

other words they did not lose one single pound for bad quality. The fishermen looked after it all the way through. We did not need fishery inspectors — we had 250 inspectors and these were the fishermen themselves. But last year, 1946, they ran into their first snag — 16% of the total product was affected by spoilage, which does make some difference in the figures. The first four years were maximum figures; last year was a doubtful year.

Mr. Burry In rising to comment on this section of the report, it does not mean I was not impressed by the rest of it. I note that the Committee has recognised that our basic problem is our people scattered around our great coastline. They have made a very good attempt to solve some of the difficulties of this problem. It has been suggested by other members that there is a gap — and we

all recognise it and are sensitive to it — between the primary producer and the exporter and the trade. The Committee has recognised this and have made some very good suggestions to solve the problem. That seems to be one of their aims. They made suggestions for the modernisation of our fisheries and I support this section of the Committee's report because this is also one of their suggestions — one way in which we can span the gap. I am pleased because it came from the Fisheries Committee with representatives on it of various sections of our country, and undoubtedly the trade and exporters have played such a part in presenting this report, it is hopeful for the future....

[The committee rose and reported progress, and the Convention adjourned]

March 28, 1947

Report of the Fisheries Committee:¹ Committee of the Whole

Mr. Chairman The committee is now considering that section headed "The Co-operative Movement".²

Mr. Fowler Mr. Chairman, I suppose I was partly responsible for this section not passing yesterday afternoon. There are, a couple of observations I would like to make now, however, relative to the co-operative movement. When Mr. Newell was speaking yesterday he stated that there was no money put into the co-operative movement by the government. Mr. Keough however did inform us that the government did have money in several of the co-operative movements, especially land settlements. Then a question from Mr. Hollett elicited an answer from Mr. Newell, that the government had advanced them \$50,000 annually for salaries and travelling expenses. I contend that any committee bringing in a report on any department or institution in which government monies are involved should show what that department is costing and is likely to cost in the future. I feel that in order to arrive at the cost of government these are the facts we must have. They are more important than the price of some fishery products ten years ago.

Mr. McCarthy Mr. Fowler seems to want to

know how much is involved so far as the government is concerned. I might say that the land settlements (at the present time there are two or three) were started with money supplied by the government, and when they were wound up there was a certain amount of stock, buildings, etc. left over, and an inventory was taken, and in the case of Lourdes it amounted to \$8,000. Some people think that \$8,000 was passed over as a gift but that is not correct. We have not yet paid off the full amount, but we have it down to about \$2,000 and will pay it off practically at any time. It is not a matter of the government losing any money. This same situation applies to Midland and Point au Mal.

Mr. Hollett What Mr. Fowler really wants to know is why the people should be taxed to the extent of \$50,000 a year to maintain or sustain some particular ideology which some people wish to bring forward. I think that's your point is it not, Mr. Fowler?

Mr. Fowler Yes, sir.

Mr. Hollett I would like to know that too. I wonder if Mr. Job can tell us?

Mr. Job I can't answer it, but I asked Mr. Newell the other day and I believe it has been more

¹Volume II:181.

²Volume II:202.