

Then the hon. member for New Westminster went on to criticize the work which had been done by the biological station at Departure Bay and said that it was of little value because the scientists there had dissipated their efforts. In the remainder of his speech, which was somewhat illogical in that respect, he went on to enumerate instance after instance where they might well disperse their efforts by carrying out investigations in other areas on other species of fish, which they had neither the time, the staff nor the facilities to do. You cannot accuse an organization of dissipating their efforts and then suggest that they still further dissipate those efforts and be consistent.

The hon. member for New Westminster referred to the annual report of the fisheries research board. The acting chairman of the board, in making his annual report said:

The fisheries research board is charged by parliament with the responsibility for carrying out such researches and investigations as will enable the fishery resources of the country to be managed in such a way as to yield the greatest possible return over the longest possible time.

Then the chairman goes on to say that the results of the board's studies are applied in the management and exploitation of the fisheries through the Department of Fisheries and the fishing industry. I must admit that if you judge by the results of the research board as they have been applied in the management and exploitation of our fisheries through the Department of Fisheries and the fishing industry, either the board or the government stands indicted for failure, because the fishing industry is today probably in the most precarious position of any major industry in Canada. It would appear to me that a thorough reorganization of the fisheries research board is long overdue, not as the fault of the scientists, but as the fault of the government in neglecting to support the board.

Some of the reasons why the fishing industry is in this precarious position cannot, of course, be directly attributed either to the board or perhaps even to the government. For instance, the cessation of the bulk buying by UNRRA and the rapidly diminishing purchases of fish products by the United Kingdom have all resulted in the elimination of foreign markets which we have enjoyed in recent years, and have resulted in a sharp decline in the price that has been paid to the fishermen. For instance, on Vancouver island a year ago a fisherman was paid ten cents a pound for fresh cod. In a letter I received only a couple of weeks ago I was informed that for the same fish the fishermen are today receiving only six cents a pound. There

is a reduction of forty per cent in the amount that the fisherman receives for his toil. On the other hand, the cost of fishing gear has gone up tremendously. In some instances it has gone up 100 per cent to 200 per cent of what it was in the basic year, 1941.

I refer to one instance only, although I have many of them here if any hon. member is interested. In 1941 the price of one-and-a-half inch mesh cotton netting was 66½ cents. Today it is \$1.54. There is a considerable increase to the fishermen in the cost of all gear and supplies, not to mention the cost of living. If this bill is intended to extend and increase the efficiency of the fisheries research board, and to bring that board into closer contact with the department by the appointment of a responsible officer to supervise and administer the work of the board, I think at best it can be described as an eleventh-hour measure to try to save the industry. I am pleased to see that there is this administrative connection because in the main, the board and the officials of the board are scientists, men who are devoting the whole of their energy and time to scientific studies. That type of professor is not always a practical man. He is not always a good administrator. That may be one of the reasons why the board has, in the past, not been able to render all the service that was expected. With the addition of an administrator from the department, I feel that the results should be more satisfactory. I do not think I am exaggerating the case when I say that for years overpressure of work and lack of adequate personnel have prevented the board from functioning efficiently, and that the lack of this administrative personnel has been keenly felt, alike by the scientists of the board and by the industry itself.

As for fulfilling the responsibilities toward maintaining the greatest possible yield over the longest possible time, as the hon. member for New Westminster has pointed out, they can hardly be credited with having achieved results in that direction, because the salmon industry in British Columbia has been, and still is, showing unmistakable signs of depletion. Neither effective nor adequate corrective measures have been taken toward stabilizing the industry at a higher productive level by maintaining or increasing the run of salmon. As has been shown by the investigations carried out by the board and by the biological station at Departure Bay, many of the streams and spawning grounds which were at one time prolific producers have now become seriously depleted and, in some cases, completely exhausted. The investigation is