

still continuing to find out the reasons why there has been this depletion, and what corrective measures can be taken.

I could give many examples. Examples have been given in the brief which was presented to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Bridges) by the industry in March, 1946, and again in April, 1947. Perhaps I might refer to just one instance mentioned in that brief. There is an area on the west coast of Vancouver island which, a few years ago, produced 15,000 cases of sockeye in one season; in 1944 it produced less than 1,000 cases. In 1939, 213,000 cases of chum salmon were produced off Vancouver island; in 1944 only 50,000 cases were produced. You may blame the biological station at Nanaimo for not having given you more precise information. But I suggest that these scientific examinations of the run of salmon, particularly when the salmon run in cycles of four years, all take time in order that the scientists may arrive at a correct solution of the problem. I do not think the industry would like to be set off at half-cock and to be advised to follow a course of action which would not be definite and satisfactory, where the results would not be conclusive.

We know that the streams on Vancouver island and on the Pacific coast are affected by many other occupations. They cannot be devoted entirely to the interests of the fishermen. Logging operations clash in some respects with the requirements of the fishing industry; and the general development of the country has, of course, militated against the further productiveness of the streams. However I think I can say that the rehabilitation of the British Columbia salmon industry is a major problem facing the fishing industry on the Pacific coast. I also maintain that this rehabilitation cannot be accomplished without the help of the scientists. While I have suggested that perhaps this research board to date has failed to produce results which satisfy the industry, I do not question the sincerity or the ability of the scientists who have been employed. Rather do I accuse the government of failure to support that board adequately in the past, and I hope that this new bill is a step in the right direction.

As I said before, for years overpressure of work and lack of personnel have prevented this board from functioning properly. I know very well that at the Pacific coast biological station at Departure Bay the work has become so congested that seldom is an investigation completed before ten other new problems are thrown at the staff. Again and again they have been asked to carry out a \$100,000 investigation for \$1,000. Satisfactory research work cannot be carried out in the conditions

under which those scientists are working. The building itself is old and out of date. There are piles of documents which have been collected only after years of long research work. In the past they have been working under the greatest possible handicap, with poor staff accommodation and poor means of storing their records. I know that matter was brought to the attention of the minister when he first visited Nanaimo, and I hope that steps will be taken to provide a new building for that Departure Bay station.

As the hon. member for New Westminster said, general investigations have been conducted on the salmon run in the rivers and streams on Vancouver island and on the mainland between the Fraser and the Skeena rivers. Hundreds of fish have been tagged each season in order to trace their migrations and to test the escapements from the spawning grounds. As the hon. member said, investigations have also been carried out with regard to herring, pilchard, ling cod, clams, oysters, seaweed and many other activities, and I suggest that if it had been possible to carry those investigations to their logical conclusion they would have been of immense value to the industry. But as I have already said, that work has been hampered by lack of staff, cramped accommodation and inadequate facilities.

Biological research is not by any means the only activity this board should undertake. There is the whole field of what might be called technological research. By that I mean research into the methods of production, processing, distribution and marketing, in order to maintain what is referred to in the industry as continuity of quality, that is, continuity of quality of the fish from the time it is caught by the fisherman until it reaches the consumer. It is true that the two major companies on the Pacific coast maintain laboratories and experimental staffs of their own which are investigating these technological matters, but quite naturally the findings of the specialists employed by those companies are not readily available to the smaller companies and the cooperatives. As yet the cooperatives are not in the position where they may maintain staffs in order to carry out this technological research. Therefore they look to the research board for assistance in that way. I suggest that this field of technological research has been hardly touched by the board, though it has a direct bearing on the development of the fishing industry.

The lack of coordination between the department and the research board has, I know, been brought to the attention of the