

Government Organization

act as a single seller of freshwater fish, principally in the United States.

The fisheries price support legislation is effective in respect of the Great Lakes where the federal role has been to stabilize the price of the freshwater fish from that source. We are looking ahead to 1970 when the federal government will, under federal price support legislation, stand ready to buy frozen groundfish products, to bid the price up in the market and to stabilize the price, particularly to fishermen, for many years to come. So, the Department of Fisheries is concerned not only with the resource and with its optimum management but also with inspection, the quality of the product and the marketing process.

The management of the resource presents a problem, particularly in international waters beyond our own Canadian jurisdiction. Hence the importance of including as much water area under Canadian jurisdiction as possible. In the case of certain resources, including those in salt water which like the crab and the lobster extend to the edge of the continental shelf, we have the complete say as to what is caught, how much is caught, and how this catch relates to the sustainable yield from that source. But in the cases where we are competing with other nations, it is a catch as catch can situation, a no-man's land, an unregulated fishery.

I think it must always be the policy of the government to endeavour to bring order out of chaos in this particular industry. In the case of some treaties, we have managed to limit the catching effort of other countries, and in some cases we have had to limit our own catching effort. In those circumstances, it has been possible to develop the resource in an orderly manner, to maintain production and to get an economic yield from that particular fishery. However, these cases are exceptions rather than the rule.

We have endeavoured, particularly on the west coast and now also in the case of the lobster fishery on the east coast, to institute systems of licence limitation. We can only do this when the fishery in question is totally under Canadian jurisdiction and control. The main objective is not to limit the catch but to limit the amount of gear, the number of vessels, to the point where the income of the average fisherman is as high as it can be. Its administration should be such as to create a reasonable differential in favour of the fisherman relative to the income of the community in which he lives. The principal objective in

licence limitation is to raise the income of the average fisherman, but it also has the effect of better conservation and the wise management of the resource itself.

There are other side benefits to the dollars spent on research, conservation and good management, than that of the commercial fishery itself. I am referring here to the sports fishery, to recreation. In many parts of North America today the investment in pleasure boats, in gear and in services for the sports fisherman is a multiple of the investment of the total commercial fishery in that area.

For instance there are six times as many privately owned sports craft on the west coast today as there are commercial fishing craft. The total investment in the sports fishery on the west coast is considerably in excess of commercial fishery. So, the dollars spent on the propagation of more fish of higher quality—in this case of salmon—also creates a benefit for the whole community. Therefore, the earlier figure which I gave of an investment of about \$1 by the Canadian taxpayer for every \$8 in commercial yield would have to be modified for this very considerable yield in pleasure and convenience to the sports fisherman and the pleasure boat owner.

Several hon. members have already spoken on this bill, and I would like to refer very briefly to their comments related to fisheries before I sit down. The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) was concerned about the ever increasing expenditure by federal government departments. I would like to point out that the combined department of fisheries and forestry in 1969 will spend less money, fewer taxpayers dollars, on its administration than the two separate departments did in the immediately preceding year. The employment in terms of man hours of the work force in the department will also be down as compared to 1968.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was concerned about growth centres, particularly as they relate to the expansion of the economy of the Atlantic region. He made a request that in the development of our resource industries we should not be unduly preoccupied with the idea that a few centres should be the only centres in the future to attract investment, particularly investment which can be influenced by federal government policy. I would like to assure him that in the case of the forest industry, and also in the case of fisheries, it will be the intention of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry to