

been brought up in that locality and they know the habits of the salmon better than those gentlemen do. When those gentlemen are sent by an organization such as the anglers to make a report on the conditions they find; when the report is not definite and does not bear out the contention of the anglers then I say there is all the more reason for the department to hesitate to put such strict and impracticable regulations into force. I am glad the minister stated that he will personally look into the matter and visit the districts affected.

Mr. RHODES: In citing the figures contained in the report of Messrs. Belding and Phelps, my hon. friend unwittingly compared things which are not equal at all. For example the figures I cited were hundredweights.

Mr. VENIOT: Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. RHODES: No, the figures I cited referred to hundredweights of salmon caught in the whole province of New Brunswick, whereas the figures cited by my hon. friend from the report of Messrs. Belding and Phelps referred to pounds.

Mr. VENIOT: I changed the pounds into hundredweights.

Mr. RHODES: There is no comparison at all, Mr. Chairman. The figures cited by my hon. friend from the report of Messrs. Belding and Phelps concerns the salmon fisheries of the whole province of New Brunswick.

Mr. VENIOT: I converted pounds into hundredweights and my argument went to show that either that report of hundredweights is not correct or the statistical report of the department is not correct. I am prepared to accept the statistical report of the department.

Mr. RHODES: This is not a statistical report of the department; it is a report as furnished to the bureau of statistics. Either I will have to have a new system of arithmetic or my hon. friend has a system I do not understand, because my statement still holds good with respect to these comparative figures.

I did not take exception to the remarks of my hon. friend regarding the lawyers who came here. While I have no great sympathy for lawyers, yet I was one once myself and perhaps I should be inclined to treat them more generously than would my hon. friend. I will say however that out of a deputation of thirty only two were lawyers, and only one of them spoke. He did not speak from the

viewpoint of clients, or any particular person. On the contrary I thought he made a very broad and conciliatory speech. I think my hon. friend will accept the statement that there is really no point of conflict between the welfare of the angler and that of the commercial fishermen.

Mr. DUFF: The commercial fishermen should come first.

Mr. RHODES: I will say to my hon. friend from Antigonish-Guysborough that the respective positions of anglers and commercial fishermen remind me of the old problem of which comes first, the hen or the egg.

Mr. DUFF: No; the commercial fishermen are earning their living by fishing, whereas the anglers are having a good time.

Mr. RHODES: On the other hand, the anglers are making a real contribution so far as conservation is concerned. The number of fish they take is negligible compared to the number taken by the commercial fishermen. I do not complain, of course, because the fishermen have a right to engage in their business. I say however that the interests of anglers and fishermen are identical inasmuch as they both want to build up and conserve a permanent industry. I assure my hon. friend that there is nothing in his suspicion that the voice of the high paid lawyer was heard to the exclusion of the voices of the fishermen themselves. By no means do I wish to contend that the regulations are ideal or thoroughly satisfactory, but I can assure my hon. friend that they were designed just as much in the interests of the commercial fishermen as any other body of men or group of individuals.

Mr. McLURE: Under this item I wish to direct the attention of the committee and the Minister of Fisheries to an item which probably does not deal directly with salmon. The matter to which I shall refer is one which has been brought to the attention of two and probably three ministers of fisheries in the last few years. While in some cases the ministers have given their decided opinions in the matter, yet the parties who have been injured have not had their claims satisfied. I refer to the subsidized fishing steamer, *Amla*. The owners of this particular fishing steamer had a contract made in the year 1929, and under their contract they interviewed the fishermen of Prince Edward Island. We find that the contract was not carried out in detail and that the people who were injured were