

have to go out of business. A community of some 300 people will have to go elsewhere to look for employment, or go on relief and do the best they can. Trap fishing is a specialized variety of fishing, and the trap fisherman is not necessarily a man who can indulge in trolling, purse-seining or other methods of fishing. The government would lose revenue. Mr. Neill has mentioned that that is not an argument, but, possibly, in some cases an iniquitous thing. Who would benefit? The committee has heard the figures as to the catch taken by the trap at Sooke. The fish that pass the traps at Sooke go into American waters. A few of those which the traps might not catch, and would not catch if they were not there, stray back into Canadian waters at the Fraser river. It is impossible to fish in the Sooke waters, so the alleged benefit which has been magnified to the nth degree to the fishing trade in British Columbia waters is, I claim, untenable.

May I say in conclusion that I think the committee would be justified in bringing in a report along the lines suggested by one hon. member at an earlier meeting to the effect that the status quo be not disturbed, but that the committee is against the policy of extending trap licences elsewhere in British Columbia than in this unique location at Sooke; and that (if Mr. Reid wishes) the minister should look into the possibility of improving the traps by opening a gate, or in some other way. It does not seem necessary, but if that would seem advisable, I make the suggestion. Finally, the minister should not be hampered in the administration of a technical branch of his departmental functions.

Mr. REID: In the event of the committee bringing in a report concerning the traps at Sooke, have you any objection to the licence fee being increased to, say, \$500 a trap?

Mr. MOYER: I am not authorized to speak for my clients in that connection. I think that is a matter which the committee could very well go into. This question of the appropriateness of licences and the various classes of gear might very well be reviewed by the committee, but I cannot subscribe to any particular licence scale. Let the minister decide on the committee's recommendation.

Mr. TOMLINSON: I would like to ask a question about dogfish. I was reading the fisheries report this morning which showed that dogfish are now being used commercially—they are being made up into an oil.

Mr. FOUND: Oh, yes. Dogfish are, to the extent that market conditions make it possible, used for conversion into fish meal oil. The difficulty of making an industry of that kind continuously successful is that dogfish are catchable in large quantities in certain places at certain times, and then they may not be there for a long time. There is no certainty of supply, but they are quite valuable for the manufacture of fish meal oil.

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: Have they reached the point where they can provide sufficient oil to make the fish meal useful on land without hurting the land.

Mr. FOUND: Oh, yes, it is the method of treatment of the meal—the type of meal used for producing it and, if necessary, subsequent treatment. Fish meal can be treated by gasoline to practically remove the oil from it.

Mr. REID: Is it not a fact that most of the oil is in the livers, and the livers are first removed. You can treat the flesh much easier that way.

Mr. FOUND: I know that the liver contains the oil, and you can use the fish.

Hon. Mr. TOLMIE: Is it the medicinal oils that are obtained from the livers; the other is lubricating oil, I think?

Mr. CAMERON: Did you ever hear of Harry Baker?

Mr. FOUND: I know who you mean.