

forward in the suggested commission on behalf of either party, I do not see how it is possible for me to give any stronger assurance that the understanding has been reached under circumstances affording a prospect of negotiation for the development and extension of trade between the United States and British America."

You will observe that while that is to be the understanding, he is very careful to not introduce in the exchange of notes, the words so urgently pressed on him by Mr. West, making clear that the intention was to carry out the arrangements not only with regard to the fisheries, but not, or at least doubtful, with regard to reciprocal trade relations. From this correspondence we apparently made the offer in the first instance, that we would allow the American fishermen in our waters without asking the slightest concession on their part, on the reason put forward in the despatch of the 26th of December, that it would enable our fishermen to go under cover of American fishermen so as to sell to American vessels and have them carried in free of duty. The point seems to be that this was out of consideration to the poor American fishermen. They would be allowed to continue through the season, because they had the belief that they would be allowed to do so until December, although their own Government knew that the treaty ceased in July, and they were fishing without law or license and were liable to seizure. To prevent this impression from being removed from their mind, our Government graciously conceded that point to the American Government. I find that by the American Fishery Bureau return for June, that there were 50 mackerel schooners out of 216 that went out fishing in Nova Scotian waters alone; and 289 out of 460 cod-fishers, fishing upon the banks, adjacent to British territory, upon the inshore fisheries of which they would be dependent for bait. In discussing this matter, I want to discuss it as briefly as possible, but I feel it my duty to my constituents and my Province and the Maritime Provinces generally, to bring this matter fairly before you, and I could show you that this matter was regarded by the American press in itself, as a one-sided operation. I would call attention to the remarks of one paper, which has taken a great interest in Canadian affairs. I refer to an article which appeared in the *Boston Herald* on the 19th of last month, giving a fair historical account with regard to this treaty and the different contentions of the English and American Governments, written, I believe, by an American now residing in Montreal, and also to an article in that paper of the 27th June:

"This benefit is bestowed practically without an equivalent in one part. It is true that under the agreement Canadian fishermen are to have the same right to fish along the coast and bays of the United States, that is accorded to American fishermen on the shores of Canada and Newfoundland but it hardly needs to be pointed out that this concession on our part is one of theoretical rather than practical value."

"The other advantage which Canadians may obtain is the opportunity of selling us bait and other supplies to those of our fishermen who desire to obtain these commodities, but this they could do if no extension of the treaty had been made and it can hardly be counted as an offset to the benefits we receive."

Again referring to the course pursued and evidences of good will, adds:

"We are sorry to add, it is a grant which if it had been made to English fishermen by an American Government would have called forth angry protests from a great many people of this country."

I charge upon the Government that by their delay in endeavoring to get through these negotiations, instead of being in a position when that Government asked for fair concessions, instead of being in a position to ask fair concessions, our fishermen are handicapped by the duty imposed on them in a way of which an illustration may be seen any day in the harbor of the city I represent—two cargoes of lumber, one going to the United States free of duty, and the other paying duty, which tells severely against New Brunswick trade. That, however, cannot be

Mr. WELDON.

helped, as it is a treaty arrangement, under which we gave the navigation of the River St. John to the Americans, so that American lumber cut by American citizens is sent free into the United States, while Canadian lumber has to pay duty. Now the position in which we are placed is not by virtue of a treaty, but by what is, according to the Government's own despatches, a one-sided arrangement, under which Canadian fishermen trading with American ports are handicapped by a duty, whereas American fishermen, taking fish from the same waters, are allowed to take them in duty free. On this subject, the *St. John Telegraph* of the 7th of July had an article which says:

"We recently referred to the one-sided arrangement by which the Ottawa Government concedes the season's fishing in our waters to Americans, while the latter impose duties upon our fish products entering their markets. The organ of the Government here then said it was doubtful if the duties imposed in the States would be injurious to our fishermen! To this feeble attempt in defence of the jug-handled arrangement, a correspondent at Deer Island, gives the following reply as to its actual working:—

"The *Sun* says it is doubtful if duties imposed on our fish by the American Government will affect our fishermen injuriously. On Wednesday, July 1st, a Canadian fisherman took to Eastport a few pickled fish, was offered 75c. per barrel of 200 lbs.—the usual price this season—but was notified that if he landed the fish he must pay duty at the rate of 3c. per lb. He was affected badly. Under present regulations our people are not allowed to carry into Eastport herring for sardines without paying a duty of 3c. per lb, or about \$5 per hoghead; but American boats, manned by Americans, can come here and buy and take in free of duty. This throws numbers of our people out of employment, several of whom have already declared their intention of being naturalised, so as to hold the privileges formerly enjoyed by them. Such are the facts."

"Another correspondent writing from Campobello, which is opposite Eastport, says:

"During the forty-five years that I have been residing in this place, the outlook never was so bad and discouraging for the fishing business as at the present time in this place. The unusual scarcity of all kinds of fish at this season, and the unprecedented low price, of all kinds, are some of the causes, but not all. What has been gleaned from the *Montreal Gazette*, of June 19th, to which you referred in your last issue, has left the impression here that the Americans will have the full privilege of our fishing grounds, and we will be virtually shut out of their markets by the high duties imposed on fish. The fishermen could patiently labor, and hope for a recovery from the general depression in their business, but this outcome of Tory rule they think is most too much to bear. It is reported here that one large boat was seized at Eastport, and also that a man was caught landing about one dollar's worth of fish at the same place, and had to pay one dollar and fifty cents in duties, and thus, after being legally fleeced he returned home minus fifty cents. The air is filled with vengeance against Macdonaldism, and the American fishermen. It is a great pity that any Government should lead its subjects into sheer ruin."

With regard to this industry, for the last 20 years some 17 or 18 sardine factories established in Eastport afforded a large trade to the fishermen of Passamaquoddy and to those engaged in fishing in the bay of the county which my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) represents; and these parties are obliged to pay 1/2 c. per pound on these fish, which virtually deprives them of a market entirely. Such is the position in which we are placed. Without discussing the arrangement, what I say is, that if any arrangement was made, it was the duty of the Government to have made attempts to secure it two years ago; it was not to be left until the legislative powers of both countries had ceased to act—until the Congress of the United States had risen, and the time had arrived when our own Legislature, though still in session, was supposed to have risen. The Government should not have allowed this matter to drift along, saying we will not make any concessions. When the hon. member from Queen's (Mr. Davies) this Session urged that the Government should take steps to negotiate with the American Government, the reply was made that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), had refused in 1878 to negotiate with the United States Government. But they continued to do nothing to the last moment, and it was shown by their own despatches and by the confidential memorandum from Mr. West, that the proposition came from the Canadian Government, and was a voluntary offer made to the American Government, without the slightest offer of concessions from the latter; and whatever concessions are granted are admitted