

the wheel by that Province's Government. In short, it is the Liberal Government's own abysmal record in negotiation and consultation that is to blame for the restructuring delays and for much of the crisis in the Atlantic fishery.

During the committee hearings last week one of the most oft repeated criticisms for fishermen, processors and provincial Governments was that they had not been consulted about restructuring although they will be profoundly affected by its outcome. This is the real tragedy of the restructuring this Bill will authorize. The Liberal Government has failed to demonstrate respect for the different needs of the fishing industry in different parts of Atlantic Canada. There is no reason to think, no reason whatsoever, that Bill C-170 will in any way change this position. Indeed, this federal Government seems to think that what is good for Newfoundland is good for Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Quebec. This of course reminds me of that old cliché about the lady with ten kids who, when one of them got sick, gave cod liver oil to the whole lot. That is in effect what is happening here. One of our Provinces is economically ill and, instead of recognizing the need of that particular Province, this Bill encompasses the whole of Atlantic Canada as well as Quebec. This Government seems determined to prop up one sector of the industry and kick out the blocks from under the others.

No one could blame the people of Newfoundland and Labrador for seizing the opportunity provided by this restructuring agreement with the federal Government. That Province has been shamefully ignored by federal programs ever since Confederation. DREE expenditures, for example in Newfoundland, have been cut in half in the past three years when, by rights, they should have been increased. Despite its strategic location in the North Atlantic, which I might add was well recognized during World War II, Newfoundland is the only Canadian Province without a permanent Canadian Forces base, and it has the lowest per capita national defence expenditure. For years the Province has been trying to negotiate an agreement on its petroleum resources. Of course, Newfoundland would jump at the chance of seeing increased federal spending on its fishery and an opportunity for a little more control over the management of the industry. Whether these opportunities will be realized remains to be seen, Mr. Speaker, as the detailed negotiations have not yet begun.

The way restructuring has been presented so far makes it acceptable only to Newfoundland. In the maritime Provinces the consensus appears to be that this federal Government should not have controlling interest of any fishery enterprise and that the large Nickerson-National sea corporation should be split up into five corporations rather than being further consolidated.

Tomorrow this Bill will be passed and the ball will once again be in the Liberal court to pursue the course of restructuring. I wonder how this Government will placate the many fishermen and processors it has already antagonized. How will it improve the fishery and create a spirit of co-operation when four out of five Provinces in the region are opposed to the federal manoeuvres? This Government is led by a man who

declares that co-operative federalism is dead. In the months ahead, we in the Official Opposition will be watching the implementation of restructuring with great concern. We will not hesitate to criticize the federal Government for unnecessary delays in the process.

● (1610)

While this Bill was in committee our Party was successful in bringing in two major additions to the Bill. One will ensure that Parliament gets an annual report on the administration of this Act. The other provides at least a whisper of acknowledgement that federal equity in fisheries enterprises will be returned to the private sector when the enterprises become economically viable.

Our Party actually introduced 11 amendments to this bill in committee. Six were accepted. At the report stage I again moved two of those, which were voted down by the government side. The fact that these two amendments were defeated as of today clearly establishes the tone in which restructuring will be carried out. It confirms the fears that have already been expressed throughout the Atlantic region that accountability and consultation will be minimized while federal control of the fishery will be maximized for an undetermined period.

Beyond these amendments there is another important change that should be made to the way in which this Bill is enacted. Representatives from the processing industry have given this issue the highest priority for changes to Bill C-170. It requires no amendment, merely the proper exercise of powers under Clause 7 of the Bill. This will allow the Governor in Council to appoint another Minister, other than the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, to administer this Act. It sounds like a small change but it would go a long way to allay the fears of the fishing industry. The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), controlling a majority of shares of some 60 or 70 per cent of Atlantic processing capacity, could be in a conflict of interest position with regard to his duties for resource management and licensing. Imagine the CBC, for example, being responsible for all broadcasting licences, or Petro-Canada for all drilling permits, and you have comparable situations. I therefore call upon the present Government to confer the administration of this Act upon some other Minister. After all, the powers of the Bill are purely economic in nature and they should be exercised according to economic and social criteria established by a Department such as the Department of Economic Development or the Department of Regional Industrial Expansion.

The Minister, in his comments today, alluded to this particular section in a way. He said it was the intention of the Government that the shares would not be held by him but would be held by the Minister responsible for the Canada Development Investment Corporation. I question whether this will satisfy the fears of the independents who appeared before our committee because of the track record of the Minister to whom he indicates this authority will be transferred.

At this point I would like to read into the record the reasons why the Minister mentioned in Bill C-170 should be some