

—that the House of Commons might make representations to the state of Washington—and that that might be embodied in the report of the committee. I think he now realizes that that is not the proper channel of communication even if we were justified in taking such action.

Mr. NEILL: The channel would be through the Governor General or the Minister of External Affairs and so on. I used the word "approach."

Mr. MOYER: The point I wish to make is that our government does not make representations to a state government in a matter of this kind; and we would not be justified in doing so even if we could.

Mr. NEILL: Don't they?

Mr. MOYER: So much has been said about the menace to the traps. I think it might not be amiss to read again something that is on the record. On the 4th of February, 1935, there was some legislation before the American congress. This correspondence is embodied on pages 3 and 4 of the proceedings of the committee of Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives of the United States when considering two draft bills introduced into the house with a view to prohibiting the use of traps in the waters of Alaska. It is also to be noted in that connection that Alaskan waters under consideration were in part at least adapted to other modes of fishing, whereas the waters at Sooke can only be fished by traps. In the above mentioned letter the United States Commissioner of Fisheries . . . —and this is concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce— . . . states in part:—As to that part of the bill which after January 1, 1936, would prohibit the use of any trap, weir or pound net in the waters of Alaska, I wish to say that in my opinion this action is unnecessary either for reasons of conservation or upon economic grounds. It is my belief that in some parts of Alaska traps are a proper and economical method of capturing salmon. In other places, where natural conditions are unfavourable, they are not considered proper and therefore are not allowed under the regulations of the department.

An important point for consideration in connection with the proposal to prohibit fish traps in the waters of Alaska is that in those parts of the territory where traps are permitted the quality of the product is of the very best. Under the circumstances I can see no need of so drastic a step as to abolish traps; in fact, such action would work great hardship upon the industry in some places.

Very careful consideration of the entire subject of traps leads me to the firm belief that their prohibition from the waters of Alaska would be unwise. There has been much popular outcry for years against traps, but, after all, it comes largely from individuals who want to avoid the effects of any competition with the fishing gear they themselves operate.

Mr. NEILL: That is already in the record.

Mr. MOYER: Yes, I said that; but several hon. gentlemen are here this morning who were probably not here when this was put into the evidence, and I think it is most appropriate at this winding-up meeting that it should be read again.

Mr. HANSON: That has to do with Alaska; it has nothing to do with us at all.

Mr. NEILL: You will notice that the word used was "prohibition." He was against total prohibition, but the evidence is that he stopped hundreds of traps in Alaska.

Mr. MOYER: We have come down to the point where there will be total prohibition if we eliminate the Sooke traps.

Mr. NEILL: Oh, yes.

Mr. MOYER: What would be the result if the Sooke traps are abolished? Two companies will be put out of business. Our cannery, we claim, will also