

cern that would do so entirely from the standpoint of making money and conserving it, I think it could be done.

Hon. Mr. KING: But after all, isn't this industry like other industries? Take the lumbering industry, for example. What happened in British Columbia and the Eastern Provinces would probably never have happened if the state had been running the business. But a certain procedure has been followed, and I think it will be many years before you change it.

Mr. FOUND: If you ask my opinion as to its feasibility, I would say it is not practicable, particularly when you come to a sea fishery.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: We are only talking about salmon. What the doctor says is true, but I would remind you that the Federal Government owned timber in that country and sold it by auction to the highest bidder, and he operated under lease subject to change from time to time. I have it in mind that some arrangement along the same line in regard to the right to fish would make it possible to conserve the fisheries and at the same time stop the drain on the treasury. The situation is complicated, of course, by provincial rights coming into the picture.

I want to ask you this question frankly, and I ask it without reference to either party. How serious a part has political influence played in the fishery conservation on the Pacific coast?

Mr. FOUND: In recent years we have had hardly anything that could be called interference.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: How recent?

Mr. FOUND: A good many years, possibly twenty years.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Not as long as that. I have been in the game longer than that.

Mr. FOUND: It depends on what one's viewpoint would be. In the very nature of things, those who represent the people have views; but in my experience I am bound to say I have found the representatives of the people to be reasonable when it comes to matters of what is considered for the benefit of the fishery.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Of the fishermen?

Mr. FOUND: Well, when it comes to licence fees, and so on, that is another matter.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Our revenue has dropped off to \$26,000, and we spend roughly \$600,000. So the interests of the public treasury have been overlooked. I quite agree with what Mr. Found says, that the industry can stand no more at the present time, but it seems to me that when business gets better this industry has to go back to a more nearly self-supporting basis, or at least to a basis as good as that of ten or fifteen years ago.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you say that political pressure had had much to do with the reduction in the revenue?

Mr. FOUND: The reduction of revenue in British Columbia, as I stated before, was decided upon following the report of a Commission that was recommended by the Fisheries Committee of the House of Commons to investigate the fisheries. That Committee went carefully into the whole situation, and reached the conclusion that in that respect the department's policy was wrong. Its report was approved and the policy was changed, and that changed policy has been maintained ever since.

The CHAIRMAN: What year was that?

Mr. FOUND: The Committee was appointed in 1922, I think.

Hon. Mr. KING: Or 1923.