

be blowing all over the place and it was thought that a great harvest could be got from these comparatively sheltered waters. However, they were able to catch only nineteen, I think it was, whales; that was the total population, so to speak, of whales in that area, and it was many years before the outside whales started to come in again, I think either ten or twelve years. That supports the point I am trying to make, that if you vigorously prosecute the taking of these dogfish in the gulf of Georgia they would not immediately rush in from some other portions of the Pacific coast. Sea lions are destroyed and although the whole Pacific ocean is open to them; their destruction has proved very beneficial to the local gill netters.

The particular reduction plant to which I refer was only paying the fisherman \$3 per ton for the fish. The fisherman could not make a living at that rate, and even with that small price paid, the plant could not pay its way. The suggestion offered is that the men should be given a bonus of \$1 per ton and the reduction plant 50 cents per ton in order to enable it to operate. I should like to give some figures to show how beneficial the operation of this plant would prove. The 3,200 tons processed by this plant represents roughly 400,000 dogfish. According to the last report of the Department of Fisheries the number of salmon caught last year of record was 37,000,000. These dogfish have the playful habit of coming along and taking a bite out of the best portion of a salmon. Of course the salmon dies. Then when the dogfish feels like having another appetizer, it attacks another salmon. I think it is fair to say that each dogfish would kill at least four salmon per day. Taking this figure, the number of dogfish processed would have destroyed in one year sixteen times the total catch of salmon last year.

The department exists for the purpose of stimulating and encouraging the fishing industry, and I do not know of a better way they could carry out this purpose. This vote is for the conservation and development of deep sea fisheries and the demand for fish, and I think it would cover the bonus to which I refer. If not, there is another vote lower down on the page where \$160,000 is to be authorized by statute for fishing bounty. This is the vote which always brings a blush of shame to the honest countenances of the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis (Mr. Short) and the Chairman (Mr. MacDonald, Cape

[Mr. Neill.]

Breton South). I notice that the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis said very emphatically this afternoon that he was opposed to bounties, but under this item we find him subscribing to a bounty of \$160,000, to which he is not entitled.

Mr. SHORT: That is a bounty provided by statute and one which we have had for fifty years.

Mr. NEILL: And paid for out of the federal treasury.

Mr. SHORT: That did not cost this country a dollar. It was paid for by the government of the United States.

Mr. NEILL: That is an old, old story, and I really think the hon. member has come to believe it. After long years of malfeasance one sometimes comes to believe in a thing. That sum is taken out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada every year. There is no reason why it should not be used for the purpose for which it was voted in the act, I think, of 1882, namely, for the development of fisheries. I know, however, this is a sore point with my hon. friend and I shall say nothing more about it at present. I was only pointing out that here would be a real, practical use for it. I do not think even my hon. friends will claim that the present use of that bounty is to the best interest even of the fishermen to whom it goes. It is handed out in small amounts and the Cockfield Brown report says that it should be used for some more general purpose; that was the only practical suggestion in the report. In any case that would be a place where this money could be used in a very practical way and it certainly would be cheaper to spend the money in that manner and help fishermen to help themselves rather than that we should have to put them on relief. A fisherman is almost like a doctor. He knows his business; he has been brought up to it for generations and he is not accustomed to other work; he would be about as much at home doing manual work on a road as a doctor or a lawyer would be. Why not help him to help himself? If you gave this assistance, you could measure it in dollars; when you go in for direct relief, you do not know where the cost is going to end. This policy would enable people to help themselves, and I know of no better way in which money could be used than to help workless people to help themselves. This reduction plant, very much to their credit be