

is just as sweet in its flavour when packed in an apple barrel as it is in a barrel that costs \$1.50. I would prefer to have oysters shipped in boxes rather than in barrels, and I think if the fishermen were consulted and a reasonably sized box could be decided upon, it would be more satisfactory than the barrel. For the past few years our oyster fishery has been going down somewhat, and if you impose extra burdens upon the fishermen you are certainly not going to do them any good. I fear that these extra burdens may drive some of our fishermen, not all, into violations of the law by fishing out of season in order to make up the extra cost brought about by the imposition of the department's regulations during the open season. I wish the department would go very fully into this matter before adopting a design on which the fishermen will have to pay a sales tax and which will impose on them extra burdens.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My hon. friend will admit that we must have a minimum size container in order to protect the trade. People want to know what they are getting.

Mr. VENIOT: They will not know any better if the oysters are packed in a \$1.50 barrel than if in a 75-cent barrel.

Mr. DURANLEAU: No doubt; but we must have a standard size of container for the protection of trade. We are as much concerned as my hon. friend to minimize as much as possible the expenses to be incurred by the fishermen in packing their oysters. To-day we are studying the suggestion made—now repeated by my hon. friend—to put oysters in boxes as well as barrels. I can assure him that the interests of the manufacturer of boxes or barrels will not prevail; we are looking after the interests of the fishermen themselves and the protection of the industry.

Mr. RALSTON: Under this item there are two or three matters which I wish to bring to the minister's attention. I submit to him that it does seem as if we have not yet realized the importance of the fishing industry in the province from which I come and the necessity for more careful consideration being given to the interests of those engaged in it. Let me point out what was done soon after this government came into power. A firm of engineers was employed to make a report in connection with the marketing of Canadian fish and fish products, based on a general survey of the industry. That had already been done two years before by a commission which investigated the maritime fisheries—a commission which I think all members regard as

[Mr. Veniot.]

being thoroughly competent to deal with the question. Nevertheless my hon. friend felt that he wanted a fresh view on the matter and he employed this firm to make a report. The newspaper notices intimated very clearly that something would come from this which would be of great advantage to the fishing communities, but when the report did come down, with all due respect to the gentlemen who made it I think the minister and the department generally felt that in so far as it proposed practical means of assisting the fishermen it turned out to be practically a dud. The report dealt with information which was already in the hands of the department; I am sure the competent departmental officers had collated it long before, and I am sure the department already had full access to practically all the information which was gathered by that firm at some considerable cost to the country. I do not say a word against the firm; I understand they are a reputable firm of engineers, though I do not know them at all. I feel, however, that this effort on the part of the present Minister of Finance to get a new viewpoint in connection with the fisheries, did not result in any real accomplishment.

Let me give my hon. friend an example. The report has been laid on the table of the house, though I have never had an opportunity of reading it. The report is very long and no copies were printed, but the minister prepared a summary, and just to give an idea of how practical it is in connection with the marketing of fish, let me read the headline recommendation at page 80 of the summary:

That the Minister of Fisheries consider the announcement of a fiscal policy with respect to fisheries, and all industries and trades dependent thereon, based upon the following principles:

(a) That the government refrain from levying any taxation—other than that which applies to all industries and groups—particularly directed to those engaged in the production, processing and marketing of fish, until such time as the industry has attained a reasonably prosperous and self-reliant status.

I cannot suggest a more futile or more meaningless recommendation. I never heard and I cannot conceive that the former minister, the present minister or the government as a whole intended to levy any special tax upon the fishing industry, yet the first recommendation is that the government refrain from doing so. I do not think it needed a firm of engineers or a commission to make a recommendation of that kind. What they mean I do not know, I am sure. I am not going through all the recommendations contained in the report.