issued and it is not our intention, unless we have to do it of necessity, to reduce the number of licences held in that particular area.

The hon. member for Kootenay West asked a difficult question regarding legal me responsibility for the protection and development of the sport fishery. In the province of British Columbia the sport fishery regulations are administered by the province. These regulations are suggested to us and orders in council are passed establishing them. Anadromous fish such as commercial salmon, for example, are definitely a federal responsibility. As I have said, proposed sport fishery regulations are forwarded to the federal government and an order in council is passed making them legal; but the control of fisheries in lakes, for example, is entirely a provincial responsibility.

The hon. member for Kent (Ont.) referred to the problems of the inland fishermen. I think the answer I have given to the hon. member for Grey North deals in part with the questions raised by the hon. member for Kent (Ont.) I agree that the intervention of the price support board last fall saved the industry in lake Erie particularly. In recent weeks we had a meeting with representatives of the industry. We still have on hand supplies of fish purchased last fall. It is our intention to dispose of this stock as soon as possible. It is more than likely that we will be called upon again this year to introduce the price support program in order to assist the industry. Last year's program had a very good effect in improving the quality of the product and controlling the market.

I will also keep in mind the suggestion made by the hon. member for Coast-Capilano to continue the special subsidy in respect of catching and processing dogfish. Due to assistance provided last year by the federal Department of Fisheries experiments were made in the preparing and marketing of dogfish for human consumption. The experiments have been fairly successful and we hope to be able to continue them this year in order to achieve practical results.

Mr. Chairman, this answers most of the questions raised. If I have forgotten any I would ask hon. members to remind me and I will be prepared to give in writing full details to the questions they have asked.

Mr. Howard: Mr. Chairman, I wonder minister. I will quote from page 315 of the whether I might follow up what the minister committee proceedings of Monday, June 6, said about the research fishing, or spot fishing 1966, almost exactly a year ago. At that time I for salmon in the Dixon entrance and the fact had raised the matter, and I will quote my

Supply—Fisheries

that this will be continued this year. In between the time I made my remarks before supper and now I have been reading the Prince Rupert Daily News of May 30 last. If I had known about this editorial at the time, I would have mentioned it in my original remarks. Perhaps I could read the article—it is very short—and ask the minister to what it pertains. It is headed "Research on salmon" and says:

A joint United States-Canadian committee on fisheries will recommend a general research program on the intermingling of U.S. and Canadian salmon, it was announced in Juneau recently.

The committee chairman, Commissioner Walker Kirkness of the Alaska Fish and Game Department, said the program would try to determine where, when and why salmon stocks from the two countries intermingle.

All waters from the northern end of Vancouver Island to Jakutat, Alaska, would be studied, he said.

The committee's recommendations are expected to be submitted to the U.S. and Canadian governments in early June.

If approved, the research program would probably continue for four to 10 years.

Is this a correct declaration, or is it another research program? If so, I wonder whether the minister could explain what this particular one is designed to accomplish.

Mr. Robichaud: Mr. Chairman, the program referred to by the hon. member is on a much larger scale than the one undertaken last year. As I have said, the one undertaken last year takes care of two different runs of salmon. This is why we had to carry it on this year in order to determine what position we should take. I will certainly make this report available so that the hon. member will have complete information in this respect. The other program he referred to has not as yet been brought to my attention, although I understand it is on a much larger scale and will affect the movement of salmon on the whole of the west coast.

Mr. Howard: The four to ten years mentioned in the article struck me as being rather long if we were to arrive at any worth-while conclusions on the other aspect of the program.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, I should like to make reference to the committee proceedings of last year in order to set the background for a particular question which I would like to put to the minister. I will quote from page 315 of the committee proceedings of Monday, June 6, 1966, almost exactly a year ago. At that time I had raised the matter, and I will quote my