

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

### REGULATIONS AND OTHER STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

**Mr. W. Kenneth Robinson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Minister of State for Social Development):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert to motions for the purpose of moving concurrence in the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments, notice of which appears in today's order paper on page 4.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Order, please. The parliamentary secretary seeks unanimous consent to revert to motions for the purpose he has described. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Robinson (Etobicoke-Lakeshore):** Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the first report of the Standing Joint Committee on Regulations and other Statutory Instruments presented to the House on Monday, June 2, 1980, be concurred in.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker):** Is it agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### FISHERIES IMPROVEMENT LOANS ACT

#### EXTENSION OF AND INCREASE IN GUARANTEED LOANS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. LeBlanc that Bill C-28, to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, this bill is certainly one which should go to committee and which should be discussed therein at quite some length. Like many other government intentions, the act finds itself in a position as it stood prior to the introduction of this amendment in which it was impossible to make a significant loan to a boat owner whose boat might require extensive improvement. For instance, in the Bay of Fundy herring industry it would have been impossible to put in a good refrigeration system in an old boat within the \$75,000 limit, and I question whether \$150,000 will adequately do the job for some of the larger boats that are afloat today. Therefore I believe that we are failing to

### *Fisheries Improvement Loans Act*

recognize, even with the limits outlined here, the need of a modern fishing industry.

We have discovered, much to our chagrin, that many of the fish packed or otherwise processed in this nation have not met the quality standards to which some of our foreign potential buyers are accustomed. Some of us have had meetings in parliamentary committees, for instance with European buyers, and we have been advised that our quality does not necessarily meet that to which others are accustomed. Therefore our markets are tenuous. We must have a policy which will improve the capability of our fishing fleet as well as of our processing industry to deliver the quality which is required to sustain the markets and to extract the price which would be available under proper quality circumstances. However, the \$150,000 will do some things for some people, but in this structure they will have to be quite small things.

I am concerned by virtue of the fact that, as the fishing industry modernizes and as inflation gallops along behind—or stays out in front in many cases—fishermen have not been able to qualify for loans. The fishermen have not been able to get loans and they have been denied the privilege of safe and adequate fishing vessels. I am saying quite frankly to the minister that I hope he will give some consideration to increasing the size of this limit as it is presently offered.

There are good grounds for making this statement because a joint presentation of the Atlantic provinces to the minister implied some time ago that in 1977 we were looking at a \$900 million-plus requirement to upgrade the Atlantic fleet so that we might take proper advantage of the 200-mile limit. When one couples that with the demand that the inshore fleet must improve its capability of delivering quality, we are looking at a lot of money required to do the job.

As a party or as a government we had proposed there become a bank type of facility which would finance the construction of these boats for individuals or groups of individual fishermen so that they could take advantage of this opportunity. The industry would then end up in a vertically integrated structure on the east coast of Canada as it has in many other spheres of our industry. We have many problems, and I hope that we may get a chance to discuss them in greater detail when we get into committee stage on this bill. There are a number of items which we should have an opportunity to discuss. I do not think that we should compromise the independence of the fisherman. We should give him an opportunity to buy a new boat and I think that this is a provision we should have.

One of the problems with the fishing industry, as with the agricultural industry, is the fact that the federal government over the last 15 years has chosen to withdraw itself as a participant in the financial structure to keep the industries in place. As a result, the provinces have had to move in. Some might have moved in anyway, because there are provinces that are inclined to top load the agricultural, the fishing and other industries. I submit that it was the vacating of the historic federal responsibility that has enhanced, encouraged and