

Mr. BARBER: I just wish to point out that the vote for fish culture, which has been condemned by some, amounts to \$240,000. That has to do with one of our main industries, perhaps the best of all the industries having to do with fish, the sockeye salmon industry. To-day, on the other hand, we are paying \$201,100 in order to maintain this board of scientists. Once more I wish to stress the importance of the minister taking into consideration the application of a little more practical knowledge and consultation with some of the practical men engaged in this industry, instead of leaving it all to a board of scientists.

Mr. NEILL: I asked the reason for the \$13,000 that appears in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. MICHAUD: That provides \$10,000 for a biological station in the lower St. Lawrence and \$3,000 to pay the salary of a lobster investigator in the maritime provinces. The lobster supply is getting low and for some years the lobster fishermen and the lobster packers have been requesting that a scientist should be entrusted with the duty of investigating the cause of his diminution of supply.

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): There are one or two general observations that I wish to make. The matter to which I shall refer may be new to the minister, but it certainly is not new to the department. For a number of years the fishermen in Nova Scotia have been agitated over the continued use of the beam trawler. Several royal commissions have been appointed to consider this matter and have made reports adverse to the continued use of the trawlers.

Mr. ISNOR: Did the hon. member say that all those reports were unanimous?

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): I did not use the word "unanimous" at all.

Mr. ISNOR: What did you say?

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): I said that the reports were against the use of the beam trawlers.

Mr. ISNOR: All the reports?

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): All of them.

Mr. ISNOR: That is not quite correct.

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): I know some of the reports were not unanimous, but in my training a report of the majority is the report. I was going on to say that what

might be termed a makeshift policy was adopted some years ago for the licensing of these trawlers, and I understand some licences have been issued this year. Before a licence is issued the department must be satisfied from evidence that the issuing of a licence is necessary in the interests of the trade. My idea of evidence is that an opportunity is given to both sides to be heard, and my complaint is that on this occasion only one side was heard. I am going to suggest to the minister, on behalf of the fishermen whom I represent, and I know I can speak for the fishermen in many other counties, that no licence should be issued until both sides to the controversy have been heard.

I am sorry I must differ with the hon. member for Queens-Lunenburg (Mr. Kinley); I do not believe sufficient money is appropriated for the purpose of properly guarding our streams. One of the best assets that the province of Nova Scotia could have from the tourist standpoint is streams well stocked with sport fish. I do not know where the hon. member got the idea that the salaries paid to these guardians were too large. The hon. member's idea was that they were so large as to be almost discriminatory when compared with other industries. These guardians are paid only \$25 or \$30 per month.

Mr. KINLEY: Not in my county.

Mr. CAMERON (Cape Breton): I have the figures under my hand. They are employed for only two or three months and I do not think you can expect to have an efficient guardian when you pay such low wages. If you want to have your streams properly protected you must pay more money for this service. I cannot recall the term used by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Neill), but whatever it was I hope the minister will remember it in his attitude toward the Minister of Finance (Mr. Dunning) in the coming year when estimates are being considered.

Mr. KINLEY: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend must have misinterpreted what I said. In one stream in my county we put on more guardians, but the department is paying them less. I think that is sound business. I am not saying that our streams should not be properly guarded; on the contrary what I say is that it is better to have more guardians, and that can be done at the lower rate; the same money employs more guardians.

I should like to say a word about the use of beam trawlers. In the light of conditions that exist I cannot see how anyone in authority