

The establishment of advisory committees and the remuneration and expenses of members of such committees are also covered by the act in addition to general requirements. It should be noted that the act allows the Governor in Council to make regulations prescribing the person to whom payments may be made, the maximum amount of each payment and the terms and conditions attached to such payments. The minister is also required to submit a report to parliament covering the operations for each fiscal year under the act and covering agreements made under the Act as soon as possible after the termination of each fiscal year.

In June of 1973, the Minister of the Environment summarized the original Fisheries Development Act as follows:

The Act provides for the exploration and development of known fisheries and of entirely new fishery resources, the introduction and demonstration of new and improved fishing vessels and fishing techniques, the development of new fish products and the improvement of product handling, processing and distribution, and a wide range of development programs, including assistance for the construction and equipment of fishing vessels. Various cost-sharing projects were made possible by this legislation which was passed initially in 1966. In short, we now have legislation which enables us to introduce measures to develop the fishery.

An Act to amend the Fisheries Development Act was passed by the House of Commons on July 20, 1973. Under the amendment, payments for the construction, equipment and modification of commercial cold storage and commercial bait freezing facilities were expanded to include payments for the construction and equipment of commercial icemaking and ice-storing facilities or commercial fish-chilling facilities which would contribute to increased productivity in commercial fishing operations.

Speaking on the amendment in committee, the Minister of the Environment stated that the additional grants would relate to both the cost of constructing and equipping icemaking, ice-storing and fish-chilling facilities ashore and the capital costs, excluding the cost of installation, of sea-water refrigerating units in fishing vessels. At that time it was stated the amendment would enable the government to make grants equal to 50 per cent of the cost of such facilities but not exceeding \$25,000 to any one applicant in any one part or location. At this point I cannot help wondering what happened to this proposal. I should like the minister or his parliamentary secretary to tell the House later just how many fish-chilling facilities have been built since July 20, 1973.

Announcing this policy, the government estimated that more than 100 million pounds of fish were rejected annually in Canada as being unfit for human consumption largely due to inadequate chilling between the time the fish were caught and the time they were delivered to market or to a processing plant. Obviously there was a need for icemaking and ice-storage facilities. The minister stated in support of his 1973 amendments:

The economic loss to the fishing industry because of fish rejected as unfit for human consumption and because of a reduction in quality of fish still sold for human use is estimated to amount to more than \$25 million annually at the present time. These heavy losses are directly attributable to spoilage of fish aboard fishing vessels and during transport to the processing plants. The spoilage occurs because of the almost total lack of ice available to in-shore fishermen in Canada. The magnitude can be appreciated when we realise there are approximately 45,000 in-shore fishing boats operated on our two coasts.

Fisheries Development Act

A recent survey has shown that \$9 million worth of additional equipment capable of producing a total of 2,600 tons of ice per day is required across Canada to satisfy fully the needs of these in-shore fishermen. Some 370 locations have been identified as requiring additional facilities of this kind with the Provinces of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia heading the list.

My hon. friends from Newfoundland will, later in this debate, put on record any developments which have taken place in that province. But it was estimated that Nova Scotia needed something like four ice making machines having a capacity of two tons of ice per day, 10 with a capacity of between 2 and 5 tons a day, 17 having a capacity of between 5 and 10 tons a day, 14 machines with a capacity of between 10 and 15 tons and 7 with a capacity of 15 to 20 tons.

Mr. Speaker, there has been almost complete silence from the Department of Fisheries with regard to this project. What has been accomplished since July, 1973 with regard to the establishment of these icemaking plants? As far as I know there are none at Peggy's Cove or West Dover, none at Mill Cove, Blandford, Ironbound, Big or Little Tancook, or at other fishing ports in Lunenburg County, Queens County or Shelburne County.

This amendment was discussed at considerable length during the meeting of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry which took place on June 19, 1973. There was a brief exchange of views concerning the shortening of contract time for fish-chilling facilities from ten to five years from the date of application. There was considerable discussion arising from the fact that certain major ports were excluded from the fish-chilling program under the draft regulations. Additional comments centred on the adequacy or otherwise of the supply of fresh water to smaller ports in Nova Scotia. Nothing has been done in this area since then; one of the major ports of Nova Scotia namely, Riverport is still suffering from an inadequate supply of fresh water. Lengthy discussions took place with regard to a possible connection between regulations governing the inspection of vessels and regulations covering the amendment to the Act concerning fish-chilling.

Members of the committee questioned government officials as to the criteria used in determining the number of locations at which additional icemaking facilities might be established. Subsequent discussion concerned the price at which ice should be available to fishermen and the co-ordination of the fish-chilling program with activities under the small harbours program. There were brief comments relating to the distance a local fisherman would be required to travel in order to obtain ice, and representations that such considerations should be borne in mind when determining the precise locations for fish-chilling and icemaking facilities. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, our fears at that time were justified, because the implementation of this program has been long delayed. I believe we have a right to know what progress has been made in these matters.

There was a lengthy discussion on the requirement in the original act that the minister submit an annual report on activities authorized under the act during the fiscal year. The minister and department officials pointed out that reports on such activities had always been included in the annual reports of the department under the activities of the industrial development branch of the fisheries ser-