

At this time, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans does not have the capability to curb the above problems which are sure to have serious consequences on our fish stocks. If it does not have the capability, why are we passing an act that, as I said, allows it to go and apply in an unequal fashion?

The association agreed that "more time was needed to implement a fishing plan that would better serve the fishermen, industry, and communities, again emphasizing better methods for conserving our stocks of fish". This is what this act is supposed to be about. They are asking for consultations.

In determining individual boat quotas, and I am reading again from the letter: "Using history, we feel an injustice has been done." This is the question that the fishermen are asking me, as well as other members of the House, I am sure, who come from inshore communities. Why can the government not listen to the fishermen? It has all this consultation. Why can it not listen to them that such a proposed quota policy is not going to work.

Yet today in Canada's Green Plan, it states at page 76, under "Domestic Action":

Individual quotas, sometimes called "boat quotas" or "enterprise allocations", are an important feature of the management of several Atlantic fisheries, including groundfish and offshore scallop. They are shares of the Total Allowable Catch (TAC), or fleet allocation, assigned to individual licence holders. Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) take the approach one step further by allowing transfers among licence holders. This provides greater flexibility and promotes more efficient utilization of fishing capacity. ITQs have been implemented in several domestic fisheries and are in place in other parts of the world, including the fisheries of New Zealand and Australia.

Just on that point, we had Mr. Nichol from the west coast come before the Fisheries Committee recently. He mentioned that 85 per cent of the fishery in New Zealand was now privatized. But the ownership was not in New Zealand. It was with multinationals. It did not belong to New Zealand any more. What was theirs in their waters did not belong to them. It had been privatized because of the individual transferable quotas.

But it is stated in the first fisheries item in the green plan:

### *Government Orders*

Accordingly, in consultation with the fishing industry and the provinces, the government will put in place a system of Individual Transferable Quotas (ITQs) for various fisheries.

There are two things in that statement by the Minister of Environment. His counterpart, the Minister of Fisheries wants to see individual transferable quotas in various fisheries. To me, various fisheries could mean the lobster fishery, the crab fishery, or any type of fishery, capelin or whatever.

I have just read from a letter from a person in desperation to the Department of Fisheries saying that it was not consulting. Nobody in the industry wants individual boat quotas. No boat that I know of under 65, wants an individual boat quota without—

**Mr. Reid:** You better check your facts.

**Mrs. Campbell (South West Nova):** My colleague says that I had better check my facts. I can guarantee you that the only ones who want an individual boat quota are the minister's officials. I do not know why they want it. Is it for their rich friends who can then buy those individual transferable quotas, and eventually we will have a multinational company of the fishery on the east coast?

• (1650)

The government uses that example, and then comes back to this act and states that "we are going to use individual boat quotas for conservation and protection of our fish stock." The whole being of this bill before us, Bill C-74, is to conserve and protect fish stock.

It does not make sense when there is a group saying that they would like to consult with the government, giving the things that they would like to see addressed, such as a management plan and consideration of under utilized species 4WS, east of Halifax on the mesh side, size of fish, fuel costs, and gear costs. Those are all good ways of looking at conservation.

With regard to mesh size, for instance, the sector applied a mesh size this year in that area, and it worked. They had been asking the department to put in a mesh size for years, and it worked. We got a good sized fish.

Now, on top of all of this and without any consultation, as of January 1, 1991, we are going to have new regulations that are going to affect every inshore fisherman whether in P.E.I., New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia. The penalties are going up.