

Deep Sea Fisheries Act

for this \$13 gratuity. It was confined to the Maritime provinces and Quebec. It did not apply to Newfoundland, Ontario and the west. Yet it was on our statute books year after year for 88 years. It was just one more thing helping to convince other people that our fishing industry was both archaic and in need of support.

I believe our commercial fishery is much healthier now; markets have improved in recent years. Indeed, in the last 18 months they have picked up remarkably. Our problem, looking into the more distant future, is no longer one of markets but of supply, conserving our fisheries resources and harvesting them efficiently. We will be upgrading our fisheries products and getting much higher prices. The market side is really not the problem. It is a problem of conservation of our resources and efficient exploitation.

The hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) talked about the \$4½ million paid under the Halifax award as being a trust. Over the years more than \$14 million has been paid to the fishermen, the sons and grandsons of the fishermen, and now the great-grandsons of the fishermen who were alive at the time the Treaty of Washington was signed. The hon. member for South Shore talked about the original \$4½ million as being a trust for a loss sustained because the fishery of those days was subject to American fishermen taking cod near our shores and being free to dry their cod on our shores around the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy.

Four years later, in 1886, that privilege expired. The United States government tore up the Treaty of Washington. Yet we are told that there is still a trust because of this ancient privilege which disappeared when the Treaty of Washington expired in 1886. Obviously, the idea of a trust is simply nonsense. Nowhere in the Treaty of Washington, the Halifax award or the Deep Sea Fisheries Act is there any reference to an obligation to make payments to individual fishermen. Indeed, this payment to individual fishermen was a device invented in 1882 by Sir Leonard Tilley.

It was perhaps politically opportune at the time. I think it could be defended in those years by saying there were no substantial programs assisting in the development of new vessels, new gear and new fishing techniques in the Maritime provinces and Quebec. Since then there have been many more effective programs introduced. If this program were to

be continued today in its old form of individual payments to fishermen, it would constitute a fraction of 1 per cent of payments to fisheries development in the Maritimes and Quebec.

The \$160,000 is earmarked for fisheries development. I would say at least \$100,000 will still be going to the fishing industry in those areas. Indeed, if we take into account the cost of administering the program, I doubt very much if there is any transfer of money away from the Maritime provinces and Quebec as a result of the changes we are instituting today by repealing the Deep Sea Fisheries Act.

In conclusion I wish to refer to an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* quoting the Canadian Encyclopedia. It states:

"Some men are naturally inclined to attempt to make things better, and these are commonly described as reformers or liberals—"

Under that definition I trust I am a liberal. "—others like to let sleeping dogs lie, and these are described as tories or conservatives."

I say it is easy to let a fishing bounty act lie. It should have been scrapped long ago. We are getting rid of it as a result of this legislation. Incidentally, the stand of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett), according to that definition, would qualify him as a tory. I think after 88 years we should eliminate this legislation, which should have been withdrawn at the very latest in 1888.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my view the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.