

*Canada Lands Surveys Act*

we have called them in Hudson bay has only one. And while I am on my feet I might add that the beluga we catch in Hudson bay weighs only from about 1,200 to 2,000 pounds. One readily sees the difference between that and the large ocean whale that weighs anywhere from 20 to 80 or 90 tons.

**Mr. Knowles:** Are not the same products obtained from both these species? Perhaps I should first ask whether the beluga is an animal, because I understand the whale is a mammal, not a fish. To which family does the beluga belong?

**Mr. Ward:** As I said a moment ago, it belongs to the porpoise family. The oil from the beluga is of a much finer quality than is obtained from the larger species, and is used exclusively in the manufacture of domestic shortening, margarine and kindred products. There is a further difference in that we utilize every ounce of the anatomy. It is not dried, but is ground and sold to the fur industry. We also salvage a considerable quantity of a very fine quality of edible sirloin steak made from the animals we process. Then we get small quantities of a very fine lubricating oil known as jaw oil. I believe it is not obtained from any species other than the porpoise family. This oil is used in the oiling of precision machinery such as addressograph machines, cheque-writing machines, wrist watches and other fine precision machinery. We produce a small quantity of that quality of oil.

**Mr. Knowles:** I note that the hon. member for Dauphin has indicated many more uses for the oil from belugas than were indicated by the parliamentary assistant for the oil from whales. I noticed in particular that the parliamentary assistant omitted any reference to the use of whale oil in the manufacture of margarine. Is it used for that purpose?

**Mr. MacNaught:** I understand that it is, but only in trifling quantities.

**Mr. Herridge:** I was interested in the information given to the committee regarding these one-blow-hole belugas. Do they abound in such quantities that there is no necessity for their being protected by fishing regulations?

**Mr. MacNaught:** The scientific studies of the commission have not yet reached that stage.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—*Definitions*.

**Mr. Knowles:** I understand we are not now approving of the convention which appears as a schedule to the bill. That has already been done.

**Mr. MacNaught:** The convention has already been approved by a joint address of both houses. It was done in 1948.

Section agreed to.

Sections 3 to 11 inclusive agreed to.

Bill reported.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** When shall the bill be read a third time?

**Some hon. Members:** Now.

**Mr. Knowles:** By leave.

**Mr. Fournier, Hull (for Mr. Mayhew)** moved the third reading of the bill.

Motion agreed to, bill read the third time and passed.

## CANADA LANDS SURVEYS ACT

## REVISION AND CONSOLIDATION OF FORMER STATUTE

**Hon. George Prudham (Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys)** moved the second reading of Bill No. 14, respecting the surveys of public lands of Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Beaudoin in the chair.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2—*Definitions*.

**Mr. Herridge:** In paragraph (e) of subsection 1 of section 2 the term "dominion land surveyor" is used, and it says that it means a person who holds a commission. Is a person holding a dominion land surveyor's certificate entitled to perform services for private interests in the provinces? What are his functions?

**Mr. Prudham:** A dominion land surveyor holds a certificate which entitles him to practise his profession in the Northwest Territories or any lands that are under the control of the federal government. He cannot register a transfer in a provincial registry office.

**Mr. Knowles:** When we were at the resolution stage of this bill we had an interesting discussion concerning the proposal to change the title from Dominion Lands Surveys Act to Canada Lands Surveys Act. As a matter of fact I think it is a good change, but I note that in other places in the bill, particularly in this section, the word "dominion" still appears. Would the minister explain how it is that the government has decided to drop the term "dominion" in some instances and replace it with "Canada" and in other cases to leave the word "dominion"?