

Supply—Fisheries and Forestry

would prefer licensing of individual fishermen themselves rather than have licences remain with the boats.

With the suggestion of a five year moratorium on new persons entering the profession the union further suggested that to remain in the industry an operator must obtain over 40 per cent of his annual earnings from the sea. This would mean that fishermen would be forced to present one tax return to the Department of National Revenue and another to the Department of Fisheries. We do not want to investigate fishermen's incomes and they do not want us to do so. Therefore there is no way we could possibly restrict people entering the industry on the basis of income, because the income of fishermen varies every year.

The union's proposed program possesses weaknesses and errors which override any advantage in this form of approach. First, by enforcing the five year moratorium on licensing of new fishermen we would be eliminating the entry into the industry of those young men whose heritage directs them to this exciting life. They have the right to enter this business just as those men in the business have the right to remain. Today's young men would be denied the right to follow this chosen pursuit for at least five years, at which time they would have no guarantee of entry. The decision would not belong to the individual but to a government controlled board which would be forced to consider all applications, not only those of fishermen's sons but others.

Who would then receive the nod to enter this profession? Would we deny entry to new Canadians? Would we limit it to people over 25 years of age and under 50 years of age, or would we limit it to friends of fishermen or friends of the government in power? Would we stop new Canadians from entering this industry? We should remember that new Canadians make up most of the labour force in the fishing industry. This is not the way to solve the difficulties.

Second, the limitation on income is contrary to the Canadian way of life. We believe that the man who works the hardest presumably receives the greatest reward, but we would be telling men not to work in the off-fishing season but to stay at home on unemployment insurance and welfare benefits. Let us remember the one fact that fishermen in our country are now receiving \$3 million each year in welfare payments and unemployment

insurance benefits; yet they return only \$100,-000 in revenue or 30 times less than the benefits which are being drawn. This is intolerable for both the fishermen and the taxpayers.

The Burnaby-Richmond delta possesses many brand names that are world famous in relation to seafood. Two of these brands are synonymous with quality salmon. They are Cloverleaf, produced by B.C. Packers Limited, and Paramount produced by the Nelson Brothers. Both firms' products are packed in the Richmond-Steveston area, and we are exceptionally proud of the part these industries play in the Canadian economy.

In conclusion may I point out that the fishermen of the Burnaby-Richmond delta do not want welfare or unemployment insurance. They do not want to stop people from entering this industry but they do want the right to control the entry of new fishing enterprises and they want the right to control prices.

Mr. Moores: Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond for his kind remarks about the minister. I suggest to the minister that possibly that hon. member should be appointed as his public relations man on the west coast.

Let me deal primarily with the catastrophic situation existing in the groundfish industry of eastern Canada and particularly in Newfoundland. Last spring I had the opportunity to write an article dealing with the then difficult time the industry was experiencing. Except for government action the present crisis would have come about much sooner. The deficiency payment scheme was introduced and lasted until the end of October. Its implementation allowed the industry to survive. Its elimination without anything to replace it has dealt the industry and the many thousands connected with it a fatal blow from which they cannot recover. It is for this reason that I plead with the minister to reconsider his position. I also realize that the existing problem was not caused by the present Minister of Fisheries, but while this may be the case it is now his responsibility to overcome the problem.

During my remarks I do not intend to be kind to the industry, but neither am I going to let the government off the hook. The imminent ruin of the frozen fish industry is so serious to the economy of Newfoundland and of Canada, so tragic in its implications for thousands of ordinary Canadians, that it cannot be sloughed aside again by the government. Make no mistake about it, the death of