

May 14, 1872

peace was contradicted most emphatically by the despatches of the Government. (*Hear, hear.*) In their minutes of Council of the 28th of July last—and when they penned that they knew the provisions of the treaty just as well as they do now—they knew then as well as now whether it was in the interests of peace, whether it was for the interests of the Dominion, that it should be accepted—yet in that minute they state as a reason why they could not accept the treaty that the principal cause of difference between Canada and the United States had not been removed by the treaty but remained a subject for future anxiety. He answered the hon. gentleman out of their own mouths. The last speaker had referred to the remarks of his colleague from Halifax (Mr. Power) respecting the advantage the treaty would have conferred upon the fishing trade of Nova Scotia had it been in operation last year. He stated that in that case Nova Scotia would have saved between \$500,000 and \$600,000 on the duties on herrings and mackerel which had been sent to the United States.

He (Mr. Jones) held in his hand the trade and navigation returns for the past year, which he presumed were tolerably accurate. He found from this document that the total amount of pickled fish—herring and mackerel and alewives—sent into the United States last year was 47,000 barrels, which, at \$2 a barrel, would be \$94,000, instead of \$600,000 as claimed by the hon. gentleman opposite. (*Hear, hear.*)

The hon. President of Council (Hon. Mr. Tupper) also stated that the treaty of 1854 was a great boon. Well, no one denied that; but contrast that treaty with the present treaty. Under the former one, agricultural products, our coal and lumber, were admitted free of duty into the United States. How different was this from the present treaty! The same hon. gentleman stated as one reason why this Treaty must be a good one for us that the American fishermen were opposed to it. The hon. member for Durham West (Hon. Mr. Blake), the other night, speaking on this point had hit the nail on the head. He stated that the reason why American fishermen opposed the Treaty was that Gen. Butler had gone down to Gloucester and harangued them, telling them that now was their time to wrest from Congress what they had long wanted, namely, a system of bounties and the bonding of their supplies. That was the sole course of their outcry against the Treaty, and the Minister of Justice (Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald) knew it very well, and he (Mr. Jones) had grave apprehensions that such a policy would be adopted by Congress. Of course they would not do so while the Treaty was pending but when this Parliament accepted the Treaty then would be their time to grant bounties to their fishermen, and to allow the bonding of their supplies.

The President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Tupper) had contended that the admission of American fishermen into our waters would not destroy the value of our fisheries, but the reports of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Senator Mitchell) had told a different story. He gave the value of the fisheries before and during the Reciprocity Treaty, and showed

conclusively that if we had adopted an exclusive policy after the abrogation of the treaty, we would now have had control of the American markets. The House was told that the arbitrators appointed to decide upon the relative value of our fisheries and the American fisheries would pay us what we lost in giving up our fisheries; but the very first question that would have to be decided before they could estimate the relative value was where were they to draw the boundary line of our fisheries, whether from headland to headland, or along the coast? If the former, of course our fisheries would be greatly increased in value; but how were the arbitrators to decide? It was, therefore, of the very greatest importance that the High Joint Commissioners should have settled definitely the question of headlands, so that the arbitrators would have had a basis on which to make their valuation.

The hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the Premier, had stated that the American markets were the only markets we had for our fish. He had not had the pleasure of listening to the speech of his colleague from Halifax (Mr. Power); but he understood that gentleman had given some figures to show that a large portion of our fish was sent to the United States. He was not aware from what source that gentleman drew his information, but he felt it his duty to be as correct as possible and he had taken the trouble to consult the public documents for 1862, 63, 64 under the Reciprocity Treaty, and also after that Treaty in 1869, 70, 71, when the United States imposed duty on our fish. He found that under the Reciprocity Treaty only about 7 per cent more of our fish went to the United States than when the duty was imposed.

The American fishermen stood in a very different position from our fishermen in many respects. In the first place they had larger and better vessels, larger outfits, larger capital, and they had in operation a system of mutual insurances. They had the additional advantage of being able to fish all the year round. Our fishermen fished in the early part of the year only; but, after the mackerel fishing was over in the fall, the American fishermen went off to the banks, and caught halibut and other fish, which our fishermen could not do. He would tell the hon. gentleman why. If he were to send his vessel there he would have to sell his cargo wholesale, and would not be able to pay the expense of taking it to market. But those people had a market at their own doors. The American fishermen thus had the advantage over ours. They were able to earn during the winter season what would pay their expenses all the year round, and that was a very important consideration. The hon. gentleman had referred to the position of the American markets during that time. Within the last two years so great had been the increase of American fishermen, since the war, since they had gone back and engaged in old pursuits, that fish had been cheaper in Boston than Halifax, and there had been large imports from Boston, and the West Indies markets had been trading from Boston instead of Halifax. If the hon. gentleman understood the matter as he did he would see those people would come with better appliances