

I was wondering if the first thought mentioned by Mr. Robichaud would have been a better one if there was some way to add that extra one cent. You must realize on the poundage landed at that price if they could get one cent a pound more on their catch, there would be no need of any subsidy, not even the \$165.

Mr. ROBICHAUD: They might be satisfied with half a cent.

Mr. CROUSE: Well, the catch of a dragger for the benefit of the members of the committee will run between $4\frac{1}{2}$ million and 5 million pounds of fish in one year and if the dragger is landing 5 million pounds of fish at one cent a pound, it means a gross of \$50,000 of which 40 per cent approximately would remain in the hands of the company or group of fishermen who own the ship and 40 per cent of \$50,000 is quite a tidy sum of money even after the Department of National Revenue is satisfied.

Mr. CARTER: I thought that one cent was going to be passed on to the fishermen.

Mr. CROUSE: Well, Mr. Carter, you know that the bulk of the boats in your area and I think in Nova Scotia are today owned by the fishermen and groups of fishermen and they are fishing as share men and therefore regardless of the method used if the price increased they are at least sure of half of that providing a good proportion of them own their own boats or are in a group which own their own boat.

Mr. DRYSDALE: As a west coaster—and this may be a naive question—what was the justification to start with of the original subsidy of \$165 and what, for instance, was the objective? We keep talking of the trawlers and draggers employed and I would be interested in knowing the number of trawlers and draggers employed, the number of crews employed and the total average catch per year and in doing that, I wonder if I could get any information on what the cod catch per year would be for the last ten years upon any basis so that on the over-all picture I can ascertain whether with the technological advances we are making whether the productivity per man and the number of fish caught has increased. In view of the subsidy being granted is any consideration being given to the question of whether or not we have perhaps too many fishermen in the fishing business? Also in connection with the cod catch, when they are looking at this over-all problem of the prices in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that is the differentiation, I am wondering whether or not that could be attributed to the ordinary laws of supply and demand and perhaps more boats are landed in Newfoundland than in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In other words, the buyers had a greater selection and could demand a lower price. I would be interested in comparative statistics of landings in Newfoundland as compared to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. This is a west coaster's attitude to the east coaster's problem.

Mr. MACLEAN (*Queens*): Mr. Chairman, I do not think we have all the figures here. They could be obtained.

Mr. DRYSDALE: Basically, what is the justification for the subsidy?

Mr. MACLEAN (*Queens*): This is a program which got started during World War II in order to increase the production of food at that time. It was brought into being under the War Measures Act, and the program is an endeavour to modernize the east coast fleet.

As you well know, the traditional fisheries on the two coasts are quite different; not perhaps as different now as a few years ago. On the east coast the fishery for the most part, as far as codfish is concerned, is carried on in the tradition of centuries; inshore fishermen using hand lines and very little