

tance from the shore, and on account of this concession, it was deemed proper to give some compensation for a recognition of the competition to which our fishermen were subjected from the Americans; but no such argument would apply to the shore fishermen. I do not think the hon. gentleman will dispute the fact, that the salmon and lobster are shore fisheries; and as the Americans are not allowed to share in these fisheries, unless they reside or do business in this country, no particular injustice is done to this class. This, to my mind, is one reason why the bounty granted is only distributed to deep sea fishermen. The hon. gentleman argues, that according to the reading of the resolution, this money is only paid to develop the fisheries; but I ask the hon. gentleman and the House, would it be likely, if it were not for these \$4,500,000, that we would give this recognition to the fishermen in the shape of a bounty of \$150,000 a year? I think not, and, therefore, maintain that it is to the deep sea fishermen that it is really due. I took occasion some time ago to refer to the grievances under which I thought the salmon fishermen are laboring, and I asked the Department to give their attention to the tax which is now imposed on their nets, with a view to having it reduced. That tax is imposed largely for the purpose of registration, and I think it might be reduced one-half, if not entirely abolished, and thus confer a benefit on these fishermen. A word or two with regard to the distribution of the bounty. It is distributed in this way: A certain amount, equal to \$2.50 is given to each fisherman in a boat, and as a boat's crew consists of four, the amount given to each boat would be \$10. But if my recollection of the regulations is correct, it does not follow that if each man of the crew did not catch the quantity prescribed by the regulations he would not get his proportionate share. The hon. gentleman endeavors to make a point by saying that in proportion to the total number now engaged in the fisheries, the boatmen do not get a sufficient share of the bounty. He argues that the regulations are oppressive, inasmuch as one of the conditions imposed on the fishermen is the necessity of fishing at least three months in the year. Any person who does not fish for three months in the year cannot fairly be called a fisherman, and I do not think it would be desirable to encourage, by giving a bounty, the farmers of the county living along the sea shore, to devote part of their time to fishing. This bounty is exclusively for the benefit of the fishermen, and I do not think the amount which should be paid to the fishermen, should be lessened by giving it to the persons who go from the shore and catch a few quintals during the time which they can spare from their farm operations.

Mr. McISAAC. Increase the subsidy.

Mr. BURNS. Though the subsidy is a very respectable one, no one would rejoice more than I would to see it increased. I wish to call the attention of the acting Minister to one fact in relation to the boat fishermen. Under the present system, as operated in my own county, at all events, the fishermen do not get what I think that they should get, namely, the whole of that bounty. I think it is unfair to give to the owner of the boat any portion of what is earned by the fishermen. Under the operation of the present regulations, one-fifth of the amount goes to the boat owners, and I will tell you how that operates in the county of Gloucester, which is a large fishing county. A great number of the boats are owned by the supplier—the merchant or the man who advances the supplies, and buys the fish. The fisherman pays to that owner a certain sum, \$25 or \$30 as the case may be, for the fishing season which is supposed to close on the 25th of August. It is unfair to the fishermen that, in addition to paying the owner of the boat a rent for it, they should also pay a share of their earnings. It would

Mr. BURNS.

be all very well if it reduced the amount which the owner of the boat charges to the fishermen; but the practical working of the regulations is not in that direction, as the money which was intended to go to these toilers of the sea practically goes to increase the rent which they pay to the owners of the boats. It is argued that in some cases that one of the men in the boat is the owner. If such is the case the other three pay him a proportionate amount of what would be a rent for it, and he should not be placed on a better footing than themselves or the supplier or the merchant who supplies the boat.

Mr. BRECKEN. Last year the forms which are necessary to be signed, did not reach Prince Edward Island until the crews had dispersed, some of them leaving the Island, and others living at a considerable distance from the officer who has these matters in charge. If possible, these papers should be sent before the season is over, so that they could be signed before the fishermen go home, for if a fisherman who is entitled to receive \$5, has to spend considerable time or money in travelling, it amounts to a tax upon his bounty, especially in the case of those who have to leave the Island.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if some of the bounties are still to be paid?

Mr. BOWELL. There is a large amount to be paid yet, as is shown by the fact of the Order in Council having been changed, doubling the amount to the fishermen.

Mr. VAIL. I may say that I agree with the opinion expressed by some hon. gentlemen that this money in a strictly legal sense belongs properly to the Dominion. But then we must consider what the money was received for. It was received from the United States Government for the privilege of allowing American fishermen to come on our coasts and catch fish, which, of course, means participating in the same advantages which our fishermen have with regard to the three-mile limit; consequently, every fisherman coming on our coast to catch fish interferes with the rights and privileges of our fishermen, not only by catching fish, but in many instances they have injured the fishing grounds by throwing their gurry overboard, and as we had no control over them, and no supervision of the fisheries, of course there was nobody to prevent it. Now, while I quite agree with the view that the money paid in that way belongs to the Dominion of Canada, at the same time if this grant of \$150,000 was made to the fishermen as a bounty, it was made for the reason that a certain amount of money was collected from the United States Government in return for the use of our fisheries, and that, therefore, a portion of it—I contend the whole—belongs to the fishermen; and I consider that the Government have granted only a portion of what was due to the fishermen. The Government of Canada received that money in October, 1878; and having used it for the four years up to October last, the accumulation of interest would add nearly \$1,000,000 to the principal. The amount received from the United States Government after paying Newfoundland was something like \$4,498,802, which was reduced by the deduction of expenses incurred to \$4,350,531. The accumulation of interest for the four years would make the fund at the credit of the fishermen \$5,400,000. I agree with the hon. member for Antigonish when he says, that the fisherman is as much entitled to a bounty on the fish he catches as the manufacturer of iron is on the iron he manufactures; but as this bounty was given for another reason, I contend that the fishermen should have the benefit of the whole amount, and that the Government, instead of paying them \$150,000 annually, should pay them about \$240,000 annually. I hope the Government will see their way clear to pay over the difference between \$150,000 and \$240,000. If the