

Now I want to refer to the question of fish culture, with which this vote has to do. There is very little space devoted in the report to the culture of sockeye salmon; some seven or eight lines on page 15 constitutes the only reference. In passing I want to observe that this branch of the service turned out about 105,000,000 fry in 1927-28, which cost us \$112,562.35, an average of roughly \$1.15 per thousand. This figure is materially higher than what the state of Washington claim it costs them to turn out fingerlings four or five inches long and six or seven months old under the pond system. I mention this fact to show that it is not a matter of cost with regard to this kind of propagation but rather a question of courage on the part of our department to get that work under way.

Our investigations have been going on ever since the branch was established in British Columbia forty-five years ago; I presume we have been investigating sockeye salmon since that time. They are the greatest commercial fish we have and they present a real problem which we must solve. I discussed this matter the other day at some length, and the minister stated in reply that the biological board had been instructed to make a complete investigation and that the department was prepared to follow the recommendations of that board. I must say to the committee that this promises no solution of our problem at all. I do not say that the men who compose that biological board have not the ability to make this investigation if they were so directed. I submit that this board now has been in operation for a great many years, and apparently they are not making any investigation whatever with regard to the rehabilitation of the sockeye salmon fisheries, which the department has said will mount up to at least \$35,000,000 a year. There is time enough to get down to theory and theoretical matters later, but I say that before we proceed with the expenditure of the amount of money covered by this vote we should have some further assurance than has been given so far that this increase is necessary. It is not my intention to offer a motion but I do suggest that if we vote \$200,100 this year it is enough. I suggest that the minister postpone these additional expenditures and reduce this vote to what it was last year. I think that is a reasonable request until such time as the minister can give us some information to show the effectiveness of this board.

Mr. CARDIN: I am informed by the deputy that the board has been looking into

the sockeye salmon question for four years and that they have complete equipment at Cultus lake.

There is another point upon which I am in a position to agree with my hon. friend. He complains that the report is somewhat technical and not in plain language. I quite agree with him and I will ask the officers of the department to try to make the report more comprehensible to the ordinary man who does not understand the scientific and technical words which are used by members of the biological board.

Mr. McRAE: Reference has been made by the minister to the cultural work which is being done at Cultus lake in British Columbia, and this information will be found on pages 117 and 118 of the report of 1927-28. This is one of the smallest hatcheries we have in British Columbia, and in 1927-28 the expenditure was only \$4,819.05. It is only necessary for any member of the committee to read these pages to realize what a feeble effort is made in studying the culture of sockeye salmon. Very few fish are released from this hatchery, and, as stated in the report, during some years none at all return. About 70 per cent of the fish must be accounted for and returns by the canneries in Puget sound south of the line, and I leave it to the committee to say just how valuable that information is. That is not even playing with the thing and it is making no effort whatever to solve this problem. Mr. Minister, this headless department of yours will have to get a move on if anything effective is to be done for the sockeye salmon industry.

Mr. GARLAND (Bow River): May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I am intensely interested in the subject which he has been discussing and I am very sympathetic to the proposal he has made with respect to the sockeye salmon fishing industry. I have been out to the coast and studied this matter a little, but I am at a complete loss to know just what the hon. member is proposing.

Mr. McRAE: I take it that the hon. member was not in the house the other day when I made a definite proposal, but I will be glad to repeat it. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, constituted as it is under governments as they must be formed, cannot grasp the situation in British Columbia. In my talk the other day I suggested that the government should appoint a British Columbia fish commission, to be composed of representatives of the fishermen, of the canneries, and of the business interests in the province, who understand this problem.