

nothing about fisheries; he has never opened his mouth in the house in regard to that industry. Why, then, should he interrupt me?

Mr. BRADETTE: I am interrupting the hon. member because he is decrying his own province.

Mr. GAGNON: The figures have been chosen for the year 1919-20 because it was in that year that the judgment of the privy council was rendered giving exclusive jurisdiction to the federal government over the fisheries in the maritimes and Quebec. Our fishermen in 1919-20 were thus at the foot of the list with an average income per season of \$398. The insufficiency of this income clearly explains their demoralization and their tendency to emigrate. It would appear that the courage and patriotic spirit displayed by the late Hon. Mr. Perron, Liberal Minister of Agriculture in Quebec, on the subject of agriculture, was needed to secure the admission of this cruel truth concerning our fisheries and to proclaim it loudly in official circles in order to arouse our administrators.

Such were the circumstances under which the provincial government, in 1922, negotiated the administration of the whole of our fisheries, the federal government consenting, without opposition, to surrender them to the province, and this was done at the expense of the provincial treasury and the sacrifice of our reputation. If not one of the objectives at least the consequence of this transaction, cleverly engineered by certain high federal officials and escaping the penetration of our provincial ambassador, was to get rid of the province of Quebec, in order to keep all fishery subsidies for the other provinces, particularly for the maritimes, which are the competitors of our fishermen even in our domestic market.

Mr. BRADETTE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has reflected on my own province. There is a rule that no hon. member may read his speech and that rule should be followed.

Mr. GAGNON: The hon. member is inconsistent, because at the beginning of the session he made about two or three speeches in the house and he has not been able to deliver one without reading it.

Mr. BRADETTE: I never read my speeches and I want the hon. member to withdraw those words, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member for Dorchester must accept the denial of the hon. member for North Timiskaming.

[Mr. Gagnon.]

That is the well-known rule. So far as the reading of speeches is concerned, any hon. member has the right to consult his notes, but the rule is that no member may read his speech.

Mr. GAGNON: I gladly bow to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and if the hon. member for North Timiskaming says that he never reads his speeches I am obliged to tell my eyes that they have not seen what they have seen and I must accept his denial. I was simply quoting some notes from a memorandum which has been given to me by one of our fishery experts in the province of Quebec.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is quite entitled to quote from his authority. While no member is allowed to read his speech, every member is entitled to consult his notes and to quote from memoranda.

Mr. GAGNON: In order to close the controversy, Mr. Chairman, I shall try to raise my eyes a little higher so as not to offend my hon. friend from North Timiskaming, who does not like to see a sheet of paper in the hands of an hon. member.

The agreement which was entered into in 1922 between the federal government and the provincial government whereby the federal government transferred to the provincial authority the administration of the maritime fisheries of the province of Quebec has been most detrimental to the interests of fishermen and to the fisheries in general, as was admitted in this house three weeks ago by the hon. member for Charlevoix-Saguenay. He then stated that it was a mistake on the part of the federal government to transfer these fisheries to the province of Quebec. The hon. member for Antigonish-Guysborough, who is also an expert in fisheries, admitted the same thing, and said that it would be more in the interests of the fisheries if that agreement should be cancelled. As I stated in the house during the debate on the motion of my hon. friend from Charlevoix-Saguenay, this agreement, which was not approved by parliament and was effectuated only by a mere order in council, is absolutely illegal and ultra vires because by the British North America Act the maritime fisheries are vested solely within the jurisdiction of the federal government.

In 1921, a few weeks before that agreement was made and after the judgment of the privy council was rendered giving complete jurisdiction to the federal government over all maritime fisheries in the province of Quebec, the federal government inaugurated a long series of reforms and especially it proposed the