

now expressed I am sure the House will take in the spirit in which it is intended.

No hon. member will, of course, be prevented from exercising his own discretion, but I felt it my duty to call the attention of the House to the necessity for great prudence in not raising without absolute necessity a doubt as to the terms of the Treaty, and even then I doubt the discretion of raising such a doubt unless it was certain that the object would be attained.

It will be remembered that we have not given all our fisheries away, the Treaty only applies to the fisheries of the old Province of Canada; and in order that the area should not be widened, it is provided that it shall only apply to the fisheries of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, so that the Treaty does not allow the Americans to have access to the Pacific Coast fisheries, nor yet to the exhaustless and princely fisheries of the Hudson's Bay. Those are great sources of revenue yet undeveloped, but after the Treaty is ratified they will develop rapidly, and in twelve years from now when the two nations shall reconsider the circumstances and readjust the Treaty, it will be found that other and great wealth will be at the disposal of the Dominion. I may be asked, though I have not seen that the point has excited any observation, why were not the products of the lake fisheries laid open to both nations, and in reply I may say that these fisheries were excepted at my instance.

It may be known that the Canadian fisheries on the North Shores of the Great Lakes are most valuable. By a judicious system of prevention we have greatly increased that source of wealth. It is also known that from a concurrence of circumstances and from situations the fisheries on the South Shores are not nearly so valuable as ours, and it therefore appeared that if we once allowed the American fishermen to have admission to our waters, with their various engines of destruction, all the care taken for many years to cultivate that source of wealth would be disturbed, injured, and greatly prejudiced, and there would be no end of quarrels and dissatisfaction, and no reciprocity, and therefore that Canada would be much better off by preserving her own Inland Lake fisheries to herself, and have no right to enter the American market with the products of those fisheries. This was the reason why the lake fisheries were not included in this arrangement.

Now, Sir, under the present circumstances of the case, the Canadian Government has decided to press upon this House the policy of accepting this Treaty and ratifying the Fishery Articles. I may be liable to the charge of injuring my own case in discussing the advantages of the arrangement because every word used by me may be quoted and used as evidence. The statement has been so thrown broadcast that the arrangement is a bad one for Canada, that in order to show to this House and the country that it is one that can be accepted, one is obliged to run the risk of his language being used before the Commissioners as an evidence of the value of the Fisheries. It seems to me that in looking at the Treaty in a commercial point of view, and looking at the question of whether it

is right to accept the articles, we have to consider that interest which is most peculiarly interested.

Now, unless I am greatly misinformed, the fishing interest, with one or two exceptions for local reasons, in Nova Scotia are altogether in favour of the Treaty; (*Hear, hear*) that they are anxious to get admission of their fish into the American market; that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market; that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade and of that great industry; and I say, that being the case, if it be to the interest of the fishermen and for the advantage of that interest, setting aside all other considerations, we ought not wilfully to injure that interest.

Why is it, what is the fact of the case as it stands now? The only market for the Canadian mackerel in the world is the United States. That is their only market and they are practicably excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is that they are at the mercy of the American fishermen; they are made the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the American's own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a nominal value and control the American market. The great profits of the trade are handed over to the American fishermen and they profit, to the loss of our own interests. Let anyone go down the St. Lawrence on a summer trip, as many of us do, and call from the deck of the steamer to a fisherman in his boat and see at what a nominal price you can secure the whole of his catch for, and that is from the absence of a market and from the fact of the Canadian fisherman being completely under the control of the foreigner. With the duty off Canadian fish, then, the Canadian fisherman may send his fish at the right time, when he can obtain the best price, to the American market, and be the means of opening a reciprocal and profitable trade with the United States.

If, therefore, it is for the advantage of the Maritime Provinces, including a portion of Quebec, which is also largely interested in the fisheries, that this Treaty should be ratified and that this great market should be opened to them, on what ground should we deprive them of this right? Is it not a selfish argument that the fisheries can be used as a lever in order to gain reciprocity in fish? Are you to shut them off from this great market in order that you may coerce the United States into giving you an extension of the reciprocal principle? Why, Mr. Speaker, if it were a valid argument, it would be a selfish one. What would be said by the people of Ontario if the United States had offered, for their own purposes, to admit Canadian goods free and Nova Scotia had objected, saying, "No, you shall not have that market; you must be deprived of that market forever, unless we can take in our fish also; you must lose all that great advantage until we can get a market for our fish"? Let it be a reciprocal argument, and you will see how selfish it is.

But the argument has no foundation in fact, no basis of fact, and I will show this House how: In 1854, by a strict and rigid observance