

they try it out with each government in turn to see if they can get away with it. They seem to be very much concerned about our British Columbia traps. At the time of this investigation about which I am talking, in 1929, the argument was advanced that if it was right for them to have traps at one point in British Columbia it was equally right for them to have them up there in the north, or in any other part.

Mr. GREEN: There is no attempt to open up any other part, the attempt here is to do away with even these traps.

Mr. NEILL: Yes, I wanted to confine it to that. However, it affects every fisherman and every fishing interest in British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. MICHAUD: In order to be completely fair I think you should state that the question has been brought here in the form in which it was brought before the house. I think you will agree to that?

Mr. NEILL: Yes, I do; I wanted it to cover everything.

Hon. Mr. MICHAUD: And the wording of the reference is such that it does cover everything.

The CHAIRMAN: It was referred to the committee on that basis.

Mr. NEILL: It is quite open. What I was replying to was the point raised by Mr. Tomlinson, that we should consider traps all over British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: So far as the petition is concerned I think it goes without saying that everyone interested whether directly or indirectly has a right to sign.

Mr. TAYLOR: Since this is very definitely established as a peculiar case, and since there are no other cases like it presented to us, could we not restrict this discussion to the use of traps at Sooke?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR: It affects the fish going into the Fraser river, and the arguments which would apply for other parts of British Columbia would not apply to this area; and conversely the arguments which apply here would not apply in support of traps at other points.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, generally speaking, I think it will be agreed that we are dealing with these four traps at this particular point at the present time. We have a witness here who has come to give us evidence and I think it would be well probably for us to hear him at this time.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Chairman, the order of reference is not restricted.

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. RYAN: The order of reference reads:—

“That the question of the advisability of the government issuing traps fishing licences in British Columbia waters be referred to the standing committee on Marine and Fisheries for study and report.”

I am not familiar with procedure in committee but I was wondering whether or not the committee had the power in any way to restrict or modify a reference to it?

The CHAIRMAN: I do not think so. It would have to be referred back to the house for such action as that body deemed appropriate.

Mr. HANSON: The principle before us is indicated in the reference and that is in our record. This company has had a privilege for 30 or 40 years and now we are asked to extend that privilege to them without giving consideration to others who are engaged in the same business. As I said in the house I think it is about time that there should be uniformity in this respect; either let everyone have it or take this privilege away from the few who have had it so long.