

This means that after 1932 five British trawlers with Canadian registry will be practically confiscated because it is an impossibility to keep those vessels in order so that they can fish only three months in the year and the other nine months pay a tax of one cent a pound on all the fish they land. This, I claim, is the most drastic legislation that has ever been enacted in this country. The idea of a government, a Liberal government especially, that claims it does not want to tax the food of the people, putting a one cent tax on one of the natural food products of our country, is to my mind simply preposterous. We had no fresh fish industry in this country until trawlers started to operate in 1910 or 1911. Prior to that time we had to depend upon our shore boats in the summer time and on our schooners in the winter. We had no regular supply, with the result that we had no fresh fish market in this country. Most of our supplies came in from the United States because our cities could not depend upon Nova Scotia giving them a regular supply during all seasons of the year.

The companies that were in business then decided that if we were to build up a fresh fish market in this country we must have modern methods, that is, trawlers that can fish in all kinds of weather and land regular supplies. As a result a splendid market has been built up by being able to give regular supplies of fish. Now this government comes forward with legislation that is going to prevent these trawlers from operating in our waters during nine months of the year unless they pay a tax of one cent a pound, which is practically prohibitive. Both the minister and his deputy know that.

Now, these trawlers have not interfered with the shore fishermen to the extent the minister thinks they have, for the simple reason that the trawler companies have in the past handled all the fish that have been offered to them by the shore fishermen. This order in council would never have been passed had it not been for the agitation, not by the boat fishermen but by the fish dealers who are operating vessels instead of steam trawlers. They were the people who agitated for the abolition of the steam trawler. But even they did not ask for its abolition altogether; they asked that nothing but Canadian-built trawlers be used. This matter was brought up in the house last session by the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Quinn) when Bill No. 26 was under discussion. He moved an amendment asking that nothing but Canadian trawlers be allowed to operate. The minister's answer to that was that this would mean confiscation of the five British trawlers with Canadian

[Mr. Short.]

registry that were already operating in Nova Scotia. Let me quote from page 3483 of Hansard of June 10 last year:

Mr. Cardin: Although I am in sympathy with the policy advocated by my hon. friend from Halifax in regard to encouraging our shipbuilding industry, I cannot accept his amendment. It would have the effect of practically confiscating a certain number of vessels which are now in operation and have been for a period of years.

So the minister's opinion then was that if these boats were not allowed to operate it meant confiscation. That is just what the minister is doing to-day by this order in council. He is prohibiting these vessels from operating, and it practically means that after April, 1932, they will not be able to operate even if they pay a tax of a cent a pound. Therefore those vessels will be confiscated. But there is no mention whatever of compensation to the owners. I believe the companies that own these trawlers if they felt they were going to be compensated would be able to make arrangements to carry on their business. Does the minister think that it is fair to confiscate these five British built trawlers with Canadian registry? They cost from \$65,000 to \$75,000 each, and they are British built. They have been registered in this country since 1917, some of them since 1915, and yet we say that after 1932 they must go to the junk heap. That is the practical effect of the order in council, because the trawlers were built totally and solely for the fishing industry and are suitable for no other purpose. Surely if it is intended to carry out this order in council and to confiscate those ships after 1932, the companies are entitled to compensation.

This matter of catching fish by steam trawlers is not new; every fishing country in the world is operating steam trawlers, and Canada is the only country which has suggested legislation of this nature.

Mr. RALSTON: Japan has this legislation.

Mr. SHORT: She is the only country in the world, with the exception of Canada which has such legislation. The United States, Great Britain, France, Spain, Norway and other fishing countries have no legislation of this nature. I do not know very much about Japan, but I hope we are further advanced than that country is. The United States have about 170 trawlers which come down and fish in the same grounds we are using. If this government prevents our trawlers from fishing the result will be that in the winter season the markets of the upper provinces will be supplied by fish from the United States. That is the condition which we had previous to the