

manner in which it is being carried on. I think the idea that the department should expect people to carry on with those investigators unpaid is rather unreasonable. It is hardly to be expected that men will give the necessary time for these long investigations without compensation. I suggest this to the minister for his consideration. I do think, however, that we have voted enough money for this department this year, and that the minister should not ask the committee to approve \$10,000 more by way of supplementaries.

Item agreed to.

Fisheries branch — contingencies — further amount required, \$3,000.

Mr. McRAE: Before we leave these estimates, I notice that \$160,000 is provided for fishing bounties. Is this bounty, which is paid under statute, confined entirely to the Atlantic coast?

Mr. CARDIN: It is by statute, and is confined to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. McRAE: I have only this to say. We have fishermen who need help out on the Pacific coast. I have no objection at all to voting \$160,000 for the Atlantic coast fishermen, but I think we should consider when the proper time comes giving equal help to our fishermen on the Pacific coast.

Mr. VENIOT: This is not given for help to the Atlantic fishermen, but as their right under a treaty with the United States.

Mr. NEILL: I protest against the remarks of the last speaker. We discussed this matter last year. This is a case where my hon. friend from Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) was very indignant because I suggested that he give up the graft which the Atlantic fishermen have been enjoying for the past twenty-six years. This money is voted by statute for the improvement of the deep sea fisheries. That is what the statute says and nothing else, but the money has been deliberately diverted from the purpose of encouraging deep sea fishing throughout Canada into a means of giving—I will not call it graft—but a little hand-out to a few fishermen on the Atlantic coast—\$1.45 to one fisherman, 89 cents to another, and they call that encouraging deep sea fishing. The money is being entirely wasted from the point of view of the purpose for which it was granted, if it was granted for the encouragement of deep sea fishing. Secondly, the money is being deliberately diverted from the British Columbia coast, where we are just as much entitled to the bounty as the people on the Atlantic coast. My friends

from New Brunswick will no doubt get up and say, as they did last year, that it has always been so. That was the biggest argument that they could advance, but when did anti-quity lend countenance to a wrong? If it has been a wrong, the sooner we stop it the better. The fact that it has been done for a number of years does not establish more than that beautiful thing called a precedent. They claim that this bounty was granted on account of some concession given to the Americans in return for which the Americans agreed to pay a sum of money, two or three million dollars, and this \$160,000 is the interest on that sum. But that money was not ear-marked for the Atlantic fishermen. It was put into the treasury of the country, into the consolidated fund. You can read the act under which this money is voted from beginning to end and backwards again and you will not find anything in it which says that the money is to be devoted entirely to the fishermen of one province. I suggest that we stop paying this bounty, a little dab here to this fisherman who goes out in a boat, and a little dab there to that fisherman. That does not encourage deep sea fishing. Is a man going to be encouraged to engage in deep sea fishing by giving him \$1.35 a year? The thing is ridiculous. This money should be used for some advantageous purpose, such as the development of biological work. I could quote plenty of cases where it could be used to advantage on the British Columbia coast.

Mr. VENIOT: Take it all to the Pacific coast and give us nothing.

Mr. NEILL: I would suggest that you give it all to the Pacific coast for the next few years to make up for the thirty years during which you have been swiping our share of it from British Columbia. I will not go into details, but there are lots of opportunities on the Pacific coast where money could be well spent in the development of the deep sea fisheries. I protest against this bounty for these two reasons: The money is being utterly wasted, and secondly, British Columbia is as much entitled by law to receive a share of this money as the Atlantic fishermen. I do not want my friends to get up and talk about precedents. What the statute says is what counts. The statute must be read by itself, and it says that the money is for the purpose of encouraging the deep sea fisheries of Canada. If there were any other intentions, they do not appear in the statute.

Item agreed to.