

suppose, in looking at this book, that this gentleman and his vessel had been exceedingly active in looking after these poachers and protecting our fisheries, but a critical examination of the paper will show that there was nothing of the kind. Why? Because, of the 264 vessels that he boarded, 259 were vessels lying at anchor in the different harbors of the Provinces, and he only boarded 5 vessels outside of the harbor. One of these five vessels was that which was seized for an actual fishing within the limits, the *Highland Light*, and she has been condemned and sold; and the other four vessels he boarded outside of the harbor while they were supposed to be trespassing within the bounds. Hon. gentlemen will see at once that this was a very small proportion. Then, we have the *Critic*, commanded by Captain McLaren, which boarded 125 vessels in all, but 132 of these were at anchor in the harbor, and only three outside. The *F. E. Conrod*, Captain Smeltzer in command, boarded 48 vessels, and of these seven were outside a harbor, at the mouth of the Baie des Chaleurs, and he reports that he boarded them and warned them not to enter the bay; but, outside of these seven, he does not seem to have boarded a single American fishing craft when it was engaged in prosecuting the fishing business in the Maritime Provinces. The *Terror*, Captain Quigley, boarded 73 vessels in all, and all of these were in the harbor except one, which he boarded at the mouth of the harbor of Shelburne. Then we have the *General Middleton*; that vessel was more or less concerned in the Bay of Fundy, with the fishing of which I am not very well acquainted, but they appear to be all small boats of two tons, three and six tons, and so on, so I will not refer to that. They are not what we call fishing vessels at all. The *Lizzie Lindsay*, Captain Pouliot in command, boarded 27 vessels in all; two of these were outside and the other 25 were in the harbor. The *Lansdowne*, commanded by Captain Dakins, boarded 93 vessels in all. Nine of these were at sea, and 82 were in harbor. Hon. gentlemen would imagine, on a first glance, that a man who boards 72 vessels has evidently done a good deal of work, but, if you examine the return, you will find that as many as forty of those were lying in the same harbor at the same time, and were all boarded on one day.

“Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What of that?”

“Mr. DAVIES. I say that these vessels were in the same harbor, and the work done consisted of boarding them in the harbor. I think he should have devoted more time to sailing along the coasts and boarding them there.”

Now, Sir, all those seizures which were made, were for vessels improperly entering the harbors without proper justification, or for violating customs laws while they were there, and the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) contention was that in regard to that very business of boarding vessels—and he need not attempt to confuse the ear of the House by pretending that it was with a view of preventing fishing outside—with regard to that very boarding of vessels he said it should have been extended to our coasts outside. Suppose the American vessels had been boarded outside. What a cry would have gone up, if instead of a record of 68 seizures made in our own harbors and waters, the hon. member was able to point to a number of seizures which were made outside our harbors. How he would tell the House that the American fishermen were persecuted while pursuing their lawful calling along our coasts. I want to call the attention of this House for a few moments to a statement which has been repeated, I am very sorry to say, very many times outside of this House. This statement has very seldom been heard here, because it is only in the American brief on the fishery question—that we have been guilty of the inhumanity of driving vessels to sea without sufficient provisions for the maintenance of their crews. The House was told a night or two ago, and it has been referred to once or twice since; and the Senate of the United States has been informed in indignant terms and with strong language that we have been guilty of inhumanity which no maritime people had ever been guilty of before. The case of the *Molly Adams* has been cited as an illustration of that. Now, Sir, as that statement has been repeated in this House—and now it will be repeated for all time to come in the American brief on this question as having been said in this House—I must ask leave even to persecute the ear of the House by repeating an oft told tale, and to assert that that offence was never committed by the Government of Canada or by any one of its officers. The statement which has been made on the part of the United States is this: that the *Molly Adams* was a vessel which had rescued a shipwrecked Canadian crew, that it had given to the shipwrecked Canadian crew a portion of its provisions, and that when that vessel brought that crew into our waters and

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

landed them on our coasts, they were driven to sea without the right to replenish their provisions. How is it, that the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, as well as those who have referred to the matter since, will take the American statement of the case and fling it in the face of those who have to negotiate arrangements for this country, when the statement has been refuted as plainly as a lying statement ever was, and when everybody knows that the refutation which we have made of it has never provoked a single word of reply? Our answer with regard to this case has gone before the United States Senate, it has gone to the State Department of the United States, it has been transferred to the man who made the charge, and more than a year has rolled by, and it is only in political discussions that we hear revived the dead story which we killed long ago. Let me read for a moment to the House what the statement is upon our side, and the statement as I have said has never been challenged even by the man who made the contrary statement:

“Capt. Jacobs declares that on or about the 26th September last, during very heavy weather, he fell in with the bark *Neskilita* which had run on a bar at Malpeque harbor and became a total wreck. That he took off the crew, 17 in number, at 12 o'clock at night, carried them to his own vessel, fed them for three days, and then gave them \$60 with which to pay their fare home, and provisions to last them on their way. He states that the captain of the Canadian cruiser *Critic* came on board, was told the circumstances, but offered no assistance, and that no one on shore would take the wrecked men unless he became responsible for the payment of their board. The collector at Malpeque, in his report, says that early on the morning after the wreck, soon after the news reached him, he repaired to the harbor to see what assistance could be given; that he then met the captain of the *Neskilita* in company with Capt. Jacobs, and was told by the latter that the crew of the wrecked vessel was comfortably cared for on his vessel and that nothing more could be done. Capt. McLaren of the *Critic* says that he had once visited the *Molly Adams* and was told by Capt. Jacobs that ‘he had made all arrangements for the crew.’ The collector and Capt. McLaren agree in stating, from information gathered by them, that the crew of the wrecked vessel came to shore in their own boat unassisted, and after boarding a United States vessel were invited by Capt. Jacobs, with whom the captain of the *Neskilita* had beforetimes sailed out of Gloucester, to go on board the *Molly Adams*.”

So that this crew had not been rescued at all by the *Mollie Adams*.—

“The collector was asked by the captain of the *Neskilita* if he would assist himself and crew to their homes, and answered that he could not unless assured that they themselves were without means for that purpose, in which case he would have to telegraph to Ottawa for instructions. The captain of the *Neskilita* made no further application. The Minister observes that it is the practice of the Dominion Government to assist shipwrecked and destitute sailors, in certain cases of great hardship, to their destination or homes, but in all cases it must be clear that they must be destitute, and the application for assistance must be made to Ottawa through the Collector of Customs. Had such an application been made by the captain of the *Neskilita*, it would have received due consideration. In answer to the charge that board could not be obtained for the wrecked crew, it is stated by Capt. McLaren that the crew of a United States vessel, wrecked about the same time, found no difficulty in getting board and that the captain of the *Neskilita* had himself arranged to board with the collector, who expressed surprise at his failing to come. Capt. Jacobs complains that he was not allowed to land from his vessel the material saved from the wreck. To this charge the collector replies that he received no intimation of any wreck material, except the crew's luggage, being on board the *Mollie Adams*, and Capt. Jacobs made no request to him regarding the landing of wrecked material, and that he (the collector) gave all assistance in his power to the captain of the *Neskilita* in saving material from the wreck. It was subsequently discovered that Capt. Jacobs had on board the *Mollie Adams* a seine from the wrecked vessel belonging to the underwriters, for taking care of which, when obliged to give it up, Capt. Jacobs claimed that he was paid the sum of \$10. Capt. Jacobs states that he was put to a loss of ten days' fishing by his detention with the *Neskilita*. The reports of both the collector and Capt. McLaren agree in giving a very different and sufficient reason, viz, very bad weather, consequent inability to fish, a disability experienced by the whole fishing fleet at that time anchored in Malpeque. The second complaint of Mr. Bayard is that when Capt. Jacobs, experiencing a dearth of provisions as a consequence of his charitable action, shortly after put into Port Medway, and asked to purchase half a barrel of flour and enough provisions to take him home, the collector, ‘with full knowledge of all the circumstances,’ refused the request and threatened him with seizure if he bought anything whatever. The collector's report hereto annexed, shows that Capt. Jacobs entered his port on the 25th October, fully one month after the occurrence at Malpeque; that in entering he made affirmation that he called for shelter and repairs, and for no other purpose whatever; that just before leaving he asked permission to pur-