

Supply

1980s that created the beginnings of the overcapacity we now have, the miscalculation of the resource, the mismanagement of the resource. I could not help but contemplate that as this motion which was put by the hon. member for Beauséjour, a Liberal motion, that the House condemn the government's mismanagement, it would surely pertain to the management of the minister of the early 1980s.

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): I am pleased to stand in this House today to participate in debate on this motion. The motion states that this House condemn the government's mismanagement, lack of leadership, incompetence and negligence that has placed Canada's fishing communities and workers in unparalleled jeopardy. Well that is putting it lightly.

I would like to focus mostly on the B.C. fishery. Mismanagement has been rampant in British Columbia for generations, but it seems to be an accelerating process in this last while. I am going to focus my comments on four main areas, the first the most recent free trade panel decision; second on fish farming and the effect that has on the fishery the third on the troll fleet versus recreational fishery in British Columbia; and fourth on drift-net fishery.

First of all, let us focus on the free trade panel decision. We have to look at this decision in the context of other government initiatives. For instance, the changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act. The effect on jobs of the free trade panel decision is quite dramatic. The figures that I have, 24,000 full and part-time workers are affected and are now at risk because of this decision. Twenty-four thousand, this is on B.C. fishery. When we talk about the kind of effects on jobs we have to think about who those people are, which people are affected.

My colleague from New Westminster—Burnaby has provided me with figures for unemployment for women generally is 11.2 per cent. Unemployment for native women is a shocking 21.8 per cent. In British Columbia, 70 per cent of the workers in fish processing are women. The majority are either native women or from visible minorities. The kind of jobs that are affected by this free trade panel decision are good jobs, paying benefits. Many of these women who are affected by these job losses are the sole support for their families because, especially in the native communities, often the men have a much

higher rate of unemployment than the women. What other jobs can these people be trained for?

• (1720)

The Minister of Employment and Immigration talks about what alternatives his government has, its long range plans for employment. Well, what is being done for the remote communities of British Columbia that are so dependent on the fishing industry for their jobs? What are the government's initiatives? I propose that it has none, that it is sacrificing these jobs.

On this free trade panel decision, I want to give you the kind of figures we are looking at. In Skagit County in Washington, the rate of pay for the fish processing industry is \$5.50 an hour versus Canada where the rate is \$13.00 an hour. Certainly if you want to be an ideological purist you can see the rationale for why the jobs are going south of the border. But I contend that the government of our country should be looking after Canadian jobs and should not be following the kind of ideological purity that is going to hurt Canadians. This free trade panel decision hurts Canadian jobs and it hurts Canadian communities.

I would like to remind the House of a quote from the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans in February of 1988 when he was speaking to the Pacific Gill-netters Association convention. He said that we do not need more fish but we could generate more year-round employment at income by doing more with the fish. What does he mean, if it does not mean processing the fish, packaging the fish. This free trade panel decision does the very reverse. It sends the jobs south of the border.

However, this panel decision not only affects the job. It also affects our sovereignty. How can we control our resource if we do not know how many fish are actually being caught? How do we measure how many fish we have? We are talking about percentages that will have been set at 20 per cent of the fish. Twenty per cent of what? How do we measure it? How do you measure a percentage of an unknown quantity? How do you know logically? Do you not have to count them all to be able to know what the 20 per cent is?

If Americans are buying on the water and paying cash, how will we know what the exports have actually been? It is impossible to monitor escapements without counting on a daily basis how many fish have been caught. This is a conservation issue. I know that some members opposite have been talking about the kind of sustainable development initiatives of this government. We are talking about management here and this government, through its