

a tin while in the United States he is charged only 21 cents for the same variety. No wonder I have suggested that the price spreads commission should have considered this matter. No wonder I say that commission should have gone to British Columbia and investigated what is really happening out there.

Endeavouring to eliminate any observations I made in a previous speech, I shall proceed to state as briefly as possible the meaning of the measure before us. This appeal of mine is on the principle of the greatest good to the greatest number. Surely in these days, when we are wondering what we will do with modern machinery, when we are wondering what we will do with our idle men, when we have a bill which will save an industry and would bring about a condition whereby twice or three times as many men would be employed—surely under these circumstances it is very strange to have it fall on deaf ears. The fame of Fraser river fishing has been built up during the past fifty years by individual gill netting. We see now that vested interests are making a demand to be allowed to go into the estuary of the Fraser river and to scoop out the fish by the thousands. If this is permitted not only will 2,000 men be driven off, and deprived of their livelihood but the great fishing industry of the Fraser river will be destroyed. I claim it is a serious matter, and that is why I make my appeal to the house. I am appealing to hon. members to allow this measure to go to the committee, or to send it back, so as to have witnesses from the coast. Ah, yes; witnesses from the fishermen would not be allowed to come here, but we find that the vested interests can always afford to send their representatives to speak to the deputy, and to state what they want. We know that in the last few days one of them has been very busy wiring back to the Pacific coast, and saying: "For heaven's sake, appeal to the members of parliament to kill Reid's bill." Is it any wonder I raise my voice on behalf of the fishermen? Surely they need some one to plead their case. I make a final appeal to this chamber to at least send this matter back to the committee; let the witnesses and all records be brought forward so that the statements made by the department will be more fully gone into.

Mr. A. E. MUNN (Vancouver North): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the bill in detail, because the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) has covered the ground thoroughly. First may I compliment the hon. member upon his gallant fight for the fishermen. I know that he has no personal gain in mind, he is simply fighting for

the individual and against the vested interests. He is thoroughly familiar with the situation in his constituency, and undoubtedly knows more about conditions at that point than I do.

I happened to be a member of the committee, and as such I was greatly disappointed to note that the committee chose to reject the bill. It is only in recent years that conditions in the territory in question have been different. I say the hon. member is not asking for too much, and I would voice my plea to have the matter returned to the committee. Let us in some way obtain evidence from the men affected, because we know there are thousands of them. I would plead with hon. members to take a fair minded view and, if necessary, to forget politics. I think we should endeavour to help a man who needs assistance and hon. members should consent to the request of the hon. member for New Westminster that this bill be sent back to the committee.

Mr. W. G. ERNST (Queens-Lunenburg): Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the committee which considered this bill I feel I ought to say a word or two by way of explanation. This bill seeks to eliminate purse seining in the waters not of the mouth of the Fraser river but adjacent to the mouth. The bill was referred to the standing committee on fisheries early in the session. A statement has been made, particularly by the last speaker (Mr. Munn), which would intimate to hon. members that fair consideration was not given to the bill by the committee. The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Reid) appeared before the committee with charts and maps to explain his bill and was as well posted with respect to it as he has been to-night. The deputy minister of fisheries then explained the attitude of the department and the reason which prompted them to allow purse seining. The statement of the deputy minister was subsequently put into writing and circulated to every member of the committee. It was sent to the Pacific coast and every interest affected was given an opportunity to make a reply. The fishermen's union made a reply through the hon. member for New Westminster, largely in the terms in which he has addressed the house to-night. With the exception of the particular fishermen's union represented by the hon. member, all the replies were opposed to the bill. The hon. member again appeared before the committee to answer as best he could the arguments of the deputy minister. After fair consideration, quite apart from politics, a vote was taken