

enough to send me from his office copies both of that agreement and of the later agreement made in 1928. The two agreements are practically identical. I do not think there are any powers in the one which cannot be found in the other. The point with regard to which I should like to have some information from the minister is in connection with the policy of the department. Clause 9 reads exactly the same in both agreements. Let me quote it:

The dominion shall inform the province as to any policy intended to be adopted by the former for the encouragement and development of the oyster or other mollusc industry as soon as such policy is decided upon, as well as of any changes that may from time to time be made in such policy as such changes are decided upon.

Under that clause, when the federal Department of Fisheries decided upon a certain policy, whether in respect to leasing areas or anything else, it was intended that before putting such policy into effect they should consult with the provincial government for their approval. I understand that last season the department decided on the policy of leasing areas, and that before they embarked upon that policy, in conformity with section 9, which, as I say, is the same in both agreements, they consulted with the provincial government. After that consultation they proceeded to lease areas.

No doubt either the minister or his deputy is familiar with both agreements. Is it the minister's opinion that the two agreements are identical in the powers they contain, or does he think that there are in either agreement certain powers that are not conferred by the other? So far as I can find out, both agreements are the same. I have before me copies of both, and after examining them carefully I cannot find any difference between them so far as the powers they confer are concerned. I should like to know from the minister whether his department consulted with the provincial authorities last year, and whether as a result of that consultation they proceeded, in accordance with the terms of section 9 of the agreement, to lease areas as the policy of the department.

Mr. DURANLEAU: My information is that there was a consultation between the Department of Fisheries and the authorities on the island before these notices for leases were issued, and it was agreed that the policy would be as outlined in the notices published in 1931 in the *Charlottetown Guardian*, the *Patriot* and other papers.

Item agreed to.

41761—204

To assist in the conservation and development of the deep sea fisheries and the demand for fish, \$136,000.

Mr. NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words on this vote. I ask the minister to consider instituting a policy of bonusing for the processing of dogfish. I realize that the granting of bonuses is a common thing nowadays, and I think in this case it is fully justified. Dogfish are worse than sharks as far as destructive powers are concerned. They not only eat fish but they destroy the nets. Sharks will destroy a net if they happen to get into one, but they do not frequent the waters where the nets are ordinarily used.

I should like to cite an instance of a reduction plant which made an effort to reduce the number of these fish. This plant was conducted by a cannery company in an effort to keep its men employed. No charge was made for overhead but it was found there was a loss of \$2 per ton on 3,200 tons of fish processed. Patriotism is all right but when it comes to a loss of \$2 per ton it cannot be kept up very long. This plant spent \$27,000, and in addition it expended \$7,000 for white labour. Some \$15,000 was spent for fish, some of which were caught by Japanese. The continued operation of such a plant would not only keep men employed in these days of unemployment but would prove of great benefit to the fishing industry. The argument is often used that dogfish are all over the Pacific, and I suppose in the Atlantic, and that it would be about as useless to try to kill them off as it would be to pump out the ocean. That seems to be a plausible argument but I think real experience shows otherwise. The waters of the ocean are not inhabited by so many fish per square mile or square yard; the different fish frequent certain areas and if they are destroyed in that area their absence is noticed for quite a long while. A reduction plant was started down on the San Juan islands south of British Columbia but they were unable to get sufficient fish from the neighbouring waters although they are contiguous to the waters of the gulf of Georgia to which I refer.

I can quote another instance in the case of whales. Whaling was indulged in very extensively a number of years ago and was found to be very profitable. Three stations were built on the west coast of Vancouver island and it was then decided to build one on the gulf of Georgia. It had been noticed that the whales were numerous between the island and the mainland, they were seen to