

*Fisheries*

prices so that from one year to another they can never be sure what their incomes will be. While the fishermen themselves have made a great deal of progress in solving their own problems, and while it must be admitted that they are a capable group, nevertheless I am firmly of the belief that they must have machinery to protect themselves. Every other class of producer has machinery whereby its interests can be protected and our fishermen must be afforded the same means of protection.

Not too many years ago we had markets for our fish in Europe, South America, the West Indies, Puerto Rico, Cuba and various other countries, but one by one these markets have been falling away. As we lost them our fishermen were placed in a more and more precarious position. More and more of them were forced out of employment and more and more of them were forced to leave the industry. Therefore, I am also in accord with the principle of a marketing board involved in this bill. I believe we should have a dominion marketing board under which we could control the marketing of fish of all kinds, not just freshwater fish. Nobody will deny there is need for improved methods and practices in the marketing of fish and fish products. This is a highly commendable objective, and anything which tends to further this end without depriving individuals—I stress this—of the rights, liberties and privileges which are so sacred to all of us will, I am sure, receive general endorsement.

The greatest factor working against the orderly marketing of fish and fish products in Canada is the surpluses we have from time to time. This also applies to farm products. In times of surpluses fish are literally dumped on the market, prices to the fishermen are depressed and, of course, the fishermen suffer. A properly constituted marketing board should be the means by which this situation can be corrected. I stress the fact that it must be a properly constituted board, but in my opinion the legislation before us fails in that respect. It fails because it does not guarantee that there will be even one qualified fisherman on the proposed board. I suggest that the producer should be given the fullest measure of control over his own product. He is the one who has the most at stake. But this legislation gives no indication that there will be even one qualified fisherman on the board proposed to be set up to help fishermen control the marketing of their products.

I say that the producers themselves should have a say on all marketing boards. I maintain that a board of this kind will never work successfully unless it has the full co-operation of the producers of the product to be controlled by it. The only way to make sure that the fishermen are behind the board is to make sure that they are adequately represented on it. I repeat that this legislation fails in that respect. The board should be the collective voice of the fishermen. It is proposed that it speak for the fishermen and protect their rights. Surely the fishermen should be given a guarantee that they will be represented on the board by people actively engaged in the fishing industry.

There is another feature of the legislation which I do not like. It smacks just a little too much of government control. My fear is that the legislation as presented could set up a bureaucracy which would undertake to regulate the production and marketing of fish. If we examine the bill we find that the Governor in Council is the body that will appoint the members of the board. I suggest that the freshwater fishermen's associations—I presume there are such in existence—should have some voice in determining who is going to be appointed to the board. As I have said, it is their business that is going to be controlled. I do not think it is fair to give the Governor in Council complete say as to who should be appointed to the board.

● (4:30 p.m.)

From day to day we see the old policy of laissez-faire rapidly becoming a thing of the past. I suggest, however, that we must not allow the government to take over all our activities. Surely we should be able to retain some power. Surely the fishermen themselves should have some say with regard to the composition of this board. We on this side of the house suggest very seriously that this is an example of government control with a vengeance. Obviously this bill is intended to give a greater measure of control over the activities of our fishermen. I feel that unfortunately there is a very grave danger that this board may become government controlled. We must not become overburdened with paternalism and bureaucracy. Already the hand of the state is almost everywhere except perhaps in the bedrooms of the nation. The Prime Minister says it has not got there yet.

Although I agree in principle with this legislation, it would appear to be an unwarranted extension of governmental authority