

*Oral Questions*

of Communications, to launch an office communications program. This is a matter of vital interest not only to my department but also to the department of my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. At that time we indicated a total possible commitment on the part of the government of some \$12.5 million. I was pleased to announce on Friday a commitment by the government to the Telidon program amounting to \$27.5 million.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

● (1440)

**Mr. Fox:** You know yourself, Madam Speaker, that this is a technology in which Canadians have a leading edge—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Some hon. Members:** Speech.

**Mr. Fox:**—ahead of both our French and English competitors. We feel that with this added injection into the Telidon program—

**Some hon. Members:** Order.

**Mr. Fox:**—combined with the additional \$100 million which industry intends to contribute, we will have a very successful electronics program in this country.

\* \* \*

**FISHERIES**

## REGULATION OF HERRING FISHING ON WEST COAST

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. As he knows, there are many very worried herring fishermen out on the west coast owing to the government's lottery, presumably the computerized lottery program, for entry into the herring roe fishery. I should like to ask the minister whether all bona fide herring fishermen will automatically qualify for entry into the roe fishing season and whether native fishermen or any other groups will be exempted from the lottery or given any other kind of classification in the lottery.

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, I fail to understand what the hon. member means by a lottery. As he knows, the herring season in 1979 was the scene of considerable disorder, and in fact of threat to the herring stocks because of pressure and the lack of discipline on the spawning grounds.

In 1980 there was a strike and the herring stock which was taken was much lower than usual, and therefore there was a conservation aspect to this. But in 1981, according to the reports of the biologists, we had to question very seriously if the type of management breakdown which had occurred in 1979 was tolerable and, in fact, if there should be a herring roe fishery at all. We decided in favour of the herring roe fishery,

considering that salmon and herring roe fishermen have had rather difficult seasons. However, we did not institute a lottery. We tried to give fishermen a choice as to the zones in which they wanted to fish so as to ensure some order, and that is still the subject of some discussion. I do not understand what the lottery issue is all about.

**Mr. Friesen:** Madam Speaker, if the minister does not know anything about the lottery, he is way behind the fishermen out there who know all about the lottery system. Conceding the fact that a conservation program has to be established, and the fishermen are the first to agree to that, I should like to ask the minister whether he recognizes the fact that a conservation program is necessary and that new regulations had to be put in place. Since he had them in place in 1980, why did he not use them instead of introducing a new program? The fishermen were already prepared and geared for those regulations. Why did the minister not do that, instead of instituting a new system in 1981 which was totally unproved? Furthermore, I should like to ask the minister whether he is planning to use the present system with regard to other stock, such as salmon, later on, for the fishermen.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** In answer to the last question, I have not heard this suggestion, although there are those who advocate that area licences might make sense. That is one of the items on which, I hope, professor Pearce in his report will give us some suggestions.

Maybe the hon. member confuses the lottery with multiple choice. What the fishermen were asked was: "If you are given an area licence, what is your first, second and third choice?" From what I hear, practically everyone was granted his first choice. I do not think the hon. member would advocate a drastic change in the regulation in the middle of a strike, which was the case in 1980, but I also do not understand his view that what was supposed to be good in 1980, for some reason does not seem to be good in 1981. I should like to hear his arguments on that.

\* \* \*

**CULTURAL AFFAIRS**

## REVIEW COMMITTEE'S ASSESSMENT OF GOVERNMENT'S PERFORMANCE

**Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre):** Madam Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Communications and it deals with the mounting criticism of the federal cultural policy review committee which has succeeded the informal advisory committee which was set up by his predecessor, the Hon. David MacDonald. In view of the fact that both the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister responsible for cultural policy are members of the review committee, how can the minister assure the House that the committee will evaluate fairly and properly the performance of the government on cultural issues?