

frontier or lake shore constituencies. It is from them we may expect to obtain information which will justify the Government in the course it has pursued of improving the law and in endeavoring to make the policy still more liberal.

Mr. GAULT. This is a subject in which I am deeply interested as an underwriter, and I hope the discussion will be of great advantage to the country. I had, yesterday, a memorial sent to me from the underwriters of Montreal, complaining that the ship *Boyne*, wrecked at Capo Charles, with \$52,000 worth of wheat on board, should have been kept there with the waves breaking over her at every high tide. I went to the Government to see if they would allow this large quantity of wheat to be sold, and that they should get *pro rata* the amount at which it would sell. This wheat was likely to sell at 8 or 9 cents a bushel, and the duty on it was 15 cents, but the Government told me distinctly that they could not alter the law, and that this wheat must either be exported or allowed to rot in the ship. I think that was one of the hardest things that I have ever known, and it seems to me that the Government might have made some order to remedy it. I should be quite willing that the Government should take the wheat themselves, sell it by auction, and put the money into the Treasury, rather than let the wheat go to waste. I think it a very great sin to let this \$52,000 worth of grain be wasted. I have used all my influence, but it amounts to nothing, and I feel very sorry about it. There are great complaints in Montreal, and the parties have just cause in this matter, and I hope the Government will bring in a Bill immediately to set this matter right.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have listened to the explanation of the Minister of Customs with great satisfaction. I may say that I have no personal interest in the matter, either for or against the tug-men. I am so situated, however, that I have a personal opportunity of knowing that the statements made in the Ewart's letter, and the reports of the United States Consul at Sarnia, are untrue; and I felt it my duty to bring the matter before this House. It was never desired by the men engaged in the wrecking business in my section of the country, that Americans should be prevented from coming in in cases where property or life was at stake. The matter is therefore understood by the collectors at Detroit and along the St. Clair River, and they are fairly alive to their duty. The only fault I have to find with these gentlemen is that they are apt to be too lenient. They certainly do not err in the direction of severity towards American tug-owners. The Minister of Customs knows that I have frequently asked concessions in the direction of allowing Americans to bring in tension irons and other appliances, when Canadian apparatus for the purpose was not available. I wish, however, to assure the Minister of Customs that when I found fault with certain collectors in the west for a too lenient interpretation of the circulars sent to them, I did not dream of accusing these gentlemen of acting in collusion with American tug-owners. I believe them to be conscientious in discharging their duties as they understand them. I think my hon. friend from Prince Edward has wandered from the question under discussion, and that, besides, if he was desirous of playing into the hands of the American tug-owners, he has succeeded admirably in doing so by raising the cry of inhumanity. That cry has no right to be brought up in this debate. It is not contended by any one that when life or property is at stake, any rules should be too rigidly enforced, and I know that collectors are in the habit of allowing American tugs to proceed to the assistance of vessels in distress in American waters, when life and property are at stake. I trust the Government will speedily bring down the papers.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not intend to discuss the general question, but desire to join with my hon. friend the

member for Montreal West, in pointing out the great hardships which seems to be caused by the operation of the present law, as to the salvage of property in wrecked vessels. The case he refers to is one of very great hardship, indeed, but it is only one of a number of cases which are constantly occurring. When last year we had, near to the city of Montreal, the misfortune to have a serious accident in the canal, the same difficulty arose, and the subject became a matter of very considerable local discussion. It seems to me to be a most extraordinary thing—and whilst I believe the law is on that side, yet, I am bound to say that I think the Government ought to be strong enough, where the law is evidently, I was going to use a strong expression, but I will say, wrong on the face of it—to say that they will take the responsibility of dealing fairly in cases of that kind, and then to bring down legislation to amend the law. The idea of the property in this vessel, the *Boyne*, lying at this moment, in the St. Lawrence, being destroyed absolutely, because it will not realise enough to pay the duty of 15 cents. per bushel, is a proposition that I am quite certain no one could, for one moment, assent to. I believe that is the law, but, I hope, sincerely hope, that the Government will take it upon themselves to issue an order that that property may be sold, even if they take the whole of the proceeds as the duty, but do not let the property itself be destroyed. As to the question that has been discussed, it is rather an old familiar subject, for the simple reason that for three or four years we had consecutively in the city of Ottawa, when in the month of January the Dominion Board of Trade held its meetings, Captain Dorrs, of Buffalo, as the representative of the upper lakes, soliciting their influence with the Government to have our law changed. It occurred to me that this was simply a branch of the general question of reciprocity between the two countries and their reciprocal relations. If they are anxious to have these special privileges, in the meantime, at any rate, whilst their means and appliances are very much greater than ours, let them give us something in return. The statements made by the Minister of Customs, to-night, show clearly, as far as the Government is concerned, that ample measures have been taken, and can be taken for the protection of life and property, and that life and property shall not be permitted to be destroyed on the Upper Lakes out of any mere matter of national sentiment or feeling. Under those circumstances, if the Americans are anxious to have full opportunity of wrecking on the Upper Lakes, let them give us the coasting trade, let them give us free opportunities for reciprocal relations between the two countries, and I have no doubt that everyone in Canada will gladly consent to their proposition. I remember, and I dare say that my hon. friend remembers, a very remarkable speech made by the late Hon. Joseph Hamlin, at a Detroit convention, in 1866, when he referred to the Reciprocity Treaty as being reciprocity in slices. The suggestion arose out of a remark by Mr. Hamlin, who was at that time, or had been just before, the Vice-President of the United States, that this was simply reciprocity by slices, and that the object of our friends on the other side was to get the people in this country to make one after another, every possible concession that can be made to every possible interest in which they are concerned, and to leave us without any concession in return. If, therefore, the American Government are anxious to have these privileges, let them come to us with fair and reasonable offers for a Reciprocity Treaty between the two countries, and I have no doubt that the Government of Canada and the Canadian people of all parties will be very glad to meet them.

Mr. GAULT. I have just had a communication from the Minister of Customs, telling me that the wheat in the *Boyne* has been sold to-day for 15½ cents a bushel, giving the Government 15 cents, and ½ cent for the underwriters, and