

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 dollars a barrel upon mackerel sent from Prince Edward 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 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.”

These are quotations that I make from the American evidence. I do not quote from our own, as Mr. Dana admitted there was such a consensus of evidence on that point, that he almost insinuated that it was too uniform to be depended upon.

I now propose to deal at length with two questions of vital importance in this inquiry, viz. :—

1st. In favour of which country is the balance of advantages arising from reciprocal freedom of trade gained by the Treaty of Washington? and

2nd. Upon whom is the incidence of duties levied upon fish exported by Canada into the United States, the producer or the consumer?

I again (if I may do so without giving offence to my learned friends on the other side) express my obligations to Mr. Miall for the valuable assistance he has afforded in preparing my argument on these points.

Article XXI of the Treaty of Washington is as follows :—

“It is agreed that for the term of years mentioned in Art. XXIII of this Treaty, fish and fish oil of all kinds (except fish of the inland lakes and of the rivers falling into them and except fish preserved in oil), being the products of the fisheries of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada, or of Prince Edward Island, shall be admitted into each country respectively, free of duty.”