

*Supply—Fisheries*

I am not in a position to argue which one is right, from the technical point of view. I regret that I have not received as yet the evidence given by General McNaughton, chairman of the Canadian section of the international joint commission, before the committee on external affairs. I believe the references in that discussion to fish and power are very pertinent to the matter before us.

One of the most extensive problems with regard to the development of power in British Columbia is the possibility of the development of power sites on the Fraser river which, as all hon. members know, is the major salmon river left on the North American continent. In the course of the debate on this particular matter the chairman of the Canadian section of the international joint commission placed on record a summary of certain views, and in order to give the proper picture I think I had better read first the question put to General McNaughton by myself. At page 264 of the report of the proceedings of the standing committee on external affairs I find the following:

By Mr. Patterson:

Q. I agree with you in that, but there are some other factors that enter into it, I think, that have to be considered.

A. Yes, I would like to see everything considered.

The Chairman: There is one thing that is certain, that if General McNaughton was not born in British Columbia, he most certainly talks like it.

The Witness: Well, I lived there for a time. I had the privilege of commanding the military district there in the old days, sir.

By Mr. Patterson:

Q. I hope you can convince the members here of the wonderful prospects we have in British Columbia.

A. With your permission I shall quote from this examiner's report of the federal power commission in the United States. This was on an examination by Mr. Marsh, in what he calls a decision in the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley case, (Pacific North West Power Co.), filed on July 23, 1957. That was a case in which there was a controversy, and wide public interest in the question of salmon versus power in the Columbia river basin.

Mr. Marsh and his colleagues went thoroughly into the existing situation. This is what he came up with, and this is what now is the policy of the federal power commission as we understand it.

I am going to omit the quotation as it is rather lengthy and simply read the summation of the decision which General McNaughton gave. After reading from the report General McNaughton stated:

That, gentlemen, is the opinion of the examiner of the federal power commission. It means that after many years of controversy and discussion of the question of whether dams are to be built in the upper waters of the Columbia and along the Snake and so on, the federal power commission decided that high dams would be built, and they put biologists and other fishery engineers to work to find ways to get a reasonable proportion of fish up and down, and they have expressed their confidence as to the progress and what could be done.

[Mr. Patterson.]

No doubt these are the views of the power interests and I should like to place opposite them one or two statements made by those who are vitally concerned with the fishery problem. I should like to read from the annual report of the fisheries research board of Canada, 1956-57, page 100. Under the section, "Problems of Getting Migrating Salmon Past Obstructions", I find the following:

No prospect is yet seen of placing dams on a river such as the Fraser, without so delaying or damaging the migrating salmon as to lead to the destruction of the large runs on which the fishery depends.

I make the observation, Mr. Chairman, that in view of the importance of both these factors, power development on the one hand and the protection of our fishing industry on the other, those who are concerned certainly ought to get together and find out in a definite way what progress has actually been made from the technological view with respect to the problem.

Can they get together and somehow harmonize their views, or must some continue to say there is absolutely no possibility yet of maintaining our salmon industry and having power sites developed on the one hand, as opposed to the view expressed on the other hand that we can go ahead and that there is no further need for hesitation because the problem has been resolved? I think it is very obvious that one view is not exactly according to the facts. I am not putting myself in either position because I do not know, but I am saying that these two contrary views must be resolved in the light of the importance of the two issues.

Further debate is continuing as to the relative values of the two industries, power on the one hand and fish on the other. In reading past debates I note that the former minister of fisheries when speaking on this matter made it very clear that at all costs the salmon industry must be conserved in the province of British Columbia. I could quote others as well in that respect. However, I am not going to go into any further detail on the matter, but I say again that the two groups concerned should get together and find out what point science has reached in the development of ways and means of protecting our fisheries in the light of power developments on salmon rivers.

I referred to the fact that while I was home for the Christmas recess I met a delegation of fishermen from the Fraser valley. They were representatives of the gill netters, and in the course of our discussion we considered the suggested regulatory and administrative changes that have been circulated.

I have here the British Columbia fishery regulations, 1957, suggested regulatory and