

refused information regarding the disposition of some timber areas on Labrador. We have been told that the government was not going to give that information. I am taking this opportunity of telling the Information Committee. I would like to back up what Mr. Bradley has said — we are here to find out facts as to the assets of the country

and those very assets may be given away.

Mr. Bradley It would be better if we had it in writing.

Mr. Cashin I shall put it in writing after adjournment.

[The Convention adjourned]

October 11, 1946

Mr. Chairman At the request of the Fisheries Committee, Mr. Keough has been added to that committee.

Interim Report of the Fisheries Committee:¹ Committee of the Whole

[The Secretary read pages 1 and 2 of the report]

Mr. Chairman That might be termed the first section of the report, gentlemen. Any member wishing to debate on the report may now speak. If you do not desire to discuss that section of the report, gentlemen.

Mr. Miller I acknowledge there is a fish plant in Long Harbour, Placentia Bay. I wonder if the government inspected that too, as it is not mentioned here.

Mr. Job The bait depots are not included.

Mr. Hollett With regard to the amount of capital invested, did the committee arrive at the amount invested by the government or did they not?

Mr. Job I don't know of any money invested by the government. That has certainly not been taken into account. There may be in one or two places advances made by the government which have been paid or partly repaid, but they have not been taken into account. These figures are rough I must confess, but they are the nearest we can get.

Mr. Hollett I saw in the estimates where a certain amount of money had been subsidised by the government for advances to possible corporations. I understood also that a certain amount had been put out, and it might be suggested that the committee arrive at the true situation.

Mr. Chairman The committee will make inquiries into that point, Mr. Hollett.

Mr. Newell Mr. Chairman, in the fourth paragraph the wording is a little ambiguous. It reads: "The frozen blueberry industry was also a very substantial business and of very definite value to the country owing to the fact that the cost of picking was very little" As it reads it might

seem as if the value was of small return to the pickers, but I am sure that is not the thought of the Fishery Committee, or is it?

Mr. Job I think that the idea was that the cost of the picking was small comparatively, and it was a very worthwhile return to the pickers. I think it was because the price paid to the pickers was small in past years.

Mr. Hollett There is another question about bait sold to fishermen. The report states that "The bait frozen (squid and herring) was substantial, but nothing like the present-day volume because the fishermen were not generally so accustomed to using the frozen bait as they are now." I don't believe that, because years ago the only reason why fishermen did not use frozen bait very generally was because of the cost, which was almost prohibitive in view of the amount of money they received for the fish caught. I was wondering if the committee would be good enough to look into the present cost of bait as supplied to first, our shore fishermen, and second, our bank fishermen. It is absolutely essential if our fishermen are to use frozen bait that some means be found to supply that bait at the least possible cost. The committee might be able to get some figures with regard to that.... It is several years since I had anything to do with fishery conditions, but in those old days there were a good many cases of the fall fishing being given up merely because for that fishery it became necessary for the banking fleet to procure frozen bait, and after trying it for a number of years they discovered that the returns which the individual fisherman made on that trip were absolutely nil when they took into consideration the cost of

¹Volume II:211.