

"If we had had this privilege last year, myself and vessel would have been \$5,000 better off this season, and all the fishermen in the bay would have been in the same boat with me. I do not say that I am too honest not to fish within the three-mile limit, nor do I believe there is a vessel in the fleet who would not, if the cutter was out of sight. I made two trips to the bay, both of which were very successful, and I lived up to the requirements of the law as well as I knew how, and did not find them obnoxious, or to interfere with my success, and everywhere I went I was courteously treated by the officials—especially so by both the cutters. Should it be a bay year next season, I hope to meet them again. Those who openly preached that they would go where they pleased, do what they wanted to in spite of law or cutters, shipped men, smuggled or openly fished inside of the limit, and indulged in the satisfaction of damning the cutter, the captain, the Government and everything else when they knew they could do it with impunity, and that the men they were talking to could not resent it by word or blow, were looked after sharp and were not extended the courtesy that was shown so many of us.

"In the interest of fair play I could not help writing you and asking you to give this to your readers, if not taking up too much of your valuable space.

"Very respectfully,

"CAPT. NATHAN F. BLAKE,

"*Schnr. Andrew Burnham, of Boston.*

"Boston, 6th October, 1886."

This is what Captain Blake says as to his experience in dealing with our customs officers and captains of cutters, and it is far from being in accordance with the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite. I think, however, that authority should be satisfactory to those gentlemen; first, because the authority comes from the United States, and, second, because the authority is named Blake. Here is an extract from the paper in which that letter was published:

(*Extract from the Boston Herald, dated 9th October, 1886.*)

#### "A FISHING CAPTAIN'S EXPERIENCE.

"The letter of Captain Nathan F. Blake, of the fishing schooner *Andrew Burnham* of this city, which we published on Wednesday, would apparently indicate that the Canadian officials have not been disposed to push the requirements of their law quite as rigorously as some of our fishermen have maintained. Captain Blake says that he has experienced not the least trouble in his intercourse with the Canadian officials, but that, as he has treated them courteously, they on their side have reciprocated in like terms. There is, undoubtedly, a great deal of bitterness felt on both sides, and probably this bitterness has led both parties to be ungracious in their own conduct, and to exaggerate the wrongs they have endured, hardships frequently due to an unwillingness to observe the requirements of the law as these are now laid down. If all American fishing captains exhibited the same courtesy and moderation that Captain Blake has shown, we imagine that there would be very little trouble in arriving at an equitable and pleasing understanding with Canada."

I wish now to call the attention of the House to the condition of our fisheries, for they have been presented before this House as in an unsatisfactory state and particularly the fisheries from the part of the Dominion from which I come. In 1873 the value of Nova Scotia fisheries was \$6,500,000, in 1878 \$6,131,000. It will be remembered that in course of the discussion in this House a few days ago more than one hon. member contended that during the period from 1873 to 1871 the fishing interests in Nova Scotia made progress but since that date had declined. I find by referring to the fisheries from that time to the present that, although the value in 1873 was \$6,131,000 it had increased in 1882 to \$7,131,000, and in 1886 to \$8,415,000, or an increase of 15 per cent. The same may be said in regard to the Island of Cape Breton, although an hon. member, I think the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, stated the other day that there had been a great exodus and that the fisheries are in an unsatisfactory condition. I propose to give a statement showing not only that the fishing industry is in a state of prosperity, but that it is in a state of great prosperity. In 1882 the value of the fisheries of Cape Breton was \$1,080,000; in 1886, \$1,561,000, being an increase of 50 per cent. We also find the number of men employed larger than it was when hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the Treasury benches. In 1877-78 we had employed in the fisheries 6,680 hands; in 1886-87, 7,591, or an increase of 11 per cent. I desire now to quote from

the *Halifax Morning Chronicle* an article on the subject of the fisheries and the operation of the Government laws against the American fishing vessels. It states, in its issue of January 13th, 1888, as follows:—

#### "THE MACKEREL CATCH.

"The last number of *Bradstreet's* contains a number of elaborate tables, in connection with the trade of the United States, showing the production of wheat, cotton, fish, and a variety of other articles, during the year 1886, as compared with previous years. The table relating to the fish trade will afford the people of the United States the most convincing proof of the absurdity of the claim that our fisheries are of no value to them. If such figures were sent out from a Canadian source their accuracy might be challenged, and it would no doubt be pretended that they were cooked in the interests of our fishermen, for the purpose of securing the removal of the duty. The facts and figures given by *Bradstreet's* are open to no such doubt, and there can be no question that their wide circulation will have a strong effect in causing the Americans to see the folly of the course they have been led to adopt, in rejecting the opportunities which have been offered them of settling the fishery question on a fair and reasonable basis.

"The mere statement of the fact that during 1886 the primary industry of the New England fishermen, the catching of fish, has been unremunerative, fails to give anything like a definite idea of the result of their exclusion from our waters upon their business, but the figures in *Bradstreet's* are intelligible enough to be understood by any one, and show conclusively that the use of our waters is a vital necessity to the fishermen of the Eastern States, and is of immense importance to the trade and to the people."

"It appears that the mackerel fleet in 1886 only secured 80,000 barrels, as against 330,000 barrels in 1885, and as against a much larger quantity than last year's catch in every year since 1869. The effect of this short catch has been to raise the price and to check the consumption. The increase from these Provinces, notwithstanding the duty, has been larger than in 1885. It is further stated that the effect of the duty has been to change the course of the export trade, most of the fish now sent by Boston merchants to Hayti and San Domingo being packed in the Provinces instead of in the States. In respect to cod there is a reduction in the catch of upwards of 79,000 quintals, a falling off which may be attributed to the difficulty of procuring bait, or may be explained by natural causes, similar variations having occurred in previous years, but figures in relation to the mackerel catch are too remarkable and too uniform in previous years to be explained away. The number of barrels caught each year since 1881 is as follows:—

1881.....	391,857
1882.....	378,863
1883.....	226,685
1884.....	478,076
1885.....	329,943
1886.....	81,953

"If the cruisers sent out by the Dominion Government had performed their duty effectively there can be no doubt that the disparity would have been greater."

I find that the same authority gives for the year 1887 the catch as 88,382, and goes on to say that our friends on the other side of the House say the cruisers have performed their duty too effectively and carried out the laws too rigorously against American fishermen, while we have the statement of the *Halifax Chronicle* to the contrary. This shows the effect that the fishery protection service had upon the catch of mackerel by United States fishermen and it proves conclusively that the fish usually caught by the people of the United States in our waters have been caught by the people of Canada, and that the benefit accruing from the catching of this fish accrues to the people of Canada. I shall not take up any longer the time of this House except to say that I have much pleasure in supporting this treaty, and I am satisfied in doing so that it will be a matter of satisfaction to the people whom I represent, a people who are largely engaged in the fishing industry and a people who do not regard this matter in the same way as some hon. gentlemen have pictured to the House and to the country since the beginning of this discussion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### CLAIMS OF MR. KING.

Mr. TUPPER (Pictou) for Mr. WELDON (St. John) moved for:

A Select Committee to be composed of Messrs. Ives, Edgar, Wood (Brockville), McDougald (Pictou), Casgrain, Mills (Annapolis), Flynn,