

delegation to arrive, and perhaps he might give us the names of the gentlemen, if he has been made acquainted with them in advance.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give the names of the gentlemen who will form the delegation, nor the precise date of their coming to Canada, but I suppose it will be about the end of this month.

Mr. MITCHELL. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us whether the Parliament of Newfoundland has authorised the delegation, or whether their Parliament has given any authority to a delegation to come here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not able to give that information.

Motion withdrawn.

#### MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following member, having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the Roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

DAVID BISHOP MEIGS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Missisquoi, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Mr. Fisher.

#### ASSISTANCE TO WRECKING VESSELS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all papers, &c., with reference to: 1. The refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist Canadian vessels while in distress in United States waters. 2. The refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow United States wrecking vessels and machinery to assist United States vessels while in distress in Canadian waters.

He said: There is a Bill before the House standing, I think, for its second reading, introduced by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), which relates closely to this subject, and I sincerely hope the hon. member will press his Bill, and that it will receive the support of both sides of this House. His Bill is to permit American vessels to aid vessels which are wrecked or disabled in Canadian waters. I suppose that that Bill would not have been introduced by that hon. gentleman unless the Canadian authorities had hitherto prevented American vessels from aiding wrecked or disabled vessels in Canadian waters. I have no doubt, however, that the reason why the Canadian authorities took this exceedingly harsh line was because the American Government prevented Canadian vessels from assisting vessels which were wrecked in American waters. I think it will be of considerable advantage to this House, in the consideration of the Bill to which I have referred, if these papers are brought down, so much, at least, as the Government feel at liberty to bring down, and I hope they will bring them all down. The motion refers not only to correspondence and Orders in Council with reference to the refusal of the United States authorities to allow Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery to assist vessels in American waters, but also as to the refusal of the Canadian authorities to allow Americans to do so, so that we will have both features of the case before us when we have these papers. I have no doubt, as I said before, that the Canadian authorities could not have adopted the harsh measures which they have in this matter, and which are to be cured by this Bill, unless the Americans had done the same, but I find in the United States Congress they do not take exactly that view of the case. They seem to think that the Canadian Government has acted much more harshly towards them than they have acted towards the Canadian Government. However, the papers will show how that is. But in order to show the House the view that is taken of the matter on the other side, I will refer to a resolution which was introduced into

the House of Representatives by Mr. Nutting, early in the month of February. In that resolution it is recited:

"Whereas, it is alleged that the Canadian authorities for years have refused, and now refuse to allow American wrecking vessels and machinery to assist American vessels while in distress in Canadian canals and waters."

So far, I take it, he must be correct, or else the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac would not be necessary. He then goes on to make an allegation, which I confess, I very much doubt, but he says:

"And it is alleged further that Canadian wrecking vessels and machinery have been, and now are allowed to come into American waters and assist any vessel there in distress."

Now, whether that is so or not, we will perhaps find out when this correspondence is brought down. But he quotes a couple of letters from American vessel owners and captains which show certainly the great hardship to them of the practice of the two Governments. One is a letter from Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, by Mr. John K. Pope. He says:

"On or about the 30th day of September, 1881, I, being controlling owner of steam-barge *Thompson Kingsford*, was notified that she was ashore at Wellington, Ont., and immediate assistance was needed. I informed our wrecker, Mr. Allan, who expressed himself ready to start, providing the Canadian authorities would give him permission to work in their waters. I therefore applied by wire to the hon. Minister of Marine at Ottawa, and after a long delay was informed that the assistance needed could be procured at Kingston, and the application was denied. I thought the treatment was severe, especially as my tugs were all ready to go, and we could have got the barge out of danger in 24 hours. As it was, during the delay, or rather by the delay, in waiting for an answer, she was subjected to a severe gale, causing great damage and eventually costing us about \$1,200 more than it would if we could have done the work ourselves. Again, about the 19th day of August, 1882, the same barge was sunk in the Bay of Quinté by collision, and I again made application to go to her relief with my own appliances, and was again refused."

Then another letter was quoted by Mr. Nutting, which was sent to him by Albert Quonce, also of Oswego, dated 1st February, 1888, in which Mr. Quonce stated:

"At the suggestion of Mr. Allan I make the following statement: On or about the 3rd day of November, 1882, the schooner *Camanche*, of which I was controlling owner, was sunk in the Welland Canal, near Port Colborne. Although Buffalo was but twenty miles from her and assistance could have been secured in six hours, we were told that American assistance would not be permitted, although at that moment the steam pumps were loaded and ready to come. The result was we had to wait for assistance from Amherstburg, nearly three hundred miles distant, and causing a delay of three days. Owing to the delay the vessel's cargo swelled and sprung her entire deck up, and almost ruined the vessel."

These statements will show the view taken on the other side, of our harsh law, and I am sure if we can do anything to secure an improvement for the sake of common humanity as well as for the sake of commercial friendship with the United States, the Government will hasten to bring down these returns so that, if possible, we may have them before us when considering the Bill of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick).

Mr. BOWELL. I would suggest that in the first paragraph the words "not already brought down," be inserted after the words "departmental orders." Some years ago a large amount of correspondence was laid before the House, and I do not suppose it is necessary to duplicate the return.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was the return printed?

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was; I know it was, because I have a copy of the printed return on the table in my office.

Mr. EDGAR. When was the return made?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not sure, I cannot say the year, but I can furnish the information. However, all the correspondence and orders made in regard to this subject will be brought down, other than those which have already been