

the marketing of their product. A special board could not improve on present methods of marketing; indeed it would tend to raise various difficulties and undermine the independent spirit of our noble fishermen.

What the Maritime Provinces need is the restoration of the open market of the United States. This market was closed in 1921 by the Fordney Tariff Bill, after the persistent refusal of the Canadian people to accept reciprocity. Since the advent of the "God-elected Roosevelt," as he has been called by the highest authorities of his country, a change of mind has been noticeable on both sides of the international boundary. The Right Hon. Mr. Bennett has told our people that he is working to bring about a reciprocity treaty with the United States. President Roosevelt has declared that he is eager to improve commercial relations with all countries. I wish our Prime Minister success. If he is able to bring about better trade relations with our neighbours to the south he will receive heartiest congratulations from the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. Certainly they do not desire to have their business controlled by a local board.

I now move, seconded by the honourable senator from Queen's (Hon. Mr. Sinclair):

That the said Bill be amended by inserting in line 21 of section 2, after the word "river," the following words: "except the products of the sea of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island."

Hon. Mr. McCORMICK: What body of fishermen made the representations to the honourable gentleman on which he bases his amendment?

Hon. Mr. TURGEON: The fishermen of Gloucester and the neighbouring counties.

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Honourable senators, my first comment on the amendment is this. I do not think you can define the sea of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island. We know what constitute our territorial waters within the three-mile limit, but there is no limit to the sea coast of a province. What is the sea of New Brunswick as distinguished from the sea of Quebec? I do not think there is a line of demarcation. We speak of the sea of a country, not of a province. But that is more or less technical, though it is important.

The honourable gentleman supports his amendment by a brief on the merits and good citizenship of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. I quite concede it would be a terrible thing to take from them any rights that they lawfully exercise. But, if the honourable gentleman will reflect, I think he will

Hon. Mr. TURGEON.

agree that the apple growers of the Annapolis Valley are also good citizens. They have used their natural resources for the benefit of their province and the Dominion as a whole. They have developed a great industry and have shown themselves to be a very important section of our community.

The honourable gentleman apparently has some idea that this is a visitation of legislative providence on offenders; that it is in the nature of penal legislation. This legislation is intended not to injure anybody, but to offer help to those engaged in the production and marketing of natural products, and to offer it on the basis of their expressed desire.

The honourable senator from Provencher (Hon. Mr. Molloy) moved an amendment excepting grain. Perhaps that has set in train a number of other ideas. As he said, we already have an Act which takes care of the marketing of grain, an Act built up on forty years of experience, and amended from year to year for four decades—one of the most completely developed pieces of legislation on the Statute Book. Why, then, give the Government the right virtually to repeal that law and bring the grain trade under some other law? There is no such special legislation having to do with marketing of fish.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the Grain Act give the Grain Commission power to sell?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh, no. It provides the machinery, the system of grading and marketing, and the channels of sale.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR: But the Grain Commission do not buy nor sell?

Right Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No. There was at least that ground for the motion of the honourable member from Provencher (Hon. Mr. Molloy); but I do not see any similar ground in relation to fish. It is hardly conceivable that the Government would bring the fish of the Maritime Provinces or any natural product under the provisions of this Bill except at the request of the producers. This Bill gives those people the opportunity to have their product handled in a certain way if they think it will bring about better results. Why deny the fishermen that right? If they do not want it they will not get it. Why say to them, "Here is machinery which others may take advantage of, but you cannot benefit by"? I do not think the honourable gentleman would want that section of the population to be treated in such a manner under the law.

Further, I understand that fish were not at first included, but were brought into this