

Skeena (Mr. Stork) referred to in the course of his speech on the Address the other evening. I had an opportunity of visiting this plant last summer, and it has certainly contributed largely to the development of the fisheries, especially in regard to halibut, on the Pacific coast. The smallest grant was given to the plant at Peterboro.

Mr. HANSON: In view of the statement the minister makes that he has been unable to spend the money voted for subsidies each year, may I ask him if there is any pronounced demand on the part of co-operative societies for this measure, and, if so, from what part of the country does it come? Or does it emanate from the officials of his department so they may be enabled to spend the money which at present they have no outlet for?

Mr. MOTHERWELL: Properly these questions should be put when the bill is before Committee of the Whole, but with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to answer my hon. friend. We have had requests from several quarters, the principal one being from the minister of agriculture for Ontario. We have discussed the matter with him several times. He is very much interested in co-operative effort, particularly as it relates to the dairy industry. The fruit-growing industry of the Niagara peninsula also made a request through Colonel Roberts, who is himself operating a plant at Grimsby and is very familiar with the local fruit industry. He recognizes that the fruit industry can only be successfully carried on in future by the establishment of pre-cooling plants, so that the fruit directly it is gathered may be put into cold storage to reduce its temperature, retard the ripening process and arrest bacterial action. We have also had a request from the Pacific coast. Hon. members from British Columbia are of course familiar with the fruit industry there. We are informed that what is wanted probably more than anything else is cold storage accommodation so that the marketing season may be extended and thus give fruit producers a chance to dispose of their products over a longer marketing period.

Mr. SPEAKER: I need not remind hon. members that they can speak only once on the second reading. Of course, when the bill is in committee stage no restriction applies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I asked a question, Mr. Speaker, preliminary to making some remarks on the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I understand the hon. member put a question a moment ago.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I do not go so far as to say that I am opposed to the bill, but my experience of cold storage operations aided by government subsidy is not such as to urge me to become enthusiastic over the proposals contained in this measure. The minister (Mr. Motherwell) says he has \$500,000 a year to spend for this purpose, and he wants an opportunity of spending it. But surely that is hardly sufficient justification for the bill. We can easily relieve him from his embarrassment by not voting the money.

Mr. MARTELL: Is my hon. friend prepared to state that the fruit industry of the Annapolis valley, comprising the counties of King's, Hants and Annapolis, is not in need of government subsidies for the establishment of pre-cooling plants for the better handling of fruit? Do I understand him to be opposed to such assistance?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know whether the fruit industry in the Annapolis valley is in need of such assistance or not. My hon. friend, I have no doubt, will tell us before the bill passes whether or not there is necessity for such state aid in Nova Scotia. If there is such necessity, I have not the slightest doubt that private interests in the Annapolis valley could very well supply the accommodation themselves. However, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to say that I doubt very much the wisdom of continuing the Cold Storage Subsidy Act, and when this bill comes before the Committee on Agriculture I hope it will be given full and frank consideration. In so far as the act has been applied in Nova Scotia the results have not been satisfactory. The present Cold Storage Act owed its genesis I think to the efforts of persons interested in the fish industry in the Maritime provinces. I am not quite positive about that, but that is my impression. As the minister has stated, some plants have been subsidized there, but gradually they have drifted into private hands, and to all intents and purposes they are now private institutions. I believe that will happen in almost all cases where such plants are subsidized by the government. I observe that the minister in moving his resolution stated that he was very doubtful whether the act should be continued, simply by reason of the fact that such few requests for aid under its provisions had been received by his department.

I do not see how you can very well distinguish between a corporation, a co-operative society, and a private individual. The end which any one of the three might have in mind would be served and the same results