

to." Well, Mr. Howard, they are written into two main types of permits which are issued by the British Columbia forest service. The timber sale licences which are issued by that forest service to cover public timber sales in crown forests or to sustain new units, public works and services and this sort of thing. These are sales which are made by auction. We have a clause called the "L" series of clauses which are inserted by the forest service for this type of tenure.

The second type of tenure which we have in British Columbia is the tree farm licence. Mr. Howard wondered how we dealt with these tree farm licences which were common after the forest act of 1947.

Under these tree farm licences, the holder of these licences must submit periodically to the British Columbia forest service harvesting plans for the timber they are required to cut. The forest service issues tree cutting permits periodically, I think it is every two or three years, to these licensed holders and, it is in these tree cutting permits where they insert a clause called the "G" clause which covers the fisheries requirements. This covers the tree farm licences, the pulp harvesting licences and this sort of thing. This leaves then only one of the categories of tenure to cover and, this is the private holdings of which there are some statutory licences to timber companies who have had these since 1910 or so and, in these situations, we deal strictly with the company involved. Almost all of these statutory licences are held by large timber companies who are very easy to get along with in comparison with the group we call the gyppo logger. We have dealt directly with these large timber concerns and have received their assurances and their co-operation in making sure that they observe the intent of these clauses we insert in the public tree cutting and timber licences. I think that covers it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARNETT: I have a question or two arising out of the same document that Mr. Howard has been referring to. If I might be permitted, Mr. Chairman, while we were dealing with the pages in the question of the timber tenures in British Columbia to make a correction. In the last line on page 206 I am reported as having said: "Prince George Island is part of the Vancouver Port, I think." This would be most unintelligible to anyone in British Columbia. As I recall it, what I did say is—

The CHAIRMAN: It is a good thing you have a British Columbia Chairman or we might hold you to that.

Mr. BARNETT: —Vancouver Island is part of the Vancouver forest district, I think.

Coming back to the document, like Mr. Howard I was a bit surprised at that sweeping statement at the bottom of page 1 that there was no pollution problem from these installations. This matter has, of course, been corrected but I would like to observe that I was surprised in part because, I had read the Research Board report on the outfall installation at Crofton. From my understanding of it, with my lack of scientific knowledge in these fields, it did not seem to me that this was in accordance with the detailed report of the research board and, I feel quite sure that the oyster leaseholders around Crofton would not be too happy with a statement that there was no pollution problem at all from these installations.

In connection with the Alberni situation, perhaps I could get some clarification of the relationship between the statement in this document, and an