

Mr. NEILL: The second recommendation is a good one.

Mr. RALSTON: It is this:

(b) That consideration be given, subject to unsurmountable constitutional or other obstacles, if any, to the ultimate withdrawal—within a specified period, announced in advance—of the fishing bounty, except any that the government may decide to apply to destructive species, and that the sum so released be devoted by the department to assist in the execution of educational and other measures directed toward the permanent improvement of the industry.

Mr. NEILL: That is the only good thing in the report.

Mr. RALSTON: I want to give the government credit for efforts along educational lines in connection with the fisheries but in doing so I am paying a lefthanded compliment to their predecessors in office also. Educational work in connection with the fisheries has been carried on by both governments, and a great deal has been done in that respect. I believe we are all convinced that this is one way in which we can assist the fishing industry, but I do not think it needed any recommendation from a commission to establish that fact, and I do not think the assistance which will result from the withdrawal of the bounty will mean a great addition to the funds available for that purpose.

Mr. MacDONALD (Cape Breton South): You would not be in favour of withdrawing the bounty?

Mr. RALSTON: No. Then the recommendations go on to deal with the fisheries conservation policy, with which I dealt last night in connection with lobsters. A sort of lefthanded recommendation is made in connection with the trawler in paragraph 2 (b):

That, in general, conservation policy shall be directed to restriction of seasons, locations, and of licences—partly as a means of securing adherence to and respect for regulations—but not of the gear or equipment used. Only such reasonable and effective regulation shall be exercised, in the latter instance, which may prevent uneconomic destruction of the species, or any serious deterrent to the quality of the fish caught.

I suppose there are more teeth in that recommendation than in any of the others, though they are well veiled and covered up. At least that is a direct recommendation against restrictions on trawlers. The next paragraph has to do with the classification of information, and the following paragraph states solemnly that the Department of Trade and Commerce shall consult with the officials of the Department of Marine and the Depart-

ment of Fisheries in connection with the information thus made available in order to initiate discussions with the various steamship companies operating from or to Canadian ports in reference to the adjustment or improvement of their services, schedules or facilities. I hardly think it was necessary to recommend consultation between various departments of the government and I venture to say that these officials have discussed many times with the steamship and railway companies the question of rates on fish and the cost of transportation. Then there is a reference to the sockeye salmon treaty, and in paragraph 5 the biological board is urged to direct greater concentration upon the solution of practical problems of fishery research. Paragraph 6 is as follows:

That consideration be given by the minister to the advisability of a reference to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada of the whole question of railway rates and tariffs respecting freight and express shipments of fish and fish products . . .

That question has been before the board more than once on applications by individual shippers. So far as I know there has been no case prepared or reference made by the minister, and it seems to me that if this recommendation had been really intended to mean something it should have been positively to the effect that a reference be made to the Board of Railway Commissioners with regard to this very important matter of the cost of transporting fish instead of gently suggesting consideration of the advisability of a reference. I do not think anything has been done in that connection at all.

The next paragraph suggests that the Canadian Fisheries Association be broadened in scope, and the following paragraph suggests that the Department of Fisheries conduct a campaign of education, as previously mentioned. Paragraph 9 recommends that the information collected be made available to the trade. Paragraph 10 suggests that encouragement be given to the formation of a lobster canners' association, and in paragraph 11 it is suggested that the biological board be requested to carry on experiments with a view to developing small fish reduction units suitable for establishment in the less important fishing centres. Units of this kind were established years ago; I do not think that is any new policy at all, and obviously this would meet only a small part of the real problems of the fishermen. Paragraph 12 recommends that every effort be made to extend the degree of diversification practised in the curing industry, and in paragraph 13 it is suggested that