

money belonged to the fishermen at all, the principal belonged to them; but if the Government keep the principal, they should pay over the full amount of the annual interest.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask, what proportion of this money is for extra service, who are the officers paid, and how much is paid to each?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not able to give the hon. gentleman the information at present, but I will obtain it on Concurrence. I have but few words to say in reply to the hon. member for Antigonish, with reference to the distribution of this fund. He sets out with the declaration that the money belongs to the whole Dominion, and that that was the argument used by the hon. Premier, when the question was first brought before the House in 1880. At that time it was not decided that any portion of this money should be given to the fishermen, or distributed in any other way than forming part of the general revenue of the Dominion; but after due consideration, and after having adopted the policy of assisting all branches of industry in the country, it was deemed advisable—as it was alleged that the fishermen had lost a certain portion of their trade—that an amount equal to about 4 per cent. of the award should be divided among the fishermen. It is quite true that they have not been granted the full amount; but the hon. gentleman must remember that a large amount of expenditure is incurred every year in the protection of these fisheries in different ways, and by that means it is completely absorbed. If the theory laid down by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) be correct, that because an award was obtained, under the Washington Treaty, in connection with our fisheries, it belongs exclusively to one branch of industry in the country, that, I fancy, might apply to a great many other industries which we are encouraging. The hon. gentleman objects to the principle upon which the bounty has been paid, and he objects to it on the ground that the Premier, in 1880, in discussing this question, stated that the fund belonged to the whole Dominion, and not to any one class of fishermen. That is quite true; but, in 1882, when it was decided that \$150,000, a sum nearly equal to the interest upon the amount of the award, should be distributed among the fishermen, the manner in which, so far as possible, the money was to be distributed was distinctly stated. I will read a short extract from the speech made by the hon. Minister of Finance at that time, which is the best answer I can give to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The hon. Minister of Finance said:

"The proposition is to reimburse the fishermen of that portion of the Dominion who have had taken from them, by the Treaty, exclusive privileges which they formerly enjoyed. It is to compensate them for the competition which they are now meeting with from American fishermen. A number of communications have been received, through members of the House representing fishing districts. There have been propositions to pay on the fish exports. It was felt that the amount would not reach the parties engaged in the business. Another proposition offered was that every man engaged in the fishing business should receive a certain sum per head. That, however, would be a difficult undertaking, although from a political point of view, it would be advantageous. But there are two objects in view in the proposition submitted: first, to encourage the construction of a class of vessels that is much needed; second, to compensate the fishermen. It is the intention of the Government to use the fishery officers for the purpose of granting licenses and looking after the matter, but it would be a difficult matter to distribute the amount according to the number of men in a boat. The point with respect to which there is at present some difficulty is as to the size of the boat, but we may arrive at that by the length of the keel and the dimensions of the boat."

I find also on this subject, in answer to a question by the then hon. member for Gloucester, that the hon. Finance Minister said:

"The law, I think, speaks of registered vessels of ten tons. Any smaller vessels are not registered, and there is where one of the difficulties lies in reaching a decision."

I read these extracts to show that the intention of the Government at the time was to confine the distribution to the fishermen who were deprived of certain privileges, and the

reason for paying a certain proportion of the bounty to the vessels was a desire on the part of the Government to encourage, as much as possible, the building of that class of boats. It will readily be understood that if it were open to all classes of fishermen, as pointed out by the then hon. member for Gloucester, any farmer taking his row-boat and spending a few days or weeks fishing would be able to claim a certain portion of the bounty. That was not the intention either of the law or the Government. The intention was to reward those who had lost certain privileges and to encourage as much as possible the construction of vessels in our own country for fishing purposes. I assure hon. gentlemen it has been with no little difficulty that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has arrived at the decision at which he did arrive in laying down some practical basis on which to act. He has carried out almost to the letter the declaration made by the hon. Finance Minister at the time, and the only object the Government can have in view is to carry out the law and give the bounty to those who are engaged in the deep sea fisheries and who are deprived of those privileges to which the hon. Finance Minister alluded, and to encourage in our own country the building of vessels to be used in fishing operations in the Gulf and the deep sea.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). From the Order in Council which I find was passed on the 7th November—of course, it was simply impossible for the Government to collect any information and pay the bounty before the close of that year—I think if the hon. Minister had undertaken to obtain the information earlier, the Government might have been in a position to pay the bounty before this time. Fishing voyages are always settled for on or about the first of the year. On the 4th or 5th of January, fishermen are always settled with and paid off; and I trust the hon. Minister will see that the returns are collected before the end of the year, and the claims paid as soon as submitted to the Department. The hon. Minister says this money was given in lieu of the privileges of which our fishermen were deprived by the Washington Treaty, and in the next breath he says it was given as a sort of protection to the fishing industry.

Mr. BOWELL. A bounty.

Mr. ROBERTSON. As a part of the so-called National Policy. It was but right the Government should extend a fostering influence to this industry, for the simple reason that, by the high tariff on all the articles used by the fishermen, the cost of carrying on that industry was largely increased; and it would be but right and fair that bounties should be paid to lobster and salmon fishermen as well. Will the hon. gentleman give me some information as to the position occupied by Mr. Ogden, of Nova Scotia, in connection with this service—what his duties are and how he is paid?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to give the particulars now, but will ascertain them and lay them before the House.

Mr. WELDON. In regard to the principle laid down by the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is altogether different to that adopted in regard to the drawback given to ships. The latter is for the purpose of returning to ship-owners in that shape the duties they have paid. In this case the fishermen are still to pay the duties, but this amount is given as a compensation for certain privileges taken from them by the Washington Treaty. If that be the principle, it is ignoring the principle laid down in the resolution of the First Minister in 1880 in regard to the right of the Dominion to the Fishery Award. What was contended then by the Maritime Provinces was, that the fisheries were their property, held in trust for them by the Dominion, and the fact that Newfoundland received her share of the award was