

way that could be stopped is not to allow the logs to go out of the country. That is a question of policy that I do not propose to discuss at the present moment. I am merely pointing out the manner in which United States legislation is turned to our disadvantage in that respect. Then take our fisheries. Fish are admitted into the United States free if caught with United States nets by United States companies, but if caught with Canadian nets or by Canadian companies they are not admitted free into the United States, so that United States fishermen come into our country and catch our fish beside our fishermen and by that species of legislation are enabled to monopolise the fishing trade of the country. Right in my own part of the country, at Lake Winnipegosis, the Buffalo Fishing Company is operating, and every year sends a number of men there to catch fish and freeze them for shipment to the United States market. Those fish are admitted into the United States free, while fish caught by the Canadian fishermen beside them are taxed at the border. That is another instance in which our trade is interfered with quite contrary to the intention that we have in allowing United States fishermen to come over here and catch our fish. The only way to prevent that is to prepare our fish for other markets, and divert our trade where such unequal privileges do not exist. We have found that every time we have been driven out of the American market by hostile legislation, we have found better prices and readier sales elsewhere. Then, again, pulp wood is another instance. Pulp manufactured in this country is excluded from the United States market, while the United States legislation admits pulp wood free to be manufactured by their own people. Then we come to the question of our fisheries on the Atlantic coast. The United States Senate has lately passed legislation in regard to that matter. They tack on to a resolution with regard to the mining regulations in the Yukon territory of Canada a condition that we should give up the rights that our fishermen enjoy on the Atlantic coast under the treaty of 1818. That treaty accorded to our fishermen the exclusive right to land and get bait on our own coasts, and also to take the short cut across our own territory to the United States market. The treaty gives us that right, and the United States was accorded that right with the right

of fishing also within the three-mile limit by the treaty of Washington. Since the expiration of the fisheries clauses of that treaty we have been generous enough to concede to United States fishermen the right to catch bait in our harbours, and also to tranship fish. The only condition we attach to it is the payment of a small fee, I think \$1.50 per ton, and these fees, in the aggregate, amount only to about \$4,000 a year, so that we have practically, in the most generous way, given to the United States of our own free will and accord, the right that they now attempt to take under conditions attached to a bill recently passed by the United States Senate. With regard to that particular question, it would be impossible for the people of Canada to give up the rights of our fishermen on the Atlantic coast in order to purchase some rights for Canadian miners on the Pacific coast. To consent to such a proposition as that would be entirely out of the question, and a most unstatesmanlike attitude in our internal government. Any negotiations in regard to our Atlantic fisheries must rest upon their own merits. Then, take the action of the United States Senate in regard to the coasting laws. Hon. gentlemen are well aware of the regulations that appertain to the navigation of certain rivers on the Pacific coast. As hon. gentlemen know, from Mount St. Elias down to the border of British Columbia, the United States claim a very narrow strip of land all along the coast; while we own the hinterland, the coast line is in the possession of our neighbours. They obtained that right by the purchase of that country from Russia. How far inland that peculiar strip along the Pacific coast extends is an open question yet, and it is also an open question as to how far the United States are infringing upon our rights. As I understand it, we agreed upon fixing the 141st meridian, and upon taking Mount St. Elias as a starting point; then our dividing line comes down the coast, the treaty says that the line passes on the coast range of mountains, but if the coast range should be further than ten marine leagues from the shore, that is 30 miles, then ten marine leagues from the coast belongs to the United States, but if the coast range should come nearer than 30 miles, then the territory beyond is Canadian territory. The unsettled state of that question is leading to difficulties