

we can still stay our hand and cry halt, and say we will wait for something better—if they had taken that ground I could have sympathised with them to some extent, because they would have believed we were surrendering valuable rights. They do not, however, take that position. On the contrary, they take this position: While they blame the Government and use very strong language, the late Finance Minister using very strong language indeed, stating that the Government had in a cowardly manner surrendered, that according to their own admission they would have surrendered long before they came face to face with the American Government; they would have surrendered when the American fishermen came to poach upon our fisheries, and they would have hauled down the flag at that time, to use the words of the hon. gentleman opposite. They found fault with that surrender, and at a time when it was, in my opinion, proper and right and fair to make surrenders, if the surrenders were called for, because when a treaty is being made surrenders have to be made on both sides. If surrenders have been made on both sides, it is in order to ensure the friendly relations which we say ought to exist between the two peoples. When the time comes for discussing those matters in a friendly manner face to face, it is the time to see what one can concede on one side, and what one can concede on the other, for the benefit of both countries. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite in what are our rights surrendered, or on what false position are we placed by those negotiations? I cannot see it, and I have therefore much pleasure in joining with the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) and with the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in giving my vote for the ratification of this treaty.

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, it was towards the close of last Session before the Government laid on the Table of the House the blue books which furnished the information upon which we have to judge very largely of this treaty. During the short time we had before the Session closed, after the correspondence was brought down, I did not do more than take a cursory glance at it, and very little opportunity was afforded to discuss it before the House closed. I must admit that I did feel in reading it very much pained and surprised at parts of the correspondence which was laid before us. I however felt that as the matter was opened up for negotiation between Canada and the United States that even if the opportunity had presented itself it would not have been right for us to wash our dirty linen in public, as it were, and to take the ground which might be construed to be in favor of the American contention. I was not surprised, however, at the arguments of the Government contained in the correspondence. I dare say they were all correct, and they were very able arguments indeed, but what I was pained and grieved at, as a Canadian, was to see the hard and inhumane way and the most imprudent manner in which our Government had enforced the technical rights which they claimed under the old Treaty of 1818. The hon. the Minister of Finance has had to educate his party a good deal recently, and there was a remark which he made in his speech the other day, which I think will apply admirably to the conduct of his colleagues in 1886, in reference to American fishing vessels. This is what he said:

"It is one thing to hold a technical construction and it is another thing to enforce it."

I do not find fault for the holding of a technical construction by the Government, but I do find fault with the manner in which they enforced it. I do not like to see this treaty carried by the House unless I for one protest against the many acts of the Government which have produced those many cases of complaint, and which I have no doubt the British commissioners in private, during the course of the negotiations, have had to admit and must have apologised for. I will give three or four instances which will illustrate

the others. There was the case of the *Shiloh* in which the contention was made that Canadian fishermen who happened to be on this American fishing vessel in a port should not be allowed to step on shore to see their friends. They were prevented from doing so. Now I say if that can be justified according to the strict interpretation of the laws of the Medes and Persians it was the most unwise and improper and inhumane thing to enforce it against our Canadian fishermen. It has been alleged against us on this side that we take the contentions of the American law breakers. I shall go to the reports of the officers of our own Government and prove from their own officials the injustice in the case. Capt. Thos. Quigley of the Government cruiser *Terror* reports:

"In the case of the *Shiloh* she came into the harbor about six p m, on the ninth of August, at Liverpool, and a signal was fired in her case the same as the others."

Just as if she was a pirate,—

"When she anchored I boarded her, and the captain reported he was in for water. I told him it was then too late to report at the custom house till morning, and that he must not allow his crew on shore, also that I would leave two men on board to see that he did not otherwise break the law and that my instructions were carried out."

"In the morning I called for the captain when taking the *Julia and Ellen* captain ashore. From there I told him as I did the other that his men could go on taking water while he was reporting, so that he could sail when he returned and not be delayed. This they did not do."

"I have reason to know that it was not water this vessel came in for, as several of the crew lived there and it was for the purpose of letting his men ashore and not for taking water that he put in. He afterwards emptied six barrels of water, stating they were sour, and fooled all day filling them, delaying the time that he might get his crew on shore. I refused to allow his crew on shore for any other purpose than to take water, after completing which, the weather being fine I ordered him to sea in the evening."

"In all cases, except when in for repairs, I place men on board to see that the law is not violated, as many of these vessels put in for the harbor and make taking water and seeking shelter an excuse either to get men or land them, or to allow them a chance to see their friends."

What a crime it was for several of the crew of the American vessels who lived in the port of Shelburne to desire to get on shore to see their friends. The officer complains that the American captain came for the purpose of putting his men ashore and not to take in water. Here is the valiant commander of a government cruiser who prevents his Canadian fellow citizens from coming on shore to see their friends, on the ground of some technical regulations of the Government. I come to the case of the *Pearl Nelson*, of which I told the Minister of Marine just now, when he interrupted the hon. member from St. John (Mr. Ellis), with an enquiry regarding that vessel's name. I told him I would be able to show that the *Pearl Nelson* was fined \$200 by the custom house officer, and that the captain of that vessel was refused permission to land the clothes of a dead Canadian at the port of Arichat until \$200 was paid.

Mr. FOSTER. We will hear how you will prove it now.

Mr. EDGAR. I will prove it just as I said I would prove it. I take, in the first place, the allegation of the American captain who says:

"I had lost a man on the Grand Banks named James Sampson, who belonged to Arichat, and I wanted to land his effects if the customs officers would allow me to. Some of my crew belonged in that neighborhood. William Batineau, my cook, and nine others of my crew took boats off the deck and went ashore without asking my permission. I saw them, but had never known that was any objection. I had been in this and other British and American ports frequently, and witnessed the landing from my own and other vessels' crews, but never before heard such landing was illegal or improper. These men took nothing with them from the vessel, nor carried away anything but the clothes they wore."

"From the time I left Provincetown I had been into no port anywhere. Next morning after my arrival in Arichat, at 8.30 o'clock, I went ashore to enter at the custom house and found it closed. I called at nine o'clock and it was not opened. I went again at ten o'clock and found the collector opening the office door. I made the regular inward report to him, and requested permission to land the clothes of James Sampson, who had been lost from my vessel on the Grand Banks."

"He told me he had sent a man for me. After I got there this man came into the office and was holding my papers, and told the man to go back and take charge of the vessel."