

*Supply—Fisheries*

This contrasts somewhat with the attitude which existed previously when the late Mr. Clark was the deputy minister.

This is no reflection whatsoever upon Mr. Clark. He was a very able, competent, personable gentleman in this field and he administered the department very effectively; but Mr. Clark was a practical man from the industrial side of fisheries. He was an administrator, not a scientist; and now we hope that the attitudes, opinions and research ideas of the people in the department will have some bearing on what is decided upon from a policy point of view, because research is essential to develop not only the fisheries of Canada but those of other countries.

We may have to pump extensive amounts of money into the research side of the department's activities. We should no longer look upon the fisheries research board—a wonderful organization—as being just an organization that exists and carries on from day to day. We think it should be more adequately financed, and that more direction and freedom should be given it in order to find ways and methods of increasing the catch, processing, and consumption of fishery products. If I may in passing, I would like to make reference to Dr. Kask, who left the chairmanship of the fisheries research board early this year. I am sure the minister and his predecessors in the department found Dr. Kask and his associates invaluable in the work which they did.

There is an interesting sidelight to the activities of the fisheries research board, and that is that throughout the year it produces a number of publications and documents based upon the research studies which it conducts. It is interesting to realize just who reads these publications and documents the most aptly, and who accepts them as guideposts in fishing. It is a well known fact that fishing skippers and captains of the Soviet union fishing fleet look upon the research department's publications as their bible in exploiting our fisheries on the high seas. It is unfortunate that our own fisheries people do not do the same thing, and that our fishing industry does not follow the activities of the board with such fervour.

The minister mentioned the development of fish flour for human consumption. I think much greater activity must be devoted to this field, to process fishery products which are not presently edible because they are not exotic enough, and to process what is now more or less considered to be waste from fish plants. These should be processed into protein concentrates for human consumption. The board should also be concerning itself with the possibility of the plant life of the oceans being processed for human consumption, because it is also a source of food.

[Mr. Howard.]

We should look ahead to the time when the world's production and consumption of fish will be perhaps two or three times what it is now, ranging upwards of 100 million tons a year, something which we could not conceive of some ten or 12 years ago. The policy of the department and the government must be directed towards preparing for this, through early planning of our investment in fisheries, in catching fish, processing them and distributing them to the point where we will remain a prominent power in world fisheries in years to come. We are that at present, but we will not be in the future if we keep fumbling along on a day to day or year to year basis.

We should also be promoting extensive use of artificial or man made hatcheries for fish because, even though we may not like it, I think in time to come we will see a greater multiple use of lakes, rivers and waters, and we will find that pesticides, insecticides, sewage and pollution coming from industries, cities and towns will increase as time goes on and will take their toll of the natural spawning grounds in lakes and other waters.

In this regard I was very pleased to note that the minister, the deputy minister and a couple of other officials—Dr. Pritchard for one comes to mind—appeared before the committee on food and drugs just the other day, and dealt with the question of the effect of insecticides and pesticides on marine life and fisheries. Unfortunately I do not think that committee, because of the complexity of the subject before it, will be able to come up with any scientific, technical and worth-while recommendations in this particular field.

If I may digress for a moment, this is one committee, perhaps more than any other standing or special committee of the house, that should have an extensive research staff provided for it, so that it can deal with the various bits of scientific and technical information presented to it, analyse that information and then, when it makes recommendations, it will know what it is doing. Without that, a great deal of the activity of the committee will be a waste of time.

As I said earlier, we must get into the field of expansion in our relations with other countries concerning international fishery conventions. We must also think in terms of the promotion of fishery colleges and enticement of more people into scientific research in those fields which relate to the ocean and to the plant and animal life therein. If we do these things, if the minister keeps them in mind from a long range and short range policy point of view, and if he takes steps to implement them, we will continue to be one of the leading fishery nations of the world.