

way, the Grand Trunk, the Quebec Central, and will be soon the terminus of other railways. Before long, the Quebec Central will be united with the great network of railways in New England, and yet Lévis has not a decent post office. We have, alongside Quebec City, a village which ought to be a city if its inhabitants were a little more ambitious or less modest; I refer to St. Sauveur de Québec which has a population of 15,000 souls. Well, St. Sauveur has no post office. How does it happen that these places have been always passed over when public buildings were being erected in small places which have not a quarter of their population? Aylmer has not one-fifth of the population of St. Sauveur de Québec; nevertheless a post office is being built there, but not a word is spoken about building one at St. Sauveur, which is, as I have stated, a locality of much greater importance. It would be well, once for all, to know how we stand. If it is understood that in order to have a post office or other public building, a county must return a member who supports the Government, then the counties which elect Opposition members will know what to expect. It, on the contrary, the Government is influenced by the needs of the locality and by the number of its population and the importance of its industries then the places I have just spoken of ought to have post offices given to them. I think that the Government should place in the Supplementary Estimates for this year a sum for the building of a post office at Lévis, and another sum for a post office at St. Sauveur de Québec. There are a number of places, I repeat, which have obtained these favors in the past and which will doubtless obtain them in the future, which do not deserve to have them half so well as the two places I have just mentioned.

Motion agreed to.

#### FISHERY BOUNTY IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McINTYRE moved for:

Copy of the names of fishermen in Prince Edward Island who for the last two years have made claims for the fishery bounty, and whose claims have been rejected; also for copies of the reports of the officers or parties against such claims, and the names and residences of such officers or parties.

He said: The fishermen of Prince Edward Island generally are not satisfied with the manner in which the fishery bounty has been distributed. This has been more particularly the case with the fishermen of King's county. The complaint on their part is that political considerations have been allowed to influence the distribution of this fund in the hands of the different officers. Year after year, for several years back, I have received letters from fishermen that, after having fished for the specified time and caught the requisite quantity of fish, and having sent in their application and sworn to its correctness, they have, notwithstanding this, on the slightest excuse, or on no excuse at all, on the part of the sub-collectors, who have usually charge of this matter, had their claims rejected. On the other hand, I had been informed that the wardens have given certain information to the sub-collector which has induced him to refuse the certificate to those who were making application, and thus the fishermen, without any further hearing, were deprived of the bounty which of right belonged to them. I desire to state a case or two in point. I think it was in 1886—but I am not quite certain as to the year—during the summer a seining boat on the coast with twelve men, fishing during the whole summer, and, when the time came for the fishermen to receive their cheques, nine of them received their cheques and the other three were without them. It is rather peculiar that the nine who received their bounties were Conservatives, and the three who were deprived were

Mr. LANGELIER (Quebec).

Liberals. The next year one of these men wrote to me, making a statement of the facts in connection with the case. I wrote back asking for affidavits from two or three of these men who had fished with them and had received their bounties. I had sent to me three affidavits from men who had received their bounties and one from the neighboring magistrate. I then went to the department and explained the matter, and showed this to Mr. Tilton, the Deputy Minister. After overhauling the matter carefully he came to the conclusion that these men were entitled to their bounty. All the information which I could obtain was that the grounds upon which these three men were deprived of their bounty before, came from information supplied by a neighboring fishery warden. Another case in point is where a father and son fished for the season and sent in their claim, and when the time came for them to receive their cheques, they went for them. The father received his cheque, but there was none for the son. The father wrote to me during the Session, and I went to the department and found that the two cheques were sent down on the same day. I communicated this fact to the fisherman, and he went to the sub-collector of the port and told him he wanted his cheque or the equivalent in money. After a while the sub-collector said he would allow him the \$3, which I think was the amount owing to him. He said that would suit him as well, as he owed something to a local grocer, and he could give him credit for that. That was the course taken by the sub-collector. I do not desire to make any comment upon that, but I understand that these cheques must be endorsed by the parties in whose favor they are made. I could recount such cases as these by the dozen, but I think these are enough to let the Minister understand how this fishery bounty is distributed in my county. I think it is a hardship for fishermen, after fishing the season round, after getting the required quantity of fish, to be deprived of their bounties on the most flimsy pretext, and often upon none at all. The case, as it stands, is enough to show that that is the fact. It is the opinion of the fishermen, as it is my opinion also, that the bounty should be increased. If our fishermen are to pay the large taxes which they are paying year after year, for their food, their clothing, and the material which enters largely into their outfit, they should receive greater encouragement than they are receiving at the present time. For many years the French Government have given a bounty, a large bounty, I think ten francs, to the French fisherman for every quintal of fish sold in the foreign markets. Our fishermen are paying a large amount for the benefit of a few manufacturers; and if the Americans are going to continue the heavy duties they now charge, the least the Government should do is to give a bounty to our fishermen equal to the amount the Americans charge on our fish. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that he had heard no complaint from the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. That may be true, and the reason is that the fishermen have got tired of making useless remonstrances to the department and obtaining no consideration for them. I trust that the present Minister, in whom the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces have every confidence, will see that they receive the bounty to which they are entitled. There ought to be some shorter way of arriving at the fact as to who is really entitled to the bounty, than the system that obtains now. It appears to me that there are cases in which the fishery overseer should have power to make an examination, cases of fishermen whose claims were being presented. Let him go round from place to place at stated periods and ascertain the facts as relating to these matters. It could be very easily done. The fishery overseer in Prince Edward Island is not overburdened with work, and this plan would do away with a good deal of the uneasiness in connection with this matter which now prevails.