

Mr. BOWELL. It is to provide for the payment of clerks, principally clerks in the Department, who were employed after hours in preparing the statements on which the fishery bounties were made, they were paid at the rate of \$2 for each five hours' work performed under the superintendence of an officer of the Department. The vote is also to cover printing and other outlays consequent upon making these payments. I might mention that no less than 13,000 claims have already been received and disposed of. The reason why clerks in the Department were employed, was, that if clerks from outside had been engaged, a couple of men would have been required to teach them what to do.

Mr. McISAAC. I should like to know from the acting Minister why lobster and salmon fishermen are excluded from participating in the bounty?

Mr. BOWELL. Because they were not affected by the Washington Treaty. This payment was given to fishermen who, it was presumed, had suffered by the Treaty of Washington, and it was to compensate for loss. As I understand it, the lobster fisheries were never affected by that Treaty.

Mr. McISAAC. I would admit the truth of a portion of the hon. gentleman's argument, if the Act authorizing the appropriation had been passed in 1880, instead of the resolutions introduced by the hon. First Minister and supported by a large number of hon. members. The argument would then have had some force. The resolution to which I refer, ends with these words:

"The portion of the Fishery Award paid over to Canada, constitutionally and of right belongs to the Dominion of Canada."

Speaking to this resolution the hon. First Minister said:

"The coasts of the Maritime Provinces of Canada belong to every British subject; and a man living in the centre or any other part of Ontario or the Dominion, if he chooses to go, has the same right to fish within these three miles of coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island as the people of those several Provinces have; he has precisely the same right; it is no exclusive right."

Further on he said:

"So, when Confederation was consummated, when the several Provinces consented to surrender their entities, and to be merged in the Dominion, the coasts of Nova Scotia, of New Brunswick, and of Prince Edward Island ceased forever, for they became the coasts of the Dominion of Canada; their waters became the waters of the Dominion of Canada, and their fisheries became the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada."

According to the doctrine laid down by the hon. First Minister, and supported by a majority of the House, the sea coast and fisheries are the domain of the people of Canada generally. The fisheries belong to no particular province or class of the population, and therefore, we cannot say they belong to any particular class of the fishermen. If this doctrine was sound in 1880, I cannot see why it is not sound now. It being sound then, there is no reason why any particular class of the fishermen should be excluded. It is true that our lobster and salmon fisheries are not affected by the Washington Treaty, but the Act authorizing this appropriation makes no exception. The Act says, and it is not in conflict with the doctrine enunciated by the hon. First Minister in 1880:

"The object of the appropriation is the development of the sea fisheries and improvement of the condition of the fishermen."

And then it says:

"Such grant to be appropriated for said purposes under orders to be made from time to time by the Governor in Council."

The money is for the improvement of the condition of fishermen and the development of the sea fisheries. No distinction is made between classes of fishermen. Neither is any distinction made in the resolution, nor in the speech of the First Minister, in 1880. I, therefore, contend, that the order for the distribution of the money for the coming

year, should be made so as to include lobster fishermen and salmon fishermen; that is to say, salmon fishermen who fish along the coast of the Atlantic, and those who fish in the Straits of Northumberland and in the St. Lawrence. These are very important fisheries. The lobster fisheries of the Maritime Provinces in 1881 amounted to about \$3,000,000. The reason given by the acting Minister for excluding these classes is no reason at all, because they are entitled to the bounty, independent of the Treaty of Washington and the Halifax Award, after the resolution passed by this House in 1880, just as much as iron manufacturers are to the bounty they are to receive. I must also complain that the Order laid on the Table the other night was not what I expected it to be. There is only one amendment, and that I admit is an important one. It doubles the money allowed to fishermen in boats, but it makes no change as regards fishermen in vessels. But the other objectionable features in the last year's Order still exist. These features are the smallness of the sum allowed and the conditions to be fulfilled in order to entitle a fisherman to participation—I mean the condition of three months' actual fishing, and the condition of 2,500 lbs. catch imposed on fishermen in boats. These conditions, I venture to say, exclude one-half of the boat fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. In 1881—I have not the returns of 1882 before me, as they are not yet published—there were 7,254 vessel fishermen, and 32,644 boat fishermen in these Provinces. It appears from the memorandum submitted the other evening that the number of boat fishermen who succeeded in getting the bounty last year is 19,392, and this number includes the successful applicants in the Province of Quebec as well as those in the Maritime Provinces. I can safely assert that now we have some 40,000 boat fishermen in the Lower Provinces alone. That number added to the same class in the Province of Quebec, it becomes evident that more than one-half are entirely shut out by one or the other of these conditions. It is absurd to argue that a fisherman is not entitled to a share because he does not catch 2,500 lbs., and does not take three months catching the quantity especially as the money is voted to improve his condition. The man who meets the worst luck needs the aid more than the man who is more fortunate in his catch. I may be told that the money is not in the nature of aid or relief—that it is a bounty. It is not a bounty in the sense that a bounty means a premium given according to the quantity of fish caught. This also is evident from the fact that a fisherman who may catch even tons, unless he spends three months catching the quantity, is entirely excluded. I hope when the Order in Council is laid on the Table for the assent of Parliament, it will be so changed as to admit a larger number of fishermen into sharing in the bounty. Let the condition of the quantity caught be removed in case of boat fishermen, as it is not applied to vessel fishermen, let the condition of time be also modified by shortening the period. The exclusion involves a greater loss now as the amount awarded to each is increased.

Mr. BURNS. I may be permitted to make some observations in reply to the hon. gentleman. Under the Treaty of Washington, I do not think it was contemplated that the shore fishermen should get any share of the award. As everyone knows the difficulties that prevailed for a number of years between the Canadian and American Governments, with regard to the rights of American fishermen to the share in the fisheries within a certain distance from the shore, led to the appointment of a Commission. This Commission led to the admission of our fish duty free into the American market. I may remark here, I do not think the United States treated us very well in evading, to some extent, this provision, by imposing a duty of 1½ cts. on the tins in which the lobsters are packed. The award of \$4,500,000 was paid for the right of the Americans to share in our deep sea fisheries, within a certain dis-