

State, written on the 31st May, 1887, to "My dear Sir Charles."

Some hon. MEMBER}. Oh, Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; it is a bad pill for our friends, and I do not wonder that it extorts from them that expression of agony and pain. Mr. Bayard says:

"It is evident that the commercial intercourse between the inhabitants of Canada and those of the United States has grown into too vast proportions to be exposed much longer to this wordy triangular duel, and more direct and responsible methods should be resorted to. Your own able, earnest and patriotic services in the Government and Parliament of the Dominion are well known, and afford ample proof of your comprehension of the resources, rapidly increasing interests, and needs of British North America. On the other hand, I believe I am animated by an equal desire to serve my own country, and trust to do it worthily. The immediate difficulty to be settled is found in the Treaty of 1818 between the United States and Great Britain which has been *questio vezata* ever since it was concluded, and to-day is suffered to interfere with and seriously embarrass the good understanding of both countries in the important commercial relations and interests which have come into being since its ratification, and for the adjustment of which it is wholly inadequate, as has been unhappily proved by the events of the past two years. I am confident we both seek to attain a just and permanent settlement—and there is but one way to procure it—and that is by a straightforward treatment on a liberal and statesmanlike plan of the entire commercial relations of the two countries. I say commercial because I do not propose to include, however, indirectly, or by any intendment, however, partial or oblique, the political relations of Canada and the United States, nor to effect the legislative independence of either country."

Now, I ask, Mr. Speaker, is not that an overture inviting this country to enter upon negotiations for the purpose of securing a modification, at least, of the trade restrictions existing between the two countries? I ask if that is not an overture that should have been responded to, if we had received it in a proper spirit, by an attempt, at least, to secure this modification of trade restrictions? Sir, I assert that it was an overture which was not met in the right spirit, and that no attempt was made by the Government of this country to meet Mr. Bayard on the lines that would have secured a modification of these trade restrictions—I assert that broadly. On the contrary, this Government has pursued towards the United States a policy of irritation, a policy of irritation characterised by the mode in which the fishery regulations were enforced, which I do not need to allude to more particularly, as it has been alluded to already. This spirit of irritation has been manifested in other respects; it has been manifested in the treatment of the question of canal tolls. We have imposed upon vessels passing through the Welland Canal a toll of 20 cents a ton, and we have granted a rebate to those vessels going to the port of Montreal of 18 cents a ton. We have discriminated against the American commerce passing through that canal to the extent of 18-20, and that in face of that fact that our shipping has been permitted to use the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, an expensive work, costing over five million dollars, entirely free of charge. For years, ever since the construction of that canal, the United States Government has kept it in repair, and furnished a force to operate its locks; and every Canadian vessel that has passed through that canal has done so without payment of a cent. The same with the St. Clair Flats Canal; the same with the improvements of the Lime Kiln Crossing, and its expensive works which the American Government have permitted us to use entirely free of charge. In return for this neighborly conduct, we levy upon their commerce passing through the Welland Canal 20 cents a ton, and we discriminate against commerce going to their ports, by rebating 18 cents of that 20 cents a ton to all vessels going to Montreal. Sir, that is not neighborly treatment. Then, when we granted the free admission of fruits, we destroyed entirely all evidences of friendly feeling and kindness of spirit in this matter by that poor little contemptible tax of one cent a basket on the baskets in which the fruit comes; and the collection of that tax, I am told by fruit importers, in some cases led to serious loss on whole car loads of fruit. They were side-tracked, in order to

go through the formalities of a customs entry; the owner in some point in Ontario would be required to come down and enter them, and by the time he had got through the entry and paid the one cent a basket on his purchase, the fruit, especially in the case of peaches, would be badly damaged in consequence of the delay. I have a letter in my pocket to that effect. No doubt this tax cannot yield anything of any consequence; nevertheless it is irritating in its character, more so perhaps than it would be if an amount of revenue of any consequence was realised from it, and it seems to me that nothing could have been more impolitic than the petty cheese-paring spirit manifested. We had this spirit manifested the other day in respect to a few curlers coming over from Buffalo to engage in a friendly game with another party at Toronto, and bringing with them an illuminated address. They were required to give bonds that their curling stones would not be kept in Canada but would be carried back, and they were charged \$1.75 duty on their illuminated address that they were going to present to the curling club in Toronto. Well, it is \$1.75 gained for the Government and bad feeling engendered. I do not think this is wise conduct; I do not think we are making enough, in the shape of revenue, to compensate for the effect upon friendly relations between the two countries, by these small affairs. Then we have the raising of invoices. I know of one case where a party who wished to import certain malleable goods, went to the parties producing the goods in this country and offered them the cost of these goods with the entire amount of duty added. It was refused, and he imported the goods, and the Customs placed its own valuation upon those goods and made him pay duty on 50 per cent. more than their cost. This is not the kind of policy that produces good feeling, it is not a kind of policy that is commendable or politic. Then we are greatly interested in sending fresh fish to the United States free of duty. We import a small amount of fresh fish from the United States, and we impose a duty of half a cent a pound on this fish, jeopardising the whole vast trade of this country with the United States in fresh fish—another specimen of the wisdom of the Government in their management of international relations. There has been, I am sorry to say, an unfriendly spirit manifested in many things. The Americans believe that spirit is unfriendly, and these manifestations have provoked resentment of a very serious character. It is believed in the United States that we have purposely made our fishery regulations oppressive and troublesome for the purpose of extorting from them concessions, and, naturally, they say: "We will see you further before we will give you any concessions under these circumstances." If our friends will read *Æsop's Fables*—

Mr. BOWELL. We are hearing them now.

Mr. CHARLTON—there is an instance related where the wind concluded that it would make a man open his cloak. It blew upon him with great force, and the more the wind blew the tighter the man wrapped his cloak around him. It was found impossible for the wind to compel that man to throw open his cloak. Well, it ceased its efforts, and then the sun shone out warm and benignant upon the man, and after it had shone a few minutes he unbuttoned his cloak. Warmer and warmer it got, and finally the warmth of the sun compelled him to remove his coat. And so it will be here. It is said molasses will catch more flies than vinegar. I believe it is true; and if we want to obtain concessions we do not want to provoke unfriendly conflict by seizing American vessels, charging one cent a basket on their peach baskets, a duty on their illuminated addresses and make them give bonds on curling stones. These are things we should not do. On the contrary, we want to treat them in a broad, generous and friendly spirit and thus engender that cordial feeling which will lead to trade concessions.