

we must meet conditions of a different kind from those which now present themselves for our consideration.

That is the complaint we make. After all, a government is not only administering the affairs of the day, but is trustee for the morrow. Whether they like it or not their actions and their conduct of the country's affairs are reflected in the morrow, and for that reason, considering conditions as they are and the figures to which I have alluded, and with the balance of trade as it is, this administration should take measures, and should have indicated in this document measures which should be taken, for the purpose of enabling us to meet a situation which every thoughtful man knows must come sooner or later in the very nature of things. It may be later; let us hope it may be, but the wise government is the one which makes provision for that situation which inevitably must arise.

For the moment that is all I have to say in this respect. In considering the speech from the throne I will adopt the course followed by my illustrious predecessors and merely deal with a few aspects which present themselves, but when we read the reference contained in the speech to the fisheries industry, for example, we are given food for thought. The fisheries industry has been very important in Canada. Last year we exported some \$35,000,000 worth of fish, and a little over a year ago the government saw fit to appoint a royal commission for the purpose of making a report upon the whole industry, that commission being in part the result of the report made by the Duncan commission in connection with matters in the maritime provinces. The fishing industry is not limited to the eastern maritime provinces, of course; it is a very important industry on the west coast, and I ask the government why, after submitting this matter to a commission, they did not give effect to the recommendations of that commission. Looking at the last paragraph on the first page of the speech from the throne I find these words:

In accordance with the recommendations of the royal commission on Fisheries, the Fisheries branch of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has been separated from the marine branch, and a deputy minister of Fisheries has been appointed.

I took the trouble to turn up that report and compare the recommendation with the statement contained in the speech from the throne. This is not an accurate statement of what that report says. The report, dated May 8, 1928, reads in part as follows:

The fishing industry is territorially widespread on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts,
[Mr. Bennett.]

each area having difficulties that are dissimilar from those of the other. It is great in variety, in extent and value; it holds a very large place in the economic life of the country; and in all its phases it is beset with complex problems of administration. The industry may, therefore, justly claim to be of such importance as to require a separate ministry. Last year, parliament authorized the appointment of a deputy minister of fisheries. We found throughout the maritime provinces a widespread feeling not only in support of this action, but also in support of the establishment of a separate department of fisheries under a minister of fisheries, and we recommend the creation of such a department to the consideration of the government of Canada.

That is the recommendation; the speech from the throne says that in accordance with the recommendations of the royal commission a deputy minister has been appointed, but the deputy minister was appointed before the report was made, and this report made in 1928 recommends not the appointment of a deputy minister but the appointment of a minister of fisheries. Does the government propose to do that? Is it the intention of the government to give effect to that recommendation? In that particular I say the government has not been as frank as it should be in putting this language into the mouth of His Majesty's representative.

With what is said with respect to research and the West India trade we are so heartily in accord that it is unnecessary to do more than pass it by, and so we come to the question of the reduction of postage within the empire to two cents from the three cent rate heretofore prevailing. The additional one cent, of course, was charged for taxation purposes arising out of the war; that is quite clear. But why should there not be a reduction at home of the rate on postal cards from two cents to one cent? If we are to reduce the postal rate by abolishing the war tax of one cent on letters within the empire, why not abolish the extra one cent war tax on postal cards within the country? That seems a reasonable thing, and I confess that in view of the declarations made by the Prime Minister in connection with communications between governments, I was somewhat astounded to find a message expressing the earnest and sincere hope of the Canadian people that His Majesty would soon recover his health linked with the statement that we were to have penny postage within the empire. I found it somewhat difficult to understand. This was not a matter of communications between governments, and Her Majesty, the Queen, in replying to the message thus sent from this country, was very careful to refrain from making any observation with respect to