

adjacent to Nova Scotia, and there is a suggestion that beam trawlers be prohibited west of St. Pierre. The banks off the coast of Nova Scotia are being ruined by the beam trawler. However, that is an international matter with which we are not concerned at the moment. The point is that we want the Canadian market for Canadian fishermen, and we think that they should have some way of determining the price for which they must sell their product. But the beam trawler is one instrument that defeats that object. We may have to come to a minimum price for the fishermen. To my mind the fishermen of Canada, whether they are right or wrong, will never be satisfied until the beam trawler is abolished. We have a population of only 10,000,000 while in the United States there is a large market with a population of 120,000,000. If we had a population of 20,000,000, the beam trawler might be necessary, but we have a condition that does not exist in any other country. Ground fishing is only one part of the activities of our fishermen; they must fish in the outports to catch lobster, mackerel, herring and seasonal fish that come along the shore. Put these men in Halifax and make them coal heavers and beam trawler operators and you will denude the shores of Nova Scotia and ruin the industry. The government must know, surely, that scientific men like those who composed the commissions that have studied this matter are not men who would be parochial in their opinions or who would give opinions without reason. And the opinions are there.

I submit that in the interests of employment the experiment should be tried and if necessary the beam trawler operators could be compensated. Just allow them the profit they showed in their income tax returns last year. This is a matter that has been before the country a long time and we will keep it before the country, not because we are opposed to progress but because we believe that progress should be genuine, and the interests of our men who need work should be paramount. There is no other means by which men can live than by working, and until you can allow men to sit at the table without working you must see to it that they have work.

Mr. MICHAUD: My hon. friend from Cape Breton North-Victoria and my hon. friend from Queens-Lunenburg seem to be under the impression that the Minister of Fisheries has the power to abolish the beam trawler. I have not, nor did I have that power last spring when the time came for the renewal of licences. It is true eminent men have given their opinion as to the necessity of the steam

trawler, but one fact remains, and it is this. The parliament of Canada has dealt with the question in all these investigations that have been carried on, and in 1929, I believe, passed section 56 of the Fisheries Act. Under the provisions of that act power was given to the governor in council to make regulations for the operation of steam trawlers. These regulations were questioned before the courts and one tribunal decided that they were ultra vires inasmuch as they were prohibitive in effect.

Mr. KINLEY: The trawlers were taxed by order in council.

Mr. MICHAUD: The tax was so high that it was prohibitive; it really prohibited the trawler from operating. If parliament wanted to prohibit the trawlers it would have passed a statute forbidding the use of them; but it provided for the regulation of these trawlers. So far the regulations have been made and administered by the Department of Fisheries; and I felt last spring, when the time came for renewing licences, that, not having the power to refuse to issue licences, I should confine myself to renewing those that had been in force in the previous year or for the last few years.

Mr. KINLEY: The minister is no doubt aware that so far as the companies carrying on the fishing business in the maritimes are concerned, it is a matter of privilege, because there is only one company that is allowed to have steam trawlers.

Mr. MICHAUD: If they complied with the regulations and made application in due form I renewed the licences. Last year one application was refused because the conditions had not been complied with.

Mr. KINLEY: That was in my constituency and I compliment the minister on not having granted it. The minister takes the point that the statute was for regulations, but I want to point out to the minister that the order in council was in effect a prohibition—absolutely—which showed the intent of the government of that day.

Item agreed to.

To provide for the payment of a bounty for the destruction of harbour seals, \$15,000.

Mr. NEILL: Is "harbour seals" a misprint? Is it intended to mean "hair seals"?

Mr. MICHAUD: Hair seals.

Mr. NEILL: I compliment the minister upon putting that item in. It is a very necessary thing.

Item agreed to.