

to protect our own people, who are now part of the Dominion of Canada, and who feel that they have not been fairly dealt with. I have a list of the names, though, of course, the amounts will be subject to investigation, and I find among the parties, Hall Merrick, Geo. Howell, H. M. Churchill, Carvell Bros., and a number of others.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not give the sums.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These claims have not been finally settled or disposed of yet.

Mr. BLAKE. How has the total, including the ten cents, been arrived at?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That covers the gross amount of all claims.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not advisable to state all the amounts, as that would be a sort of admission that the claims are all correct, and the matter has to be investigated. These are the amounts of the claims, by those who are British subjects; but these amounts may not all be allowed.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the gross amount of all those claims \$30,086.10?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is the gross amount.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman has stated very fairly and very correctly, I think, the circumstances in connection with the breach of faith on the part of the United States Government. There is no doubt that they were guilty of a very great breach of faith. They undertook expressly that if American vessels were permitted to fish in our waters they would recommend to Congress a remission of those duties. Their vessels were permitted to fish, and they refused to recommend the remission of duties. I understand that they claimed that it was a general undertaking between themselves and the Dominion of Canada, and that inasmuch as Canada refused to admit their vessels, they could not recommend the remission of the duties on behalf of Prince Edward Island, although they took advantage of the privilege we allowed them. So far, the facts are correct. But the list the hon. gentleman read does not tote up the amount he is taking a vote for. In 1879, for the first time, application was made to this Government for the payment of these duties. Of course this Government had nothing special to do with it. The First Minister said I opposed the vote last Session. I did not oppose the vote. I pointed out several reasons why the mode in which the vote was given was unjust; and I pointed out that some statements made in the vote were not correct. I intend to do that again to-night. A great deal of capital was made of the fact that I brought these matters before the House, and in every paper in Prince Edward Island belonging to the party opposed to me, I was denounced. One paper, under the heading of "Grit Treachery to Prince Edward Island," went on to say:

"They have no legal claim for this amount. It is justly due by the Government of the United States, and refusal by that Government to refund is an act of bad faith, which is worse than the repudiation, by Philadelphia, of its debts, in days gone by. Our merchants have no claim whatever against the Dominion Government; they have no such legal claim for any portion of the Fishery award as might be enforced in a court of law."

Then follows a column and a-half of abuse of your humble servant, because I ventured to do—what? Because I ventured to call the attention of the Ministry to the fact that the statement they put in this vote was not correct. The statement here is:

"It not having been deemed advisable, in the general interest of the British case, to put forward and press the claim of those merchants before the Halifax Commission."

Now, the hon. gentleman knows very well that it was not in the province of the Halifax Commission to consider this

claim at all. They were appointed for a distinct purpose—to decide the sum of money that should be paid to Canada for the use of her fisheries between certain points of time—between 1873 and 1883. This was a transaction which took place in 1871, and if this statement is allowed to go on our record, it will appear that we pressed claims before that Commission which the Commission had no authority to recognize, and which, had they considered them, would have invalidated the award. Now, as one of the counsel, I want to assure the hon. gentleman that nothing of the kind took place. These claims were not pressed, as they did not come within the province of the Commission; and if the Commissioners had included a dollar of that amount in their award, they would have rendered the whole award liable to be set aside, and the United States would have been justified in repudiating it. They were not appointed to consider whether or not the United States was guilty of a breach of faith. I admit that they were guilty of a breach of faith, and to use the language of the First Minister, I cannot understand on what ground the United States can refuse to pay this claim. You may decide to pay this claim as a matter of generosity; if you do, I am not going to oppose it; but I want it to be done in the proper way, and not by putting on record statements which are inconsistent with the facts, and which would militate against my action as one of the counsel and against the action of the arbitrators at the Halifax Commission. The hon. gentleman will see that the amount he proposes to vote here covers only a portion of the claims. He only read a portion of the names of the claimants; I will read the rest of them. The claims which make up this sum are: Hall & Myrick, for themselves, \$20,818.69; Hall & Myrick, for British subjects, \$9,883; G. W. Howlan, \$9,106.60; H. M. Churchill, \$4,889.50; Carvell Bros., \$1,228.50; Baker & Nickerson, \$987.20; A. A. Macdonald & Bros., \$2,234; Macdonald & Owen, \$492; Samuel Prowse, \$386; J. A. Matheson, \$262; A. Matheson, \$24; J. A. Macdonald, \$146; Wise and Russell, \$166; John Cairns, \$165; Owen Connolly, \$146; Reid Bros., \$30. In that list there are five Americans, and the hon. gentleman docks off one. I objected to that last year. He happens to be a supporter of your humble servant. I asked on what ground could you pay Churchill, Baker & Nickerson, and Wise & Russell, and refuse to pay Mr. Hall? The hon. Minister could not support his vote at that time, and he withdrew it; and then the public papers turned round and heaped obloquy on my shoulders, because I contended that if you are going to vote this money—and I am not going to oppose it—if you are going to vote it on generous grounds, you should be generous all round, and vote it justly and fairly. Why do you refuse to pay Hall & Myrick's claim? Although an American, Myrick has for a quarter of a century been doing the largest fishing business in Prince Edward Island. He resides there with his family; he has put over \$100,000 into his fishing business; he has seven of the principal fishing stations on the Island; he has nearly 400 hands employed during the summer and a very large number in winter; he has from seventy to ninety boats; and he does as much fishing as all the others put together. He is not an American in reality, because he has been living amongst us for a quarter of a century, and has done more to open up the fisheries of Prince Edward Island than any other man, and is essentially a British subject. He invested his money in that business on the assurance given him by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, that if he did so he would have his money refunded. In the Sessional Papers of 1880 is the letter which Mr. Hall wrote to the Lieutenant-Governor, dated in September, 1871, in which he called attention to the fact that, from articles which appeared in the Boston papers, he thought there was going to be a breach of faith on the part of the United States Government, and he wanted the Lieutenant-Governor to give him an assurance that in