

Mr. FOUND: There is this side of the case that it would be well for the Committee to consider. At the present time the Government is getting through the Board the assistance of a number of the best universities in the country, without any cost, the work that the university men are doing being interlocked with that done by representatives from the department and representatives from the industry. I am not sure that it would be more efficient if we had it absolutely as a scientific division of the department, as it is in the United States and in Great Britain. And certainly our costs are not greater, nor anything like as great, as they are in other countries where the fishing industry is as important.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: The costs are fairly substantial. Surely the universities would not be less sympathetic if the work were done under your direction.

Mr. FOUND: That may be true, sir.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: Is it not a fact that there was a bill brought down some years ago to put the Board under the department? I am certainly of the opinion that it should be under the department.

Mr. FOUND: In the meantime the Board has been working as closely and as earnestly with the department as if it were a division of the department.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: It is not logical that an expenditure of this size would be carried out as well when not under the supervision of the department as if it were under the department. I do think, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee should consider this matter as to whether the Biological Board should not be a branch of the department.

Mr. FOUND: The Secretary of the Board is a member of the department and exercises a great deal of influence.

Hon. Mr. McRAE: You deal with them a little differently from the way you would if they were a part of your staff, is that not so? And I again refer you to the fact that a few years ago you wanted a bill passed to have the Board under your department. I say you were right then, and that such a policy is right now.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Reid is here now. If it is the wish of the Committee we might hear him at this time, and allow Mr. Found to conclude later.

Mr. THOMAS REID, M.P. for New Westminster:

Mr. Chairman and senators, like yourselves I am deeply interested in the matter before you, especially as it affects the Fraser river, which is one of the districts that I have the honour to represent.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you going to deal with the subject first from the point of view of this convention for the protection and the maintenance of the fishery, and secondly as to how it would affect the industry?

Mr. REID: I thought I would make first a few remarks dealing particularly with the salmon treaty, which was under discussion all morning. The question of propagation was touched upon by Senator McRae. I feel that perhaps he and I are of the same opinion on the question of propagation. I am still in doubt as to whether the moneys spent in propagation in our province are bringing about as good results as we would like. Last year I took some time to look into the question of propagation in the hatcheries, and I was surprised to learn that in taking the eggs from the fish the procedure is different from the natural one. I say this for the benefit of the members who have perhaps not given the matter such intimate attention as some of us have. According to the information given to me, when the salmon lays its eggs it does not lay all at the one time, they are not all ripe at the same time. But in the propagating, the eggs are stripped all at the one time into the buckets, before the milt of the male fish is placed upon them, with the result that it is only the mature eggs that are fertilized and