

this case also came up before the authorities of the United States; that is, the consul of the United States made representations in reference to it; and, therefore, the case was one in which the conduct of this Government had to be carried on with the greatest care, and the greatest regularity had to be shown in our dealings with the various vessels, not only the vessel in the case of Collector Ross, but in this case itself, which had come to the knowledge of the United States authorities. Now, there is a letter of recent date: I do not see it attached to this return—

Mr. FRASER. I may say that the Minister gave me those letters as being all the letters I asked for.

Mr. TUPPER. I say I do not observe here a letter sent to the department by this officer, in which he puts forward an additional excuse inconsistent with his first report. That is in April, 1890. The hon. gentleman obtained these papers from the Customs Department; but I have some other papers, which the hon. gentleman can see, and they will show the House that this officer has turned and twisted in regard to this matter.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Do I understand that the alleged infraction of the law took place in April, 1890?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, in April of last year, and the case was not considered when the report was obtained. When the full facts were obtained, we had reached the end of June of that year, and Parliament not being in session, the Council was not full when the question came up, and it stood over for consideration when the Council should be full; because we had before us, not merely the case of this overseer, the collector of Customs, but an international question that concerned our enforcement of this Act in reference to the fishing vessels of the United States, and we had the communication of the consul of the United States touching the subject. In consequence of its importance it stood over, and, as I explained before, the delay that occurred afterwards when the Council was ready to deal with the subject, at a time when the fishing had ceased, and the foreign fishing vessels were not on our coasts; but the action was taken soon enough in the public interest, previous to the fishing season, when the officer would have to enforce the Act.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) When was he dismissed?

Mr. TUPPER. He was superannuated in May of this year. But the case which the hon. gentleman made out to-day, and the facts that occurred subsequently when he varied entirely his defence, and stated that it was from inability and want of assistance that he did not enforce the Fishery Act, show that there would have been, if these facts had been known, a case of absolute dismissal, instead of the treatment that was accorded to him.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to have all the correspondence.

Mr. BOWELL. I gave the hon. gentleman all the documents I had, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Marine will give him all that he has.

Mr. FRASER. I may say that the letter in which he gives the excuse that he was unable to make the seizure is dated previous to the letter which was read by the hon. Minister of Marine.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. TUPPER. No: read the letter. The hon. gentleman will find that he is misinformed.

Mr. FRASER. The letter from which the hon. gentleman read was dated 28th June, 1890.

Mr. TUPPER. The letter I read was dated in April.

Mr. FRASER. It was in the letter of April, 1891, that he gives the excuse that he could not. I admit all that; but I submit that the Minister makes a very poor case when he says that this man was dismissed because the Government could not deny the matter. The official was continued in office, and the offence was not considered so serious by the Government up to that time. But my opponent said publicly on the streets after the election, that he would be dismissed.

Mr. TUPPER. I am not responsible for that.

Mr. FRASER. I am only showing that the force which was brought to bear on the Government was a force from without and not from within. My opponent said that openly, and he afterwards rejoiced that he was able to carry that threat into effect.

Mr. TUPPER. If that was done, it was without my knowledge.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to have the opportunity of dealing with this matter further, when I get the rest of the correspondence.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) What became of the fine?

Mr. TUPPER. It went to the Receiver General.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House again proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Fisheries—Salaries, &c., P.E.I. \$4,000

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I was not in the House when these items were passed in the Committee of Supply, and I have only a question to ask my hon. friend opposite. It is with reference to Morell River in Prince Edward Island, which is the best fishing rivers in the Island. Formerly very large quantities of the finest trout were caught in it, and efforts have been made by private individuals to preserve many portions of it. Formerly, also, salmon were caught there in large numbers, but of late years, owing to the abominable habit of netting, the river has ceased, to a very large extent, to be a good fishing river, though the sportsmen on the Island have made constant efforts to stop that practice. I think it was two years ago that the department, having already one or two local inspectors, appointed a third gentleman as guardian, Mr. Dowse. He was a resident of Charlottetown: and I find no fault with the appointment, because he had a good deal of knowledge of the fish in that river, had spent much time fishing there, and was