

3.—Mr. John Campion, of Souris, P. E. I. :—

I should not consider it any hardship to have to pay \$2 per barrel duty, because if American vessels were excluded we would have a monopoly of the market.

4.—Mr. Joseph Campbell, of Souris, P. E. I. :—

Were the American fishermen excluded from our inshore fisheries we could set up the price of mackerel ourselves. Americans do not catch enough mackerel to supply their whole markets.

5.—Mr. William S. McNeil, of Rustico, P. E. I. :—

If American fishermen were excluded from inshore fisheries and a duty raised of \$2 per barrel on our fish in the United States market, I think we would perhaps gain on it in the price we should obtain for our fish.

6. Mr. Poirier, of Tignish, P. E. I. :—

Could we keep them out we should have no objection to paying duty in the United States market. The number of fish would be limited and the market would be good for us, and the good price we could get would by far overbalance the \$2 tax.

Last year we got a big price for our potatoes although there was a protective duty of 15 cents per bushel upon them in the United States. We monopolized the market that year to a certain extent. If the Americans have a right to take away our fish and glut the American market with them it will reduce the price and we cannot get a sale for ours at all.

7.—Hon. William Howlan, of Cascumpecque, P. E. I.

Were the Americans excluded from the Canadian inshore fisheries an advantage would accrue to Canadian fishermen irrespective of any duty that might be imposed on Canadian fish in United States markets. If the quantity of fish required by the United States is, say 100,000 barrels, and the catch by American fishermen is only 60,000, it follows that they are 40 per cent short. So up goes the price of mackerel and they must go outside for them. That was clearly established last year in potatoes. While they were 20c. a bushel at the Island they were exported and sold at \$1.10 in the United States, were there was a duty on them of 15c. The consumer must have paid the duty.

11.—Mr. William McLeod, of Port Daniel, Gaspé :—

Were the Americans kept out of our inshore fisheries our fishing grounds would be protected and our fish increased. In a short time our people would enter in the business themselves, and as for a market the consumers must have our fish and would buy them. I represent the opinion of all my neighbours engaged in fishing, and I and they will be quite satisfied if the Americans were kept altogether out of the inshore fisheries and the imposition of a duty of two or three dollars a barrel on our mackerel would not injure us, for the consumers would pay the duties if levied.

12.—Mr. Philip Vibert, Percé, Gaspé :—

The fishermen and fish houses in the District of Gaspé, say from Bay Chaleur to the River and River du Loup, don't ship anything to the United States except salt herring. Their markets are Spain, Portugal and Brazil. The foreign markets regulate the price of fish other than mackerel. We should not object to the imposition of duties if we were protected in the enjoyment of our rights as to the inshore fisheries.

22.—Mr. John Nicholson, Louisburg, C. B. :—

The benefit of the free market accrues very little to the fisherman. It remains mostly in the hands of the merchant. The fishermen do not get enough to pay for the injury that is done by scaring their fish off. I do not consider it any benefit whatever to Canadian fishermen to have their fish go into the American markets free of duty. Our fishermen ship their fish to Halifax. The Halifax merchants buy them and ship them where they please, perhaps to Boston. Only a small quantity of British fish goes into the American market.

29.—Mr. James McLean, Letite, N. B. :—

If the Americans were kept out of our waters altogether and we had the privilege of sending fresh fish into their markets it would be vastly better for us now. Prior to the Treaty we had better times, got more fish, and could afford to pay the duty.

30.—Mr. James Lord, Deer Island, N. B. :—

When we had to pay \$1 a barrel duty on salt fish exported to the United States, we generally got enough more to pay the duty. As regards salt fish the Treaty has been an injury to us. Witness would rather pay a reasonable duty and keep the Americans out from British fishing grounds.