

felt it their duty to declare distinctly and positively that we could not do that by the course we were taking. Take the hon. Minister's own statement :

"Yesterday we stood face to face with a non-intercourse Bill, sustained by the united action of the Senate and House of Representatives, sustained by almost the whole press, Republican and Democratic, of the United States, sustained with few exceptions by a prejudiced, irritated and exasperated people of 66,000,000 lying to the south of us."

And again :

"They [the American negotiators] said that such was the expression of public men in regard to Canada, and the treatment by Canada of their fishermen that if to-morrow any relaxation of the commerce of the United States was made by an Act of Congress, it would contain a clause exempting Canada from its operations so as to deny us its advantages."

And continues the hon. gentleman :

"We turned our attention to the only means by which we could avert what everybody would feel would be the greatest disaster that could befall this country.

Now, Sir, the position in which we were placed, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, was, that among a people of sixty millions we scarcely had a friend. Yet, there are something like a million Canadians in the United States, but the hon. gentleman tells us that our position was such that there was not one of them to raise a voice for us. In the House of Representatives at Washington there are men of Canadian birth or origin, men who had lived in this country for a time, and who must have turned occasionally with some feeling of respect and affection to the land in which they had lived ; yet there was not one in the national legislature to raise his voice for us. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that the press, republican and democratic, were united against us. On that press there are many of our young men, too many, south and east and west, who are filling responsible positions on the press, and there was not one of those to say a word with voice or pen in the interest of Canada. The situation is so humiliating that it must have caused the hon. Minister of Finance quite a pang to make the statement to the House. Now, Sir, with regard to the concessions we have made, it will be well to remember that in 1818, when the treaty was made, there were very few custom houses, and very few ports of entry, and the American fishermen no doubt acquired by time and long usage privileges which they came in time to regard as rights. The whole situation was full of difficulty but immediately after the expiration of the Treaty of 1871 we commenced to enforce with greater strictness and rigor than ever before our regulations—so much so that the Americans spoke of our action as unfair, ungenerous, and inhospitable, and what some would call inconsistent ; members of Congress spoke of our passion and spite, and a prominent member of Congress described our enforcement of the treaty as inhuman. The treaty was one intended to give American fishermen shelter, and it was intended that when they came into our ports or along our coasts, and when seeking that shelter, they should be just as much in the exercise of their rights as our own people. But we made it so difficult that many of them preferred to seek the open sea to entering our ports at all. The hon. Minister of Marine the other night, in an endeavor to satisfy the House that his treatment of these fishermen had been very humane, made this statement to show how lenient he had been :

"The schooner *Hereward* was detained for shipping a man, and was released immediately with a warning. The *Boynton* was allowed to land an injured man from her vessel for medical attention. The *Fanny Starling* was allowed to purchase provisions for her homeward voyage. The *French* was allowed to ship a crew to take the vessel home when he discharged her own crew, and was detained for repairs quite a long time. The *French* and *Argonaut* were seized within the three-mile limit and their crews allowed to be shipped home in United States fishing vessels. Technically we could have insisted that they should not have this privilege, but we gave the privilege and gave it heartily. The schooner *Perkins* had shipped a man illegally and was detained, but she was released after discharging the man. The schooner *Gracey* was allowed to ship men to take the vessel home. The schooner *Perkins*

was extended the same courtesy. The schooner *Pendragon*, whose crew had sickness on board, was, under medical advice, allowed to purchase fresh provisions and meats of all kinds, just as long as the doctor gave a certificate that it was necessary for the health of the crew."

And so on through a long list. Well, I think it is discreditable to the country that the hon. Minister of Marine should take credit for such things as these. Why, they are the ordinary things a man would give to his enemy under the circumstances. Along our coasts, where their vessels are continually coming, as our vessels are continually going along their coasts, there is a constant interchange of courtesies and civilities. The customs and coast-guard vessels of the United States have frequently towed our vessels through ice and other dangers and difficulties, have taken them into port and out, making no difference between the vessels of the two countries ; and yet the hon. gentleman claims credit for himself and his department that they did these things. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman can have no soul—no official soul, at any rate. A case of a particular kind was mentioned last year by the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn), where a vessel came into port where a man lived who had been lost overboard. The captain desired to land his effects and went ashore. During his absence, as was the common custom, the men went ashore, yet that man's vessel was seized and a fine of \$200 imposed upon him. He was in a strange place, had no money and had to go around and raise it as best he could. When the matter was represented to Ottawa, the Minister of Customs undoubtedly remitted the fine and allowed the vessel to go free, but the very fact that this imposition was put on the captain, shows how easy it is, by means of such imposition, to create the feeling which the hon. Minister of Finance described as existing in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my hon. friend name the vessel ?

Mr. ELLIS. I do not know the name.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentlemen vouch for the accuracy of the statement ?

Mr. ELLIS. The hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Flynn) made the statement last year in his place in the House, and the hon. gentleman did not contradict it then.

Mr. EDGAR. The vessel was the *Pearl Nelson*, and the fine was \$200.

Mr. FOSTER. Will you vouch for that ?

Mr. EDGAR. I have the blue-books which will prove it.

Mr. ELLIS. It is just possible that the Opposition itself in this House was rather too lenient with reference to the conduct and policy of the Government. I do not wish to refer strongly to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries because, in this matter, I am enjoying my little triumph over him, in a quiet way ; but he went down to the constituency of St. John, in 1887, and made there an eloquent speech. One of his positions was that he had introduced in the House of Commons a Bill which made it forfeiture for a vessel to be found within the three-mile limit, except for the purposes of shelter and repair and obtaining wood and water. I do not know how to characterise such a boast in language fitted to characterise it, which would not meet, Sir, with your censure, but the boast is one that reflects no credit on the country, and which would naturally be taken hold of by the American people to show how ungenerous we were. It has been constantly announced by the Government up to the present year that there was to be no change in their policy. It was only last year that the Premier said :

"We stood simply on our rights, we stood simply on the Convention of 1818. We stated, and we hold to it, that the change of years and the commercial treaties that have been made between England and the United States did not and could not in any way, in the most remote degree, affect the terms of the Convention of 1818 ; that convention was