

This brings us to the point of how we should approach the resolution of this difficult situation. We do not adhere to the view that, because some of the private sector is currently experiencing financial difficulty, state ownership is required to bring about resolution to this event. Indeed we may be jumping from the frying pan to the fire. It would be equally wrong to conclude that the small scale private sector companies alone could deliver our future prosperity. Rather we would have been more anxious about determining what are the manageable units within the large concerns and insure that by providing support and loan security, private investment would have been found to acquire those manageable units and run them as viable concerns. Yes, there would have been a period of disruption while the reordering took place but had we undertaken this activity when the problem was recognized at least two years ago, I submit the industry would be stabilized at this time and markets supported.

To date, my own Province of Nova Scotia has refused to sign an agreement with the federal Government. There were proposals made at Port Hawkesbury in September but we were informed in committee that they are now in limbo as a result of backtracking by the federal Minister.

Some of the points still to be resolved were laid before the committee in an excellent presentation by the new provincial Minister of Fisheries, Mr. John Leefe. I will not read all of them but simply four to which he referred. He stated that no agreement was yet signed and listed some of the points that are in disagreement between the federal and provincial Governments, for example, a commitment to transfer equity back to private enterprise within five years. Another point is maintenance of existing northern cod quotas together with incremental increases every year. No one level of government will have a majority of control of the new company, and finally, the Nova Scotia-Canada multi-million dollar fisheries development plan is to be renegotiated. These and other problems still remain to be resolved.

A spokesman for the Independent Sea Producers also raised in the committee some very important points. In the interest of time I will only mention one or two. The independents contend that restructuring represents an effective but somewhat subtle nationalization of the Atlantic fishery. The independents have no confidence that the new super companies will be run on a commercial basis and expect that they will need continuous subsidies. Consequently, the independents will have to deal with very unfair competition. For the independents, restructuring will have particularly negative implications in the following areas: fish prices, wages, marketing, resource allocation, policy development and implementation and financing. The underlying concern here is that the new super company will not be permitted to function in a commercially responsible fashion. I could go on, but this shows the fear of the people who are still trying to operate in the industry.

There is even some concern that this Bill is entirely unnecessary since its requirements are, in my view, covered by an Act called the Fisheries Development Act. Two clauses of this Act in particular appear to give the Minister all the power that he needs to help the industry through this period of depression within the industry. I would like to present two of the clauses of that particular Bill to show what I mean. According to the Fisheries Development Act, Section 3(1), the Minister:

—may undertake projects (a) for the more efficient exploitation of fishery resources and for the exploration for and development of new fishery resources and new fisheries;

Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act

- (b) for the introduction and demonstration to fishermen of new types of fishing vessels and fishing equipment and of new fishing techniques; and
- (c) for the development of new fishery products and for the improvement of the handling, processing and distribution of fishery products.

Section 3(3) states:

The Minister may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, enter into an agreement with any province providing for the payment to the province of contributions in respect of the cost of any project that is undertaken by the government of the province or any agency thereof and that the Minister is authorized to undertake under subsection (1).

Section 5 states:

The Minister may make payments to such persons or classes of persons, in such amount and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council,

- (a) for the construction and equipment of
 - (i) commercial cold storages, or
 - (ii) commercial bait freezing facilities equipped with mechanical refrigeration, that will be suitable for the preservation of fishery products.

I could go on but it seems to me that the officials of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans should have taken time, upon examination of this over-all problem, to see what vehicle could have been used in order to assist the people in Newfoundland and some in my Province of Nova Scotia who are in dire straits as a result of the cyclical downturn. I say "cyclical" as one who spent some time in the industry. I know that the biblical quotation of "seven fat years and seven lean years" seemingly applies to the fishing industry. We do have our ups and downs, as I am sure you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, coming from New Brunswick. Instead of using this vehicle to which I just referred as a *modus operandi* in order to resolve these difficulties, these officials have jumped in with a whole new piece of legislation which is, in effect, balkanizing and dividing all the Provinces of Atlantic Canada as well as Quebec.

In conclusion, I simply wish to say that if this is the best that the federal Government can come up with after two years of procrastination and exhaustive study by the Kirby task force, we on this side have decided to let it get on with it because time is running out for the people in Atlantic Canada whose financial resources in some areas are completely depleted. That is the sad side of this entire mess which we face today. This is why we agree to third reading today.

I believe it is significant that with the exception of the Hon. Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) whose amendment dealt with the Saltfish Marketing Corporation and therefore ruled out of order by you, Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservative Party and its Members are the only ones who moved amendments in the House in the hope of strengthening this Bill and in the hope of making it more acceptable to the independents still functioning in the industry. Unfortunately, when these amendments were moved some Liberal Members who obviously do not like the Bill negated these very amendments which would have strengthened it. This is called window dressing in the trade. They are called paper tigers because without that type of support we are stymied and handtied. As I said earlier, we are here with a gun