

member for Fraser Valley was quoting from, which made a bitter attack on almost everybody who differed from them. They attacked if not the integrity at least the intelligence of everybody who ventured to differ from them, right down the line.

Where the argument comes in now is with reference to what the hon. member for Fraser Valley says. This was what they were so convinced of, the last word of experience at that time; why the complete turnover? Of course the minister can say it is only a fool who never changes his mind, but let us observe the conditions under which it was changed. We recommended that an investigation should be made by practical men accompanied by scientists. In the course of a year or two—because it takes a long time to get a department to move—they got the thing going. In 1925 they started this investigation, and they picked, out of all the world, Cultus lake, presumably because the geographical formation made it convenient to put in the necessary weirs and traps. The word Cultus is a Chinook or Siwash word meaning "worthless," and I am told it was so named in the early days because it was useless for any class of fishing. The biological board said that in this lake there are large numbers of squaw fish and Dolly Varden char, and they also refer to suckers, Williamson's whitefish, and chub. Apparently the lake is swarming with these predatory fishes, which feed almost entirely on the young salmon, and it was a godsend to them when we started rearing young salmon for their daily meal. Consequently they could hardly expect that the results would be distinctly favourable. Now they come along and decide to shut down on all the hatcheries. And on what data? Here it is. The minister quoted in part the report. It is a voluminous report, but this is a summary of it:

On the whole—

After eleven years' experiments.

—it may reasonably be concluded that in an area such as Cultus lake, where a natural run of sockeye occurs with a reasonable expectancy of successful spawning, artificial propagation, for purposes of continuing the run to that area, is unnecessary and, if producing any additional results over natural spawning, these would not appear to be in any way commensurate with the cost.

That is fairly vague, after eleven years' experimenting. Then they add a rider, in case that was not vague enough:

This conclusion may not apply to areas where there is no reasonable expectation of successful natural propagation.

So that it leaves the door open to say: Go to the place where there is no good natural

propagation and it will be a success. But if it is a success in the one place it should be a success in the other place. After eleven years' experimentation that is as far as they can go towards making a definite conclusion. It is known to the department that this investigation has been going on since the year 1925. It was intended to run for ten years, and they finished with the work and made that report last fall. One would suppose, would one not, if one were dealing with a body that was a business organization in any way at all, that they would suspend action on this policy until they saw the results of this investigation; in other words, that they would not build any more hatcheries, at any rate so close to the period when the report would be expected. But I found last fall that the hatcheries in my district were being frozen out, men were being taken away from them just at the very time they were needed, their efficiency impaired and reduced. Why? Because the money voted was exhausted. I naturally asked why, and the answer I got is this, among other reasons, that there was the construction of a new hatchery in Nova Scotia. This is not an attack on the minister, because my friend the right hon. leader of the opposition was in charge at that time. Indeed, the leader of the opposition had no more to do with it than the present minister, being equally ignorant, I have no doubt. I do not say that offensively: no doubt the department knew about it. The department knew these investigations were narrowing to a focus, a conclusion that was more than likely to be inimical to their policy, and yet they go and build a new hatchery in Nova Scotia. There was an election coming on. I do not know whether that had anything to do with it. At any rate the department should have put its foot down and said, "No. Pending a decision on this point we won't build a new hatchery anywhere." But there is the sort of haphazard policy—no, it is not a policy, a hand to mouth method by which they go along.

Now, in the last few years hatcheries have cost us not a little. I got a return limited to the last fifteen years, and the total cost of hatcheries in Canada was \$4,728,000—practically four and three-quarter million dollars. That is a good deal to spend on hatcheries. We are now going to throw them into the discard and we are not clear whether we should or should not do this. We are saying that it might be as well to do this, or perhaps there may be some other place where the same system would be successful. I should like to quote