

ment. We cannot afford it.

I note the small amount the government has spent or is going to spend on research. It is a great pity. The fisheries have been and will continue to be the mainstay — surely we should invest a little money in that vital aspect of it. I have not much to say about co-operation. I think it is a worthwhile movement and is contributing a great deal to a better economic setup and outlook and I wish it all success. Another last point, the matter of insurance for fishermen, some sort of guarantee or safeguard for families. I think it is a terrible state of affairs in 1947 that the primary producers are in such a precarious position. I would like to go on record as being in accord with any scheme which can be formulated to assist fishermen and their dependents.

**Mercantile marine** — I agree with Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Bailey. It is basic and the people wish a return of some shape or form of our old mercantile marine. We had a tremendous fleet in the old days. Sometimes Newfoundlanders went off on a barque or brigantine to the ends of the earth....

**Mr. Smallwood** Mr. Harrington has reminded me of a point I forgot to raise. I was asked to raise it by persons engaged in the fresh fish trade. There are in St. John's something like 1,000 shops, maybe more. Quite a few of them are beginning ... to sell fresh fish.... The point is this: in Canada and the United States, and I imagine in Great Britain, shops selling fresh fish are required by law to have the proper cold storage facilities.... I am wondering if there are any regulations on it. Is anything being done to protect the quality of fish after it leaves cold storage?

**Mr. Job** Until quite recently all or most of it was sold to one or two fish shops. Recently they are selling more to grocery stores, but they deliver only a small quantity each time. It is all wrapped. They have no cold storage facilities in those shops.

**Mr. Hollett** I rise again to congratulate the Committee on the excellence of the report. I can quite see what a tremendous amount of work was put in on it. In doing that I am reminded of the remark Mr. Harrington made when he said there was a controversy about a road. There was no controversy whatsoever. A remark was made that the word "vital" be taken from the record. That

was all there was to it. This Convention has gone on record as believing that the building of the road at a cost of \$1.25 - \$2 million was not of vital concern as far as the fisheries is concerned. But Mr. Reddy from Burin has chosen to take the matter up again. I still maintain that the Convention was right when they adopted that. It is an accomplished fact. The government has decided they are going to put the road through. It was most unfortunate that the name of the man who has established a plant there should have been introduced. I am sure that gentleman would be the last to think there was a move on his part to get the road through. I do not think that even that gentleman thinks that because he wants to extend his plant in Burin, the government should extend the road.

**Mr. Job** I would like to thank Mr. Hollett and others. I hope you will all bear in mind that Mr. Keough has been largely responsible and that he has worked very hard. As regards Mr. Hollett's objection to the use of a certain gentleman's name, that gentleman is on record before our Committee as advocating that road....

**Mr. Newell** I do not want to be like the speaker who said he did not want to delay the House and then got up and made a second speech. There are two questions — what are the fisheries worth to the country, and what are they worth to the people? Can they provide a decent living for the people engaged in it? I think the first has been covered by the Committee. I am not going into that \$25.25 or \$24.75 millions. We take that with the knowledge there is an element of guesswork in any such estimate, and the Committee has done a good job in making that estimate. I also feel we have the right idea in being enthusiastic about branching out into newer forms of fishery.

With regard to the second question — how much will the fisheries be worth to the people engaged in it? That depends to a greater extent upon ourselves. I would like to say that even at high prices, even when conditions are at their best, in many parts of this country the fisheries have not been providing a decent standard of living for the people engaged in them. There are several reasons for this. The high cost of credit that was stressed here. There are methods of handling and the attitude many people have towards the articles which they themselves produce. Five years ago the situation came up in