

Supply—Fisheries

measure. From talking with various members who are not in accord with the measure now before us, I am quite certain that they would be quite prepared to vote for it if it included the provision contained in the amendment and commencing with the word "but".

An hon. Member: They did not ask my advice.

Mr. Higgins: They did not ask your advice? That is not fair because I think everybody else has been asked about this matter, and if the hon. member has not been asked there must have been an omission in some way. I am certain that the sponsor of the bill would not want the hon. member to be passed over in any way.

Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Siphoned off.

Mr. Higgins: Siphoned off. I must say that I have been trying to look at this thing honestly, and I can see no objection to including the amendment. Some hon. members have asked me where I come into the picture, and why I should be interested in a matter of this nature at all. This bill deals with oil, and we have an awful lot of oil, fish oil, in Newfoundland. I presume, as the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) stated the other day, we could call it a kindred subject. Oil is oil, although I doubt very much that we will ever have to construct a pipe line to bring our fish oil up here. But if there is a possibility of using such oil I would have very great pleasure indeed in asking parliament to adopt such a bill, and I certainly would include in it that it should be an all-Canadian route.

If somebody would guarantee that there would be sufficient fish oil used, then I would be quite prepared to introduce a bill and to ask that the measure include the policy of Canada first, which is the only objection to the bill now before us. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I cannot talk much longer because it is nine o'clock.

On motion of Mr. Higgins the debate was adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: It being nine o'clock, the house will resume the business which was interrupted at six o'clock.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Beaudoin in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES**General services—**

145. To provide for transportation, dressing and dyeing and other expenses incidental to receiving and disposing of fur seal skins accruing to Canada

[Mr. Higgins.]

pursuant to provisional fur seal agreement between Canada and the United States by exchange of notes dated December 26, 1947, \$500,000.

Mr. McLure: Before the committee recessed at six o'clock, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni was speaking on this very important question. I did not desire to interrupt him in any way at that time, but I should like to learn from him the source of the information he gave the committee with respect to the destruction of salmon by the fur seals of the north. This is the most astonishing information I have ever heard with regard to fur seals. If his information had been that the fur seals were eating the whales and porpoises of the north, where the fur seals live for two and a half months of the year, then that would really be news. However, nobody knows where the fur seals come from or where they go. The only time they can be located is for two and a half months from June on, and then for nine or ten months they disappear. Nobody knows where they spend that period of ten months. I want to make a few remarks about this matter because it is a very interesting subject. Before doing so, however, I should like to ask the minister a question. What is the cost of machining, dressing and dyeing—I do not want anything for cartage, carrying charges or anything like that—of the different firms namely Martins of England, Martin-Schnauffer of Toronto, and the Fouke Company of St. Louis? If the minister will give me that information now, I shall proceed with the matter later.

Mr. Mayhew: I suppose the hon. member realizes that some of the skins go to the Fouke Company of St. Louis, some to Martins in London, and some to the new plant of Martin-Schnauffer of Toronto. Dressing and dyeing for the St. Louis company amounted to \$165,620.60.

Mr. McLure: Can you give it per skin?

Mr. Mayhew: No, you would have to divide that by 7,210, and that would give you the answer. Dressing and dyeing for Martins in London amounted to \$13,744.80. You divide that by 3,605 to get the amount per skin. For Martin-Schnauffer of Toronto, it amounted to \$49,959.68, and you divide that by 1,203 skins.

Mr. McLure: I have not worked out that arithmetical problem, but I understand that the cost of machining, dressing and dyeing in these three plants is practically the same. I said a moment ago that this was an interesting item, especially to the Department of Fisheries, because it is one item on which they make a real profit. The government, through the Department of Fisheries, makes