

solved by any means; but there are factors which help to some extent to relieve the situation. One is salt assistance in the salt cod industry. There is an item on that and we will consider it shortly. I do not want to take up any more time on it at present than to mention it.

Another very important factor as far as the economy of the fisherman is concerned is that he is now qualified for unemployment insurance. However there is still a very great problem in trying to assure that the income of the fisherman is being kept at a level which can provide at least a reasonable standard of living. This is a very acute problem, especially where the fisheries are carried out in the old traditional way which is the only practical way in many areas, especially in the out-ports of Newfoundland where there are not ready markets for the processing of fish into fillets or where it would not be practical to modernize a fleet of draggers for every little cove where there are out-ports and where there are people, who are going to live and going to earn a living in the old traditional inshore fishing.

I do not think there is anything more I need say on this at the moment. Mr. Clark or Mr. McArthur can give you more detail on the situation as it appears at the present time.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: Returning to the remarks made by Mr. Robichaud, has the attention of the minister been drawn to an article in yesterday's *Financial Post* captioned "Now Our Fisheries are Threatened"?

Mr. MACLEAN (*Queens*): No. I have not seen that yet.

Mr. PICKERSGILL: There is one observation I would like to make. I do not think this is the place to have the political debate which I think will take place in the house on this item in relation to the quotation I have just read, and as far as I am concerned I am quite prepared, having given the minister notice, to debate this matter further in the house. I would not want the minister to feel because we let the item pass here in committee, with which I have no objection, that that indicates that we are satisfied about this particular question.

Mr. CROUSE: On this whole broad discussion of floor prices, I would be the last one to speak against it because I am very interested in the fisheries; but, for the benefit of the members of the committee who are not familiar with the practices carried out by the fish buyers, I have in front of me some recent, and not so recent, trip sheets which show the methods used by buyers in other sections of the country in respect of grading. There apparently is a wide range in the grading by certain fish buyers when buying fish in respect of the classes called No. 1 and those that are called scrod and they have many ways of lowering the price to the fishermen.

In speaking of the range in prices, they have not varied in the last ten years despite the fact that the fisheries department have carried on extensive experiments; they have improved the method of marketing fish and have assisted in establishing freezing plants. But none of these improvements have found their way back to the basic producer in the form of an increased price—not even by one cent per pound.

For example, in 1947, for large cod laid down at Nova Scotia the fishermen were paid $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound, and for haddock at that time they received for the large haddock $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. To come up to 1957, ten years later, large cod had decreased from $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound to $3\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound. In other words, although the cost of shipping and every item which the fishermen must use in conjunction with the fishing has practically doubled—and I think that is agreed, from 1947 to 1957—the price of fresh cod went from $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents to $3\frac{1}{4}$ cents and the best haddock from $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents to a point where now, for 520,000 pounds of large haddock the dealer pays 5 cents for his first 50 thousand pounds and only 4 cents for the balance. Those are the methods the fish buyers use to