

were even broader than the treaty itself. We know that the hon. gentleman has paid so little attention to the 30th article that, when he communicated the effect of it to us the other day, he gave us information which was altogether misleading. The statement made by the hon. gentleman is not in accordance with the action of the American Government. That affects, not merely the short line of railway between one extremity of the Welland Canal and the other, but it affects the transit trade across the Province of Ontario. The vessels that are loaded with wheat at Duluth and carried it to Sarnia, or that were loaded at Chicago or Milwaukee and carried it to Sarnia, or Maitland, or Collingwood, for the purpose of having it re-shipped at some lake ports to the eastward, are now excluded from that trade, and when we look at the treaty in this particular, we find it is not as broad as the commercial regulations of the United States, because the treaty only provides for the carrying of American products from one American port to another, in vessels, with an intermediate transit over some Canadian railway or through Canada; whereas the regulations made by the Executive of the United States not only provided for that case, but for a case of this sort, that flour and grain, and so on, shipped in the west, landed at some Canadian port, carried by Canadian railways to Ogdensburg or to the Eastern States, was also admitted to be carried in part, so far as carried at all, in Canadian vessels. Under the Treaty of Washington only those cases were dealt with where the article was carried at each extremity in a vessel, which was practically an interference with the coasting trade, but the regulations made by the Executive also permitted goods that were intended for the various ports in the United States, and that were taken on board some Canadian railway, to be carried for the remainder of the way through Canada, and through a portion of the United States, by railway. Now, the repeal of those trade regulations not only repeals the 30th article of the Washington Treaty, but also those other regulations which provided for these cases. That is a very serious matter. Take, for instance, the Beatty line of steamers. They have four large steamships engaged in this trade during the summer season. They are all thrown out of employment. So with regard to our shipping on the lakes; so with regard to those ships which carry grain and flour to Maitland or Collingwood, to be carried to Toronto, and put on vessels for the port of Oswego. The trade on the lakes is most seriously affected by the repeal of this article, but it is still further affected by the repeal of these Executive regulations relating to the trade; and yet the hon. gentleman, after two years' notice of the intention of the American Government to terminate these provisions, has not taken, in all that time, the first step for the purpose of establishing new and satisfactory trade relations with the people of the United States. I think the hon. gentleman has not succeeded, as he declared he had, in adopting a course that was or is likely to be to the general advantage of this country.

Mr. McLELAN. I judge that the hon. gentleman does not so much disapprove of the present position of affairs as complain that action was not taken earlier. We were in this position: We had been the last to send a representative for the purpose of negotiating a reciprocity treaty in 1875; we had also declared publicly by our Statute Book that we were ready to negotiate with the United States for reciprocal trade whenever that country saw fit to negotiate with us; but we were in a different position. In 1883, when notice of the termination of this treaty was given, we did not send a delegate, we did not officially go to the United States Government, we did not beg for a renewal of that treaty, but informally, and through the Governor General of that day, Lord Lorne, we suggested to the American

Mr. MILLS.

Government that a commission should be appointed, consisting of representatives of both Governments, to visit the whole coast of British America and of the United States, and to consider the question of the fisheries, and obtain such information as we thought would be necessary, with a view to adopting a new treaty. That suggestion was made to the American Government in 1883 through Lord Lorne—informally, not officially. To that suggestion we had no response. No information, either official or informal, was given to us, that they would respond to that suggestion, or that they would join us in a commission to obtain such information as was desirable to have in negotiations for the renewal of a treaty. Having met us in that way, having made no response, I think we would have been too much in a position of suppliants and beggars if we had again moved without any intimation from them. When we approached the termination of the treaty a suggestion was made which has resulted in the correspondence which has been submitted to the House. I do not understand that the hon. gentleman complains of the action taken, but only that we did not take it early enough. Both the hon. gentlemen who have spoken made that their ground of complaint; and if they will consider that in 1883 we did all that we properly could do in order to open negotiations on the question, preliminary to making a treaty, I think then they will agree that we have done all we honorably could to bring about negotiations in respect to the fisheries and reciprocal trade between the two countries.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not feel like continuing the discussion upon this subject, for the reason that, as it is now before the American Government, I think it is unwise to go into it at any great length, and for that reason, also, I rather deprecate the action of my hon. friend from the county of St. John (Mr. Weldon), in raising the question at this time. But I have no doubt that hon. gentleman was inspired by a sense of the duty that he owed to his constituents, and in a matter of so much importance to the people of the Maritime Provinces that is certainly, to my mind, an excuse for ventilating it at this time, although I think the continuance of this discussion, and even the discussion, so far as it is gone, cannot be otherwise than detrimental to the future settlement of the fisheries. Sir, there have been two very grave statements made, one by the right hon. Premier and the other by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), which I think ought not to have been made in this discussion, looking at what is ahead of us. My hon. friend from Bothwell stated, if I understood him distinctly, that the Halifax award of \$5,500,000 was far beyond the value of the Canadian fisheries.

Mr. MILLS. No; I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. MITCHELL. What did you say about it?

Mr. MILLS. I said the American Government assumed that the amount was beyond the value of the fisheries, and that was the reason why they terminated the treaty. I expressed no opinion as to their value.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am very glad I misunderstood my hon. friend, because it would be of the last importance to us that, either with regard to the value of our own fisheries or with regard to the facilities which we may get, in respect to trade, that matter should not be discussed until it is taken up by the two Governments. Our worthy friend the Premier made a statement which I regretted, if I understood him correctly. I understood him to say something to this effect: That, inasmuch as the Americans were admitted to fish in our waters before the treaty expired, and as we took the fish of our fishermen into American markets free, it was no hardship to us to allow the Americans to continue to fish in our waters, and that it would be sufficient compensation to our fishermen in the future to get their fish free into the United States markets.