

Supply—Fisheries

Pattullo bridge and Mission City. This matter was given very extensive consideration in debates in other years, especially when it was brought to our attention that the minister was contemplating the imposition of those restrictions above the Pattullo bridge.

At that time we raised strenuous objection and backed up our representations by the statements of the fishermen concerned. We endeavoured to point out to the then minister the fact that the proposed measures would not accomplish the purpose for which they were intended. If I remember correctly, without going into any great detail, one of the reasons given for the closure was that it was a conservation measure. I may say that at that time the fishermen were of the opinion that it would not contribute substantially to the accomplishment of the objective.

Another factor introduced was the matter of quality. The hon. member for New Westminster and myself made representations to try to point out that as far as this area and the proposed closure regulations were concerned the matter of quality did not actually come into the picture. I was speaking to a delegation of fishermen when I was home for the Christmas recess, and I asked them whether they were still convinced that the regulations imposed were neither necessary nor effective. They assured me they were more convinced than ever that those measures had not resulted in the achievement of the objectives contemplated at that time.

This matter has been brought to the attention of the minister. I hold in my hand a copy of a paper containing the full text of a telegram to the Minister of Fisheries with respect to a public meeting held at Langley on Saturday, September 7, composed of fishermen and others interested. This telegram brought to the attention of the minister the matter of closure, and made certain recommendations.

I regret that I was not able to attend that meeting because I had a previous engagement to open one of the fairs in my area. I communicated to officials of the fishermen's union the fact that I could not be there and asked them to make that clear to the meeting, but I understand it was no done. However, the hon. member for New Westminster and the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond were there and supported the recommendations.

I am not going to take time to read the telegram, but I shall refer to it and ask the minister to continue to give it his serious consideration. I understand the matter is still under active consideration, and I do

hope the minister and his officials will, as they review the whole matter, come to the conclusion that in this instance the fishermen are right and that a relaxation of those regulations is fully warranted in the future.

Mr. Regier: Will the hon. member permit a question at this time. Has any fishermen's organization, or any fishing interest, ever made representations to him endorsing the action taken by the government in applying the closure?

Mr. Patterson: To endorse the regulations?

Mr. Regier: Yes.

Mr. Patterson: No, I have had no representations to that effect. All of them have been to the contrary. Perhaps I could put on the record the latter part of this telegram:

Resolution has full support united fishermen and allied workers union, George Hahn, M.P., Tom Irwin, M.P., George Mussallem, Maple Ridge board trade, George Parkinson, Fort Langley board trade, Ted Kuhn, Reeve Poppy, Eric Flowerdew, Langley council, all of whom were present.

I have just been reminded that Mr. Ted Kuhn was the Conservative candidate who ran in opposition to my hon. friend from New Westminster.

There has been considerable discussion on other occasions, Mr. Chairman, and the matter of the development of the Fraser river for power purposes has been referred to in this debate. My friends from across the way have succeeded in injecting into the debate references to the Wenner-Gren proposals for the development of the Rocky mountain trench. It was introduced in a hit and run fashion just a few days ago in the course of another debate, and I should like to suggest that the statements made in this respect are apparently based upon a false premise. Therefore I suggest that those statements and those implications must have had a political bias attached to them. I should like to ask the members who have heard those reports to take that matter into consideration when they are thinking along those lines.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when a diligent attempt must be made to reconcile the two factors of fish and power as far as British Columbia is concerned. There is a wide divergence of opinion and, I may say, very vocal defences of the respective positions at the present time, with one side stoutly defending the position of the fishery interests and the other side contending that sufficient progress has been made in the matter of assisting fish on their way to the spawning grounds and protecting the fingerlings on their way to the sea that further delay in the construction of power sites on the salmon streams is unwarranted.