

Iceland is expanding, so is Sweden. Norway is seeking maximum expansion. Great Britain will be back to pre-war strength within a year. Other countries are building new and improved vessels, including factory ships. The action of the fishery industry in shaking off traditional modes has brought about greater concentration. Private companies have joined large co-operatives; have federated and expanded; fisheries unions have developed and become a permanent part of the industry. It means we have to get on our toes or Newfoundland is going to be left far behind in the march of progress. She cannot afford to be left far behind with over half the economy of the whole country. What can we do about it? This Convention, nothing. What can the country do? It seems to me we have to reduce the cost of production in the fisheries and in other things as well. Like Mr. Job, I never lose the chance to stress that.... The fisheries are burdened with costs that they do not have in other countries. If we are to compete we must bring down the cost of production. Second, scientific research; and third, new methods of production and of processing. I would say the fishery has to get off in new directions — herring, oils, meals, fertilisers, canning — I have great faith in canning. The Committee tells us that Senator MacLean appeared before them — he is one of the biggest fish men in Canada — and one of the members asked him, "Why is it you are not bothering the United States?" "I never even think of them, we are shipping to 100 different countries," he said. That is canned fish. His plant is costing \$250,000. We have enough to put up five like that and not miss it. If Senator MacLean can have 11 or 12 in Canada, why not 10 or 12 modern efficient plants in Newfoundland? We have to do it.

In connection with new methods, it is only fair to say a word of praise of the Hon. Mr. Job who is one of its pioneers in the fish trade of the country. Every now and then his firm comes up with something of a pioneering experiment, and they are still at it. Then Mr. Crosbie in whose energy, in whose ability, courage and daring in the fish trade, I have the utmost respect, as I expect everyone else has.... Also Mr. Monroe, Mr. Hazen Russell and the Harveys, who have broken new trails, started new products. But it is not vast enough; it has to be done under tremendous pressure if the fisheries are going to provide

a living for our people.

Fourth is the question of a new tariff. I understand that there is a feeling among some that capital should not be brought in for our fisheries; that if we cannot produce the capital, we should do without it; any new development in the fish industry we cannot get with our own capital, we should not get it. This country has been running 250 years. The amount of capital we have accumulated is woefully below the amount we need. It is nothing to be ashamed of. The United States itself was built up with capital brought in from Great Britain. Canada was built up with capital brought in from Great Britain and the United States; New Zealand and South Africa, the big countries loaned it out, they became developed and loaned it to other countries. I am not an economist or a statistician, but I see the fisheries have to have new capital by thousands or millions. Why not become a greater country than Iceland with its 120,000 population? We have 318,000 population. Why not become one of the most modern? If we have not got the capital in Newfoundland, let us go after it and bring it in.

Fifthly, we can put tremendous emphasis on organisation. The Fisheries Board deserves a lot of credit. Let us bear one thought for William Coaker and for Mr. Justice Dunfield who was a director of Job Brothers in 1919. They were pioneers; they were too early to have the idea of organisation. The Fish Exporters Group was born in 1919 and it has flowered and blossomed. Give them credit, but do not forget the men who preceded them.

Sixth, the co-operative movement. That I regard as fundamentally one of the most important developments that has taken place in the fisheries, and especially in regard to the cost of production. One way to reduce cost is by co-operation.

Seven, a separate department of fisheries. I would not have fisheries linked up with land, forests, etc., I would have a completely separate department of fisheries. At least one of the departments of the government can specialise in one department of fish.

I am not going over the estimate of \$25 million. Whatever differences of opinion we may have at least we can agree on this. When it gets down to estimating the value of this country, it would be very poor criticism if I tried to paint the