

Page 187—Smith :

Q. *You speak as a fisherman ; you want to get the most you can. How much do you think you would get ?* A. *As much as the duty.*

Q. I don't know but you are right. Perhaps you would like to have a little more on. Supposing a duty of \$3 was put on, I suppose it would still have the effect of raising the price of fish ? A. I think it would kill us. No, let me see. I don't know anything about that. I think by keeping the English fish out, our fish would bring a better price.

Page 201—Procter :

Q. Speaking as a fisherman, would you prefer to have the duty on ? A. Personally, I would rather have the duty on. Q. Why ? A. Because the duty is better for us, for it would have a tendency in years of good catches to prevent your people from increasing their business. It has that tendency.

Q. Has it any tendency to better you, as well as to injure your neighbours ? A. That is what we were looking for—for better prices.

Q. Has it a tendency to increase prices to your fishermen ? A. It would.

Q. So, if it increases the price of the fish, it strikes me the consumer must pay the increased price ? A. I am not clear that the duty has anything to do with it ; it is the catch.

Page 207—Procter :

Q. And did not the duty on Canadian caught fish replace the bounty ? A. Yes, and the reduction of the duty on salt was granted as an offset for the removal of the duty.

Page 203—Procter :

Q. And that came later ? A. Yes, two or three years after the ratification of the Treaty.

Q. When it was proposed to take the duty off you remonstrated, thinking that this would reduce the price of fish, and this was the general feeling among fishermen and of the inhabitants of the coast of New England ? A. Yes.

Page 312—Warren :

Q. Now with regard to the right of carrying our fish free into the United States, I suppose you think that is of no advantage to your fishermen, that provision of the Treaty ? A. I have no idea it is any advantage to our side of the house.

Q. It is a disadvantage, isn't it ? A. Yes, it is against us.

Q. Be kind enough to explain how ? A. All these things seem to me to be regulated by supply and demand. If there is 100,000 barrels of mackerel hove into our market on top of what we produce the tendency is to depreciate prices.

Q. If this provision of the Treaty increases the supply of mackerel in the United States market it will bring down the price of fish ? A. State that again.

Question repeated. A. I think it would have that tendency.

Q. That is the reason you think it is no advantage to your fishermen to have the privilege of fishing inside ? A. No, putting both questions of the Treaty together, it is no advantage, because the supply is increased and the prices are depreciated.

Q. You will admit this, that it is an advantage to the consumers by bringing down the price ? You admit that ? A. Yes.

Q. Then in point of fact it gives you cheap fish ? A. The tendency is to cheapen them.

Q. For the people of the United States. A. Yes.

Page 326—Lakeman :

Q. The American fishermen want the duty back on fish, I suppose ? A. I do not know about that, I am sure ; but they naturally would wish to have it back again, I suppose, in order to exclude our fish from their market.

Q. I suppose that the consumer got his fish cheaper, owing to the removal of the duty, and the admission of your fish into the American market ? A. The consumer would then get his fish cheaper—the more fish that are put on the market the cheaper the consumer gets them.

Q. Is not the result of the treaty, which admits your fish into the American market, on equal terms with the American fish, to make the price of fish lower in that market ? A. It has that tendency evidently.

Q. Therefore the consumer gets his fish for less money ? A. Evidently he does. When herring are abundant the price is lower.

Q. It further follows that although a certain class of fishermen may lose something by this free admission of British fish into the American market the American public gain by it ? A. By getting their fish at a lower price ? Of course it makes the price of fish lower in that market. That is clear.

Q. Then the consumer gets the fish cheaper ? He evidently does,—the larger the quantity that is put upon the market the less the price will be.

Page 389—Sylvanus Smith :

Q. Supposing the mackerel caught in colonial waters were excluded, would it, or would it not, have any effect upon the price you get for your fish ? Supposing one-fourth of the quantity consumed in the States was excluded, would it have any effect on the price of the other three-fourths ? A. I think some, not much. I think it would stimulate our home production.

Q. In what way would it stimulate it ? By raising the price is it not ? A. Well, to a small extent.

Q. Well, then the effect of the British mackerel coming in is that the consumer is able to buy it cheaper than he otherwise would. A. Well up to a certain point. The effect would be very small. There is not a large enough quantity. It is our home catch that affects it.

Page 429—Myrick :

Q. What would be the effect upon the business of your firm of putting back the former duty of \$2 a barrel upon mackerel sent from P. E. Island to the States ? I would like you to explain your views in this regard, particularly ? A. Well, I suppose, since we have got our business established there, and our buildings and facilities for carrying on the fishery, it would be difficult for us to abandon it altogether, but we would then turn our attention more particularly to codfishing, until at any rate, the mackerel season got well advanced and the mackerel became fat, and if any would bring a high price it would be those taken in the latter part of the season. We might catch some of them, but we would not undertake to catch poor mackerel to compete with those caught on the American shore.

Q. Explain why not ? A. Well, No. 3 mackerel, which are poor mackerel, generally bring a good deal less price than fat mackerel, and men do not catch any more poor mackerel than they do fat ones ; the cost of catching them, and of barreling and shipping them is the same, while the fat mackerel bring a better price. We would carry on the codfishing business irrespective of the American market ; we would catch, cure and ship codfish to other markets—to the West India markets, and we might make a fair business at that ; but as to catching mackerel exclusively under such circumstances, it would not do to depend on it at all.

Page 430—Myrick :

Q. What is it that fixes the price of mackerel in the United States market ? A. *Oh, well, of course it is the supply and demand, as is the case with everything else.* When there is a large catch of mackerel on the American shore, prices rule low ; this is a very sensitive market. If a fleet of 500, 600, or 800 vessels are fishing for mackerel, and those interested get reports of the fleet doing anything, the market falls at once—and this is the case, particularly when prices are any way inflated.

Page 488—Isaac Hall :

Q. You told Mr. Foster that if a duty was re-imposed you would consider very seriously whether you would continue in the business ? A. Yes.

Q. You made that statement on the assumption that you paid the duty ? A. Yes.

Q. I think it has been explained very clearly that the price of fish depends almost altogether on the catch,—this is the case to a large extent ? A. To a large extent—yes. If there is a large catch of mackerel prices rule low, and if there is a small catch they rule high.

Q. If the evidence given here on the part of British witnesses is correct, two-thirds of the fish taken by American vessels in the Gulf, I may say, are caught inshore ; and assuming that two-thirds of their whole catch in the Gulf is taken inside of the three mile limit, could the American fleet, if they were excluded from fishing within this limit, prosecute the Gulf fishery for the other third—would this pay them ? A. I think it would be a difficult business to do so, if that proportion is correct.

Q. *If the price goes up, who pays the enhanced price : is it not the consumer ?* A. Yes.

Q. And if the catch is large, the price goes down :—so it would depend in some measure on whether the catch on the American or on our own shore was large, as to who would pay this duty ? A. Yes ; and on the quality of the mackerel.