

that whatever difficulties the current situation imposes, the objective is to bring the industry back to life as quickly as possible.

Second, there should be no tampering with the concept of the resource as a common property. No matter how tempted some may be to apply classroom economic theories to the fishery, notions which imply a break with the common property principle will dismay and confuse. At a time when legitimate fishermen are having great difficulty, the idea that a property right in the resource might be allotted to some and not to others will create bitterness and division and will effectively end any opportunity for a co-operative approach to the problems by all user groups.

The third imperative is industry participation in fisheries management. This must be something much more than mere consultation. The working paper reads:

As it seeks to resolve these difficulties, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans will undertake extensive consultation with the commercial fishing industry and sport fishery groups through such organizations as the Minister's Advisory Council and the Sport Fish Advisory Board, native groups, and other government agencies.

That is all very well, and a similar high-sounding statement is a standard final paragraph on all Government press releases. It does not mean much.

We are told that the Minister's Advisory Council has already advised the Government on a number of issues. Instead of accepting the advice, the Government appointed a new study group headed by a bureaucrat.

What we have in mind is an industry management board appointed by the respective user groups to determine policy and to report directly to the Minister. Policy recommendations, with the rationale for them, should be made public. This is the only way the difficult decisions, impinging on one group or another as they will under current circumstances, can ever be made to work. The immediate advantage to this is that those who know the most about the industry and the impact of decisions on the industry will be formulating the policy. The insistence that their deliberations be made public will guarantee accountability.

There appears to be widespread support for some sort of voluntary buy-back program. The details of such a program should be determined by the board. These details would include reduction targets aimed at ensuring the economic viability of those remaining in the industry. Such a program should start immediately, be funded by up-front federal money, with repayment by the industry as the beneficial results of the fleet reduction and enhancement of the fishery accrue to the industry.

I have noticed that the working paper does not include anything about habitat in any of its four strategic alternatives, or in other words options. Underlying the existence of a fishery is habitat protection and enhancement. Without habitat there is no fishery, unless one wants seriously to suggest that hatch-

Supply

eries and ocean ranching are an acceptable substitute for natural habitat and wild stocks.

To let this happen would be to abandon our heritage. The Department has issued a discussion paper entitled "Toward a Fish Habitat Management Policy". The Department's proposal reads as follows:

The Department should strive to achieve no net loss of the productive capacity of those habitats that support Canada's fisheries resource.

This is an appropriate objective although it may not prevail in every circumstance. However, it is a site specific proposal. This does not address the challenge to restore habitat generally in order to establish in British Columbia the desired objective of net gain of habitat. However, another departmental policy proposal is for fish habitat conservation, restoration and development. The Department's discussion paper sets that out.

The working paper to which I have referred makes a specific point that neither of these two policy objectives are policy yet with respect to the Government. Also the working paper indicates that nothing in it "is intended to imply adoption of these principles". There may well be need for further discussion with respect to site specific no net loss, but there is no need for any further discussion in British Columbia about the necessity for a general net gain for fisheries habitat.

The Salmonid Enhancement Program is in a transition stage. Dr. Pearse has counselled caution before proceeding to the next stage in order to evaluate successes or failures. This may be wise, especially as it relates to hatchery enhancement. However, is there any real doubt that small stream rehabilitation and restoration and enhancement of wild stocks can be successfully implemented? Evidence of success in certain places is already clear. There is no question that the combination of fleet reduction and further restrictions on catch will cause hardship for some time. It would seem that now is the time to do everything to reintroduce and enhance stocks wherever possible. To the degree that this is aggressively and imaginatively commenced now, there should be a corresponding acceleration in the rate of stock increases generally.

Second stage Salmonid Enhancement Program funding should be brought forward immediately for this purpose. To the extent possible the necessary work should be done by fishermen displaced by fleet reduction or by economic circumstances.

In conclusion, the fishery is in a crisis state because fisheries management neglected to concern itself with the life cycle of the salmon. Because of the neglect, we must now suffer through a period of fleet reduction and reduced fishing. It is too easy to make the mistake of thinking that that is all we have to do. That was the error of yesteryear. From now on we must do all things necessary to maintain the salmon—protection and rehabilitation of habitat, enhancement of stocks and wise management of the harvest by industry. If we do this, we can guarantee the success of the salmon at every stage of its