

large units of administration. We have done the same thing with churches. We have tried to rationalize everything into bigger units, worshipping stupidly and foolishly at the temple of largeness and forgetting that you do not have to be big to be great or to be good. I think that in Atlantic Canada, where in a very real sense this country began, the decline of the community, the loss of its schools, the loss of the community hall, the loss of fishing centres and all these matters have done things to our way of life which have not been improvements but, indeed, have been quite the opposite.

Down in eastern Canada, where the fisheries industry used to be king, to have it declining and shrinking is something that everybody, whether engaged directly in the fishing industry or not, should be deeply concerned about. We have lost that sense of common interest and have become depersonalized. That is not good for a society like ours which should underscore the closeness of the relationships between people.

● (1620)

I thought of this as I compared my residence in Ottawa with my residence in the little fishing centre in the very beautiful seaport of Victoria, Prince Edward Island. Some months ago my home in Ottawa was burglarized, quite extensively for an impecunious person like myself, and no one saw what happened. In my little home in Victoria, if I sometimes inadvertently leave a light on in the attic or the basement, my 95-year old neighbour will let me know right away. This is the kind of concern that I cherish. But in my street in Ottawa, just the summer before last, someone looted one of the houses, taking away all the furniture in a big truck. No one knew about it, because there is no sense of community, no personal contact. That is the kind of thing which made the little community so important: it was centred on the church, the school, the town hall, the wharf and places where the community got together. We have lost that.

I agree with my colleague that in recent years it has been difficult to get to a centre of authority in terms of harbours. If you approach the Department of Transport you are told that the Department of Public Works has jurisdiction over certain areas, and then you find that in matters pertaining to small harbours it is the Department of Fisheries that has authority. I think the hon. member for Annapolis Valley was correct in saying that the people who work in the departments are conscientious. I do not think that most public servants are bad or stupid; I think the majority are pretty good folk, trying to do the job as best they can. There is always a little bit of runaround, however.

I have been concerned about a particular matter for some months and have come to the conclusion that every time I write a letter about it to the Department of Transport a copy will be sent to the Department of Public Works and to the Department of Fisheries. In that way they will all hear the same story at the same time—and so far they are all performing with the same lack of activity. In relating the ancient fishing industry to tourism, a fairly modern industry, this bill has recognized a development. We have had the story of Nova

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

Scotia, and I should like to say a word or two now about Prince Edward Island, another important fishing centre. My hon. and reverend colleague, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), planned to take part in this debate, but we decided that the chamber could probably tolerate only one Prince Edward Islander at one sitting. What I say today in general terms expresses the concern which he shares. Of course, I will not be able to express myself in the ecclesiastical language he could use, being, as Anthony said, "a plain, blunt man".

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to read things into the record, and very seldom do so, but I should like to refer to the annual report of the Department of Fisheries for 1976 which begins as follows:

The fiscal year 1975/76 could have best been described as a year of retrenchment for the Canadian fishery, a year when government bought time for the industry while it carried out an in-depth study of its complexities in an attempt to determine the reasons for its lack of stability and ability to sustain itself as a viable part of our Canadian economy. Meanwhile, fish stocks continued their decline, management procrastinated and the foreign fleets continued their systematic harvest offshore. At this time we are still making polite gestures at the ongoing Law of the Sea Conference, the U.S. government now having declared their intentions to establish a 200 mile limit. Surely, if for no other reason than the fact that our neighbours have beat us to it we will follow suit.

If I may interpolate, that is very prophetic and timely, as meetings are now going on. It continues:

On the provincial scene, with our 1976 fishing year about to begin, we are told that 80 per cent of the Gulf redfish quota has been taken by those who should be fishing offshore, and the gulf cod fishery doomed to a similar fate unless some positive steps to curtail these fisheries are taken. Gulf based fisheries which rely heavily on the greater portion of these quotas will have to settle for what is left and undoubtedly will have a lean year in '76.

Obviously, our ability to manage our fishery considering the interests of those Canadian fishermen who totally depend on the Gulf of St. Lawrence has much to be desired. There is no doubt in the minds of those of us who rely on this fishery that while we are aware of the need for a 200 mile economic zone and what it may do for the Canadian fishery, we are more aware of the need for some intelligent management of our fishery here in the Gulf.

I could talk about the problems of a fish not mentioned by the preceding speaker, the mackerel. It may not have flesh the colour of the salmon, but it is one of the finest, most delectable fish we have in this country. I should like to commend the minister for a program he began—though I fear he may have dropped it—to promote across the country that important, highly nutritive and tasty fish, the mackerel. It is a terrible situation when we find that mackerel in our supermarkets comes from Norway, Japan, Portugal or Spain, and often it can be taken in the Atlantic Ocean. I have been horrified when I have bought fish which I thought was packed in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia and then found it labelled, in small print, "Product of Japan". When I check with fishermen in my own area I am told that in a given year they throw out a couple of thousand pounds of mackerel because there is no market for it.

It is time the country was educated on the nutritive value of fish, and it is time the fish plants were furnished with the best equipment available so that they can compete in the marketplace. We must also learn not to discard portions of the fish and, instead, to put them to use in making fertilizer and other ingredients important to agriculture.