

that fine, and that the reason for the seizure of the vessel and the imposition of the fine was that he came in to land the clothes of some dead seaman. The hon. gentleman cannot prove that assertion from the blue-books he cited. The captain has stated in his own affirmation that he came in under stress of weather, that ten of his men landed in boats without having previously entered at the customs, and the vessel was seized for that offence and that alone. The \$200 fine was deposited for that offence and that alone. It was the day after the offence had been committed and after the vessel had been seized and the fine imposed, that the captain himself came on shore and brought with him the clothes of the seaman, and he gave these clothes to somebody who delivered them to his friends. To say, therefore, that the seizure was made and the fine imposed for bringing these clothes ashore is to make a statement which is not true. This charge was also made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis). When I asked him to name the vessel he could not do so, but the hon. the member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said it was the *Pearl Nelson*. So much for that charge. With reference to the *Laura Sayward*, the hon. gentleman read correspondence in which it appeared that the captain was badly treated. The hon. gentleman did not make himself sufficiently acquainted with the blue-books that were before him, for if he had, he would have found in the later correspondence that this same Captain Medeo Rose made an affidavit contradicting entirely the alleged statements which were read by my hon. friend. I will read his statement to the House, made on the 20th April, 1887:

"I called at the custom house early the next morning before seven o'clock; stated that, as the wind was fair and blowing a strong breeze, I would not wait for a reply to telegram, but take a clearance, which the collector gave me. I was treated kindly, allowed to enter my vessel after customs hours, and a clearance granted me next morning before the office was supposed to be opened. I was at the port again in November, on my way to the Banks, and the collector allowed me to report my vessel inwards and outwards and gave me a clearance at eight in the evening.

"The statements purporting to have been made by me to the effect that the collector refused to give me my paper when I asked for it, also that his treatment towards me was harsh and cruel, driving myself and crew to sea, having but little flour, water, &c., are all untrue.

"And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true."

The hon. gentleman's information in this respect was, therefore, not correct, and his statement based on it consequently not well founded.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not take back a single word of what I said last night, and my hon. friend is trying to get out of the whole thing upon a quibble. As to the case of the *Pearl Nelson*, I state again to-day that these dead men's clothes could not be landed until the fine of \$200 had been paid. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that the fine was imposed upon this captain for having landed some Canadians on shore to see their friends, but until the captain had paid that fine of \$200, which was remitted more than a month after, he was not allowed to land the clothes of the dead fisherman, and that is not denied by any of the Canadian officers, from the beginning of the correspondence to the end. There are two things in that transaction which I complained of: One was the imposition of the fine of \$200 and the seizure of the vessel for allowing two Canadians to go on shore; and the other was that before that fine was paid, the captain would not be allowed to land the clothes. As to the *Laura Sayward* there is nothing in the statement I make in which I am mistaken. The hon. gentleman will recollect that in that case I complained, not that the captain did not get out his papers when he landed, because this was not material to the question, but that he was not allowed to buy for the American fishermen seven pounds of

sugar, three pounds of rice, and a little oil and something of that kind. That was refused.

Mr. FOSTER. They were never denied any right.

Mr. EDGAR. This paper shows that the officer of the Minister reported that he did deny them the right, and that he telegraphed to the Minister of Customs twice in one day to know whether those people could buy a pound of sugar and two pounds of potatoes.

Mr. BOWELL. He did quite right.

Mr. EDGAR. The Minister says that was quite right, but the Minister of Marine says he did not do that at all. He tries to make out that there was no refusal.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say so. I say that the officer acted under his instructions. He had no instructions to allow commercial privileges to a fishing vessel, and, when he was asked for those privileges, he first did as an officer should do; he said, I will telegraph to Ottawa and see if I can get instructions to do that. That is what he did, and he did not make an explicit denial of the request made to him, but said, it is not in the line of my duty and I will telegraph to Ottawa. There was no lack of provisions for the preservation of life, and that is shown by the second affidavit.

Mr. EDGAR. I will leave it to the Minister of Customs, who has stated that the officer did quite right in refusing to give this relief.

Mr. BOWELL. I said that, if he did refuse, he did what was right.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister did not say that he did so.

Mr. BOWELL. I did.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said that the officer did right. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries says that he did not do it at all, and the Minister of Customs says he did it, and it was right for him to do it. The Minister of Marine says that, if he did it, it was wrong, and the other Minister says that, if he did it, it was right.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am surprised that those two hon. gentlemen should remain in the same Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, after the views which he has put forward. Certainly, the inhuman acts which they have endeavored to justify have been denounced by the Minister of Finance, and that ought to lead those hon. gentlemen to retire from the Cabinet of which the Minister of Finance is a member. Why should they remain in the Cabinet with the Minister of Finance, who is marking out a different policy altogether from that which they are attempting to pursue? I would like the Minister of Finance to give us some explanation in regard to this clause. The Minister of Justice, in an elaborately prepared memorandum, informed the council that it was utterly impossible to maintain an efficient protection over our fisheries if such a rule as this, which was the principle contended for by Mr. Phelps, was recognised. I have no doubt that the Minister of Finance has fully considered that question, and will be able to give us a full and satisfactory answer to the declaration of the Minister of Justice in that regard. I am sure that the Minister of Finance has no intention of throwing open our inshore fisheries to be poached upon, or to leave this Government utterly helpless to exercise police protection over them; and, as I have full confidence in the judgment of the Minister of Finance in this matter, I have no doubt that he will be able to satisfy the House that he is able to give that protection which the Minister of Justice said it was possible to afford.

Mr. JONES (Halifax). On a previous occasion, I called the attention of the Finance Minister to what appeared to me to be a clause providing for reciprocal advantages, but which, while giving the American fishermen the advantages