

*Supply—Fisheries*

attitude to take at the present time to say that power must take precedence over fish, and my attitude is not dictated entirely by purely economic reasons, either. I remember that last year when I was speaking on the fisheries estimates the then minister of fisheries made the comment—not at all an offensive comment, but a pleasant one, I thought—that I had placed this problem on a more fundamental basis by pointing out that we have in the world today a tremendously dangerous development in our thinking which would subordinate life and living things to manufactured goods of every kind and for every purpose; and I believe it is very important that we should be as cautious as possible about taking any steps which would destroy one of the major miracles of nature to be found in our country, namely the mysterious return of the salmon from the ocean every four years to spawn in the streams of the Pacific coast, a sight which cannot but impress anyone who sees it.

To destroy this in order to produce more aluminum, more this or more that, would seem to me to be an offence against the very purpose of life. In view of possible power developments in the future which might make installations of the present kind uneconomic it would seem to me most injudicious and most unwise to relax for one moment our determination to maintain the fisheries based on the rivers of our country. I think we should feel extremely regretful in 10 or 15 years from now, if having destroyed the fisheries on the Fraser river, one of the great fisheries of the world, we found that the hydro development there was no longer an economic project in the light of new developments in the use of atomic power. There have been indications from Britain in recent weeks that such developments are within measurable distance of achievement. I hope the Department of Fisheries will maintain the rigid determination that has been shown in the past to avoid any rash destruction of fisheries in favour of a short term advantage in the generation of power for manufacturers.

These are some of the matters which fishermen on the coast wish to have brought to the attention of the minister. I think most of these fishermen take the position that no matter what government is in office these matters will, and must be, attended to. They will be watching very carefully of course just what action the present administration will take in these matters, but their criticism will, I think, in the future as well as in the past be directed rather to the actual administration of fishery policies by civil servants of the department than to anything else. I hope the new minister will examine some of the actions which have been taken and

perhaps review them and take heed of the views of the commercial fishermen on the Pacific coast who, I think by and large, are well seized of the necessity of careful conservation measures with a view to maintaining the industry on which the livelihood of so many people depends.

**Mr. Hahn:** At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate the minister on his appointment to his present post in charge of the Department of Fisheries. I think this is a recognition of the fact that he has always taken an active part in discussions on fisheries matters and shown a keen interest on many occasions, not merely in the fisheries problems of the east but also in those of the west coast. I was particularly pleased that the new minister should have taken the time, while he was on the Pacific coast studying the fisheries question in that area, to call on myself and others—not just on members of his own political party—in order that we might discuss with him some of the problems which affected our constituents.

**Mr. Cannon:** On a point of order, I wonder whether the shorter member for Halifax is still in the chamber or whether he left after he had delivered his own speech, as he accused the hon. member for Charlotte of doing.

**Mr. Hahn:** I am, frankly, not amazed at what has just taken place in the committee, but I certainly wonder what the hon. member for Halifax has to do with the member for New Westminster, except that we both have the problems of the fishing industry on our minds. I trust that in future any interruptions which may occur will have something to add to what I have to say, or that they will seek to show that the arguments I am making in respect of the fishing industry on the Pacific coast are incorrect.

I certainly agree 100 per cent with a few of the points which have been raised today. The hon. member for Nanaimo has just referred to three important problems: the bounty on dogfish, the reduction in the population of sea lions, and the question of territorial waters. I think these are three matters of which the minister should take very careful note because they are matters which much concern the fishermen on the west coast. I do not wish to add to the hon. member's remark on these subjects at this time; but I wish merely to point out that these are questions which have been drawn to my attention as well as to his and, no doubt, they have been placed before each of the hon. members representing constituencies on the Pacific coast.