

*Inspection of Canned Salmon*

speaking about this very same thing, the transport of fish from one area to another, said:

As dominion inspection of canned salmon takes place it safeguards the public irrespective of where the fish had been transported from to the cannery.

That is the opinion of Hon. Mr. Howe, who is in charge of the fisheries for the province of British Columbia. So we are not alone in regard to this matter.

The most serious matter, however—and I say it in all seriousness to the acting minister—is the question of purse seines in the gulf of Georgia. I might say that on the 8th of February I wrote the acting minister regarding this matter and I received a reply from him dated the tenth, in which he says the question is still receiving consideration. I will just ask you to note that, Mr. Speaker, because at the time that letter was written the order in council had been passed or was being passed. I think it is unfair to write a letter to a member saying that this would receive consideration, "this" being the protest that I was then making against purse seining in the gulf of Georgia, at a time when the order in council had already been passed. I would like some explanation of that, especially if the acting minister is going to reply, because the order in council is of the same date. I do not know who is responsible for the orders in council which have been put into effect, but we had an explanation to-night of who was responsible for at least one of them, when the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Stevens) took the responsibility for the one regarding the gutting and cleaning of salmon. The men engaged in the industry have been entirely ignored, and by this order in council which allows purse seines in the gulf of Georgia have had it put over them. I will send this map to the minister when I am through. I have it marked, and if he will examine it closely he will see that the area now taken in by the order in council practically cuts across the mouth of the Fraser and blocks the whole river. I would remind him also that gill nets cannot operate where seines operate, so that if seines are allowed here to catch pinks in the mouth of the Fraser it will do away entirely with the men who use gill nets. That is point number one. I am also drawing his attention to another point, that the individual fisherman fishes far into the area now open to seines. It will absolutely do away with the individual fisherman, and at a time like this I maintain is very serious indeed. The acting minister may say: Oh yes, but the pink salmon

[Mr. Reid.]

are in far better condition being caught out there than after they come up the Fraser river. This is questionable, Mr. Speaker, but even so the pink salmon in the Fraser river is not such a serious matter as to warrant the use of seines, because from the particulars before me I find that in 1931, out of 83,000 cases that were canned in district No. 1, which is the Fraser river district, there were only 557 cases of pinks. The year before there was a smaller catch, 13,375, and out of that 896 cases of pinks. So the matter of catching pinks out there is not as serious as either the deputy or the acting minister would have us believe. Another point overlooked entirely is this, that the pink salmon that is caught there does not all go into cans; part is canned, but a great part of the catch is dry-salted and shipped abroad. The Japanese fishermen sent more dry-salted pink salmon to Japan last year than was canned, according to the return of the deputy minister, which I have in my hand. It was valued at roughly \$12,000,000. And pink salmon is not only canned and dry-salted; it is also sold to the public and used as one of our excellent fishes to eat fresh.

Another serious matter, and one I would ask the hon. minister to pay some attention to, is this: In 1930 there was a treaty adopted by Canada, called the Sockeye Salmon treaty. It was acceptable to this country, but up to date it has not been passed by the Senate of the United States. I had great hopes that with the change of administration this would pass the United States Senate this year. But by passing order in council No. 274 and allowing purse seines in the mouth of the Fraser and the gulf close to the international boundary I claim we have struck a serious blow at the chances of the passage of that Sockeye Salmon treaty by the United States Senate. If we had approached them and said, "You are using traps and seines below the international boundary and are catching the majority of the fish; we spend thousands of dollars a year in breeding fish which on the return journey are caught by the destructive methods used on your side, by both seines and traps", we might have come to an agreement that would allow us a fifty per cent catch. But now we are attempting to retaliate. We say: They are using seines; now we will use seines. And I suppose this is going to be the thin end of the wedge for the introduction of traps; because they use traps we will say the Canadians might as well use them too. I am very sorry that this move was made at this time, especially since a bill has just been introduced into the Senate of the United States asking for the abolition of the use of