

only hope of a good business rests with the chance of an early season. It would be a good thing to regulate the space between laths. The establishment of new factories should be discouraged.

Mr. Joseph Poirier, of Grand Anse, expresses his approval of all the proposed regulations, and says he is willing to pay a license fee to secure the grounds now fished by him. He supplies his fishermen with fishing gear, and pays them so much per pound for the lobsters supplied.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. Geo. D. Longworth, of Charlottetown, is not prepared to answer fully just now. He, however, strongly urges the prohibition of new canneries within the limits of packers already in the business.

Mr. Archibald J. Macdonald, of Georgetown, considers that parties permanently engaged in the business will be benefited by the license system. Collectors of Customs should be authorized to issue licenses, which could be countersigned by fishery officers on their first visit to the factory. The only feasible penalty would be to cancel the license and close the factory. Parties fishing illegally usually keep their buoys under water and trust to other marks to locate them. It will be hard to discover these violations. If the incubators are properly looked after, and all the ova saved, more real good will be achieved in one year than in all the past years. Packers refusing to attend to this part of their duty should have their license cancelled. The close season should be from 1st July to 1st May, but the size limit should not be enforced during the fishing season. The 1½-inch regulation would condemn all traps in the Gulf. It might be all right on the Atlantic coast and Newfoundland, but in the Gulf 1 inch or 1½ inch is all that is required.

Messrs. Robblee & Co., of Miminegash, do not consider that the proposed regulations will fill the bill. What is wanted for Prince Edward Island is to commence fishing as soon as possible after the 1st of May and close on 30th June, without exception. They have come to the conclusion that if they do not get the lobsters one year they will get them the next; and allowing them 46 weeks of protection in one year would be money in their pockets. They are strongly opposed to a division of limits by licenses, as American firms would soon hold all the waters of their coast.

Mr. J. Hantz, of Pinette, remarks: Why collect a license fee from lobster fishermen, when you pay a bounty to other fishermen, who do not run greater risks nor bear less expenses than the former? The close season suits that locality, unless spring is very late. The proposed label is unnecessary where there is a fishery officer. The proposed space between the slats is objectionable, on the ground that they are not put close to prevent young ones from getting out, but to save the claws of the larger ones, which, if they got through, would be broken off in getting the trap into the boat.

Mr. J. H. Myrick, of Tignish, favours the license system, if present occupants are to be protected on their grounds. Sections 2 and 3 will not sufficiently benefit anyone to compensate for the trouble of complying with their requirements. The fee is reasonable. The close season, if well enforced, will furnish the best protection, not only to the fish, but to the packers and fishermen. Section 6, relative to small lobsters, is objectionable, because its observance has always been found most difficult. Fishermen throw back a good many small lobsters, but to return all that come under 9 inches is practically impossible. The clause respecting labels on cases of canned lobsters will be