait in some of our ports, she could take up her lines in the evening on the fishing bank, reach port by morning and get back before evening to the fishing ground. Thus the most important question to the New England fishermen has been this one of bait. Without it they are unable to carry on deep-sea fishing, and have only the fishery of the Banks of Newfoundland which is exceedingly dangerous. Of the number of vessels that have gone there every season it has never been known that the whole of them have returned in any season; it is called the fisherman's graveyard, and none but the most hardy and intrepid spirits go to the Grand Banks, and most of those men are Canadians from Nova Scotia, particularly the Island of Cape Breton. It has never yet been known in the history of that bank fishing that the same number of men and vessels that went out returned to port. Still they pursue their calling, because it is a necessity of the fishing business that every year the men shall earn wages for the support of their families.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald (B.C.)—Is the fishing extra good on that bank?

Hon. Mr. Howlan—Yes. It is a totally exposed place and they have to fish in 80 to 120 fathoms of water. Once their anchor is down it is not easy to get it up; they have to stay there until the vessel is loaded, and in heavy gales of wind vessels have been known to go down.

Hon. Mr. Kaulbach—Are you referring now to the Grand Bank?

Hon. Mr. Howlan—Yes. Of the fleet that visited Grand Bank last year there were 145 men lost:

Fishing Losses, Season 1887.

Hailing Port.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Value.	Lives lost
Gloucester	13	863.43	$62,900	84
Provincetown	3	367.15	$5,000	46
Beverly	1	94.05	8,000	15
Newburyport	1	8.78	1,000	—
Portsmouth	1	43.82	—	—
Sedgewick	1	55.05	—	—
Others	2	15.15	500	—
Total	22	1,447.27	$97,400	145

Hon. Mr. Kaulbach—Chiefly in United States vessels?

Hon. Mr. Howlan—Altogether United States vessels. I do not think that we do any Grand Bank fishing, and I do not think that we do any winter fishing there at all.

Hon. Mr. Kaulbach—We do very little.

Hon. Mr. Howlan—I am somewhat acquainted with the fisheries of Norway, Scotland and Ireland, and I do not think there is any fishery in the world where the risk is so great as on the Banks of Newfoundland. I have here the total catch that comes into the United States markets, not only the home catch, but the catch from our waters, and without going over all the different items, I will take that which stands next as a merchantable fish—the codfish. The total domestic receipt, home caught, amounted to 141,792 quintals, and with that were 35,112 quintals of foreign fish—total 176,904 quintals. In dealing with this question the other night, the hon. member from Ottawa stated that the great proportion of our fish sold in the United States. Those who are at all acquainted with the fisheries and our foreign market for fish, are aware that the fish which come from Canada, particularly from the Baie de Chaleur and from Lunenburg, are worth more in the markets of the world than those United States caught fish. The great majority of fish caught in the United States waters are for home consumption. With their 60,000,000 people, and their great and extensive arteries of commerce, their fish are sent to all portions of the country, and sell for more in a fresh than in a salted state. But so far as the West Indies, South America or Mediterranean markets are concerned, they are supplied from the fisheries of Canada. I have digressed for the purpose of placing before the House the exact value of the fisheries, which, we have been told, were given away and would entail ruin upon us. I put this frankly the facts beforte the House for the purpose of placing them in possession of a knowledge of the value of those fisheries which, it was said, we were about to be robbed of. Before I leave that subject, I may say this—that the whole fishery question appears to me almost in the position of a family quarrel. The father and the elder son went into the forest and made a home for themselves. After the son had gone out for himself upon another homestead, the father and he had quarrelled, and required to make a division of the spoil. It has always appeared to me that although these fisheries are ours, we should not forget, and history will not permit us to forget, that the people of the United States assisted us in gaining the fisheries, which have formed the subject of this recent arbitration. It is a very important factor in the case, looked at from several standpoints. It is important that the flag which covers our tonnage is found perhaps in a greater degree in the harbors of the United States in carrying to foreign markets of the world their products than perhaps any other flag in the world, and whilst we have a very large commerce with them and are willing to be neighbors as we always have been, there is no doubt in the world that the fact enunciated last night by the hon. member from Amherst, as told to him by Charles Sumner, is correct. I can endorse it. When I was in Washington in 1869, Sumner told me almost the same words. It is an open question, one that I am not so well satisfied about, whether we were not to blame in the course we took at that time. Here was a nation with which we were on friendly terms. We had traded with them, had intermarried with them, and in a moment of excitement they had quarrelled among themselves. Some of our people espoused the cause of the North, some of the South. There was this to be said, that while they did not expect the sympathy of people on the other side of the Atlantic, they did expect some sort of regret from us that family dissensions had so increased, that a storm had swept over the country and deluged almost every hearthstone with blood. They did think that they were entitled to our sympathy, and that was why the treaty was abrogated. It is true that like begets like. Little invidious distinctions were drawn about articles of commerce, and one thing after another occurred to cause vexation and annoyance and formed ground for complaint. For instance take this very fisheries question. After the repeal of the reciprocity treaty the Internal Revenue laws of the United States forbade any fishermen from buying salt or barrels, and the latter had to be stamped and registered in the Custom House, so as to prevent the fishermen from buying barrels made in Canada. Then the next thing that came up was with regard to tins containing lobsters, and so it went on from one thing to another until we put our cruisers on to protect our fisheries. It has been stated here that no such step had ever been taken before. Those who had read the history of Nova Scotia are aware that the legislature of that Province in 1837 appropriated £500 to put cruisers on for the protection of our fisheries. We put those cruisers on, and instructions were issued to the commanders, copies of which I have had the pleasure of reading. I have also seen the instructions given to the commanders of the American ships, and in all cases they were on both sides that they should be very careful in carrying out what was considered the law. In the first place, when the American gunboats were sent to the fishing grounds, they were instructed wherever they met one of their vessels to notify them that they must not get inside the three mile limit, and that if they did they must take the consequences. It has gone on that way until we have found a means of settling this difficulty amicably. We have heard a good deal of talk here about the headland question. That has been an open and vexed question: neither nation has tried to carry that out strictly. By this treaty we have settled that. Now bear with me a moment while I describe to you a master of an American fishing vessel. Probably his father had been a fisherman—and this description will apply alike to our Canadian fishermen or perhaps in a greater measure than to the United States fishermen—he has served his time before the mast in one of those vessels until he has accumulated a little money, going to the Grand Banks and mackereling in the summer. By his industry and temperate and careful habits he has so impressed a merchant that he is able to take care of a vessel and he is placed in charge of one, and all his earnings he puts into that vessel, owning perhaps one-sixteenth of it. That vessel is his home—his everything. It is not only his past and present, but it is his future. He knows that if he is successful in his voyages it advances him until he becomes owner of the vessel and is able finally to retire as he has seen others retire. I point this out to show you how careful these fishermen are not to get into trouble. After living for thirty years where a large number of fishermen frequent during the summer season I may say, and I do say it with due consideration, that taking any other body of men as they are I doubt if you will find any that are better behaved under all the circumstances connected with the matter, and when you find fault with those fishermen with whom are you finding fault? It is true that the navigation laws of the United States, which have not been repealed since they were passed in 1876, are very illiberal as compared with those of England. They require the master of a vessel and two-thirds of the crew shall be American citizens. Any man who has had anything to do with vessels in the United States will tell you that this law is almost in abeyance. It is not going too far to say that two-thirds of the men who manned American fishing vessels are Canadians, and that being the case, it is only another proof of the fact that we have a hardy school in which to train our fishermen. It is only another proof that the protective policy which this Government has pursued towards the fisheries for the last few years has had a beneficial effect. My hon. friend from Lunenburg will be able to tell you that fifteen or twenty years ago to see an American fleet was to see the handsomest vessels afloat. I was surprised two years ago, in passing through the Straits of Canso, to meet a sail of fifteen vessels from Lunenburg, which were larger and handsomer than those from the United States. We have been enabled to build up our fishery and employ our hardy fishermen under the policy of the Government. But there is a large portion of our people who have no way of making a livelihood unless they go on those vessels because they get larger wages. I mention this for the purpose of showing that in a great majority of cases the people that we call American fishermen are simply relations of our own. When the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was before the Senate the leader of the Opposition went out of his way in the absence of any papers, to make most unwarrantable assertions on the subject of this Treaty, and when I smiled he flew at me and told me that I would vote for anything proposed by the Government, no matter what it was. When I spoke of the delimitation he said that masters of fishing smacks, as he called them, of *one* or *two* tons whould have to get large charts. I could not help laughing when I remembered that a fishing smack would have to come 600 miles and carry several barrels of salt and provisions for her crew or twelve or sixteen hands and that such vessels were usually from 80 to 100 tons burthen. Now, there is one fact with regard to this delimitation. I have told hon. gentlemen how these fishermen—owning their own vessels—how necessary it is for them to know where this three mile limit is, and how necessary it is for us to know it. We are not disposed, as a Canadian people, to be unkind or ungenerous towards the people of the United States. We are not known to be wanting in humanity and hospitality, but we stand directly upon the law and our rights, and we are compelled to do so. How were those men able to tell, or how could any man tell, whether he was inside the three mile limit or not until it was defined? and to settle that question was one of the points brought up in the dispute. Is that question not in a better position than it was before? Is there any doubt or difficulty about it, and what is the proposition to settle it? The proposition is to take a friendly ship of each nation properly equipped for the purpose of surveying, taking surroundings and laying down this line of demarcation, so that there will be no more of those difficulties regarding exclusive rights, regarding the bays of Canada and those of Newfoundland. Those who are acquainted with the winter fishing of Newfoundland will understand the value of having those bays, where all this frozen herring is caught, properly defined. If an American fisherman ventures into any of those bays, he will have his chart on board, and knowing the law, and the line of demarcation, if he finds himself arrested for being out of his limits, he knows that he is himself to blame for it. But there are times when it is difficult for any fisherman to tell whether he is within three miles of the shore or not. Night comes on, and he hauls his jibs to the windward and drifts. Perhaps next morning he is fifty miles from his fishing ground, but he can tell by the soundings on his chart exactly where he is and whether he is inside or outside of the three mile limit. The hon. gentleman from Ottawa when speaking on the Address took the opportunity to make a loud and boisterous attack upon the Treaty, without any papers being before him. I told him then that when this Treaty was laid upon the table of the House, that I would be ready to reply to him; that it was no time then to discuss the question. But what was the result? The hon. gentleman's speech was telegraphed all over the United States, and I have before me a letter from a friend in Washington stating that Mr. Scott's speech was the view of the Senate of Canada on the fishery question. I say it was a disgrace to that hon. Senator, before the Treaty was laid on the table and before he knew anything about it to discuss it in the way he did. Will those different sets of opinions which were uttered by him last night be telegraphed all over the United States as being the views of the Senate of Canada? No one considers for a moment that they will; it will be very clearly given forth that the opinions first uttered by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa on this subject were the opinions of the Canadian Senate. Here is the hon. gentleman's speech in big letters in the New York *Herald*, published the morning after its delivery, as also the remarks that were made by the hon. gentleman from Halifax. I contend that such a course as that certainly does not accord with the patriotism for which the hon. gentleman is usually distinguished. But while he tells us that it is robbery on the part of Canada to assert her rights, he tells us in the same breath that we have given away all our rights and disgraced ourselves; and the most amusing part of his argument is that Mr. Chamberlain came over from England for the purpose of doing what? Watching over the rights and interests of the manufacturers of England. What the manufacturers of England had to do with the fisheries on this side of the water is a thing I cannot understand. But the people of the United States had his speech the next morning. Here it is as telegraphed to the New York *Herald*:

"AN INCONGRUOUS DOCUMENT."

Canadian Members of Parliament Oppose It as Conceding Too Much.

OTTAWA, Ont., February 24, 1888.—In the Senate to-day, referring to the fishery treaty clause in the Governor-General's speech, Senators Ross (Quebec) and Sanford (Hamilton) both said that they looked upon it as a means by which the vexing fisheries question can be set at rest forever.

Mr. Scott, Opposition leader, said he could not accept the resolution of the fisheries question provided by the Chamberlain treaty in spirit suggested in the Governor's speech. The friction between the two countries had been intensified by an incongruous document concocted in Washington. Instead of sending to England for a diplomat who came out with the sole object of insuring peace between Great Britain and the United States, the honorable and and chivalrous course for Canada would have been to have granted freely and voluntarily these concessions to the United States, and to have told the people of that great country: "We want to deal with you, we want to trade with you, without the intervention of British plenipotentiaries." Who could say authoritatively where the privilege granted under clause 11 ended? The language of the clause was so dubious that he believed before twelve months it would be found that the interpretation of the clause would give rise to most angry contention.

It was doubtful how the United States Senate would deal with the Treaty, particularly in view of its recent action on the extradition question. In throwing out the extradition treaty the United States Senate had lowered itself morally in the eyes of the world.

"Mr. Power, of Halifax, said that, looking at the treaty as a whole, it was not one which would be viewed with much satisfaction by Canadians. Canada had given up a good many privileges which American fishermen had been anxious to get. He looked upon article 13 as only proper. The Americans should certainly carry with them some indication of their character. Article 14 was not unreasonable, and article 15, if it ever went into effect, would not be a bad thing. He regretted, however, that by the concessions the Canadian Government had made they had thrown away the only lever by which reciprocal trade with the United States could be secured."

(*Continued on 2nd page.*)

The weigh of the coal transgressor is hard—on the consumer.

Rough on rats—kid glove manufacturers.

Children Cry for Pitcher's Castoria.