

Atlantic Fisheries Restructuring Act

the Liberal Party. I think that is very significant. I say to the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. Breau) that I wish we had had your votes in favour of some of those amendments. No matter how this Act might be administered, we would at least have had access to information which might have contributed to an opportunity for this House and the fishing industry—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member for South West Nova invokes a question of privilege.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who was speaking is referring to the Chairman of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee said here in the House that it would be unbiased. At no time was the Chair asked to break any votes in that Committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): That is perhaps a point of explanation, but it is hardly a question of privilege in the true sense of the word.

Mr. McCain: Mr. Speaker, may I draw to the attention of the House that in the spirit in which the Fisheries Committee has functioned, the Chairman has pretty much reserved the right to participate in that Committee as if she were not chairman but, rather, as a normal member, and she has had—

Mr. Evans: There are clear rules on how chairmen vote.

Mr. McCain: Just a minute. You were not there. Let us get Ottawa Centre out of the fishing business where it does not belong.

• (1720)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order, the Hon. Member should address his remarks to the motion as well as to the Chair, please.

Mr. McCain: My regrets, Mr. Speaker. My respect for the Chair is inalienable, Sir.

We have a question raised through the interjection by the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) as he referred to the Hon. Member for Gloucester. We have sought the answer repeatedly. What becomes of the surplus redfish in the Gulf? Nova Scotia says it has it, that is part of the deal. Newfoundland has implied it has part of that surplus as part of the deal.

An Hon. Member: There is no surplus.

Mr. McCain: Well, the biologist says there are another 50,000 tons we ought to be catching. I do not know whether you call that surplus. The TAC is not utilized, put it that way.

New Brunswick has had no assurance because there has been no negotiation. We do not know what is going on between Quebec and the Minister. We know there is some reorganization, apparently scheduled to be in place in Quebec, but we do not know how many redfish they have. Prince Edward Island has no conception of whether or not it will in turn have any redfish. No one will answer because everything is so secret in

these negotiations. Here we are with the full knowledge of the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate, the Hon. Member for South West Nova and the Hon. Member for Gloucester, voting for a pig in a poke because we feel there is a social responsibility which has motivated us to give this Bill quick consideration. This goes against our principles, because we are conscious of the consequences.

This is the only proposition the Government placed before the industry in spite of advice which I would like to read into the record. I am quoting from the Kirby report as follows:

Improving the climate of co-operation and confidence in the industry will require strong leadership from processors' and fishermen's organizations, as well as changes in attitude among all participants in the fishery, including government. This recommendation will probably be the one that is most difficult to implement.

That is the one on which Mr. Kirby has capitulated under pressure, I suppose, from Government. The primary mandate of the Kirby task force was to recommend:

How to achieve and maintain a viable Atlantic fishing industry with due consideration for the overall economic and social development of the Atlantic Provinces.

Again I wish to quote from the presentation to the Committee by the New Brunswick Department of Commerce and Development. It said:

Recommendation number 45 of the Task Force, "do not establish a new general program of financial assistance for either fishermen or processors", appears to conflict with the preamble to this Bill.

The potential damage to the Atlantic fishery, the profitable and independent part of the industry, is incalculable unless the Bill in its present form is amended.

The presentation continues:

Certain trends are readily discernible. Comparing the years 1976 (the year before the 200 mile limit was proclaimed) and 1980 (the latest year for which data is available), the number of staff-hours worked in New Brunswick increased by 35 per cent over the period, compared to 41 per cent for Canada. The total wage bill in the same period grew by 107 per cent in New Brunswick and 102 per cent for the Canadian fish processing industry.

In other words, New Brunswick was outpacing the rest of Canada. It continues:

This growth in employment in New Brunswick is impressive when one considers that New Brunswick has not benefited from the declaration of the 200 mile limit as have other Atlantic Provinces.

On page 4 of this report it says:

Plants that are owned by larger integrated firms cannot respond as quickly and must often cope with corporate bureaucracies which inhibit such agility. Statistics Canada reports that New Brunswick has more owners working in production than any other province in Canada.

If we look at the value added in New Brunswick versus the rest of Canada it shows that the value added as a ratio of market landed is 4.5 for New Brunswick, 1.9 for Nova Scotia, 2.0 for Prince Edward Island, 1.9 for Quebec and 2.5 for Newfoundland. In other words, the little independent is accomplishing a 4.5 increment in value. That is separate and apart from what is to become the nationalized structure. They have functioned very well. I quote again:

The New Brunswick industry has been successful because a diverse product mix and more finished production by independent "hands on" management and ownership.