

*Supply—Fisheries and Forestry*

many fishermen and too many boats chasing too few fish and too little money”.

British Columbia fishermen have been asking for a program of licence limitation for the past 25 years. It is eight years since Dr. Sinclair, the royal commissioner who dealt with this problem, made some specific recommendations. So that I think in taking up this issue the minister should be commended.

However, the ministers' method of dealing with the situation has been to propose the licensing of boats so as to limit the number of boats fishing. In the opinion of the fishermen, as represented by their union, this will put the whole industry further under the domination of the large fishing companies, many of whom are foreign owned.

On this particular point I can do no better, to illustrate the difference in the points of view of the government and the fishermen in British Columbia, than to quote from the union paper which carried an article dealing with the two methods involved—the government's proposal and the proposal of the union. According to *The Fisherman* for September 13, 1968:

Under the union's scheme, the licence would be issued to the fisherman, to be retained only as long as he could show he was obtaining a set proportion of his annual earnings from fishing. Since it would be non-transferable, it would have no financial value in itself. Upon the fisherman's leaving the industry, for whatever reason, it would be surrendered. The fisherman could sell his boat and gear at market price and his place would be taken by the next on the waiting list of applicants.

Under the government's scheme, the licence is to be issued to the boat—either an A vessel that can be replaced by a new boat or a B vessel that cannot be replaced. Even announcement of the scheme has had the effect of inflating the price of vessels that qualify for a licence.

As the union has pointed out, the fact that the companies finance the majority of boats places them in a position to dictate which fishermen shall or shall not have the right to fish.

In the fisheries committee of this house various members of all parties have discussed this particular matter with the minister. The committee wishes to go to British Columbia and meet the fishermen and other interested parties in the industry, particularly to discuss the issue that is involved in this type of licence limitation. We wish to get the advice of the industry, and we want to get it before the plan really comes into effect. I think this is the only wise course to pursue. Either we go there as a committee and meet with the fishermen, or they should make strong representations to the fisheries committee on this particular point about the type of licence

[Mr. Mather.]

limitation involved. I make that recommendation to the minister.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Another matter I want to touch on is the 12-mile fishing limit. I was very glad to hear the minister say in committee the other day that he intends at an early date to move to implement the components of the 12-mile fishing legislation having to do with headlands. The entire matter has been pending for years. All this time fishermen from other lands have been able to fish Canadian fishing resources. In the north Pacific we have only gone through the motions of passing the 12-mile fishing limit laws. I think that we ought to put the law into operation and so safeguard a major industry.

I, with other hon. members on a committee, recently went to Peru, where they have a major fishing industry. Though that country is relatively small when compared with Canada, it enforces rigorously a fishing limit that extends either 200 or 250 miles from its coast. Surely Canada can do what Peru has done, spell out clearly what are our own fishing borders and enforce those borders.

My next point will interest the minister, since as well as being responsible for fisheries he also has an interest in forestry. In fact, I have heard the minister described as the minister of fish and chips—the minister responsible for fish and wood. The other day in the fisheries committee he said that he would take up immediately with the provincial forestry authorities of British Columbia the question of pollution of the Stellako river—a pollution which enrages conservationists and fishermen—by logging operations. The former minister of fisheries attempted to remonstrate with the authorities, but I do not think he got very far with them. Since our present minister comes from British Columbia, he may be more successful than the previous minister in making his views prevail. In any event, he knows how urgent it is to stop the pollution of the Stellako river by lumber runs. I expect the minister knows what has been happening in the area.

As other hon. members noted, not only is it important to harvest fish but it is also important to sell that harvest. Not long ago I sent the minister a letter suggesting that whenever possible in promotional campaigns the word “fish” ought to be dropped, and that sea foods ought to be referred to by their generic names. I said:

Having in mind that this is “buy-more-fish-month”, I would like to make a suggestion as to how more people might buy more fish.