

thing under the sun in relation to fisheries can be discussed, for another day, but if the committee are agreeable we might put through the smaller votes.

Mr. BAXTER: Vote number 242, which provides \$95,000 to assist in the conservation and development of deep-sea fisheries and the demand for fish, deals with a large question of policy. I do not know that we will gain any time by postponing matters; they will be discussed just the same.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am trying to make a reasonable compromise.

Mr. BAXTER: We have given you the big end of the compromise all through.

Mr. GRAHAM: Personally, I have been sitting here every night until after midnight and I am just beginning to get accustomed to it. I think we ought to reserve the \$880,000 item because some hon. gentlemen who wish to discuss it are not here. My proposition is that we reserve the two large items I mention, put the others through, and then adjourn.

Mr. CALDWELL: If the minister will guarantee that we can discuss any matter that arises in connection with the votes referred to I see no reason why we should not accept his proposal.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not think there is any question about that. We have been discussing every possible thing under the first item.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Just before that is done let me point out that I asked a question some time ago and I understood the minister was having the matter looked up.

Mr. CARDIN: The members of the Biological Board of Canada are: Dr. A. P. Knight, chairman; Dr. E. E. Prince, secretary-treasurer; Dr. J. P. McMurrich; Mr. John Dybhaven, Mr. Handfield Whitman, Mr. J. J. Cowie, Professor O'Donahoe, Professor C. J. Connolly, Professor P. Cox, Very Rev. Canon V. A. Huard, Professor W. J. McClement, and Dr. A. H. McKay.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Do the members of this board receive any remuneration or any salary?

Mr. CARDIN: They receive no salary.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Has any reorganization taken place in the board? My reason for asking the question is that we were promised last session, I believe, that the board would be reorganized, particularly in so far as the Pacific representation was concerned—that

someone would be appointed who would devote his whole time to studying scientific questions in regard to fisheries on the Pacific coast. Up to the present time, as I understand it, representation has been confined to some university professor who during his holidays, would devote a certain time to studying the habits of fish. That, however, was not considered to be a satisfactory method of representation and, if the minister will remember, the Fisheries Commission of 1922 made certain recommendations in that connection. I think we were promised that some better system of representation would be adopted, and that is what I would like to have an explanation about.

Mr. CARDIN: As a matter of fact the act was amended in 1923, in order to increase the membership of the board and to permit the appointment of three additional men. Two of these were to represent industry—one from either coast—and the third was to be from the department. In this way the particular industries concerned and the department were linked together in such a manner it was thought, as would promote the best interests of those industries. The representative chosen for the Atlantic coast was Mr. Handfield Whitman, of Halifax, and for the Pacific coast Mr. John Dybhaven of Prince Rupert. The question of giving British Columbia larger representation on the board is under consideration and will be taken up at the next meeting of the board.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I did not catch the name of the British Columbia representative.

Mr. CARDIN: He is Mr. Dybhaven.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Is he a scientific man?

Mr. CARDIN: He is representing industry, I am informed.

Mr. McQUARRIE: That does not touch the point at all. As I understand it we were to have a scientific man on the coast who would devote his whole time to studying the habits of the fish, the possibility of restoring the run of salmon on the Fraser river and other matters connected with the Pacific coast fisheries. The minister knows how important the matter is particularly in regard to the Fraser river. The minister no doubt is aware that a few years ago we had a run of salmon on the Fraser river which brought in something like 900,000 cases of salmon per year. That run has been depleted so that at the present time it amounts to simply a matter of fifty or sixty thousand cases or so a year. In consequence the loss to the country is enormous. The matter to be looked into and