

An hon. MEMBER: It is not in the mouth.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): Just outside the mouth. At least it is in the area that was formerly prohibited, and that is the point at issue. Since 1933 the policy of the department in this respect has changed, and changed for the very obvious reason that the canners were not able to catch in the waters where they formerly fished. My hon. friend shakes his head, but I had a good deal to do with the controversy in the west when that decision was arrived at, and my hon. friend can be sure that if seine fishing is allowed there for any length of time it will put the gill net fishermen out of business. If that is the object to be attained, you will succeed admirably. My hon. friend says there is no politics in this, and I am not approaching it from the political standpoint at all; I am approaching it from the standpoint, at this time particularly if at no other, that seine fishing should be prohibited in order to provide employment for a greater number of men. My hon. friend has practically the same conditions down in the east, although I am not so familiar with conditions there. But if a certain amount of fish can be consumed it stands to reason that the greater the number of men employed in catching them the more employment there will be, and so far as I am concerned if this bill comes to a vote I am going to support it for that very reason, and despite the fact that the committee voted against it.

Hon. GROTE STIRLING (Acting Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I have very little to add to what has been already said with regard to this bill. It appears to me that there can be no finality in dealing with legislation if a bill is to go through the ordinary course of first and second readings, be considered by a committee as closely as this matter was considered, then rediscussed here with the same statements repeated on both sides, and perhaps be sent back to the committee. It is a controversial matter, as I was careful to point out at the commencement of my remarks on the second reading, but it is a matter to which the department has given a very great deal of attention.

My hon. friend from West Edmonton (Mr. Stewart), at the last moment, shall I say, introduces his suggestion that perhaps seining has been permitted in this small area for the purpose of ultimately driving out the gill net fishermen.

Mr. STEWART (Edmonton): That is what will happen.

Mr. STIRLING: A more extraordinary misconception, if the hon. member has listened to any of the statements which have been made heretofore, I can hardly conceive. Let me in a very few sentences simply put the case.

The late run fish come through the straits of Juan de Fuca, hugging the Washington shore. There they are taken in the cold, clear, salt water in enormous numbers for the purposes of the Washington canneries. When they get close up to the dividing line between the United States and Canada, which is not many miles from the area into which the Fraser river pours into the gulf of Georgia, they can first be taken by Canadian fishermen. They mill around in that triangle of water, beyond the brackish discoloured water of the Fraser, and in that water they can be taken, but they cannot be taken in that water by the gill netters. When I say they cannot be taken there I mean that the gill netters principally do their fishing in the discoloured brackish water off the mouth of the Fraser, but as soon as the fishermen get into this cold, clear water where their nets are easily visible they do not succeed in taking fish, and they go back again to the brackish water. Therefore if these fish, where it is first possible to take them in Canadian waters, are not taken by gear that will take them they will not be taken by Canadians, and the amount of trade in canned salmon which Canada can do in world markets will not be as great as it otherwise would be.

My hon. friend the sponsor of the bill (Mr. Reid) has repeated here this evening a good many of the statements which he has made on two previous occasions. He has expressed considerable disagreement with the statements of the deputy minister. I should certainly have thought that the place to make known those disagreements was in the deputy minister's presence on the occasion when this matter was so fully discussed by the committee.

Mr. MUNN: He did so.

Mr. STIRLING: And the answers were given. To-night he desires to reiterate them, and surely there is no reason why he should not. But the house should not take it that those statements have in any way impressed the officials of the department because that is not the view held by the department. In this matter the only proper course for the department to take is to try to hold the balances even after a consideration of all the facts, and that is the desire of the department. Changes have come over the fishing