

fish imports for Canada to make up of \$5,679,128.

In other words, the biggest possible gain in the American market open to our fishermen is this amount of \$5,679,128.

Now the Canadian home market for 1910 amounted to \$15,992,548 or nearly three times as much. This market will be thrown open to the American fishermen by Reciprocity. So the Canadian fisherman risks a market of over \$15,000,000 in order to get a fighting chance in a market of a little over \$5,000,000.

Is that a fair trade?

And the menace to our home market is a very real one. Boston, Portland and Gloucester enjoy a much shorter haul to the richest parts of it than do the Maritime Provinces. They could easily cut in and capture a large part of the trade now held by the Canadian fishermen.

Moreover, it must be remembered that this home market for Canadian fish covers the entire country. British Columbia fish come far east, and Atlantic fish are carried as far west as Winnipeg with the help of Government assistance on freight rates. The importance of this assistance may be shown by the fact that it reduces the express rate from Halifax to Montreal from \$1.50 to \$1.00 per 100 pounds, while the rate from Portland, Boston or Gloucester is 80 cts. To-day the import duty of 1 ct. a pound keeps out the American fish; but, after Reciprocity, fish will be free.

Then the "most-favored-nation" clause comes in here. Our own market will be opened to the fish exports of every one of the doughty Twelve "most-favored-nations" who are to have free access to our markets under Reciprocity. Mr. Jamason, M.P., gave them in Parliament as follows:—

Norway.....	\$12,000,000
Sweden.....	1,880,000
Denmark.....	1,850,000
Japan.....	1,000,000
United States.....	9,652,088

EXPERT OPINIONS.

Then Mr. Jamason quoted a number of Nova Scotia opinions on the subject which show us what "the men who know" really think of the prospects. Mr. William Duff, of the Atlantic Fish Company, a Liberal, said in an interview in the Halifax Chronicle:

"Under reciprocity there would be only a small quantity of fish shipped to the United States. In 20 years most of our fish will be going to Western Canada and we will be getting better prices."

Mr. T. M. Irvine, M.P.P., a Liberal, and a member of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, said:

"This question of reciprocity is not so important as it was years ago. Our own fish are beginning to find their way to our own markets, and with good storage and transportation, Nova Scotia fish will soon be able to supply the greater part of the needs in Western Canada, now largely supplied from the New England markets."

Mr. George A. Cox, ex-M.P.P. for Shelburne, a Liberal, said:

"I do not consider the benefit to our fresh fish market will be so great as it is now. I think in a short time we can capture the fresh fish market (of Canada) from them—(United States). We have

found a better market in Montreal and Toronto than in the United States. With a little better railway facilities to the upper provinces all our fish would go there."

Mr. F. C. Whitman, of Annapolis Royal, a large fish dealer and a Liberal, said:

"Reciprocity in fish would not help our dried fish business. Our best market is the West Indies and South America."

Mr. H. B. Short, of Digby, local manager of the Maritime Fish Company, said:

"They shipped fresh and smoked fish from Halifax to Vancouver. He thought the Canadian market was their market for fresh and smoked fish, and for salt fish. South America and the West Indies. There are times when they could send fish to the States, usually when the United States catch was off. When the Canadian government increased the duty on fish from 1/2 cent to 1 cent per pound, Nova Scotia captured the upper Canadian market. If fish were admitted free, the Americans would secure the Canadian market again."

Capt. Howard Anderson, a Liberal of Digby county and a fish dealer, said:

"When I came here twenty years ago the fish dealers were calling for reciprocity, but I never agreed with them. We have a fine market right here in the Dominion for our fish, and it is only a short time till we consume in this Dominion all we can produce. I believe reciprocity would kill our fresh fish business in Montreal and the west generally."

VALUE OF OUR FISHERIES.

Then it must be remembered that Canada and Newfoundland have practically a monopoly of the Atlantic fishing grounds. The Americans have fished out their fisheries; and that is the reason why they have long been so anxious to get at ours. To-day, for certain kinds of fish, their supply cannot meet their own demand, and they simply must import. Under such circumstances, any duty they impose is nothing more than a tax levied upon themselves.

Our fisheries have grown without the smallest reference to the coming or going of free access to the American markets. Those who talk about their value in "the good old days of Reciprocity," are only betraying how little they know about the subject.

In 1861, when the Elgin Reciprocity treaty was in full force and the Civil War had sent prices soaring, the value of the fisheries of Nova Scotia was \$2,376,721 and that of New Brunswick reached \$184,806. Eight years later, or three years after the abrogation of the treaty, the Nova Scotia fisheries were—according to Government reports—worth \$2,501,507 and those of New Brunswick, \$638,576. Here were increases in both cases in spite of the fact that Reciprocity had been lost in the meantime.

Then came the Washington treaty in 1871, and opened the American markets to our fish once more. But there was no great increase in the value of our fisheries. They augmented at about the same rate as had been shown during the five years of exclusion from the American markets. In 1883, the Washington Treaty was torn up, and a duty put on our fish once more. The Americans are very fickle in these tariff agreements, it will be noticed.