

gentlemen of what they ought to have known before, that he had no power to make any such concession, that he had no power to repeal an Act of Congress, that the proposition ought to have been made while Congress was in session, so that they would have had an opportunity of considering it. And so the American fishermen were given the use of our fisheries for a season without any compensation, and without any reserve. Then we were told that they cared nothing for the generosity that we had extended to them, that they were in no mood to make any concession, that the Gloucester fishermen were still opposed to the free admission of Canadian fish to the American market; and so they were to be taught by a policy of retaliation the power which this country possessed. Sir, we were told that Canada was the great maritime state of the new world, that our fleet was almost as large as that of the neighboring republic, and that while we did not want to quarrel with them, while we did not want to adopt a policy of exclusion, while we were ready to trade with them if they were disposed to trade, we were quite able to live without them, and that we were quite able to show them that we were capable of protecting the fisheries that we possessed on our coast, and so the policy of Jingoism was begun.

"We don't want to fight,
But, by Jingo! if we do,
We've got the men, we've got the ships,
We've got the monee, too."

It was in that spirit that the hon. gentlemen entered upon the consideration of this question. Sir, what defence did the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries make the other night? Why, it is that we were standing upon our legal rights, that what we did was within the undoubted rights that Canada possessed under the Treaty of 1818. He told us that he had not strictly enforced the provisions of that treaty; he said there were many cases in which the fishermen of the United States were allowed in our waters, privileges which they had no right to claim under the treaty. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman's policy was vacillating, it was capricious, it was arbitrary. It may have been that in every instance that he mentioned he made the concessions which he speaks of; but, Sir, there were many instances in which he did not make concessions. And what defence does the hon. gentleman make when it is complained that his conduct was occasionally arbitrary, vexatious and unjust? Why, Sir, he says: It is not in the bond; I complied with the law; I kept within our rights; I did not do to you anything that the law did not authorise me to do; and so, because I did not violate the treaty of obligations between the two countries, you have nothing of which to complain. Well, Sir, I deny altogether that position. I say it was the duty of the hon. gentleman to act in accordance with the principle of humanity and of modern civilisation. It was his duty to do no harm, to put no impediment in the way of the fishermen of a friendly power, as long as he was not giving them facilities for violating the law of the land. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, I say, in many instances, did that which was altogether unjustifiable. I hold in my hand a report of some of the complaints of some of those fishermen, and I will read a few with reference to the action of the officers under the charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There was the case of the *Sarah B. Putman*, of Beverly, Mass., which was driven from the harbor of Pubnico, in a storm, 27th March, 1886. That was the complaint. Now, the hon. gentleman will not say that the Treaty of 1818 gave his officers a right to force a vessel to leave the harbor in a storm.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you know?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am pointing out the charges that have been made by the people of the United States against the Government of which he was a member.

Mr. FOSTER. By whom was that charge made?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I will, by-and-bye; answer the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. Please answer now.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). No, I will not. I purpose to make my own speech in my own way. We know that those hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are the last parties who will submit to interruption, and I will, in this speech, follow their example. Now, I will say this. It does not matter whether that statement was well or ill founded. It was the kind of statement that was made to the American people, it was published abroad in their newspapers, it was that which formed public opinion in the United States, and it was that which compelled those gentlemen to make the discreditable surrender which we are this evening considering; and what I complain is that these hon. gentlemen, knowing the country with which they had to deal, knowing the jealousy with which they guard the interests of their fishermen, were not sufficiently careful to give them no cause of complaint, and were not sufficiently careful to see that when a complaint was made, it should be redressed, or answered at the time, if untrue. Now, there was another case, the *Rattler*, which was a ship from Gloucester. It is complained that she was warned off at Canso, N. S., in June, 1886; that she was detained in the port of Shelburne, where she entered seeking shelter, and that she was ordered out from that port. Then again there was the case of the *Caroline Vought*. She was from Booth Bay, in the State of Maine, and was warned off at Paspébiac, N.B., and was refused an opportunity of taking water on board. Now, Sir, the right to take water is one of the rights under the treaty, and what I am reading at this moment are complaints of American fishermen, not that the Government had acted in a narrow and inhospitable spirit, but that they had acted illegally and contrary to the provisions of the treaty by which their rights were secured. Then again I will take a few cases of the next year. There was the case of the *Christina Ellsworth*, a schooner of Eastport, in Maine. The complaint of her master was that in every harbour she entered she was refused the privilege of buying anything, that she was compelled to enter at every custom house, that she found that the customs charges at every place, almost, were different from what they were at the preceding place. Then there was the case of the *Stowell Sherman*. She was ordered, in distress of weather, out of Cascumpec Harbor, P.E.I., after having entered it in a storm. Then there was the *Walter L. Rich*, a schooner of Wellsfleet, Mass. She was ordered out of Malpeque Harbor, P.E.I., in unsuitable weather, for fishing, and was compelled to return to her own port without having an opportunity of fishing, in consequence of the refusal of shelter by the Canadian authorities. Then the *Newell B. Hawes*, that made harbor at Shelburne, N.S., she was ordered out at 5 o'clock in the evening, in the face of a storm. Her commander refused to go, and at 7 o'clock the next morning she was ordered out to sea although there was a dense fog which made it quite impossible that she could leave the port safely. Then there was the *Helen F. Frederick*, of Cape Porpoise, Maine. She was ordered out of Port Latour, U.S., where she had gone for shelter and water. Now if those representations are all well founded, then all of those cases mentioned were in violation of the rights secured by the treaty. There are many other cases which show harsh and unnecessary police regulations, but I mention these that were brought under the attention of the Government of the United States and made the subject of diplomatic discussion between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain in consequence of the complaints set forth. Then there was another class. There are four purposes for which fishing