

in England and elsewhere, will more than compensate any city or town for any outlay. I hope other cities and towns in the country will follow the example furnished by Owen Sound.

188 To make good to those merchants of Prince Edward Island, who were British subjects, the amount of duties paid by them to the United States Customs on fish and fish oil in the year 1871, under the arrangements entered into in advance of the legislation necessary to bring the Treaty of Washington into force, by which arrangement United States fishermen were granted liberty to fish in the territorial waters of Prince Edward Island, on the understanding that the President of the United States would ask Congress to refund these duties, which arrangement the President subsequently declined to carry out, on the ground that the proposal contemplated the united actions of all the British North American colonies, which was not had, and that it would not be practicable to separate the colonies or carry into effect for one what the President was willing to effect for all, it not having been deemed advisable in the general interest of the British case to put forward and press the claim of these merchants before the Halifax Commission.....\$30,086 10

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is an argument, not a vote.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. Then no explanation is required.

Mr. BLAKE. This appeared in the Supplementary Estimates last year. I recollect we discussed it to some extent, and the Minister of Finance said he was not able to give full information on it, and would bring it down later, when full information could be given. I am now asking for the full information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman somewhat forgets the circumstances. I remember the hon. member for King's made a strong speech on the item.

Mr. DAVIES. The First Minister, I am sure, was not present, and the Finance Minister said, that inasmuch as the right hon. gentleman was absent, and he was the only one who knew all about why it was put in the Estimates, he would withdraw it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true.

Mr. BLAKE. And it did not come back.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman did not bring it up again last Session. I would like the hon. gentleman to explain to whom this money is to be paid, and in what proportions.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I expect a memorandum on the subject in a few minutes. I think, however, the hon. gentleman has forgotten something in connection with this matter. I think he took exception to the vote and it was intimated that if the hon. gentleman did not wish it to pass we had no objections to drop it; that as he was representative of the Island, we would drop it, at any rate, for that year, and it was dropped accordingly.

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell the whole story of why I took exception to it. He knows that the grounds of my objection were that no explanation whatever was given of why we should vote for it, or of the parties to whom it was to be paid, or the proportions in which it was to be paid: Another ground was, that it was stated that a good many were not to get this money, while others were to be paid. These were the reasons, so that the hon. Finance Minister did not explain all the why. I contended that we should have the reasons given for paying the money, and that it should be paid to all the persons who stood on the same footing.

Mr. ALLEN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be true that I was not here when it was first discussed, but I know that when I heard that the hon. gentleman had taken objection to it, I said to my hon. friend who sits next me: Well, if he chooses, as a representative from Prince Edward Island to object, there is no necessity for the Government to give it. Afterwards the hon. gentleman was told by the Finance Minister, when I was present, that in consequence of the opposition which was made to it, the Government would not press it.

Mr. BLAKE. That seems to be a new notion of responsible Government. I presume that the votes presented to this House are upon the recommendation of the Government, by whom alone they can be presented, the assent of the Crown having been obtained, and they are presented because the Government is of opinion that justice and public policy require that they should be passed. The course the hon. gentleman took last Session was a course which I do not think was worthy of him. We asked for further information; we asked for the names, the amounts to each, and we could not get them; we were told, amongst other things, that it was late, that objection was taken, and that they would drop it for that Session. Now it comes up again, and we want the information which we vainly asked for last Session.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It may be necessary to state briefly the circumstances under which this claim is presented. It is known perfectly well that the Government of the United States submitted a proposition to the different Provinces of Canada, and Prince Edward Island, which was not then a part of Canada, that if we would allow the use of our fisheries to American subjects, they would admit the fish taken and cured by our own people to be received into the United States free. That was the proposition distinctly made. It was declined on the part of Canada, and accepted in good faith on the part of Prince Edward Island—accepted by the men employed in these fisheries and the Government of Prince Edward Island. What was the result? The result was, the American fishermen had the use of the fisheries of Prince Edward Island, the duty was exacted upon the fish taken there by the inhabitants of the Island, notwithstanding what I consider to be as solemn an engagement as one Government could make with another. They demanded the duty, and I may say for myself, as an individual, that I scarcely know of any transaction, between one Government and another, as discreditable as the conduct of the United States Government with reference to this question. That being the case, it was supposed that the Prince Edward Island fishermen had a just and equitable claim upon Canada for the amount of this money—upon this principle, that it was taken into account by the Commissioners sitting at Halifax.

Mr. DAVIES. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We enquired into that matter, we enquired if it was taken into account in the award which has been made, and we felt that there would be a just claim, one about which there could be no question. It was considered a desirable and proper thing by the Minister of Justice, who had the matter in hand, to state the whole matter in these Resolutions. It did not form part of the engagement, part of the consideration to Canada. Under these circumstances, after it stood for a number of years, it was considered that these parties now being a portion of Canada, not being able to obtain their just rights from the United States, the Government should come to the House and ask for the amount of money they had expended to reimburse them, or at least those of them who are British subjects. It is not intended to pay those who are not British subjects, because if the United States Government failed to do justice to their own subjects, let them look to their own Government for consideration. We desire simply