

mittee, it is not my intention to keep you long. Referring to the Commission of Government getting the credit for the increase in price of fish, that may be all right; but this has been made possible by an export fee. Who pays that fee? Does it not come from the fishermen, to be given the Fishery Board or the Commission of Government to go to market and negotiate the price for fish? Taxes have been collected from fishermen by way of protection for the trade exporters. The fisherman has not been taken care of; Mr. Brown for a number of years was trying to get the fishermen and the exporters together. Last year there was a common understanding that a certain price would be paid; there was no agreement really made. I understand the fishermen on the average received about \$13.50 a quintal. I am not at all satisfied with the price the fisherman has been getting. There is too big a gap between fisherman and exporter and that gap shall have to be bridged. If something is not done, in view of what we have seen happen a year ago, we may find the exporter becoming a millionaire too soon and the fisherman becoming a beggar too quick.

Mr. Fowler It is a fact that during the war 50 cents was taken from all the fish exported from this country; that was for the price of salt. Take a hogshead of salt for every ten quintals of fish; the salt costs the fisherman \$11 a hogshead, is that a fact?

Mr. Job I do not know.

Mr. Fowler I contend ten quintals to a hogshead is a conservative figure. The section of the report dealing with the salt codfish industry is, in my opinion, the most important section of the whole report, from the point of view of the number of men employed, which the report shows to be about 25,000.

Coming as I do from a district interested in practically every branch of the salt codfish industry, I feel that there is not enough of the kind of information that the people are expecting from this report. There is an array of statistics, but these are published frequently in government bulletins and in the press and therefore cannot come as a surprise to many. Now, we have a Fisheries Board, an institution of recent years, but the most the Committee says about it is that there is a Fisheries Board and that, in their opinion, it is doing a good job. They do not tell us how they arrive at that conclusion. I would like to know the

number of personnel of that Board, what it is costing, and who is bearing the burden of cost. Are we getting adequate returns for the money spent, and how? I would like to see set forth the ways the Board has helped, and plans to help, the fisherman, merchant and exporter. I understand the Fisheries Board is costing around \$250,000 annually and an expenditure of this magnitude warrants more comment and explanation than is given here. I contend we should be supplied with copies of the Salt Codfish Act in order to get some information on the working of the most important of our industries.

With regard to the question of rebates on salt, as far as I understand it the rebate on salt applies to the man who has salt left over. If a man has 50 hogsheads of salt left over he gets a rebate of 35 cents a hogshead and the man who uses his salt gets no rebate. If the Fisheries Board had not entered the picture, what would the landed cost of salt be? Would it be \$11 or \$12?

Mr. Job I think it would be much higher.

Mr. Fowler Have we any expert advice on that? What do you say about it, Mr. Crosbie?

Mr. Crosbie I do not know very much about it. [*Mr. Fowler read an article by R. Gushue in The Atlantic Guardian*]

Mr. Harrington While we are on this salt codfish business, I have been under the impression for years that there were branches of foreign concerns here, which get a percentage of some sort on fish going out of the country. Who bears the brunt of that?

Mr. Job I do not know what you are referring to.

Mr. Cashin I have heard a lot of good things said about the Fisheries Board. In this report we should have outlined how it was set up. I believe it was set up under legislation which gave it power to control the export of fish. It is costing the country \$225,000 a year; it employs 85 people; they have trade representatives abroad; I presume that these trade representatives sell the fish and that there are no brokers employed anymore and these trade representatives in the various capitals of Europe — such as Portugal, Spain and Greece — sell the fish; or are the London brokers we used to have still in business and get commission on the sale of fish? If this Fisheries Board are such wonderful people (and I do not know anything against them), if they sell