

we are concerned, it has not been the policy of any government to allow trap fishing.

Mr. FOUND: Except on the southwest coast of Vancouver Island, which is competing in this area.

Hon. Mr. KING: It is true that there was opposition to the treaty when it was before Parliament, but at the same time those who were very closely associated with the fishery, and the provincial Government, thoroughly endorsed the treaty.

However, the treaty did not pass in 1929, and we have the new treaty with the two amendments that I speak of. It would seem to me that perhaps we lost an opportunity in 1929, because we were advised at that time that the Washington interests were ready to accept it and had withdrawn their opposition. Since then that opposition has been revived. As for the withdrawal of the treaty, that is a matter of Government policy. This committee might make a recommendation, but I should like to have an opportunity to very seriously consider it before being a party to it.

The committee rose until 3 p.m.

The Committee resumed at 3 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: I have two letters here, one from Mr. Found to Captain Dennis, Acting Chief of the Naval Service, asking for information as to the cost of the seal patrol service, and Captain Dennis' reply.

(The Chairman reads the letters.)

Hon. Mr. McRAE: That is a little more of the same kind of nonsense that we have been getting for a long time, Mr. Chairman. I suggest we ask for the log of the last three years, showing the days that have been spent on this work. Personally I have been disgusted with that sort of procedure on the part of the navy for a long time. The idea that a boat running on the high seas at that season of the year is on training work, is absurd.

Mr. FOUND: I tried to convey to Captain Dennis as clearly as I could what I understood to be the wish of the Committee. Would it not be well if the Secretary of the Committee would write for the log, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think it would be better for the Secretary to write, and ask for the log, showing when the boat was actually patrolling.

Perhaps this would be a convenient time for Mr. Found to give us an outline of the work of the Commission on the culture and propagation of salmon.

Mr. FOUND: Mr. Chairman, the question of artificial culture of salmon from the commercial standpoint has been one on which there has been a good deal of difference of opinion for a number of years. At least there was in the earlier years a good deal of difference of opinion. Certain knowledge was available. We know, for instance, that while under natural conditions say upwards of fifteen per cent of the eggs that are laid are fertilized and hatched, under artificial conditions we feel we are doing very badly when we do not get 90 per cent of the eggs that are collected, hatched. In fact on occasions we get very much more than 90 per cent. We know that we can distribute to the areas in which they would have been naturally hatched, active young fry to the quantities that I have indicated. What the return from that fry is to the commercial catch is a matter of conjecture, and has been everywhere. Hence it was decided ten years ago that we should seek to replace opinion by knowledge. There was only one way to do that, namely, by getting some controlled area and make an investigation. It seemed to be a long time to have to wait, but in view of the importance of the matter it was considered the best thing to do. The Biological Board went into the matter very carefully, and after a good deal of investigation Cultus Lake, a tributary of the Fraser, was chosen, because that area could be under absolute control—that is we could control all the fish going