

Supply—Fisheries and Forestry

In spite of runaway inflation in costs and diminishing prices for fish, the industry is even fighting for a place on the ocean in which to fish. This results from a lack of action by the government which failed to implement Canada's Territorial Sea and Fishing zones Act which was passed away back in 1964. Today the minister spoke at great length about a wonderful new industry, one of the stars of the fishing industry, the queen crab fishing industry. While we welcome a new fishing venture which the department, through its fisheries research, helped us to establish, I would say to the minister that the queen crab industry is primarily located in the gulf of St. Lawrence. It is an industry, Mr. Chairman, which is exposed to exploitation by every other nation, and will be so exposed until Canada's territorial sea and fishing zones limit is implemented. This is something the minister must take into consideration because unless some action is taken to implement that act the queen crab industry will be exposed to foreign exploitation. It is for this reason I said the minister inherited some of these problems.

I recall the former secretary of state for external affairs rising in his place and saying that this measure would be implemented immediately it was passed by parliament. It has not been implemented yet and the lack of action by the government has created no small problem for our Atlantic coast fishermen. The minister said, in effect, that the fishing industry must stand on its own feet. I ask the minister, is this attitude going to be adopted toward other government operations? Is this the attitude that is going to be adopted toward the C.B.C. which this year will have a deficit of as much as \$150 million? Are we going to make the C.B.C. pay its way? I agree with the minister's concept that it is desirable to have all our industries stand on their own two feet. However, I cannot agree that our fishermen, faced with abnormal economic conditions forced upon them by the actions of other national governments, should be allowed to founder on the rocks of economic privation, desperation and despair when they need help.

I ask the minister, what does he think will happen to these people? What does he think will happen to many of our small fishing ports unless some action is taken by the government? It is not possible to put all these people on welfare and we cannot let them

starve. We cannot ask them to compete, without aid, with Norway, for example, whose parliament approved a state subsidy for their fishing industry up to May 31, 1969 in the amount of \$32 million U.S. dollars. This type of support measure for Norwegian fishermen is aimed at reducing the cost of fishing gear and bait and will be paid on the amount of these items actually bought by the fishermen. With some of these costs borne by the Norwegian government, it is possible for exporters to sell their fish at lower prices than those required by Canadian fishermen.

However, this is only one sample of the type of competition our fishermen are forced to meet. In my opinion, the government has no alternative at the present time but to formulate a policy of direct federal assistance to the Atlantic fishing and processing industries. This policy must take into consideration the immediate short term needs of the industry whose operating losses have depleted financial reserves of the fishermen as well as processors, and it must also consider a long term approach which will assist in reducing costs and expanding consumer demand for fisheries products.

According to all reports, there will be no easing in the immediate future of the pressure on world markets for the salt cod or the fresh frozen industry from European and Scandinavian countries. Until peace is restored in Africa, the fishermen of Iceland, Norway and Denmark will continue to press for greater exports to the United States. In fact, during the past eight months these exports have increased to the United States by some 40 million pounds. It is imperative, therefore, for the short term for the government to re-establish the deficiency payment program and the salt fish surplus disposal program. The deficiency payment program could be implemented in a number of ways.

I am well aware of some of some of the problems facing the minister in this regard, especially in relation to the general agreement under GATT and the Kennedy round. For example, the deficiency payment could be made on a graduated scale to fishermen and boat owners based on the number of days registered as fishing at sea, thus spreading the payments to a number of varieties of groundfish. For processors the deficiency payment could take the form of a supplementary payment on a percentage basis covering the number of man-hours worked by shore employees. Other formulas for the deficiency payment could no doubt be worked out, but