

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 dollars was put on, I suppose it would still have the effect of rising 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. Am I 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 208—Procter :—

"Q. And that came latter?—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 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 consumers 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 low.

"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