

solely for the catching of ground fish such as cod, haddock, rosefish and flounders. It is incapable of capturing any other variety. If all our fishermen, or even a substantial portion of them, were deep sea fishermen and interested only in the production of groundfish it is conceivable that the industry could, without much disruption, be trawlerized. But with eighty-seven per cent of our fishermen engaged in a diversified form of fishing which includes in addition to cod and haddock the production of lobsters, mackerel, herring and a score of other varieties not producible by trawlers this instrument is utterly impracticable.

And again:

Clearly then the unrestricted use of trawlers is inimical to the interests of the inshore fishermen, and on behalf of its members this association must continue its opposition to them.

Lest the charge be made that we are unprogressive, may we call attention to the fact that in the past fifteen years the fishery of the maritime provinces has been a subject of inquiry of three royal commissions namely the royal commission on fisheries 1928, the royal commission on price spreads 1935, and the royal commission of economic inquiry Nova Scotia 1934. All three commissions recommended against the trawler.

The minister has stated that he is subsidizing druggers by order in council. I first objected to the order in council, because the preamble designates a dragger as a small vessel and then in the body it says that she may be as large as the minister may decide. I objected to that, because we are subsidizing the latest type of trawlers and they are now being built in Nova Scotia.

For years I have been concerned about the employment of our fishermen, and I did not think they could get full employment if we permit trawlers to supplant the fishing schooner and the other boats of the fisheries. Three fishing schooners will catch as much as a trawler and the charge that they will not land the fish in as good condition is unfounded. The whole economy of the fisheries and other allied industries in Nova Scotia has been built up on the use of schooners. They have been the best producers of fish; they have been successful and are paying large amounts to this government in the form of income taxes.

The people in my county are not scared of the trawler, because they have been in the forefront of the fishing business. But they do object to being subsidized out of business. This subsidy is being paid to druggers and long liners, and the fishing schooner, which has been doing this work for twenty, thirty or even fifty years, is to be subsidized out of business by the payment of \$165 per ton to another type of vessel.

I object to discrimination. As the member for Lunenburg, as a member representing fisher-

[Mr. Kinley.]

men, I cannot be expected to support anything which would discriminate against the fishing industry in the part of the country I represent. I realize that much of this subsidy money will come to my riding since two of these vessels are to operate there. If we have reached the stage where we must experiment, if we must try out these vessels, let it be done, but let us carry on and let it be a free field without favour. I am going to be fair with the minister and tell the committee that I went to him and said that I would not stand for this. I thought I had his promise of equitable treatment and he did give us depreciation for fishing schooners for one, two or five years. The order in council provides that the subsidy paid will be subtracted from the cost when depreciation is received. If we are successful in our fishing the schooner will be in a good position and I thank the minister for that.

Mr. REID: Does that apply to the other boat?

Mr. KINLEY: That applies to the other boat except that it will get \$165 subsidy. While in the long run you are just as well off with your depreciation as you would be if you got the subsidy, the fact is that when you sell your boat you get the subsidy if it has been paid, whereas in the other case you must adjust the depreciation to the age of the boat according to ordinary depreciation rates. I do not blame the minister because I think he was sympathetic. However, I think he met difficulty. My people have been in the forefront of the fishing industry for nearly a hundred years. The county of Lunenburg did not come to the government for relief during the depression. They carried on their industry successfully, and I strongly object to discrimination being shown against a fishing fleet which has been such a success in producing the wealth and the culture that is to be found in my county. After trying as much as possible to get this matter adjusted, I think the time has come for me to say that I think we have been given only part of what we should have received.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): I think we ought to have a statement from the minister.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): This is all out of order as far as the item is concerned.

Mr. HANSON (York-Sunbury): The minister agreed to take it up now.

Mr. BERTRAND (Laurier): Perhaps it would be just as well to go on. The hon. member for Cape Breton South has spoken about the brief and I agree completely with a lot of what he said. I am absolutely in favour