

Direct Assistance.—For the rest, the action of the government has been in the way of rendering direct assistance in specific cases of difficulty. The inadequacy of the bait supply in the Maritime provinces has been met by the establishment of bait freezers. Experimental reduction plants were operated for some years to encourage the capture of dog-fish. For several successive years, also, an expert was engaged to conduct a series of demonstrations in the Scottish method of curing herring, with a view to improving the Canadian cured product. A scheme for the bettering of the Canadian method of drying cod and haddock has also been authorized. A quarterly bulletin on the sea fisheries is issued for the benefit of the trade. Finally, a fleet of armed cruisers patrol the coastal and inland waters for the prevention of poaching and the enforcement of regulations. An intelligence bureau in connection with this service consists of nearly a hundred stations, from which the movements of fish, supply of bait, etc., are announced daily to the fishermen.

During the war it became desirable to increase as far as possible the consumption of fish, reserving the less perishable animal foods for export to our allies. The government therefore, undertook to provide for the rapid transit of sea fish on its railway lines to the markets of the inland provinces, and to stimulate by a publicity campaign the consumption of fish. Though much was accomplished in this direction, the annual per capita consumption of fish in Canada is now estimated by the Fisheries branch at not more than 20 pounds, a low figure considering Canada's position as a fish producing country. The branch has done much to improve the fast freight service for fish products from the Atlantic coast to Montreal and Toronto.

International Problems.—So rich a fishing area as the north Atlantic could not fail to attract other countries, and old customs became elevated into rights, some of which have lasted until the present. The French shore is a Newfoundland question, now a sentimental one entirely. Very different is the question of the rights of the United States, whose fishermen, in the colonial period, provided the chief food supply for New England and who were granted by the Treaty of Independence a specific right to a share of the Canadian inshore fisheries. Losing this privilege by the war of 1812, the United States, after 1818, surrendered all but their right to call at Canadian ports for shelter, wood or water. In the years 1854-1866, the Reciprocity Treaty restored to Americans the right to use Canadian ports on the same terms as native fishermen. In 1871 again, the Treaty of Washington abolished the American duty on Canadian salt-water fish as an equivalent for the free access of American vessels to Canadian fishing grounds, adding, under the Halifax arbitration award of November 23, 1877, a payment of \$4,500,000 by the United States to Canada. In 1885, however, the United States terminated the fisheries article of this Treaty, and a period of acute disagreement between the countries followed. A settlement was negotiated in 1888 but was rejected by the United States senate. Later a *modus vivendi* was agreed upon, which, having been subsequently renewed from time to time, still constitutes the fisheries arrangement between the countries. It permits American fishing vessels, on payment of an annual license fee of \$1.00 per ton, to fish around the Magdalen islands and on the north shore of the gulf of St. Lawrence from Point Joli eastward, to enter all bays and harbours on the Canadian coast, to purchase bait supplies or outfit, to transfer catches and to ship crews. They are forbidden, however, to fish or prepare to fish in territorial waters.

On the Great Lakes, also, the more important fishery problems, such as restocking and marketing, are necessarily international in character, and are complicated