

ago. Yet we were told to-night that it was an entirely new interpretation we were putting on the treaty, and an entirely new and objectionable mode of enforcing it. We have been told that our policy is shifting and changing, and that we are unable to hold for two Sessions consecutively the same policy. I wish to show how hon. gentlemen opposite have changed and chopped in their criticisms. Why, let the House remember this: that, in 1886, all these 68 seizures to which the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has referred had been made, that the *D. J. Adams* and the *Doughty* had been seized, that every reason for making seizures had been adopted and enforced during that long and troublesome period in our fisheries dispute. Let me remind the House, moreover, that the reports made by the present Minister of Finance, then Minister of Fisheries, and myself, and which had been approved by Council, and which were denounced by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) to-night, as "brag, and blow, and bluster," were put upon the records of this House early in 1887. Nay, more, they had been put before the Parliament of Great Britain early in the autumn of 1886, and had been then published by our own newspapers here. Accordingly, every man who took any interest in this question knew their contents, and when this House assembled in 1887, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), and all his associates had read my report on the *D. J. Adams* seizure, and Mr. Foster's report on that whole question. They had read and digested all those reports which they now declare were "brag, blow and bluster"—and did they ask the House to condemn them then? Did the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) rise in his place and condemn them? Did the leader of the Opposition rise and say: "this is brag, blow and bluster?" Did they say: "this is a narrow, cruel and harsh interpretation of the Treaty of 1818?" Did they say those 68 vessels should not have been seized, that we treated the Americans harshly, that we had seized too many American vessels? The records will show. But I find on looking over the records that, on the 17th June, 1887, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did bring this subject before the House. He brought it to the notice of the House on a report which he says to-night is "brag, blow and bluster."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) No, no.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will not be able to accept the hon. gentleman's denial of a statement which I heard him make a few moments ago.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman will, perhaps, do me the justice to allow me to explain.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The hon. gentleman has intimated two or three times that I spoke of his report as being a report of brag, blow and bluster. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me entirely. I never did make use of such language to-night or on any occasion, but to-night and on previous occasions I have said that as far as the law is concerned, I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is not the point. The hon. gentleman has stated to-night that he was unable, and that any lawyer would be unable to differ from me so far as the interpretation of the document was concerned, but he said that these reports and Orders in Council and the policy of the Government based on them was mere "brag, blow and bluster." But I do not care if the hon. gentleman did not say so, it was in 1887 that he should have condemned us if he thought we should be condemned. I want to contrast now the attitude which he has taken to-night with his attitude when the whole policy was fresh before the country, when he had the reports in his hands, when he knew the whole history of the 68 seizures, but when he was not quite

so certain whether it would be to their advantage or disadvantage to attack us. In disclaiming any desire to embarrass the Government with respect to this question, the hon. gentleman said, on 17th June, 1887:

"My intention is simply to discuss this question in the light of the facts as they exist at present. The Government having, as I said, neglected their duties, and being now through that neglect brought face to face with the present condition of affairs, namely, the expiration of the Washington Treaty, I think I expressed the opinion of both sides that in taking steps to protect our fisheries, the Government carried out the wishes of the very large majority of the people."

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.) Hear, hear. I say so now.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The policy which we had carried out was well understood. The hon. gentleman had the reports in his hands, the Order in Council and the records of the 68 cruel seizures which he has detailed to-night—all the data on which was based the policy which he now described as "brag, blow and bluster." The hon. gentleman continued:

"I am quite sure that under the then circumstances that was the only proper course to be taken; and so far as they have taken that course they have my cordial support."

We had it, but only for one Session. —

"I am not going to open up those grave questions which have been discussed" —

With "brag, blow and bluster?" No. —

"— with very great ability by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I have given a good deal of time to the reading of the papers on those questions" —

The hon. gentleman had not been misled or taken by surprise. —

"— and I think that so far as the controversy is concerned between Mr. Bayard and Mr. Phelps, the American Minister to England, on the one side," —

And to-night the hon. gentleman took the report of Mr. Phelps and backed it up. —

"— and the gentleman who acted for Canada on our side, our case has been very well presented."

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I do not deny that to-night.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is one other point on which I wish to refresh the hon. gentleman's memory, even though it be as to very recent history. We heard to-night about the dreadful category of 68 seizures,—we heard it over and over again. The fact was that what the hon. gentleman complained of on 17th June, 1887, with that list before him, was that the seizures were all made in the harbors and that the cruisers had not gone out and searched the seas for those vessels. Why, he said, the fishery protection has been a farce because our cruisers have searched for American vessels only in the harbors of Canada while they should have taken them on the seas:

"It would strike those who know something about the habits of the American fishermen as very singular, that, if the poachers were watched, only one was seized for fishing within the 3-mile limit. The charge which I make—and I do that without making any charge of improper conduct against those who are carrying on the service—is that their time was devoted too much to the boarding and taking control of American vessels in harbors, while they did not give the proper protection they should have given to the sea-coast fisheries outside."

I shall give the hon. gentleman the full benefit of his statement, and of course anything that is in his favor I will read to him:

"It was a matter of public notoriety, it was talked of at every fireside, it was talked of at every dinner table, it was talked of in every exchange in the Maritime Provinces, that the cruisers were almost all the time in harbor. It may be that it was necessary for them to be in harbor. It may be that it was necessary for them to watch these vessels but my experience, and the information I have derived from those who have the best knowledge of the subject, leads me to believe that it was altogether improper for them to remain in harbor for the time they did. I find, taking up the copies of the different boarding books of these different vessels, that the information I had, and the facts which were generally known in the Maritime Provinces, are endorsed by the official statement which is obtainable here. I find, in the first place, that the schooner *L. Houlett*, under command of Captain Lorway, boarded 264 vessels; and one would