

*Inspection of Canned Salmon*

boat with its costly equipment would be lying idle. Such a boat could not carry enough crew to do all the operations simultaneously because the accommodation is limited, and the expense of carrying such a crew would be prohibitive. So far as I am concerned—and I am not trying to make a partisan statement—I am convinced it would not be economical to gut and ice the fish taken by a seiner. Further, I think it would be very difficult to gut and ice by gill netters. That, I believe, is an argument against the suggestion that the whole matter might be very easily overcome by simply gutting and icing. It is all very well to make that statement, but in my view it is a requirement impossible of fulfilment.

I shall now return to the point I had reached at six o'clock. I was dealing with what I called the real motive or object—perhaps object is the correct word—for the introduction of the order in council. I said this was an attempt made by the canners who had tried by thoroughly legitimate means to repeal the legislation passed in 1918 by the Union government, which proclaimed the open door in fishery matters. I said it was an effort on their part to get back to what they termed the good old days, when each man owned his own water, and so on. I said that, failing success by way of changing the legislation, they had sought to achieve the same results by having changes made in the regulations covering fishing. In their view it would have had the same effect, while ostensibly their efforts would have been devoted towards the conservation or improvement of quality and so on. The methods by which they sought to bring about these results were quite numerous, and for that reason I shall deal with only three of them.

Many methods were suggested, and at one time I was familiar with all of them, because these efforts have been continued for about ten years. I have files in my room and at home which would fill a wheelbarrow dealing with the different attempts made to get indirectly what they could not get directly. The three main methods which come to my mind at the moment—and I state them because I know they have been the subject of attempts quite recently—were first, that fish caught in an area would have to be processed, or manufactured in that area, and could not be taken into an adjoining area. I should add that when I use the term "area" at least some hon. members will understand that the whole of the waters is divided into areas. Had they been successful their object would have been attained, and they would have had the whole thing in a nutshell, because they would have cut off the cannery which did not have

an area, and would have made the individual fisherman the servant of the cannery. The fishermen would have had to take the prices offered by those canners. If they did not choose to accept those prices their punishment would have been that the canners would not buy their fish.

The second attempt was along the lines of limiting the distance fish could be taken after being caught. That contention was in favour for quite a time, but there were so many obvious reasons against it that eventually it was abandoned.

Then, the third attempt was towards limiting the time within which fish caught would have to be canned. If the processing in area in which fish caught had been established it would have affected not only the outside cannery but also the fishermen. I want to explain what I mean by the outside cannery. When the open door was adopted it became possible for a cannery to be put up not immediately adjacent to the fishing grounds, and they depended upon getting their supply of fish, under the laws of Canada at the moment, anywhere they could. This processing in area regulation would eliminate them. As time went on it was found that a different system as regards the place of canning was more profitable. In the old days when a cannery was located say in the Skeena district it was at an isolated place, no town, no village, no residents, just used for six or eight weeks in the summer time. The cannery owner would have to send up the whole equipment from Vancouver, perhaps five hundred miles away, and not only the whole equipment, but the whole provision for a preconceived pack. He would have to get cans for perhaps a big pack, would have to guess as he best could what the pack would be, and would have to buy cans for that pack. He would have to make arrangements for sufficient labourers to handle that big pack; he would have to take food for them and start a village and make provision for all that goes with quite a large settlement for the time being. Then, as nature cannot be counted on, it might turn out that the pack would be disappointing; he would have large supplies of food and tins, and a large amount of labour employed which he could not use, and would be burdened with heavy charges for taking it up and down again. So it was discovered that he could do better by locating his cannery at a place like Vancouver or Alert bay or Port Alberni, where he had ready access to wholesalers, and did not need to buy even five sacks of flour more than he needed. In fact the question of