

his vessel if he bought anything. He was 300 miles from home, on an inhospitable coast with every door barred against him, and short of provisions. Although they made the run home in three days, his crew was on short rations for a whole day. Now, I think the country is scarcely aware of the extent to which the operations of the fleet have been carried on, or of the very great number of complaints and the seriousness of the complaints made, because the laws have been so rigidly and it would seem so harshly enforced. Indeed, if the statement made by those men are true, the remark made by the Secretary of the United States Treasury, that the laws were enforced with brutality, would not seem to be, under all the circumstances of the case, too strong. I do not desire, however, to prejudge the case. This is only evidence on one side, but I think it would be advisable to have all the information before us. There has been considerable delay already in reference to the correspondence on this subject between our Government and that of Great Britain which has been promised us, but the promise is unfulfilled yet, although I see in the St. John organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a statement on Tuesday that the correspondence had been laid before Parliament, and a summary of it given in that paper. Now, however, that is not so much what I desire to touch upon as the resolution which I move.

Mr. FOSTER. I regret that I was not in my place in the House so as to have heard what my hon. friend has said in making his motion, having been called away for a little while to attend to those fishery papers, which, I may state here, will be brought down to-morrow. With reference, however, to the motion my hon. friend may press it, for it will be granted, but it was not necessary. The whole of the information which he has asked is already in the hands of the printers, and will be brought down in a special report, which will be laid before the House just as soon as it is ready.

Mr. THOMPSON. As my colleague was not in when the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Ellis) addressed himself to this matter, it is only respectful to him that a word or two should be said in explanation of some of the cases to which the hon. gentleman made reference. I regret that I was not able to catch all that the hon. gentleman said, but I certainly understood him to refer to several cases, in respect of which it has been charged by the authorities of the United States that a want of consideration, a want of hospitality, was evinced by the officers of the Customs and the officers of the Fishery Departments on the maritime coast of the Dominion. I also understood the hon. gentleman to say, I was glad to hear the statement, that he was not disposed to prejudge our case from the evidence which appeared on one side. The hon. gentleman, however, was altogether too flattering to that side of the case when he characterised the statements to which he referred as evidence. I presume he gleaned his information from some documents which have been laid before a Legislative Assembly in another part of the continent. The hon. gentleman's selections were made from a number of rambling and inaccurate statements made against the British and Colonial authorities, by persons who received a general invitation to send in all the claims which they could possibly make against our Government, which was supposed to be liable to damages in the end. It has transpired not only from the investigation of these complaints, not only from the investigation conducted by our own officers, but subsequently by the admissions of some of the persons who made these very unvarnished statements to which the hon. gentleman had recourse—it has transpired that those statements are utterly without foundation, were reckless, were oftentimes based upon misapprehension and

a want of knowledge of the circumstances; as, for instance, the statement that these vessels, while not allowed the privileges of a port, were obliged to pay port dues and other charges of that description. That has never been the case in any instance, and the hon. gentleman will find when the papers are brought down, as my colleague states they will be presently, that the assertions which have given him so much uneasiness, made on the part of the authorities on the other side of the question, are not at all of the character which will induce the hon. gentleman to retain those uneasy feelings as to our side of the case; and he will find then that the statement of a distinguished gentleman connected with the Administration of the United States, that the treaty has been administered with brutality, was as preposterous an exaggeration as the English language would permit.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not present when the hon. gentleman from the city of St. John (Mr. Ellis) made his statements on this matter, and I am not going to discuss this question anterior to bringing down the papers. I think it is only right that we should have the papers before us before we discuss a matter in which we might be led into accepting impressions or making statements which might be detrimental to our own country. I will merely say that I think that the Government have earned approval in relation to their refusal to allow parties to buy bait as an article of commerce. I will not even discuss that question just now, but simply say this in justification of the attitude which I may assume hereafter, when the papers are brought down. It would be premature to discuss the matter further until these papers are before us; it would be unfair, perhaps, to the Administration, and might injure our own case.

Motion agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS TO MASTERS OF VESSELS PROTECTING THE FISHERIES.

Mr. ELLIS. In making this motion of which I have given notice, I will take the opportunity of saying that I would be very glad if the Minister of Justice gets out of the difficulty as easily as he anticipates. I have gone over a great deal of the correspondence and a great many of the complaints made, and I am glad to know he is in a position to inform the House as positively and as confidently as he does, that the matter will be ended amicably. I observed only a very short time ago, before the close of the sessions of the Senate of the United States, that a gentleman who was a senator from the State of New York, who had held a position in the Cabinet of President Grant, and might be supposed to know a great deal about the state of feeling in that country, stated with great deliberation that the position at the present moment was a cessation of commercial relations, retaliation or war. Now, if the matter has changed to any extent, as the Minister of Justice thinks it has, we are all glad to know it. I do not absolutely wish to have the papers if they are in the form in which the Minister of Justice says they are; I do not want to make my motion against his desire, but I wish to place the facts before the country. This is the motion of which I gave notice:

Copy of the instructions issued in the year 1887 for the guidance of the masters of vessels engaged in the Fisheries Protection Service.

With regard to that, it appears that last year there was a warning issued to all foreign vessels, whether they were fishing or not, to keep out of our ports. I believe that was withdrawn, but it was a serious matter at the moment.

Mr. FOSTER. I think a little reflection will convince my hon. friend that this motion ought not to pass the House at this time. The hon. gentleman made reference to a warning issued last year from the Department of Marine, which was afterwards withdrawn, and which con-