

whether the purse-seines did any damage, and that, under all the circumstances, he would decide that the punishment should therefore be nominal, the measure being considered by us as merely tentative. If the hon. gentleman is going to attack the principle involved in the Bill he should have the courage of his convictions. He should reform all the laws; he should take away from the Crown the power of pardon and invest it in the judges. Do we not stand in peril of our lives at present, according to this excited legal luminary, since we cannot appeal to the judge, in case of trouble, and ask for remission of the penalties imposed by the Legislature of this country? But the hon. gentleman was most unfair—I do not think it is unusual for him to be so—in reference to the statistics. He was not at all satisfied, and he thought he could hang his hat on a little peg. He was stretching out in a most disgraceful way for arguments, and after confessing that he knew nothing about the facts, he showed that he knew nothing about the law involved; and failing in both, he brought a charge of want of candor against myself—that, in giving statistics to the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) I had carefully refrained from giving all the statistics. I did not pretend to do that. The hon. member for Queen's claimed, as I understood, that there had been no decline in the mackerel fisheries in the last ten years.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). You suppressed two years.

Mr. TUPPER. The hon. gentleman again indecently and offensively repeats that I suppressed two years. The *Hansard* will show that. The hon. gentleman contradicts me now, being careless of the facts and of the feelings of any one who is contradicted; but that goes for very little with me from that hon. gentleman, except that I think it necessary to call attention to the unfair spirit which induced the hon. gentleman to resort to such a contention. There was no occasion to import temper into this discussion. The hon. gentleman said there was no reason for the fishermen to oppose this Bill, and, therefore, in the littleness of his mind,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. TUPPER—with his Lilliputian spirit, the hon. gentleman was not willing that I should have the credit of introducing a Bill which would be so acceptable to the fishermen, so he said that, while the principle of the Bill was right, I was endeavouring to enslave the fishermen and to obtain a control over them which should not be allowed. Let me give the hon. gentleman a few more statistics. He seems to be hungering for statistics. I shall give him fuller statistics than I did, and, if I had known that he was so willing to receive more information, I would have given them to him before, instead of repressing them, as the hon. gentleman says. In the years 1888, 1889 and 1890 the catch of mackerel made by United States fishing vessels in the waters of the Nova Scotia coast and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence is as follows:—1888, 83 vessels, 10,418 barrels, averaging 126 barrels per vessel; 1889, 62 vessels, 6,755 barrels, averaging 109 barrels per vessel; 1890, 64 vessels, 8,443 barrels, averaging 132 barrels per vessel. Then the Canadian catch, to which I have already alluded, in 1885 amounted to 148,450 barrels, against 90,000 barrels in 1890; and the United States catch in 1885

amounted to 330,000 barrels, against 16,140 in 1890. Yet the miserable carping criticism is raised that I did not give two years in the statement that I made, and that, therefore, I abused my position here. We will see who was trifling with the intelligence of this House or making an exhibition of the grossest ignorance when I show that the comparison is 148,000 barrels in 1885 against 65,000 barrels in 1888, and 90,000 barrels in 1890, while the American catch was 330,000 barrels in 1885 against 16,000 barrels in 1890, figures which I have already given. The hon. gentleman desired that I should compare the 16,000 barrels of 1890 with the 17,000 barrels of 1889. The facts show that in 1890 there was a slight increase in the total catch over 1889, but that is not satisfactory to anybody who examines the mackerel fishery, because, while the total catch was 106,000 in 1890 as against 83,000 in 1889, we find that in 1885 the total catch amounted to 470,000 barrels. I hope the hon. gentleman now appreciates the statistics that I have given. Hon. gentlemen understanding the mackerel fishery will find that in 1890 there were about 20,000 barrels more than in 1889, but there were several hundred more barrels caught in 1885. The gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces who are interested in the mackerel fisheries will not pretend that that fishery has not declined in the last few years, and that the work of those hardy toilers in the sea has not been performed with the worst possible luck in the last few years. I have spoken of the complaints which the hon. gentlemen have made, and have used these statistics for that purpose.

Mr. FLINT. Has the Minister received any information as to the mackerel fishing this year?

Mr. TUPPER. Yes; and the mackerel fishery is improving. The reports which are before the House add to the strength of my contention in regard to purse-seines, and that is, that the purse-seines having broken up the schools of mackerel, as described by the experts, the purse-seines were laid aside. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I am alluding to official documents, and he ought to know that the purse-seines have not been used in the last year or two to the same extent by the fishing vessels—certainly not by the American vessels—as they were before. Lieutenant Gordon in his report of this year ascribes the temporary falling off and the temporary improvement in the mackerel fishery to the rest which the mackerel have received from the purse-seines not having been so much used. The fishery this year is better all round, I am glad to say. Coming back to the question, I am glad to find that gentlemen who have opposed the penalties in this Bill are those who say they do not believe in the principle of the Bill. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) waives his objection at the desire of the fishermen, but the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) says he does not believe in the principle of the Bill. Both those gentlemen quarrel with the penalties and say that they are too severe. Consequently, those who believe in the principle of the Bill cannot be very far astray when it is opposed by those who think we are going too far in advance. I submit that in view of the Customs law, the criminal law, the present Fisheries Act containing provisions for omission, the same as these other laws, we are not going a step in advance of the spirit of our Legis-