

[The section was adopted, and the Secretary read the next section¹]

Mr. Job There are two more appendices, one is the extracts from Mr. MacKay's book,² we thought it would be a good thing to put the extracts before the Convention. Appendix L³ is a summary taken from the Post-War Planning Committee's report. I think we might take that as read. Appendix M⁴ is a rather interesting document prepared by the Natural Resources Department in reply to a request for information as to the amount expended in connection with the fisheries since 1934. Delegates can refer to it at any time and we can also take that as read, if that is agreeable.

Mr. Smallwood What is the position now with regard to remarks of a general character on the report as a whole?

Mr. Chairman You have an opportunity to do that on the motion to adopt the report as a whole.

Mr. Spencer Page 64 of the report: "(m) Bounty for Repairing...." I understood an arrangement was made some years ago about that. I wonder if the Committee could tell us, is that practice now discontinued?

Mr. Job I think we shall ask Mr. Ashbourne if he could tell us that.

Mr. Ashbourne It had been the practice of the government to pay a bounty for repairing vessels. It was discontinued. I am afraid I cannot read the minds of the Commission of Government as to why this should be discontinued. I do remember one enquiry was made as to whether a bounty was payable or not, and it was remarked that the bounty was not payable at the time. Coupled with that was some remark about the matter of inspection, as to whether or not it might not be abused. That depends entirely upon the inspector himself, and I see no reason why, if the system could be abused by some who wanted to affect sham repairs, the person who wanted to effect any repairs should suffer. I am in accord with the

suggestion and I believe there are vessels along the coast that could be repaired. It has been done in the past. With the exception of that excuse I do not know of any other reason why the matter was dropped.

While I am on my feet I would like to reply to a question asked by Mr. Hollett as to the quantity of Merchantable fish shipped out of this country last year, and if any of it was classed as such. I went to the Fisheries Board this morning and I give you the official figures:*

There is no report at the Fisheries Board of the amount of Merchantable fish exported from Lamaline.

Mr. Hollett A few years ago Lamaline was the exporting center, now it goes direct from Grand Bank.

Mr. Harrington The Committee gives the approximate number of men prosecuting the salt codfishery. I wonder if the Committee could give the number engaged in fresh fishery?

Mr. Job Those numbers there partly fished for fresh fish and partly engaged in salt fishery. These numbers refer to the entire fishery.

Mr. McCarthy Page 2 of Appendix I:Does that mean that if a local vessel left St. John's to go to Halifax, she could not land freight along the coast?

Mr. Job Yes, that is the meaning. What is happening is this — take a vessel loading at Port Union bound for Placentia Bay. She clears from Port Union and is permitted to carry cargo from Port Union to Placentia Bay. If it is any other vessel clearing for a foreign port, she is not permitted to carry cargo between ports.

Mr. McCarthy Were any enquiries made as to the reason?

Mr. Job There was no satisfactory reason given. The only reply was that it was the custom in Canada.

Mr. Hickman I think it was originally instituted to prevent foreign vessels or time-chartered ships

*	Merchantable	
1943	22,019 qtls.	4.27% of the total exports of graded fish
1944	8,165 "	1.78% " " " " " "
1945	11,528 "	1.98% " " " " " "

¹Volume II:243.

²Volume II:246.

³Volume II:246.

⁴Volume II:249.