

control in those areas designated by the provinces for inclusion under the provisions of this fish marketing enactment?

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt): In the areas concerned it will have a monopoly as a result of the combined provisions of this act, which gives it a monopoly in regard to any purchase for sale or export abroad or for export from one province to another, whether or not within a designated area, and the provincial legislation in respect of all the concerned designated areas covering the sale of the products within the boundaries of the provinces. That will give it a complete monopoly on the purchase of fish within the areas concerned.

Mr. Peters: In provinces where there may be internal sales, have the provincial governments agreed to implement legislation which will allow the equalization of interprovincial and export sales as well as local marketing by this corporation?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether hon. members might not feel that we are reviving committee of the whole at this stage. It seems to me that some of the questions asked and the type of discussion we are beginning should take place when the bill is considered in committee, if it is referred by the house to the committee.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, we have passed the resolution dealing with the regulations covering interprovincial and export trade in freshwater fish, and Bill C-148 to establish a Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation received first reading on December 18. At that time a number of speakers from the official opposition as well as other members spoke extensively on this measure, and questions were asked which have now been answered by some sections of the bill.

It is my understanding that it is the government's intention to refer this bill to the standing committee on fisheries and forestry where it will receive a thorough, clause by clause study. Therefore it is not my intention to speak at great length on the measure at this time. However, there are one or two points with which I shall deal briefly, especially since the bill raises some doubt about the overlapping of authority between the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and the saltwater fish industry.

As I stated previously, this bill sets a bad precedent in that it implies that only our

Fisheries

inland fisheries are facing economic difficulties. During the Christmas recess I had an opportunity to visit my constituency and was told that the landings of the groundfish and shellfish industries of Nova Scotia would for the first time in history exceed 700 million pounds with a value in excess of \$50 million. These are the figures for 1968.

I am also informed that these tremendous advances in volume and value were made against a groundswell of falling prices for frozen and salted groundfish, and that three or four species, namely herring, scallops, lobster and the new queen crab industry, have enabled our processors to stay in business and remain solvent. The old, historic backbone of the saltwater fishing industry is broken. Here I refer to groundfish species such as cod, haddock and pollock, which are being purchased, processed and sold in many cases at less than the cost of production owing to the devaluation of foreign currencies and excessive competition in our major market, which is still the United States.

All the facts pertaining to this situation have been made available to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis), the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) and the rest of the cabinet, but unfortunately we have to date heard nothing from the government that would give encouragement to the fishermen of the Atlantic provinces who are literally fighting for economic survival with their backs to the wall. Even the so-called band-aids for the saltwater fishing industry have been removed and nothing has been put in their place. For example, we no longer have the salt rebate assistance program, and for the benefit of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) I would point out that dredging, construction and the maintenance of wharves and skidways, which are essential to our fishermen, have been seriously curtailed.

In view of the fact that the income of fishermen is declining, the government's attitude can only be construed as one they have adopted from Rowan and Martin's "Laugh-In", where "sock it to me" is the big event of the night. "Sock it to the fishermen" seems to be the attitude of this government with its recent announcement that wharfage, storage rates, berthing, wintering and laying-up charges for shipping and fishing interests have not been altered for ships up to 100 feet in length but for those over 100 feet in length we understand that the increase in these