

holding post mortems as this board did; they are trying to devise improved methods in fish culture. But apparently this board did not.

It is very interesting to refer to the conclusions at which this board of scientists arrived. I have in my hand the report of the biological board. In addition to that, attached to it is one from the director, Mr. Clemens. He says:

I feel that there is an opportunity for the department in this way to put the salmon production of the British Columbia coast on a sound basis.

That refers to clause 5, which reads:

Looking at the problem on a broad basis, it would seem that the quickest and most effective method of keeping up the spawning stock is to limit the catch.

That comes from a scientist!

As I have pointed out in my annual reports to the commissioner of fisheries of British Columbia, if on the Fraser river in a given year, instead of the industry putting up 120,000 cases it put up only 100,000 cases, this would mean approximately 480,000,000 additional eggs on the spawning beds. This reduction in pack would in a sense cost the industry \$240,000. On the other hand, to gain this advantage, the hatcheries, even allowing a four per cent efficiency as compared with a natural efficiency of two per cent, would have to handle 240,000,000 eggs. This would require the erection of at least five additional hatcheries, each having a capacity equal to that at Pemberton, and the operating costs would be approximately \$200,000. All this would be at the expense of the country as a whole.

Then he concludes:

I feel that there is an opportunity for the department in this way to put the salmon production of the British Columbia coast on a sound basis. Until the catches are brought under control and limited to the productive capacity of the river system, I see little hope of maintaining the sockeye salmon fishery.

This comes from a scientist employed by the department to carry on an investigation. The control of catch has been carried on by men in the department. It does not require a scientist to advise limiting the catch, but that is all this scientist had to offer us after eleven years of investigation.

In conclusion I urge upon the government, in view of the acceptance by the United States of the sockeye treaty, that further investigation be made before such drastic action is taken, because I think it will be found, under one of the clauses, which I have not at hand at the moment, that the United States will contribute fifty-fifty in regard to the propagation of salmon. I understand that the hitch is that they have amended it to provide that there should be eight years' investigation. I do not blame them for asking for further investigation, because I would not like to see any board set up and proceed to carry out

[Mr. Barber.]

recommendations upon which this order in council is based. I would suggest to the Prime Minister—and this is not criticism of the government; for the government are not responsible, for this condition, but they are responsible for passing the order in council—I would suggest an inquiry in the meantime, something in the way of a judicial commission that could go into the findings of the biological board and call in practical men. I suggest to the government a more thorough investigation before the government act on this order in council.

To take action on the order in council at this time when the treaty is about to be accepted, and wipe out all hatcheries in British Columbia, would be a very serious thing. I feel that the matter should receive further consideration. As I have said, the order in council is based entirely on the figures of the biological board, which are not on a sound basis. It does not make any difference what was done with the eggs; the biological board say: "We are interested only in the results, and we arrive at those results by simple arithmetic—so many eggs planted, so many migrants pass out; therefore it does not pay to raise these fish." That is the only criticism that is offered; it is the whole basis of the conclusion. In this report no suggestion is offered as to how the cost can be cut down. The entire investigation, extending over eleven years, has simply been a post mortem.

I want to tell the Prime Minister that one reason why I cannot give further information is that any time I talked to a man employed in the department he would say: "For heaven's sake don't quote me, or my head will come off." That is an unfortunate condition. If the Prime Minister would appoint someone who could call these men in and go into it with them, I think it would be in the interests of this great industry, which we are told to-day can be built up from \$3,000,000 to \$25,000,000 a year. I am convinced the proposal is well worthy of consideration before the order in council is put into effect.

Hon. J. E. MICHAUD (Minister of Fisheries): I understand that the grievance which my hon. friend has laid before the house is based on the action of the government and the departmental officials in closing some of the salmon hatcheries in British Columbia.

Mr. BARBER: Not some, all of them.

Mr. MICHAUD: This action was determined by a report of the biological board made to the government, as my hon. friend has said, after five years of experimentation.

Mr. BARBER: Eleven years.