

Supply—Fisheries

country, will be looking for further sources of food supply from the sea and will automatically look for salmon which is not of their own origination, in order that their salmon can come back home again and spawn for the years to come.

I do not understand why the Soviet union will perhaps not enter into an agreement such as the north Pacific fisheries treaty, if they were approached on this subject and asked about it as long ago as 1957 or 1958. I am given to understand that Japan and the Soviet union have had a convention relating to the salmon fisheries of the Asian area, and there is no reason why the Soviet union would not be interested in engaging in a similar sort of treaty in which we and the United States were involved. We would like to have a very clear indication from the minister as to whether the campaign promises which his party made in the election campaign really mean anything now. We ask him what he is doing, has been doing or intends to do about seeing them put into effect.

A vitally important field, I think, is leading or getting this government to point itself in the direction of international agreements and high seas conservation measures, to ensure that future generations have fish for their children as we desire to have this food for ours. When it comes to matters that concern us more directly in a national or domestic way, I think we all realize that the east and west coast fisheries differ; that there are different species of fish on these coasts; that there are different methods of catching them, and there are different economics, and so on, involved as between the east and west coasts. Since 1957 we have had, at least from the practicalities of administration point of view, an orientation toward the east coast. The hon. member from Queens, when he was a member of the Conservative cabinet, was the minister of fisheries. He is, of course, from the east coast, as is the present Minister of Fisheries. Without casting any reflection upon the ideas or attitudes of ministers, it is an automatic fact of politics that one's hometown induces the greatest pressure to do things, as distinct from communities which are further away.

If we look at this year's estimates, for instance, just as one example, without going into the details in a way contrary to the rules, we see that vote 155, which involves a very important field, namely educational work in fisheries techniques and co-operative producing and selling among fishermen, concerns a total amount of \$120,000, with the east coast fisheries receiving ten times that of the west coast. I am not saying they should not, because this is a vitally important contribution; but it does show that there is

heavier emphasis, even in that one vote, given to the east coast than there is to the west. I am not saying this is wrong in so far as the east coast is concerned.

We find that the Fisheries Prices Support Act has its greatest, if not exclusive, application to east coast fishermen and is practically unused on the west coast. The Newfoundland bait service is, again, directly connected to the east coast fisheries, and salt fish assistance and the like. Perhaps the only act under which the west coast fisheries might have some advantage is the Cold Storage Act, which allows for subsidies to be given for the building of cold storages. Unfortunately this is not under the Department of Fisheries; it is in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, which is an extremely sad state of affairs not only for fishermen but for agriculturists as well. In addition to that, subsidies under this act have been suspended, so what advantage fishermen on the west coast might have had in receiving cold storage subsidies has gone, because there is no more to be obtained under that act.

On the order paper there is a resolution to appoint two ministers of agriculture, one for the east and one for the west. I understand that one of the ministers has already appointed himself to this particular position and is merely waiting for the formality of the measure going through parliament, if it gets that far. But if it is sensible or reasonable, and this government thinks it is a correct thing, to have a minister of agriculture for the east and one for the west, it is even more important to have two ministers of fisheries, one for the east and one for the west, so that west coast fisheries can receive the fullest possible consideration from the federal government.

We would like to make some specific suggestions to the minister and his department. These suggestions are at this stage along rather broad lines, because they involve what we consider to be questions of policy connected with the principles we enunciated earlier, namely those of conservation, exploitation and a recognition of the growing population of the world and the importance of fishery products as a source of protein.

We think that the research attitudes in the Department of Fisheries should find their way into the levels of discussion on policy. In this regard, without any reflection upon the individuals concerned, we find that the present deputy minister, Dr. Needler, a scientist in the field of fisheries, is likely to bring into the policy level of the department the attitude, concept and ideas of a research scientist.