

THE MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE

AND THE

LOBSTER FISHERY

BY

R. N. VENNING.

(Superintendent of Fisheries.)



OTTAWA
GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU
1909

THI

A v
especially
during ti
thus pro
various p
ferent ju
exploitati

It is
welfare o
their req
of the ge
and devel
of the de
which, he
probably
of great

Mr.
during th
February,

'Tha
committe
they arise

Toucl
coast line
now empl
enormous
for a spec
of the fish

The
were unan
the severa
the adopti

Conse
House int

'That
by addin
and Fische
on Mr. S
p. 1369),
the specia
select sta
eries as f

Robe
(Inverness
W. Danie

8548—

THE MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE AND THE LOBSTER INDUSTRY

(By R. N. Venning, Superintendent of Fisheries.)

A very interesting and important factor in the working of the department, especially as affecting the Fisheries Branch thereof, consisted of the appointment during the year of a select standing parliamentary committee on Marine and Fisheries, thus providing a means hitherto inaccessible of investigating and discussing the various phases of the fisheries and the fishing industry as they might develop at different junctures in the general application of the fishery laws and regulations, and the exploitations of the fisheries.

It is felt that this move by parliament will have a very beneficial effect upon the welfare of the valuable fisheries assets of the Dominion in that it will bring them and their requirements as well as their possibilities, more prominently before the attention of the general public as well as of those who may desire to engage in their prosecution and development, and it cannot but have a tendency to greatly strengthen the hands of the department in its endeavour to enforce provident fishery laws and regulations, which, however beneficial and necessary, can never be considered as very popular, probably the least so of all restrictive measures having for their aim the conservation of great national assets.

Mr. John H. Sinclair, M.P., Guysborough, N.S., who had initiated the move during the session of parliament of 1908, moved in the House of Commons on the 3rd February, 1909 (*Hansard*, unrevised edition, p. 504), the following resolution:—

‘That, in the opinion of the House it is advisable to appoint a select standing committee of the House to deal with questions relating to Marine and Fisheries as they arise from time to time, and the rules of the House be amended accordingly.’

Touching the question of the fisheries, Mr. Sinclair explained that the enormous coast line of Canada, with its prolific fisheries, as well as the great number of persons now employed in an immense industry, although only in its infancy and capable of enormous possibilities for adding to the wealth and prosperity of the country, called for a special committee which could devote its labour and research to the development of the fishing industry of the Dominion.

The mover of the resolution was followed by many members of parliament, who were unanimous in its support, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries congratulated the several speakers, and intimated that a rule would be drafted and brought down for the adoption of the House.

Consequently on the 19th February last, the Hon. L. P. Brodeur moved the House into committee to consider a proposed resolution as follows:—

‘That Rule No. 10, Chapter 2 of the Rules of the House of Commons, be amended by adding after the words “on Agriculture and Colonization” the words “on Marine and Fisheries,” such being designed to carry into effect the decision of the House, on Mr. Sinclair’s resolution as previously explained (*Hansard* unrevised edition, p. 1369), following which on February 26, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, from the special committee appointed to report the lists of members to compose the select standing committees reported the composition of that on Marine and Fisheries as follows:—

Robert Bickerdike, Geo. H. Bradbury, Hon. L. P. Brodeur, A. W. Chisholm (Inverness), A. H. Clarke, (Essex), A. B. Crosby, John A. Currie (Simcoe), John W. Daniel, A. L. Fraser, Honoré Gervais, C. F. Jameson, J. W. Kyte, A. K. Mac-
8548—1½

lean, (Lunenburg), D. D. McKenzie, W. S. Middlebro, Frederick D. Monk, Bruno Nantel, F. F. Pardee, J. H. Sinclair, Ralph Smith, (Nanaimo), Hon. R. F. Sutherland, Jas. D. Taylor, (New Westminster), W. F. Todd, O. Turgeon, Hon. A. R. Warburton.

After preliminary arrangements were made by the committee, its first session to take evidence, under the Chairman, Mr. J. H. Sinclair, was held in this House of Commons, committee room No. 32, on Monday, March 8, 1909, the subject being the 'lobster industry,' and with the exception of two sessions, at which some evidence with regard to the oyster fishery and the fisheries of Georgian bay and adjacent waters were taken, every session up to the end of the fiscal year was devoted to full and comprehensive inquiries into the lobster industry, which indeed had not been nearly completed and bid fair to run well on to the end of the session of parliament.

THE CANADIAN LOBSTER FISHERY.

It may not be inappropriate to refer briefly to the history of the lobster fishery of Canada.

About the year 1873, the fishery had assumed sufficient importance to attract more than ordinary attention. It was at that time prosecuted chiefly on the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where there were in the former province about 40 and in the latter about 24 canneries in operation. These are said to have used about 12,000 tons of raw material, and to have exported to the United States about 2,000 tons of canned lobsters, smaller quantities having been consigned to other markets. The value of the lobster catch cured in 1873 was \$1,214,749.50, while about \$120,000 worth were disposed of in a fresh state.

In view of the fact that excessive fishing had exhausted the lobster fishery along the north eastern coast of the United States, and that the enterprise therein embarked in had been transferred to Canada, the department was impressed with the necessity of some measures designed to protect and perpetuate the natural supply by some economic regulations.

Thus the experience of the United States was sufficient to suggest some deterrent measures to avoid in Canada a repetition of conditions there. It was appreciated at the time that it was easier to exhaust a local asset such as the lobster fishery than it would be to revive it after the event. Hence the necessity for some timely precautions.

LOBSTER FISHERY REGULATIONS.

This consideration of the matter was productive of the first fishery regulation touching the lobster industry that was ever adopted by the Governor General in Council by virtue of the authority of the Fisheries Act, and because it was the initial legislation in this regard, its substance is here extended. The order in council was dated July 7, 1873, and the essential part was as follows:—

'In the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick no person shall at any time fish for, catch, kill, buy, sell or have in possession any soft shell lobsters or female lobsters with eggs attached; nor shall lobsters of a less weight than one and a half pounds be at any time fished for, caught, killed, bought, sold or had in possession; but when caught by accident in nets or other fishing apparatus lawfully used for other fish, young lobsters of less weight than one pound and a half shall be liberated alive at the risk and cost of the owner of the net or apparatus, or by the occupier of the fishery, on whom, in every case shall devolve the proof of such actual liberation.'

This was the signal for strong remonstrances from various quarters, the chief objections emanating from proprietors of canning establishments, because of the effect of the regulation in curtailing the supply of raw material which could, under the restrictions imposed, reach their canneries; nor was there any lack of objection on the part of the fishermen.

Prominent among the remonstrances were petitions from western Nova Scotia; the reasons set forth being: (1) the majority of lobsters taken were under 1½ pounds weight; (2) the lobster, unlike the salmon, was not confined to any particular locality, but was a denizen of the vast ocean and not likely to decline; (3) the capture of these shell fish was to take wealth from the ocean and add to the riches of the country, which was no loss to the ocean owing to tremendous reproductive powers, and if not taken may never revisit the same place; (4) every average catch of lobsters was composed of ones less than 1½ pounds weight; (5) it would deprive those engaged of their livelihood and destroy a fast-growing industry; (6) a somewhat similar law recently became a dead letter in the United States.

These points were not difficult to deal with by any one who had given the subject any consideration since they were all in the line of special pleading, carrying with them their own answer.

The first objection, however, may be regarded as interesting inasmuch as it was capable of verification or refutation.

The result was an inquiry into the question through the inspector of fisheries whose district embraced both provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the course of his investigations he addressed a letter to every fishery overseer in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in whose district the fishery was pursued, asking him to give the average weight of lobsters taken in his jurisdiction.

The information elicited was as follows, and it is interesting to note that it demonstrates in the main that where the greater number of lobster canneries existed the smaller was the average weight of the lobsters taken:—

NOVA SCOTIA.

County.	Average Weight.	Number of Canneries.
Halifax (East)	2	8 and 2 more building.
Halifax (West)	2½	7
Lunenburg	2½	3
Queens	2½	3 and 2 more building.
Shelburne	2½	7
Yarmouth	2½	1
Digby	3	None
Colchester	3	None
Pictou	5	1
Guysboro	1½	8
Antigonish	4	1
Victoria	3	None
Richmond	2	2
Cape Breton	2	2

NEW BRUNSWICK.

County.	Average Weight.	Number of Canneries.
Restigouche	3½	3
Gloucester	3	5
Northumberland	3	4
Kent	2	8
Westmorland	3	None
Albert	4	None
St. John	4	None
Charlotte	2½	4

It is not to be forgotten that this is as far back as 1873, thirty-six years ago, and at the present time there can be found no such averages as those above mentioned; nor is it to be forgotten that in 1873 no less than 4,849,998 cans of lobsters were put up in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick against 10,911,498 in 1908 in the Atlantic provinces.

The inspector explained that the object of the regulation was to provide such a restriction as would effectively protect the fishery and at the same time interfere as little as possible with the work of the fishermen, and that had the object been simply to protect the fish he would have advocated a close season of sufficient length to cover the whole spawning or breeding season. He added that any fixed close time to be of service as a protective measure would need to cover July, August and September, and that such a close season would practically prohibit the business in some sections, particularly on the north shore of New Brunswick where the weather ordinarily prevents commencing before the last of May.

Following strong representations by a deputation of persons engaged in the lobster fishery, the Order in Council of July 7, 1873, was rescinded and replaced by an Order in Council of April 23, 1874, which read as follows:—

‘In the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, no person shall during the months of July and August, fish for, catch, kill, buy, sell or have in possession any soft shell lobsters, or female lobsters with eggs attached, nor shall lobsters of a less size than nine inches in length, measuring from head to tail, exclusive of claws or feelers, be at any time fished for, caught, killed, bought, sold or had in possession; but when caught by accident in nets or other fishing apparatus, lawfully used for other fish, lobsters with eggs attached, soft shelled and young lobsters of less size than nine inches in length shall be liberated alive at the risk and cost of the owner of the net or apparatus, or by the occupier of the fishery, on whom, in every case, shall devolve the proof of such actual liberation.

The year previous, 1873, the legislature of the State of Maine passed the following law:—

‘Section 1. No person shall catch, preserve, sell or expose for sale, within the limits of the State of Maine, any lobsters between the first day of August and the fifteenth day of October of each year; and from the said fifteenth of October to the first day of April next following of each year, no lobster shall be so caught, preserved, sold, or exposed for sale, under ten and one-half inches in length, measuring from one extreme of the body to the other, exclusive of claws or feelers; but from the said first day of April to the first day of August of each year there shall be no such restriction as to time or size, in the taking, preserving, selling or exposing for sale such fish.

‘Section 2. Any person violating any provision of the above section shall be punished by a fine of ten dollars for every such lobster so caught, used, sold, or exposed for sale as aforesaid; one-half to the person making the complaint and one-half to the use of the town in which the offence is committed.’

It may be here explained that the Fisheries Act, Chapter 45, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, empowers the Governor in Council to make regulations for the better management and regulation of the sea coast and inland fisheries, which shall have the same force and effect as if enacted therein, on publication in the *Canada Gazette*.

It is by virtue of this authority that the regulations controlling lobster fishing operations are framed.

The following is a short resumé of the various close seasons and other prohibitions from the beginning, bringing them down to the restrictions under which the lobster fishery is now conducted, and might be of interest here:—

1873.—There was no close season; but it was forbidden to take or possess soft-shelled and ‘berried’ lobsters, and those under one and a half pounds in weight;

1874.—The months of July and August were established as a close season, and a legal size limit of nine inches introduced. Other prohibitions retained;

1876.—The above close season was changed to from July 10 to August 20, and the remainder of the maritime provinces. Other prohibitions retained;

1877.—Sectional close seasons introduced from August 1 to 31, for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and the southern coast of New Brunswick; and August 20 to September 15 for Quebec and the northern coast of New Brunswick. Other prohibitions retained;

1879.—Close seasons changed April 1 to August 1 for the western coast of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and April 20 to August 20 for Quebec, Prince Edward Island and the northern coast of New Brunswick. Other prohibitions retained;

1887.—Close seasons changed July 1 to December 31 for Atlantic coast from Cape Canso to United States' boundary line; and from July 15 to December 31 for the remainder of the maritime provinces. Other prohibitions retained;

1889.—Same dates as above continued; but the size limit was changed to nine and one-half-inches. Other prohibitions retained;

1891.—No change in close seasons or other prohibitions; but the legal size limit was put back to nine inches;

1893.—An experimental Order in Council was adopted for the province of Prince Edward Island providing that the two lowest laths of slats on each side of every trap should not be less than 1½ inches apart. This was not found effective and was discontinued after 1894.

1894.—Regulations of 1891 unchanged; but lobster fishing was prohibited in the lagoons of the Magdalen islands, and the use of trawls for lobsters was prohibited in Gaspé and Bonaventure counties, in Quebec.

Before coming to the existing regulations, a few remarks as to the sectional close seasons may not be out of place.

The question of a uniform close season has been open to much argument in the past and the records of the department reveal that scarcely a season has passed without requests, based on geographical and climatic conditions in different districts, for extensions of the open season.

Messrs. Frank Buckland and Spenser Walpole ['Report on Crab and Lobster Fishery of England and Wales, 1877'] on this point say; 'A universal close season is impracticable, because the season which would suit one part of the coast would be quite inapplicable to other parts;' and they consequently recommended empowering the Secretary of State to institute local close seasons in certain districts, with great caution and after careful inquiry. They made similar recommendations with regard to the lobster fishery of Scotland.

The evidence pointed to June, July and August as the months that should be closed against fishing, and the investigators said: 'It is worth observing that the three months of June, July and August, which the majority of witnesses thus indicate as the best close time for both crabs and lobsters, are precisely the months which the Act 9, George II, Chapter 33, section 4 enacts as the close time for lobsters.'

The foregoing resumé of close times reveals that as long ago as 1877, the necessity for sectional close seasons was recognized and admitted by Canadian legislation, and although changes have since been made in the dates and geographical divisions, the principle has not only been maintained; but greatly extended, inasmuch as at present there are no less than ten different close times.

It is perhaps a noteworthy coincidence that the Canadian government should have in 1877, simultaneously with Messrs. Buckland and others, who reported in that year on the lobster fishery of England, Scotland and Wales, recognized the propriety and need of discriminating in the matter of close seasons according to the conditions and requirements of different localities.

In 1898 a commission was appointed to investigate and report upon the Canadian lobster fishery, with a view to devising regulations designed for its betterment.

As a result of the report of this commission, a complete readjustment of the close seasons and size limits was effected by Order in Council, December 7, 1899 and April 8, 1903, and subsequent minor changes so that the regulations affecting the lobster fishery at present existing are:—

No. of District or Section.	LIMITS OF DISTRICT.	Close Season.	Size limit.
1	Counties of Yarmouth, Shelburne, Queens, Lunenburg, and part of Halifax to Halifax Harbour, N.S.	June 1 to Dec. 14.	9 inches.
2	Counties of Charlotte, N.B., and Digby, N.S.	June 16 to Jan. 5.	9 "
3	County of St. John, N.B.	June 30 to Jan. 5. *	9 "
4	Bay of Fundy, part counties of Albert, N.B., Kings and Annapolis, N.S.	June 30 to Jan. 14.	10½ "
5	From Halifax Harbour, including Guysborough County, to and through the Gut of Canso, then to Red Point, Richmond County	July 1 to March 31.	8 "
6	Gulf St. Lawrence, comprising the Counties of Inverness, Antigonish, Pictou, Colchester and Cumberland in N.S., Westmorland (see No. 7), Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester and Restigouche in N.B., and Bonaventure and Gaspé in Quebec	July 11 to April 19.	8 "
	Excepting that portion of the Strait of Northumberland between N.B. and P.E.I., from Chockpish River to Cape Tormentine in N.B., and from West Point to Cape Traverse in P.E.I.	Aug. 11 to May 24.	8 "
	From Red Point, Richmond County, north to Cape St. Lawrence, comprising also Cape Breton and Victoria Counties, then in Saguenay County, P.Q., from Pt. de Monts eastward, Labrador, including Anticosti Island	Aug. 1 to April 30.	8 "
9	Around all the Magdalen Islands, P.Q., including Bryon and Bird Rock	July 11 to Aug. 31 then from Oct. 1 to April 19.	8 "
10	P. E. Island (except as provided in No. 7).	July 11 to April 26.	

* Except in portion of Digby Co., fronting Bay of Fundy, where the size limit is 10½ inches.

These regulations are supplemented by the following prohibitions:—

- (a) The capture of soft-shelled and 'berried' lobsters.
 - (b) The selling or offering for sale or barter, and the supply or purchase, for canning purposes, of any fragments of lobsters or broken meat.
 - (c) The setting or placing of lobster traps, &c., within one hundred yards of any stationary salmon net.
 - (d) The setting or placing of lobster traps, &c., in any waters of the depth of two fathoms or under.
 - (e) The boiling of lobsters on board of any ship, vessel, boat or floating structure for canning purposes, except under special license.
- NOTE.—Such licenses have never been granted.
- (f) The preparation for lobster fishing by placing gear of any kind before six o'clock of the morning of the day on which the legal season opens.
 - (g) Fishing for lobsters in the lagoons of the Magdalen Islands.
 - (h) The use of trawls for lobster fishing in Gaspé and Bonaventure counties, Quebec.

The penalty for a breach of these regulations or any of them is provided by the Fisheries Act, as not exceeding one hundred dollars and costs or imprisonment not exceeding three months, accompanied by liability to confiscation of vessels, boats and fishing gear illegally used.

LEGISLATION TO CONTROL CANNERIES.

It was early recognized that the real difficulty in the way of proper protection to the lobster fishery was to be found in the canning phase of the industry, for although

no €
impo
befor
cond
every
macl
reasc
the p

beca
whic
and p
with
natu

legisl
Chap
conta
repea
1895-
82 of
I
S
the M
S
forty-
S
witho
S
with t
S
year,
emple
detail
S
empty
S
S
eggs a
S
It
neries
the lot

TL
fishery
lobster
adian
limit,
they tl
depart
tioned
85

no expedient presented itself, forming so important a factor in protection as the imposition of a size limit, looking to the prevention of the destruction of the fish before the age of reproduction had been reached, it was nevertheless apparent that the conditions of the canning business admitted of, if not indeed effected the packing of everything large and small which came to the 'pots' or traps. Hence, without some machinery for the control of the canning operations, it was hopeless to expect any reasonable enforcement of a legal gauge, or indeed any other regulation designed for the protection of the fishery.

The same evil was not encountered where the trade was confined to live lobsters, because the article was not marketable unless of a reasonable and acceptable size, which made it in the interest of the fishermen as well as the trader to avoid capturing and placing on the market unsaleable lobsters, and these interests working in harmony with that of the lobster fishery, afforded, in a considerable measure, the assistance nature required to keep up an equilibrium between the supply and demand.

The control of the canneries therefore became essential, and the first Canadian legislation in that direction was an amendment to the Fisheries Act—57-58 Victoria, Chapter 51—assented to July 23, 1894. It was, however, found to be too cumbersome, containing unnecessary provisions and details, and was, in the following year (1895) repealed, and the law at present in force—amendment 58-59 Victoria, Chapter 28, 1895—substituted in lieu thereof. This legislation forms sections 35 to 42 and 76 to 82 of Chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

For convenience it may be briefly epitomized as follows:—

Section 35. Prohibits the canning or curing of lobsters except under license from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Section 36. Fixes the fee at \$2 per 100 cases, or fraction thereof, each to contain forty-eight one pound cans or ninety-six half pound cans.

Section 37. Forbids the removal of cases of canned lobsters from the canneries without being stamped with the government label.

Section 38. Provides that cases imported into Canada must be labelled or stamped with the government label.

Section 39. Imposes an annual return from each cannery by September 1 in each year, of number of fishermen employed, number of traps used, number of persons employed, distinguishing sexes, and number of cases packed, together with any other details which might be required from time to time.

Section 40. Imposes the obliteration and destruction of government labels on empty cases.

Section 41. Requires production of license on demand by a fishery officer.

Section 42. Imposes preservation and delivery to fishery officers, on request, all eggs attached to lobsters brought to the cannery.

Sections 76 to 82. Provides penalties for breaches of above provisions.

It will be observed that the above Act refers solely to the control of lobster canneries entirely separate and distinct from the regulations previously cited under which the lobster fishing operations are conducted.

APPLICATION OF THE REGULATIONS.

The three principal factors in the protection and perpetuation of the lobster fishery are:—(a) a proper close season; (b) the prohibition of the taking of 'berried' lobsters, and (c) a size limit. Each of these restrictions forms a feature in the Canadian regulations, whereas in the adjoining States they have been satisfied with a size limit, and have to some extent purchased 'berried' lobsters from the fishermen which they then liberated alive. This is somewhat in the line of the idea adopted by the department at the Gabarous pound. A strict enforcement of any of the above mentioned regulations, would go a long way to ensure the perpetuation of the lobster

fishery, but if it were possible to achieve a strict application of all of them there would never be any fear of the permanency of the industry.

So far as the close season is concerned it may safely be said that there is comparatively little difficulty in its enforcement. The lobster canneries close at the advent of the prohibited season, and the traps are or should all be taken in. Those which are not being obviously illegally set, and comparatively easy of detection, can be seized and destroyed by the fishery overseers and patrol boats, which has a very deterrent effect upon illegal fishing since it means the total loss of the fishermen's gear. Thousands of traps have thus been destroyed by the officers when found illegally fishing and any lobsters therein liberated.

To the fact that this particular provision of the regulations is comparatively easy of enforcement is largely due the further fact that the lobster industry is not in a worse condition than it is to-day after about forty years of persistent exploitation from the United States boundary line in the Bay of Fundy, to Labrador.

With the preservation of the 'berried' or seed lobster, however, the case is very different, these are captured along with the legal ones, by, say some 3,000 boats, operating and taken to about 700 canneries. Hence the chances of detection are very small and even if the department had a man stationed at every factory, its object in detecting the traffic in 'berried' lobsters could easily be defeated by the fishermen, were they so inclined, by the adoption of the method known as 'brushing' 'wiping,' or 'washing,' which simply means the removal of the eggs from the lobsters, to prevent detection, and throwing them overboard where they are just as effectually lost to the stock as if they had been boiled in the canneries with the lobsters from which they were taken. A further difficulty in the way presents itself is the fact that many of the boats do not land their own catches; but are visited by collecting smacks which receive the lobsters and transport them to the canneries.

It is only just to say here, however, that there are many evidences that the fishermen are fast becoming imbued with the necessity for the protection of the 'berried' lobsters, recognizing the enormous havoc wrought upon this source of their livelihood by the wanton destruction of an average of say 10,000 eggs with every 'berried' lobster they take to the canneries, and we hear from many quarters that at least locally there is concerted action among the fishermen to refrain from taking from the water such 'berried' lobsters as they find in their traps and to return them for reproduction purposes. It would be greatly in the interests of the fishermen, and all concerned should this feeling continue to grow bringing with it a higher appreciation of the provident protective measures conceived and promulgated in their own interests.

These two provisions of the regulations: the close season and the protection of the berried' lobsters occupy the position of being necessary restrictions acknowledged even by those whom they most affect and are therefore not arguable from a commercial standpoint or from that of expediency, but must be regarded as an essential to the permanence of the industry.

Passing to the size limit the conditions are wholly different, as this is the restriction which most affects the canner. The market regulates the size of the lobsters sold alive or boiled in the shell, 9 inches being the smallest which can legally be placed upon the adjoining markets in the United States, and 8 inches upon those of Canada. Hence it is obvious that these sizes will be the minimum which will find their way to such markets.

On the other hand so long as there is a good market for live lobsters in the United States, the canner—in localities where transportation makes the live traffic possible—finds himself unable to procure lobsters for his purposes except those under 9 inches, and as the legal sizes limits in Canada are 10½, 9 and 8 inches, it will readily be seen that the canner is necessarily restricted in his supply of raw material. The result is inevitable and it goes without saying that large quantities of lobsters under 8 inches and therefore illegal have found their way into the pack of the canners.

The
regardi
limit.

Co
lobsters
bears e
smaller
aiding
that th
the size
Field,
all lobs
and lar
lobster
to this
the freq
the pro
would s
say 16 i
lobsters.
to the c
sought

The
possible
destruct
more im
latter p

It n
wholly a
is not o
presenti

It h
the lobst
develop
try, prod
produce
as to w
ciently d
tories. w

The
were mac
officers
statement
the effect
ber of le
delegated
specific
vinces.

In o
with the
Moncton
provinces
within th
overseers,
mouth, I

The above explanations as to the difficulty in effectively enforcing the provision regarding 'berried' lobsters gain force when applied to the application of the size limit.

Considerable diversity of opinion exists as to the necessity for a size limit for lobsters. It is generally admitted for all practical purposes that the average female bears extruded eggs at about 9 to 9½ inches in length. Some have been observed smaller than this but they are said to be exceptional and therefore of little value in aiding the establishment of a proper legal size limit. The theory of such a limit is that the creature should be permitted to reach maturity which must be regarded as the size when it first bears extruded eggs and therefore capable of reproduction. Dr. Field, of the Massachusetts Fish Commission, has advanced the idea of permitting all lobsters, say from 9 to 10½ inches to be taken, protecting both the smaller and larger ones, by prohibition. His theory as the writer understands it is that the lobster of commerce in the United States is the lawful one from 9 inches up. Added to this is the fact that those most in demand are regulated by the epicurean taste of the frequenters of hotels and restaurants and range from say 9 to 10½ inches. Since the production of eggs largely increases with the increasing size of the lobster he would save all those over 10½ inches because the progeny of one large lobster of say 16 inches would be of more benefit to the stock than that of four or five 10½-inch lobsters. Thus he would save the immature as well as the large brood lobsters leaving to the catcher, dealer and consumer the size best fitted for the market and most sought after.

The writer has had more than once put to him the argument that as it was impossible to kill all the small lobsters at once, the taking of the small ones was less destructive than generally believed, and that the taking a single brood female did more immediate harm to the stock than the capture of thousands of small ones. The latter part of this idea is in consonance with the theory of Dr. Field.

It must not be lost sight of, however, that Dr. Field was dealing with conditions wholly at variance with those existing in Canada. So far as the writer knows, there is not one lobster cannery in the United States, while there are about 700 in Canada, presenting conditions which must be met.

It has been explained early in this paper that the real difficulty in dealing with the lobster question was born of the introduction of the canning phase, and it has developed with it. The lobster canning business is a great maritime province industry, producing in 1908 10,911,498 cans, valued at \$3,273,447, while the live lobster trade produced 98,373 hundred weight, valued at \$926,832. The question, therefore, arises as to whether regulations for the protection of the lobster fishery should be sufficiently drastic to seriously cripple, or in many instances automatically close the factories, with attendant effects upon the communities where they are operated.

The department realizing that for some time past no real concerted attempts were made by the canners and fishermen to observe the size limit, and that the fishery officers had not been able to properly enforce the law in this particular regard, and the statement having been made that a strict enforcement of the size limit would have the effect of closing the lobster canneries, by reason of the fact that a sufficient number of legal sized lobsters could not be secured to operate with profit, the writer was delegated to visit the maritime provinces in October, 1907, and inquire into this specific point, by conference with inspectors and fishery overseers of the several provinces.

In order that the inquiry might be as thorough as possible, he arranged meetings with the officers at Halifax and Port Hawkesbury, N.S., Charlottetown, P.E.I., and Moncton, N.B. He took with him to each meeting the inspectors of fisheries of the three provinces to enable them to observe the general conditions obtaining outside as well as within their own districts. At Halifax two inspectors of fisheries and fourteen fishery overseers, representing the counties of Halifax, Lunenburg, Queens, Shelburne, Yarmouth, Digby, Annapolis and Kings, were consulted and examined; at Port Hawkes-

bury two inspectors of fisheries and nineteen fishery overseers, representing the counties of Cumberland, Colchester, Pictou, Antigonish, Guysborough, Richmond, Cape Breton, Victoria and Inverness, were likewise consulted and examined; at Charlottetown one inspector of fisheries, one assistant inspector and three fishery overseers were similarly dealt with, and at Moncton one inspector of fisheries and eleven fishery overseers were also consulted and examined.

Although the object of the inquiry was to glean all possible information from the officers of the department as to the actual state of affairs with regard to the observance of the size limit for lobsters, no opportunity was lost to obtain information from outside sources should any interested persons desire to afford the same. Consequently at Halifax, by request, the writer met at the Board of Trade rooms eight gentlemen interested and discussed the question with them. Again at Mulgrave, leaving Port Hawkesbury, he obtained the views of two other gentlemen interested in the matter. Also at Moncton he was waited upon by three gentlemen who were all lobster packers, who were desirous of giving their views.

In this way the ground was very fully covered and as the scope of the inquiry was limited and specific the information was thoroughly reliable.

Up to this time the evident disregard of a proper observance of the size limit was attempted to be explained by the packers and fishermen from their own standpoints, each naturally endeavouring to cast the onus upon the other. The fishermen held that if the packers would not take the small lobsters they would not bring them in; while the packers' contention was that they were in the hands of the fishermen, and if they did not take them as they came large and small, they could not get any to pack, as some one could always be found who would take small lobsters, if mixed with the legal ones.

The information gained in the course of the inquiry above explained could lead to only one conclusion, as it made it quite clear, that—with the exception of a few spasmodic attempts and the earnest endeavour of some energetic officers, in certain districts—practically around the whole coasts of the maritime provinces where canning operations are carried on, there has been an absence of any regularly concerted attempt either to comply with or to strictly enforce a close observance of the size limit—although from the trend of the evidence which was to some extent incidental to the inquiry it would seem that the regulation requiring the liberation of 'berried' lobsters was being enforced with more or less success.

When the 9-inch limit was adopted by Canada in certain sections lobsters under 10 inches were illegal in the Boston market, and it would therefore seem that the object of placing the limit at 9 inches was to enable the canners to obtain all lobsters between 9 and 10 inches; as it would not pay to can such as could be sold alive. Since that time a change in the Boston law has been made whereby 9 inch-lobsters are legalized on the market. The effect of this change on the packers west of Halifax is to practically take from them all lobsters down to 9 inches and if canning is to be permitted to continue there at all, there would appear to be no good reason, under the changed conditions, for a different size limit than obtains east of Halifax—that is 8 inches.

The preponderance of opinion developed at the inquiry was to the effect that in many cases a strict enforcement of existing size limits would, if not entirely close up the canneries, so cripple them as to make it unprofitable to continue operations.

The view held by the canners to-day seems to be that if they are obliged to render a strict observance of the size limit they cannot proceed with the prosecution of the industry.

If upon investigation which will doubtless follow the work of the newly constituted parliamentary committee on Marine and Fisheries, it be found that this view is even approximately correct we will find ourselves forced to face an alternative difficult to deal with.

T
the in
36 ye
'J
Atlant
tion sh
that w
T)
was in
the ob.
(canne
spawni
hibit t
H
in the
service
'T
carryin
tective
ments
the stil
with tl
Gulf o
not one
interest
enforce
at fish
packers
to the
business
of fishes
and by
exercise
law the
the fine
The
same in
of consi
gation r
ductiver
The
already
me I an
gulf a r
the mild
that in t
done for
required
Whe
the lobst
grounds
decided t
the infor
that such

This view of the matter is not a new one, and it is interesting to note that during the inquiry of 1873, referred to in previous pages, Dr. S. P. Reid, of Halifax, writing 36 years ago to the Commissioner of Fisheries, said:

'Lobster canning is now an important industry and factories exist all along the Atlantic coast from Cape Breton to Cape Sable. It is desirable that no undue restriction should be placed on it, but it is none the less necessary that regulations be adopted that will tend to maintain its continuance.'

The Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who at the time, was investigating the complaints against the original regulation in 1873, said: 'Were the object simply to protect the fish without regard to the fishermen and preservers (canners), I should have urged an absolute close-time sufficient to cover the whole spawning season. But, as before stated this would in some localities practically prohibit the business.'

Here is the testimony of the late Lieut. A. R. Gordon, R.N., on this point, written in the year 1889, twenty years ago, when officer in command of the fisheries protection service:—

'The present regulations in regard to size limit and the destruction of females carrying exuded ova are intended as protective measures and are without doubt protective enactments; but the question arises how far the enforcement of these enactments is possible with the existing means at the command of the department and the still wider question as to whether the enforcement of the regulations is compatible with the existence of the industry. I consider the fact undeniable that taking the Gulf of St. Lawrence district if the above quoted regulations were strictly enforced not one single packing factory could run for one single day, and if the packers, whose interests and desire it undoubtedly is to maintain this fishery, were to attempt to enforce the law, the fishermen would directly reply that they could not make a living at fishing with adherence to those regulations, and therefore could not fish for the packers. The rigid enforcement of the existing regulations is therefore tantamount to the closure of the factories and would in practice have the effect of diverting the business from the hands of responsible citizens who are now engaged in it to those of fishermen of small means, who would get their supplies of cans from the merchants and by boiling the lobster in their houses and barns render it almost impossible to exercise any control whatever over them, and if those men were caught breaking the law the whole property which could be seized would probably be insufficient to pay the fine and the alternative of imprisonment would have to be inflicted.

The history of restrictive legislation of this nature has been everywhere the same in every country where enacted. It has failed to protect the fish and it is worthy of consideration whether shorter seasons for packing and the aid of artificial propagation may not attain in a greater measure the desired end, viz., the increased productiveness of the fishery without the actual stoppage of an important industry.

The shortened season coupled with the reduction in the number of factories, has already to a perceptible extent benefited the fishery and from the information given me I am led to believe that the lobster catch for the season of 1889 will show in the gulf a marked increase over that of 1888 and further whether the result be due to the mild winter or to the legislative enactments of the close seasons the fact is stated that in the early part of the season the run of lobsters averaged larger than they had done for some years—that is to say, that the packers reported that fewer lobsters were required to fill a can than formerly.'

Whether or not the size limit, the object of which would appear to be to protect the lobster until it has reached a reproducing size and age is conceived on proper grounds or adequate knowledge, seems to be an open question, but if it be ultimately decided that such method is the best which can be devised to effect efficient protection, the information at the disposal of the department points strongly to the conclusion that such limit should not be less than 8 inches.

It seems to be quite within the possibilities that it may be expedient and indeed in the general interest having regard both to the lobster fishery and to those exploiting it, to abandon the size limit altogether and lengthen the close-season so as to admit of the minimum amount of fishing consistent with a reasonable prosecution of the fishery. This together with a strict enforcement of the prohibition of the capture of 'berried' lobsters, and of the close-season under more severe penalties such as cancellation of licenses is not unlikely to achieve better results than hitherto and ensure the continuance of the fishery in a productive state.

UNITED STATES FIRMS ENGAGED IN LOBSTER CANNING IN CANADA.

Incidentally reference has already been made to the advent of the New England lobster canners to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It appears that about forty years ago the excessive fishing and canning of lobsters on the north eastern coast of the United States, had exhausted the fishery there and the capital invested in the enterprise was transferred to those provinces by the United States firms which in changing the base of their operations became practically the pioneer lobster canners of Canada.

At this time there was no question of any diminution of the lobster fishery, nor were there any regulations governing the same. There was a practically virgin fishery awaiting exploitation, and the people even hailed with pleasure the advent of the foreign capital and operator because of the employment given, the market for the catches and the general benefit accruing to the community from the establishment of a new industry in its midst with its attendant incidental advantages.

In a report by the late Prof. J. F. Whiteaves, of deep sea dredging operation in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Appendix N, Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1873, p. 196), he speaks of the market for lobsters in the United States and Europe and says:—'In spite of their increased commercial value it is nevertheless a fact that in some of the northern parts of the gulf good marketable lobsters are used to manure the field.' And again, quoting from an informant, Mr. W. S. Brown, Shippegan, N.B., he says:—'The heavy gale of last August drove more lobsters ashore within five miles of my packing houses than I could make use of during the whole summer. They formed a row of from one to five feet deep and I should estimate them at an average of one thousand to every two rods of shore. The next that came in shore after these were very small, averaging from two to four inches in length and upwards and the coast seemed alive with these small lobsters.'

In a report for 1873, the Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, said:—'By far the largest canning establishments now in operation in Nova Scotia are carried on by Americans, who buy by tale or weight from resident fishermen.'

It must also be remembered that there was neither restriction nor license system at the time these people established themselves in a business which was free and open to all. From that time forward they and their successors have continued to operate lobster canneries in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Quebec.

When in 1894, the license system was inaugurated by legislation these canners as old operators of some twenty years standing, received licenses which have since been renewed and augmented.

At the end of the year 1908, the following licenses were held by United States firms in Canada.

STATEMENT of Lobster Canneries operated by United States firms in the Dominion of Canada during the year 1908, by Provinces and Counties.

PORTLAND PACKING CO., PORTLAND, MAINE.

Province of Nova Scotia.

Antigonish County—Nos. 156 and 157..	2
Guysborough County—Nos. 153, 154 and 155..	3
	<hr/>
	5

Province of New Brunswick.

Westmorland County—Nos. 462 to 466..	5
	<hr/>

Province of Prince Edward Island.

Prince County—Nos. 501 to 504 and 601, 602 and 603..	7
Queens County—Nos. 572 and 573..	2
	<hr/>
	9

Province of Quebec.

Gaspé County—Nos. 739 and 740..	2
	<hr/>

BURNHAM, MORELL Co., PORTLAND, MAINE.

Province of Nova Scotia.

Antigonish County—Nos. 79, 80, 114 and 115..	4
Cape Breton County—Nos. 227 and 242..	2
Cumberland County—Nos. 86 and 87..	2
Guysborough County—Nos. 88, 104 to 113..	11
Halifax County—Nos. 101 to 103..	3
Inverness County—No. 252..	1
Pictou County—Nos. 81 to 85..	5
Richmond County—No. 235..	1
	<hr/>
	29

Province of New Brunswick.

Charlotte County—No. 304..	1
	<hr/>

H. C. BAXTER & BRO., BRUNSWICK, MAINE.

Province of Nova Scotia.

Cape Breton County—No. 250..	1
Guysborough County—No. 117..	1
Inverness County—Nos. 240 and 241..	2
Richmond County—Nos. 230, 231, 259..	3
Victoria County—No. 249..	1
	<hr/>
	8

MARINE AND FISHERIES

H. L. FORHAM, PORTLAND, MAINE.

Province of Nova Scotia.

Guysborough County—No. 176..	1
Inverness County—Nos. 244, 245, 246..	3
	<hr/>
	4

Province of Quebec.

Bonaventure County—No. 715..	1
	<hr/>

D. W. HOEGG & Co., PORTLAND, MAINE.

Province of New Brunswick.

Gloucester County—No. 374..	1
Restigouche County—No. 394..	1
	<hr/>
	2

Province of Quebec.

Bonaventure County—Nos. 721, 722, 723..	3
Gaspé County—No. 724..	1
	<hr/>
	4

SNOW FLAKE CANNING Co., BRUNSWICK, MAINE.

Province of Nova Scotia.

Cape Breton County—No. 269..	1
--------------------------------------	---

RECAPITULATION.

PORTLAND PACKING Co., PORTLAND, MAINE.

	Canneries.
Nova Scotia..	5
New Brunswick..	5
Prince Edward Island..	9
Quebec..	2
	<hr/>
Total..	21

BURNHAM & MORELL Co., PORTLAND, MAINE.

	Canneries.
Nova Scotia..	29
New Brunswick..	1
	<hr/>
Total..	30

H. C. BAXTER & BROS. BRUNSWICK, MAINE

	Canneries.
Nova Scotia..	8

H. L. FORHAN, PORTLAND, MAINE.

	Canneries.
Nova Scotia.	4
Quebec.	1
	<hr/>
Total.	5

D. W. HOEGG & Co., PORTLAND, MAINE

	Canneries.
New Brunswick.	2
Quebec.	4
	<hr/>
Total.	6

SNOW FLAKE CANNING CO., BRUNSWICK, MAINE.

	Canneries.
Nova Scotia.	1

A total of 71 canneries.

LOBSTER HATCHERIES.

The question of the artificial hatching of lobsters has engaged the attention of the department for years; but up to the present time the practical operations have not been pursued quite to the same extent as in the case of other fisheries, although great demands are being made upon the department to augment the number on all parts of the Atlantic coasts and greater strides are being made in the direction of lobster hatching, extended arrangements for which are now being pushed with increased vigour. The report of Mr. F. H. Cunningham, superintendent of fish culture, forming Appendix 13 to the annual report will give full details with regard to lobster hatcheries.

Some initial experiments were made on a slight scale in the introduction of floating incubators, which did not meet with a sufficient measure of success to induce any extended operations.

As far back as 1891 a lobster hatchery was established at Bay View, Pictou county, Nova Scotia, which has been successfully maintained and operated since that date, to the entire satisfaction of the department. This was the pioneer lobster hatchery of Canada.

IMPOUNDING AND SUBSEQUENT LIBERATION OF SEED LOBSTERS.

In connection with efforts to maintain the supply of lobsters by methods of artificial propagation and protection of the breeding fish, an interesting experiment was begun in 1903 at Fourchu, Cape Breton county, Nova Scotia, under the auspices of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

An arrangement was made with Mr. H. E. Baker, of Gaborous, a large operator in the canned and live lobster trade in Cape Breton Island, for the utilization of his lobster pounds at Fourchu, which were partitioned off for the reception of lobsters of different classes and in different stages.

The principle of the scheme was to purchase from the fishermen 50,000 desirable seed lobsters, and place them in a suitable pound for protection, where they could be retained and fed during such time as fishing operations were proceeding, after which, or when the eggs were sufficiently advanced, the lobsters were to be liberated along the coast whence they were taken, thus permitting such of them as had not already cast

their fry in the pounds, to hatch their eggs in their natural haunts, in conformity with the strict methods of nature.

A specialist of the department was sent to inspect the working of the scheme, and August 5 of that year he reported that the eggs were hatching out in millions within the enclosures of the pounds, and the young lobsters were making their way through the wire netting into the sea. At the time of his visit there were still in the pound about 20,000 'berried' lobsters, the eggs of which were in various stages of development, while the enclosure was teeming with vigorous, newly hatched fry.

In accordance with the arrangement 49,769 seed lobsters, from the pounds, were delivered alive, in healthy condition, to the fishery officers authorized to receive the same, and were conveyed to the localities from which they were taken by the fishermen, where they were liberated to complete their procreative functions.

The success of the initial years operations as detailed above warrants the department in continuing the arrangement from year to year up to the present time, and many applications have been received for the inauguration of similar pounds in other localities, but the department so far has extended its hatcheries where conditions were favourable leaving the question of the extension of lobster pounds for future consideration.

LIMITATION OF CANNERIES.

The rapid increase in the number of canneries operated called for the exercise, by the government, of some restraint upon their multiplication, as well in the interest of the cannerymen themselves as in that of the preservation of the fishery, and when it transpired that a maximum number of canneries reasonably allowable in given districts, compatible with profitable results and rational protection, had been reached, the department refused to increase the number of licenses, without which no cannery may be operated.

Broadly stated, then, the policy of the department, in congested localities, where limitation is obviously necessary, has been to restrict the business to the canneries already established.

There are sections of the coast, however, in the more remote regions, where the same reason for so drastic a policy does not obtain, and after careful investigation into the conditions and requirements of such districts, new establishments may be authorized if no obstacles intervene.

The controlling power thus afforded emphasizes the expediency and wisdom of applying the license system to the canneries instead of to the actual fishing operations, as is the case in all other fishery licenses on the Atlantic coasts.

Influenced by the high prices for canned lobsters for the past few years, numerous complaints have been made against the policy of refusing new licenses, principally on the grounds that it created a practical monopoly and enable the cannerymen to control the price to be paid to the fishermen for the raw material which they must necessarily accept being unable without license to can their own lobsters; also that in some instances cannerymen refused to pack the lobsters offered by the fishermen. These cases having been carefully inquired into, the minister decided that if a number of lobster fishermen, not less than fifteen, formed themselves into a co-operative association to can their own lobsters caught by them and agreed to share alike in profits or loss, then a license would be granted them or one of their number named by them, but subject to cancellation and not to be renewed if not used in accordance with the agreement.

During the past two seasons several such co-operative licenses have been issued, thus removing the appearance of monopoly.

EXISTING CONDITION OF FISHERY.

For many years past much has been said and written about the woeful depletion of the lobster fishery, and the facility with which the utter extinction of this valuable

crustacean, has been predicted is somewhat remarkable in the face of the facts. To say the least these pessimistic views have been based on insufficient information of the conditions obtaining, and cannot find sanction in the event.

It does not seem that the lobster fishery is anything like destroyed, nor would it seem that its destruction is within measurable distance. One cannot fail to appreciate that probably the time has come when most persistent efforts should be made to see that the condition of the fishery instead of deteriorating or standing still, should progress which probably can be done through the medium of regulations perhaps better designed to suit existing conditions, than may be those which resulted from a commission of inquiry into the industry of eleven or twelve years ago; but that the fishery is a thing of the past and that we have now to adopt excessively drastic measures to rehabilitate it, it is submitted, has not been demonstrated:

Let us examine the statistics of the industry for the past twelve years, which embrace those for the year previous to the regulations consequent on the recommendations of the Commission of Inquiry of 1898, which are as follow:—

Lobsters canned and sold in the shell.

BAY OF FUNDY.

Year.	St. John.		Annapolis.		Kings.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.
1897		3,800		1,553		20		5,373
1898		6,390		1,535		187		8,112
1899		5,980		1,515				7,495
1900		6,080		1,838				7,918
1901		12,215		895		248		3,358
1902		2,114		1,545		500		4,159
1903		2,310		2,448		641		5,399
1904		1,848		362		810		3,020
1905		2,485		485		760		3,730
1906		2,884		1,560		854		4,298
1907		4,824		6,004		678		8,506
1908		2,068		5,533		679		8,280
Totals		38,998		25,273		5,377		70,648

¹100 cwts from Albert Co. ²200 cwts from Albert Co. ³300 cwts from Albert Co. ⁴400 cwts from Albert Co. ⁵250 cwts Albert Co.

DIGBY AND CHARLOTTE.

Year.	Digby.		Charlotte.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.
1897	27,072	113,521	101,904	15,470	128,976	128,991
1898	29,424	223,222	108,072	12,766	137,496	235,988
1899	27,408	20,794	105,696	11,125	133,104	31,919
1900	48,500	51,165	99,552	9,539	148,052	60,704
1901	129,735	67,091	109,440	8,732	239,175	75,823
1902	123,510	18,707	68,676	8,654	192,186	27,361
1903	131,226	19,681	99,800	7,180	231,026	26,861
1904	121,576	21,732	38,200	7,324	159,776	29,056
1905	186,614	19,100	90,240	9,775	276,854	28,875
1906	172,464	10,838	80,236	7,080	252,700	17,918
1907	153,298	7,845	54,412	7,077	207,710	14,922
1908	167,584	8,116	31,968	5,362	194,552	13,478
Totals	1,318,411	581,812	988,196	110,084	2,306,607	691,896

MARINE AND FISHERIES

SOUTH WESTERN COAST OF N.S.

Year.	Lunenburg.		Queens.		Shelburne.		Yarmouth.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.
1897 . . .	136,784	11,475	139,968	4,018	320,730	60,040	529,036	25,422	1,126,518	100,955
1898 . . .	148,128	1,053	160,461	3,616	439,908	55,150	653,976	18,100	1,402,536	77,919
1899 . . .	128,448	704	146,880	3,257	294,860	48,879	676,000	16,690	1,247,188	69,530
1900 . . .	154,640	545	89,276	30,100	434,512	48,480	673,000	17,451	1,351,428	96,576
1901 . . .	118,086	531	137,472	30,750	625,794	9,850	617,800	17,650	1,499,152	58,781
1902 . . .	135,775	643	83,506	680	543,370	44,562	1,027,200	34,320	1,789,851	80,205
1903 . . .	122,032	1,122	193,868	1,310	547,344	12,970	986,736	30,000	1,850,080	45,402
1904 . . .	117,670	1,151	164,880	2,834	621,562	12,580	1,122,768	31,892	2,026,880	48,457
1905 . . .	103,280	1,496	153,280	2,700	618,662	31,565	907,968	20,000	1,783,190	55,761
1906 . . .	124,460	1,906	91,920	3,245	610,316	24,566	807,520	22,100	1,634,216	51,807
1907 . . .	140,608	2,160	116,160	4,685	645,458	11,047	689,660	31,200	1,591,886	49,092
1908 . . .	139,776	1,123	141,000	3,393	573,008	23,876	597,936	33,883	1,461,720	62,275
Totals . . .	1,570,687	23,909	1,618,774	90,588	6,275,584	383,555	9,289,600	298,708	18,754,645	796,760

SOUTHEASTERN COAST NOVA SCOTIA AND CAPE BRETON.

Year.	Halifax.		Guysboro.		Richmond.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.
1897 . . .	537,552	12,197	933,572	1,140	406,148	98	1,877,272	12,435
1898 . . .	590,352	18,063	915,956	811	368,530	552	1,874,838	19,426
1899 . . .	473,384	13,073	825,936	2,282	348,622	3,641	1,647,942	18,996
1900 . . .	480,520	9,222	901,028	3,930	406,152	3,308	1,787,700	16,460
1901 . . .	440,784	12,842	672,240	3,168	324,284	902	1,437,308	16,912
1902 . . .	416,854	12,305	588,496	2,392	189,970	2,883	1,195,320	17,500
1903 . . .	432,624	9,563	543,196	2,673	255,160	1,344	1,280,980	13,580
1904 . . .	453,624	13,810	533,852	2,009	270,152	1,283	1,237,628	17,102
1905 . . .	407,380	21,541	491,500	9,895	237,518	2,198	1,130,398	33,604
1906 . . .	379,632	7,141	487,220	2,551	151,656	2,176	1,018,508	11,868
1907 . . .	322,488	11,297	401,848	3,429	119,678	587	844,014	15,313
1908 . . .	363,360	3,709	402,116	3,600	164,880	496	930,356	7,805
Totals . . .	5,298,554	144,783	7,699,960	37,900	3,242,750	19,398	16,241,264	202,081

EAST COAST CAPE BRETON.

Year.	Cape Breton.		Victoria.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwts in shell.
1897 . . .	492,552		176,664		669,216	
1898 . . .	413,308	4,000	134,516		547,824	4,000
1899 . . .	477,072	23,066	120,436	151	597,508	23,217
1900 . . .	586,512	2,157	144,216	90	730,728	2,247
1901 . . .	430,720	969	122,560	11	553,280	970
1902 . . .	188,980	1,376	90,304		279,344	1,376
1903 . . .	325,256	5,945	177,014	81	502,270	6,026
1904 . . .	389,366	2,912	216,312	70	605,678	2,982
1905 . . .	224,740	15,035	163,140	4,061	387,880	19,096
1906 . . .	234,608	10,422	137,208	10	371,816	10,432
1907 . . .	212,656	2,631	106,644	27	319,300	2,658
1908 . . .	271,280	2,175	93,456	23	364,736	2,198
Totals . . .	4,247,050	70,678	1,682,530	4,524	5,929,580	75,202

Lobsters canned and sold in the shell.
STRAIT COAST NOVA SCOTIA.

YEAR.	Cumberland.		Colchester.		Pictou.		Antigonish.		Inverness.		Total.	
	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.
1897.....	490,952	20,688	495,816	165	297,560	298,872	33	1,514,188	198
1898.....	505,524	14,400	417,299	164,256	259,256	1,355,672	24
1899.....	489,168	20,208	419,376	410	130,848	257,756	1,317,366	410
1900.....	389,000	36,722	500,832	150	158,036	250,834	1,345,424	910
1901.....	488,352	39,120	479,080	110	136,128	240,864	1,441	1,383,548	1,591
1902.....	435,792	49,872	413,184	190	128,256	222,075	761	1,249,179	1,989
1903.....	447,648	33,552	462,432	166,652	329,492	493	1,439,156	808
1904.....	402,216	37,248	457,920	175,816	272,492	938	1,345,692	1,068
1905.....	375,936	36,480	512,740	182,384	312,526	5,660	1,420,066	6,065
1906.....	363,972	33,264	470,536	137,328	398,712	4,000	1,398,812	5,647
1907.....	463,296	38,976	482,912	171,888	254,756	1,533	1,361,828	2,689
1908.....	515,325	53,856	532,560	159,168	224,302	528	1,485,214	7,715
Totals.....	5,372,184	2,558	414,386	5,594,624	1,029	1,918,006	3,316,941	12,477	15,616,135	16,064

EAST COAST NEW BRUNSWICK.

YEAR.	Restigouche.		Gloucester.		Northumberland.		Kent.		Westmorland.		Totals.	
	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.
1897.....	37,400	320	1,351,400	570	108,600	130	414,100	395	400,000	1,420	2,311,500	2,785
1898.....	22,550	490	902,000	500	118,000	130	462,600	250	500,000	1,250	2,005,150	2,620
1899.....	25,000	220	686,700	650	107,200	200	443,110	500	868,400	1,280	2,071,410	2,860
1900.....	22,600	235	618,020	635	93,600	270	418,600	450	786,320	2,500	1,939,140	4,110
1901.....	20,400	1,130	568,200	640	75,500	280	325,000	358	743,800	4,250	1,732,900	6,658
1902.....	27,000	1,050	707,120	875	99,200	280	318,500	3,550	744,800	4,300	1,896,620	10,085
1903.....	37,072	1,475	792,040	1,150	123,500	400	363,260	730	721,000	4,300	2,036,872	8,055
1904.....	60,000	350	865,400	1,230	140,000	400	350,500	630	601,000	5,100	2,016,900	7,710
1905.....	28,000	250	877,000	1,150	137,600	400	437,600	2,750	625,000	1,700	2,153,200	6,260
1906.....	30,000	250	804,720	1,225	194,800	270	441,904	470	869,200	1,710	2,340,624	3,925
1907.....	38,800	310	948,000	1,050	200,000	250	488,500	440	1,000,500	1,450	2,676,600	3,500
1908.....	37,800	300	948,000	1,100	211,000	230	533,300	377	954,900	880	2,685,000	2,887
Totals.....	387,622	6,460	10,069,400	10,795	1,653,000	3,240	4,996,974	10,810	8,755,920	30,150	25,871,916	61,455

MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND QUEBEC.

Year.	Magdalen Islands.		Gaspé.		Bonaventure.		North Shore.		Totals.	
	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.
1897...	703,656	226,552	64,666	94	41,328	1,036,202	94
1898...	612,290	200,202	85	89,520	116	165,046	1,067,058	201
1899...	639,690	190,854	92,628	125	136,676	1,059,658	125
1900...	595,568	132,600	91,930	80	202,008	1,022,106	80
1901...	449,518	92,548	72,936	70	210,169	825,171	70
1902...	429,826	67,228	63,972	55	146,992	708,018	55
1903...	666,208	104,004	18	60,300	90	147,922	978,434	108
1904...	588,572	86,286	46,770	120	127,006	848,634	120
1905...	885,646	97,720	72,370	183	90,676	1,148,412	183
1906...	547,067	107,332	54,624	85	89,777	798,800	85
1907...	588,109	104,928	62,592	90	64,094	819,723	90
1908...	513,024	77,328	45,525	80	60,599	125	696,476	205
Totals.	7,218,984	1,489,582	103	817,833	1,188	1,482,293	125	11,008,692	1,416

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Year.	Kings.		Queens.		Prince.		Totals.	
	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.	1 lb. in cans.	cwts. in shell.
1897.....	775,236	508,005	1,183,441	2,466,682
1898.....	642,944	546,776	39	1,150,300	35	2,340,020	74
1899.....	778,260	545,948	12	1,096,936	34	2,421,144	46
1900.....	716,448	499,804	75	1,007,460	60	2,223,712	135
1901.....	751,692	520,992	1,113,386	32	2,386,070	32
1902.....	754,368	484,944	90	800,291	134	2,039,603	224
1903.....	903,024	557,952	285	874,424	115	2,335,400	400
1904.....	1,024,656	606,234	1,500	870,210	33	2,501,100	1,533
1905.....	931,248	742,624	50	508,752	300	2,182,624	350
1906.....	914,496	482,064	350	892,728	90	2,289,288	440
1907.....	1,027,008	674,544	300	1,137,937	420	2,839,489	720
1908.....	1,120,416	647,568	510	1,330,460	20	3,098,444	530
Totals....	10,339,796	6,817,455	3,211	11,966,325	1,273	29,123,576	4,484

Lobster Canneries and Traps.
BAY OF FUNDY.

Year.	St. John.		Annapolis.		Kings.		Total.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897		10,900		7,925				18,825
1898		10,700		6,500				17,200
1899		13,200		3,550				16,750
1900		10,000	2	7,900			2	17,900
1901		10,000		4,525		947		15,472
1902		5,250		9,100		991		15,341
1903		5,090		7,800		1,064		13,954
1904		5,050		5,500		1,192		11,742
1905		119,650				1,252		20,902
1906		25,425		9,400		1,722		16,547
1907		34,905		11,755		1,875		18,535
1908		45,400		12,950		1,785		20,135
Totals		105,570	2	86,905		10,828	2	203,303

¹ 200 in Albert Co.

² 300 in Albert Co.

³ 300 in Albert Co.

⁴ 500 in Albert Co.

DIGBY AND CHARLOTTE.

Year.	Digby.		Charlotte.		Total.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897	4	24,700	7	24,192	11	48,892
1898	7	31,110	8	23,059	15	54,169
1899	11	28,885	7	17,702	18	46,587
1900	9	30,274	12	19,461	21	49,735
1901	8	35,111	7	20,620	15	55,731
1902	11	29,120	9	18,189	20	47,309
1903	10	34,376	5	17,179	15	51,555
1904	10	34,029	4	18,900	14	52,929
1905	11	35,470	4	6,476	15	41,946
1906	12	35,210	4	18,586	16	53,796
1907	15	34,105	4	19,746	19	53,851
1908	16	36,548	4	19,615	20	56,163
Totals	124	388,938	75	223,725	199	612,663

SOUTH WESTERN NOVA SCOTIA.

Year.	Lunenburg.		Queens.		Shelburne.		Yarmouth.		Total.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897	7	14,230	8	12,478	9	82,085	9	30,250	33	139,043
1898	7	14,850	10	12,767	11	101,620	9	30,250	37	159,487
1899	6	12,000	13	12,700	12	101,320	11	23,150	42	149,170
1900	7	13,200	11	11,080	24	108,210	17	32,500	59	164,990
1901	6	15,220	7	15,231	25	109,200	22	37,200	60	176,851
1902	6	15,295	9	17,085	23	112,500	20	38,035	58	182,915
1903	6	16,910	9	19,345	21	109,400	19	40,810	55	186,465
1904	6	20,220	9	18,900	21	113,450	14	40,848	50	193,418
1905	5	20,870	9	19,000	21	42,700	15	40,855	50	123,425
1906	6	15,030	9	15,800	19	52,600	12	44,930	46	128,360
1907	7	19,000	8	17,800	16	74,500	14	45,180	45	156,480
1908	7	18,650	6	22,600	15	93,000	14	47,000	42	181,250
Totals...	76	195,475	108	194,786	217	1,100,585	176	451,008	577	1,941,854

SOUTHEASTERN COAST NOVA SCOTIA AND CAPE BRETON.

Year.	Halifax.		Guysboro.		Richmond.		Total.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897	24	64,675	30	85,800	15	68,544	69	219,019
1898	22	64,210	34	118,100	15	40,670	71	222,980
1899	20	62,680	34	111,550	15	79,050	69	253,580
1900	22	89,650	32	125,575	20	51,980	74	267,205
1901	21	80,630	28	117,600	12	72,895	61	271,125
1902	20	76,625	27	97,800	10	41,080	57	215,505
1903	20	70,786	28	88,900	11	38,450	59	198,136
1904	20	77,783	29	85,160	11	39,900	60	202,843
1905	21	79,000	29	88,100	11	36,250	61	203,350
1906	19	74,050	38	70,700	11	46,050	68	190,800
1907	20	85,620	25	88,600	9	32,100	54	206,320
1908	20	91,140	27	102,100	11	40,715	58	233,955
Totals.....	249	916,849	361	1,180,285	151	587,684	761	2,684,818

LOBSTER FISHERY

EAST COAST CAPE BRETON.

YEAR.	CAPE BRETON.		VICTORIA.		TOTAL.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
	1897.....	16	42,400	20	26,215	36
1898.....	14	43,700	18	18,175	32	61,875
1899.....	15	61,199	17	13,699	32	74,898
1900.....	13	46,351	20	13,217	33	59,568
1901.....	18	38,270	17	13,983	35	52,253
1902.....	12	39,050	12	15,550	24	54,600
1903.....	14	31,588	18	14,553	32	46,141
1904.....	12	29,890	17	14,256	29	44,146
1905.....	11	39,200	18	14,064	29	53,264
1906.....	15	33,390	14	16,553	29	49,913
1907.....	12	32,365	11	13,886	23	46,251
1908.....	12	31,686	10	14,224	22	45,910
Totals.....	164	469,059	192	188,375	356	657,434

STRAIT EAST OF NOVA SCOTIA AND C. B.

YEAR.	CUMBERLAND.		COLCHESTER.		PICTOU.		ANTIGONISH.		INVERNESS.		TOTAL.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
	1897....	24	31,500	1	1,200	26	44,550	5	16,100	20	49,960	76
1898....	28	39,450	1	1,200	25	46,415	6	22,150	24	51,000	84	163,215
1899....	31	45,265	1	1,500	28	43,175	6	26,160	27	55,000	93	171,100
1900....	37	46,630	4	4,600	26	47,700	6	20,800	27	49,305	100	169,035
1901....	38	47,250	3	4,400	27	49,480	6	19,250	20	41,100	94	161,480
1902....	36	54,390	3	4,400	25	47,660	6	17,400	20	41,450	90	165,300
1903....	37	49,250	3	4,000	21	43,700	6	16,800	19	37,320	86	151,070
1904....	40	52,290	2	4,000	22	44,429	6	21,300	18	40,400	88	162,424
1905....	37	48,500	2	3,000	23	54,959	6	21,150	18	47,400	86	175,000
1906....	32	47,120	2	4,000	23	59,800	6	18,400	20	55,400	83	184,720
1907....	31	47,804	2	4,300	23	61,550	6	18,060	18	47,900	80	179,614
1908....	31	54,330	2	4,400	21	64,675	6	21,847	17	47,950	77	193,202
Totals..	402	563,784	26	41,000	290	608,093	71	239,417	248	567,185	1,037	2,019,479

MARINE AND FISHERIES

EAST COAST, NEW BRUNSWICK.

YEAR.	RESTIGOUCHE.		GLOUCESTER.		NORTHUMBERLAND.		KENT.		WESTMORELAND.		TOTAL.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Tr.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897....	1	2,260	59	76,860	9	12,200	55	48,400	70	46,100	194	185,820
1898....	2	3,260	60	80,700	12	13,000	56	55,000	61	58,000	191	209,960
1899....	2	3,500	64	82,300	13	14,000	58	48,500	72	61,800	209	210,100
1900....	2	4,100	67	85,300	16	15,300	55	52,700	85	60,000	225	217,400
1901....	2	4,200	67	89,400	14	14,500	57	54,900	74	58,000	214	221,000
1902....	2	4,200	64	91,400	14	14,700	35	37,000	74	59,000	189	206,300
1903....	2	4,680	61	94,000	13	15,000	40	38,000	78	66,500	194	218,180
1904....	3	5,100	63	101,000	13	15,000	44	43,500	79	68,000	202	232,600
1905....	3	6,650	65	105,000	12	15,000	46	41,500	68	75,000	194	243,150
1906....	3	5,650	67	101,800	12	16,500	45	39,000	66	79,200	193	242,150
1907....	2	5,100	69	113,500	12	17,000	39	34,700	58	95,000	180	255,300
1908....	2	6,600	70	111,500	11	18,500	41	54,500	59	95,700	183	286,800
Totals..	26	55,300	776	1,132,760	151	180,700	571	547,700	844	822,300	2,368	2,738,760

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

YEAR.	KINGS.		QUEENS.		PRINCE.		TOTAL.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897.....	50	75,880	63	49,800	107	90,453	220	216,133
1898.....	52	96,500	60	59,290	118	128,495	230	284,285
1899.....	55	90,680	67	67,000	118	125,434	240	283,114
1900.....	55	87,595	63	77,550	128	136,972	246	302,117
1901.....	54	95,310	62	72,500	109	113,070	225	280,880
1902.....	51	98,576	51	54,930	90	88,390	192	241,896
1903.....	53	101,775	51	57,680	86	93,740	190	253,195
1904.....	54	117,675	53	74,240	92	104,060	199	295,975
905.....	52	111,050	55	78,880	89	94,030	196	283,960
906.....	52	122,900	52	74,825	84	115,220	188	312,945
907.....	49	118,500	51	64,500	84	122,970	184	305,970
908.....	50	130,000	51	83,960	82	136,339	183	350,319
Totals.....	627	1,246,441	679	815,155	1,187	1,349,193	2,493	3,410,789

MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND QTEBEC.

Year.	MAGDALEN ISLANDS.		GASPÉ.		BONAVENTURE.		NORTH SHORE.		TOTAL.	
	Can-neries.	Traps.	Can-neries.	Traps.	Can-neries.	Traps.	Can-neries.	Traps.	Can-neries.	Traps.
1897.....	63	76,370	22	29,655	9	9,895	5	775	97	116,695
1898.....	88	99,385	29	35,230	9	14,395	28	13,460	154	162,470
1899.....	87	90,135	27	41,450	11	15,750	30	12,010	155	159,345
1900.....	100	85,065	26	26,350	13	16,600	20	6,970	159	134,985
1901.....	83	78,520	22	19,500	12	13,600	34	17,100	151	128,720
1902.....	43	56,500	14	7,950	12	11,170	24	16,450	93	92,070
1903.....	34	51,110	16	15,350	11	10,600	22	9,250	83	86,310
1904.....	45	58,200	15	15,500	11	11,600	20	7,620	91	92,920
1905.....	50	50,645	11	24,200	12	11,000	19	8,800	92	94,645
1906.....	38	61,650	13	7,500	15	13,720	12	6,765	78	89,635
1907.....	57	82,712	14	8,064	10	9,150	15	8,464	96	108,390
1908.....	48	74,230	13	16,160	11	13,050	18	6,449	90	109,889
Totals.....	736	864,522	222	246,909	136	150,530	247	114,113	1,341	1,376,074

RECAPITULATION.

Lobsters canned and in the shell.

YEAR.	Nova Scotia.		New Brunswick.		Prince Edward Island.		Quebec.		Total.	
	1 lb. cans.	cwt. in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwt. in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwt. in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwt. in shell.	1 lb. cans.	cwt. in shell.
1897.	5,214,266	229,682	2,413,404	22,055	2,466,682	94	1,036,202	11,130,554	251,831	
1898.	5,210,294	326,313	2,113,222	21,776	2,340,020	74	1,067,058	10,730,594	348,364	
1899.	4,837,402	134,462	2,177,106	19,965	2,421,144	46	1,059,658	10,496,310	154,598	
1900.	5,263,780	169,196	2,038,692	19,729	2,223,712	135	1,022,106	10,548,290	180,140	
1901.	5,003,023	146,488	1,842,340	17,605	2,386,070	32	825,171	10,056,604	164,195	
1902.	4,637,204	120,902	1,965,296	20,853	2,033,603	224	708,018	9,350,121	142,034	
1903.	5,153,712	88,586	2,136,672	17,545	2,335,400	400	978,454	10,604,218	106,639	
1904.	5,357,454	92,513	2,055,100	16,882	2,501,100	1,533	848,634	10,762,288	111,048	
1905.	4,917,148	134,871	2,249,440	18,520	2,182,624	1,350	1,148,412	10,497,624	153,924	
1906.	4,595,816	87,956	2,420,860	12,889	2,289,288	440	798,800	10,104,764	101,370	
1907.	4,270,326	84,279	2,731,012	12,401	2,839,489	720	819,723	10,660,550	97,490	
1908.	4,399,610	87,321	2,716,968	10,317	3,098,444	530	696,476	10,911,498	98,373	
	58,860,035	1,702,569	26,860,112	210,537	29,123,576	4,484	11,008,692	125,852,415	1,919,006	

148

RECAPITULATION.
Number of lobster canneries and traps.

Year.	Nova Scotia.		New Brunswick.		Prince Edward Island.		Quebec.		Total.	
	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.	Canneries.	Traps.
1897.	218	692,612	201	220,912	220	216,133	99	116,695	738	1,156,352
1898.	231	645,157	199	243,719	220	284,285	154	162,470	814	1,325,641
1899.	247	681,183	216	241,062	240	293,114	155	159,345	868	1,364,644
1900.	277	698,972	237	246,861	246	302,117	159	134,385	919	1,382,985
1901.	258	702,292	221	251,620	225	280,880	151	128,720	855	1,363,512
1902.	240	657,531	198	228,738	132	241,896	93	92,070	723	1,221,286
1903.	242	625,052	199	240,449	180	233,195	83	86,310	714	1,205,006
1904.	237	643,352	206	256,560	199	235,975	91	92,320	738	1,288,397
1905.	237	591,770	198	269,276	196	253,960	92	94,645	723	1,239,651
1906.	238	600,125	197	266,161	188	312,915	78	89,635	701	1,298,866
1907.	217	636,400	184	286,951	184	305,970	96	108,390	681	1,340,711
1908.	215	705,600	187	311,815	183	350,319	90	103,889	675	1,477,623
	2,857	7,790,256	2,443	3,068,055	2,493	3,410,789	1,341	1,376,074	9,184	15,645,174

An examination of the above statistics will reveal that though there have been material fluctuations in the quantity of gear operated and the lobsters packed from year to year in specific localities, and that there has been considerable reduction in the shipments of live lobsters, looking broadly over the whole lobster fishing areas, the fishery has been and continues to be a comparatively steady one.

The total value of the catch during 1908, it will be observed, aggregated \$4,200,279, as follows:—

	Cans.	In Shell.	Total.
Nova Scotia..	\$1,319,882	\$834,612	\$2,154,496
New Brunswick..	815,090	87,485	902,575
Prince Edward Island..	929,533	3,710	933,243
Quebec..	208,942	1,025	209,967

This places the lobster industry as that of second in importance in Canada, the first being salmon, the value of which, in 1908, was \$4,814,250, and the third cod, which, in 1908, was valued at \$3,361,409.

It will also be noticed that the bulk of the live lobster trade is conducted on the southwestern portion of Nova Scotia and in the Bay of Fundy, where, owing to the climatic conditions and the proximity and readiness of access to the large markets for this product in the United States, the conditions for the industry are peculiarly favourable.

PROBABLE CHANGE IN THE LOBSTER TRADE.

The writer confidently looks for a coming revolution in the live or lobster-in-the-shell trade. Hitherto it would appear that the epicurean demand has been, as it at present is, for a live lobster to be cooked for immediate consumption; the fact that it is alive immediately before being served apparently fills every requisite, and the article is prized beyond any other lobster diet that it is possible to produce.

Everywhere and in every connection has a marvellous development of cold storage taken place, which has done so much for the commercial world as well as the producer and the consumer in all branches of transportation and conservation of perishable articles of food, and it is not too much to say that it has created a new era in this respect, and is yet capable of enormous development and ramifications. This great aid is as capable of application to all branches of the fish traffic as it has been and is fast becoming to the agriculture, dairy and other products, in which it is so great a factor.

To this aid, then, it is looked to evolve a lobster trade which has hitherto been but fluctuating and unsatisfactory, due principally to the absence of proper cold storage transportation, as well as to the carelessness of those who have engaged in the business in a desultory manner, the net result being that the article reached the consumer at a high price, but in very poor and unattractive condition; hence the business has not developed.

The probable innovation to which the above remarks have reference is the practical replacing of the 'live' lobster by the 'boiled-in-the-shell' lobster, the development of which under the conditions above explained seems to be merely a question of time and effort on the part of the producer to educate the popular taste with a prime and wholesome article of food.

If the growing necessities and conditions are correctly assumed the time is fast approaching, if it has not already arrived, when the long established prejudice against cold storage in fish foods especially, will disappear with the many similar ones that have preceded it.

It does not appear to require any great argument to induce a choice between the two articles. It may be, and doubtless is, that in some short carriages live lobsters could reach their destination in prime and excellent condition, and being immediately

cooked would be as nearly perfect as possible. This result, however, can be attained only where all conditions are most favourable beginning at the capture and landing ashore, and followed during the transportation of minimum distance, to the marketing and preparation for the table. In all other instances, however, it must be apparent, that days must elapse before it is possible to place the lobsters upon the markets at their destination, the number of days being gauged by the distances and facilities of transportation, and live lobsters have been shipped to Chicago and to Denver, Colorado. The main object to be achieved is to have them reach the objective point showing some signs of life. This being accomplished the venture is supposed to have been successful. When comparatively long distances have to be covered it is physically impossible that the lobsters can reach their destination in anything like a condition to ensure a good article of food when cooked, and indeed it is doubtful if many of them would not be rejected for boiling at some of the canneries. Obviously these lobsters must be in a half starved, sick and dying condition and their flesh shrunken.

On the other hand the 'boiled-in-the-shell lobster' is cooked immediately upon landing when in the prime condition, with no chance to deteriorate. Supposing it then be carefully washed to remove the scum and any other impurities incidental to boiling, thoroughly dried, neatly wrapped in tissue or oiled paper, packed in compartment boxes, placed in cold storage and maintained chilled in a uniform temperature, it seems to go without saying that this would be the preferable article to introduce into the markets, as it must ultimately prove itself to the consumer.

In 1903-4 the writer was associated with some other gentlemen in making some inquiries in fishery matters on certain portions of the Bay of Fundy and Magdalen Islands and where distances made it impossible to engage in the live lobster trade, he advocated and suggested to the fishermen the method above explained, which he has since continued to do when discussing the lobster business with those interested.

Therefore with the development and growth of the application of cold storage, he is convinced that the establishment of a large and lucrative business in the direction above explained is within measurable distance, and it would be impossible at this juncture to predict the effect such an event may have upon the canning industry in view of the price which such an article would demand upon the markets, and as it would undoubtedly open to the Canadian producers the almost unsuppliable markets of Europe.