

both the cannery interests and the men should place their proposals before the deputy or the government. When the fishermen hold their meetings first, the canning interests have time to know what is being proposed or opposed by the fishermen. They then meet in secret and tell the deputy minister what they believe should be done for the good of the industry. They are not thinking or acting on behalf of the fishermen—oh, no; they are acting on behalf of themselves, the vested interests. The cannery interests have considerable capital at hand, and are also in a position to send deputations to Ottawa. In fact, I believe that has actually been done; a deputation did arrive not long ago, at a time I believe previous to the change of the act, by order in council.

We have always understood that we would be told when changes were going to be made. But in connection with the order in council no consideration was given to us at all. Like a bolt from the blue it was put into effect. The first we learned about it was when the notice appeared in the Gazette.

The statement is made that the cannery interests represent all the canners, but I suggest that is not true. In support of that contention I shall read from a letter before me received from Colonial Packers Limited of Vancouver, British Columbia. I believe the deputy minister received a similar communication, reading in part as follows:

The canned salmon section of the Canadian Manufacturers Association is the only association formed to date by the salmon canners and they certainly do not represent one hundred per cent of the canners, of whom we believe there are nineteen. They are the body who are consulted in cannery matters as a rule, but it is extremely doubtful whether half the canners in British Columbia are members, but the fact that it is dominated by the three large companies is unquestioned.

Regarding the amendment to section 27a of the Meat and Canned Foods Act which states "No certificates shall be issued for canned salmon that has not been landed fresh at a cannery for canning within twenty-four hours after being caught, excepting fish that has been gutted and iced immediately after being caught" we should like to inquire; Why not?

Surely the inspection board was created to function in these cases. If they are satisfied that the salmon was fresh when packed what bearing has the length of time in which they were landed on the matter? According to this regulation if a canner lands salmon twenty-five hours after being caught and cans it immediately he is deprived of all chance of a certificate whereas if the salmon is landed twenty-three hours after capture and held in the cannery for a further twenty-four hours it can obtain a certificate if the board passes the product although it might be much older fish than the other. Does this make sense?

I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He said there were two sides

to the story, but fortunately or unfortunately there are three sides to it. I shall give another side which he has entirely omitted. Not being Deputy Minister of Fisheries, he is probably not aware of what I am about to state. He said the object of the change was to have the fish properly gutted and iced, and so kept fresh and in proper condition. Last year certain canning interests on the Fraser river brought in from the American traps over 27,000 American caught sockeye salmon which were later canned, stamped and sent, I believe, to Great Britain. That is the information I have, and I have stated it to the deputy minister. I am sorry the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not in his seat, because I should like to tell him that the sockeye salmon caught in those traps might have been there two, three or four days, and the longer they are kept in traps the greater is their deterioration. Although brought from the trap to the canneries within probably four hours, they may have been in the trap for five days and so would not be as fresh as fish caught in other districts and brought perhaps a forty-eight hour journey to the cannery.

There is another aspect. I might point out in passing that the canneries who had objected to the poor fishermen sending their fresh salmon across the line when they could obtain better prices there last year themselves deliberately bought fish from the American traps and brought fish in from the United States because they could purchase them a little cheaper. They practically told the fishermen of the Fraser to do what they liked with their fish, because they could buy cheaper on the American side. I think that ought to be taken serious notice of, and I am glad the acting Minister of Fisheries is in his seat. Not only has objection come to the acting minister from the Colonial Packers Limited, but objection has come also from the cooperative association, and, through its secretary, Mr. Maiden, from the British Columbia Fishermen's Protective Association of New Westminster, which is composed of hundreds of members. I might point out that there are over fourteen hundred individual licences issued on the Fraser river, and all those men are vitally concerned in this matter of the transport of fish.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill) and myself are not the only ones who hold the views that we are expounding here to-night, because I note in The Province of February 6 that the Hon. Mr. Howe, the Minister of Fisheries for British Columbia, attended a meeting in New Westminster, and,