different picture. The price paid for handling costs of these $7 a quintal fish is given. The question was:

What were the arrangements made with exporters or others for handling the fish produced by the fishermen?

The answer was as follows:

Merchants

The following costs, f.a.s. bulk per quintal, for the handling of the fish including labour, overhead, cartage, wharfage and shrinkage, by areas, were allowed: St. John's $2.43; Bonavista $2.07; Conception Bay $2.32; North of Cape Bonavista $1.92.

It might be simpler to put the small table on *Hansard*, as it is, because the minister has it already, if there is no objection.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Higgins: That is all right so far as Labrador is concerned. When the minister is replying perhaps he will tell me when it is proposed to make this extra payment to which he refers in his statement. I take it the initial payment is $7. Are the Labrador fishermen to be paid any more? That dealt with the Labrador fish. In the same broadcast the minister referred to the shore fish and he said this:

I'll turn now to the shore fish. Substantial sales have already been made by the exporters. There is, however, a higher production in the world at large, and export prices will be down somewhat this year. Our Department of Trade and Commerce is making every effort to keep markets open for our salted fish and it is looking forward to the removal of some of the obstacles that now stand in the way. In the case of shore fish, the prospects are much brighter than for Labrador, and we expect the fishermen to move this fish into the exporters' hands without delay. We will also expect merchants around the coast to give the fishermen a satisfactory price.

The Chairman: Am I to understand that the hon. member has the consent of the committee to have the documents printed in *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mayhew: The statement to which the hon. member is referring is already on *Hansard* of May 21.

The Chairman: It is already on *Hansard*.

Mr. Mayhew: I am not objecting to its being put on, but I point out that it is already on *Hansard* of May 21.

Mr. Higgins: I do not think it is on *Hansard*. It was an order for return. It did not actually appear on *Hansard*.

The Chairman: Agreed.

[Mr. Higgins.]

Mr. Higgins: The table follows:

	St. John's	Outports
	$ per qtl.	$ per qtl.
Semi-dry to hard dry	2·02	1·73
Ordinary cure to semi-dry	1·75	1·49
Ordinary cure to hard dry	2·92	2·63
Ordinary cure to 40 per cent	2·20	1·91
Semi-dry to 40 per cent	1·46	1·17

I now continue with the minister's broadcast:

We would ask the fishermen to move the fish under our assurance that the prices support board will review the shore fish situation as the season advances. Should it happen that the fall in price to fishermen has been so great as to merit support action, the board would recommend to government that a deficiency payment be made on shore fish. I am confident that, with this assurance, the fishermen and the salt codfish association will be able to arrange a price that will allow the fisherman to move his fish into the exporters' hands.

I do not believe I have to argue with the minister on that, because I believe that statement means what it says; because in answer to the hon. member for Iles-de-la-Madeleine at page 2158 of *Hansard* the following appears:

Mr. Charles Cannon (Iles-de-la-Madeleine): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. In his statement to the house yesterday the minister said:

It is only under special conditions that government action under the support act should be contemplated. There is, in our opinion, no need for such special action at this time.

Will the minister tell the house whether this statement applies only to the 1951 catch or also to the 1950 catch?

Hon. R. W. Mayhew (Minister of Fisheries): The hon. member gave me notice of the question. I think it is quite apparent from the statement I made that I was referring to the 1951 catch. We have already given support to the 1950 catch in buying Labrador codfish. We have also agreed to make an investigation of returns to fishermen on shore fish for 1950. That investigation is now proceeding, and it will probably be July before it is finished. We are not going back on anything that we have promised to do. In my statement I was referring to the 1951 season.

Therefore I am going on the assumption that the minister is reviewing the deficiency in payments received by fishermen last year for their fish, and that some time next month the amount they should have received will be made up by the federal government. That I take it is what the guarantee means.

In connection with the fishermen not making their money last year, the minister has announced very little carry-over of last year's fish and suggests that they are starting off with a pretty good year in sight. That I agree with for the reason that the fish is sold. I shall read now from a speech of the president of the Newfoundland salt codfish association, delivered on February 13, 1951. One