

eggs as the operatives dwelling in the factory boarding-houses of New England, the production of hen's eggs is one of the most important branches of our domestic industry. These factory operatives consume one egg every other day. Suppose we call the present population of the United States, numbering over sixty million, equal to fifty million adults. Suppose we serve each adult with one egg every other day, say fifteen dozen a year, at fifteen cents a dozen, we find then that the egg product of the domestic hen is worth about one hundred and twelve million five hundred thousand dollars (\$112,500,000) a year—more than double the value of our silver product; about fifty per cent. in excess of the value of our wool clip; nearly, if not equal in value even to the excessive product of pig iron of the present year. Does any one propose to protect the domestic hen by a duty on Canadian eggs? (Perhaps some geese may do so.) If not, then why tax Canadian fish and potatoes? We imported last year about six hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$650,000) worth of potatoes; we taxed them two hundred and ninety-two thousand dollars (\$292,000). A few years ago, when the crop of potatoes in New England was very short, the people paid in that year a tax on Canadian and Irish potatoes of over twelve hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$1,250,000.) All these taxes on fish, potatoes, meats, and other provisions which Canada provides for us, enter directly into the cost of the manufacturing and mechanical arts in the United States, chiefly of New England. Does any farmer gain? Not one cent. This duty upon Canadian food simply extends the area of railway carriages. It is wasted on hauling meats and potatoes longer distances by railway.

Let us return to the fisheries. The late Professor Spencer F. Baird once told me that the quantity of fish taken from the ocean for the supply of human wants was literally no more than equal to a drop in a bucket of water, compared to the multitude of fish which the multitudinous seas stand ready to give up for our use. Could these fish be diverted *in the water*, from the shores of Canada to the harbors of New England, should we erect a barrier at the mouth of every harbor to prevent them from entering in full measure? If not, why do we erect a barrier to prevent their being brought in *UPON the water*? Who objects? Is it the man who says that the American fisherman should do that work, and not the inhabitant of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Cape Breton? Then make it a penal offence for the owner of a fishing smack in Gloucester or in Portland to employ the fishermen of these Provinces in sailing their smacks and catching their fish. More than one-half the fishermen who do this work in these fishing smacks, I believe three-fourths, are citizens of Canada.

Who then objects to the removal of the tax on fish? The owners of the fishing smacks of Gloucester and Portland, and of a few other places. Who are they? Let them stand up and be counted. Let them give a reason why they should deprive the working people of New England of the advantage of an abundance of fish, free of taxation. If they then raise the issue that the fish consumed by the people of the United States should only be brought into their harbors in fishing vessels owned by the same people, then we ask them to consider only their own advantage, as shown by the