

Supply

not be some consensus to stand schedule A and to go to schedule D, which would allow flexibility regarding all of the subjects involved.

Mr. Breau: Mr. Chairman, we have no objection as to how it is done, but I suggest that another way would be to revert to clause 2, which covers the whole subject of appropriations. We have no objection, as long as we do not restrict hon. members from questioning ministers on any subject. Whether we stand schedules A, B, and C and go to schedule D or revert back to clause 2, which is a very general clause, I think it would be better to have wide latitude.

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the intervention which has just been made, but it strikes me that Your Honour's suggestion is the better one. If we revert to clause 2, that also raises the whole question of twelve-twelfths. What we want to talk about are items in the departments. As a matter of fact, when we moved to schedule A, I thought the general understanding was that we would discuss all of the schedules. Your Honour is quite correct in saying that we have to be relevant, but if we stand schedules A, B and C and move to schedule D, it seems to me that the door will be wide open.

Mr. Stevens: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated yesterday, we prefer to talk only about relevant subjects with regard to schedules A, B and C, but if hon. members wish to stand those three and go directly to schedule D, we have no serious objection. We would just like to get on with the bill.

The Chairman: Hon. members should consider the fact that when we are considering clauses other than clause 1, we are operating under very strict rules. These rules are meant to prevent us from getting ourselves into a difficult situation and from ending up with amendments which relate to different clauses or different schedules at the same time. There seems to be a disposition, as I suggested, to stand schedules A, B and C and to proceed to schedule D. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: The House will now proceed to the consideration of schedule D. The hon. member for Selkirk-Interlake had the floor last night.

On schedule D—

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, last evening I was speaking of the horrors which would be wrought upon the Manitoba fishing industry by two nasty little fish, those being the gizzard shad and the rainbow smelt, should the Garrison diversion be allowed to go ahead as envisioned by its North Dakota planners. Reflecting upon my comments last evening I am struck by an uncanny resemblance between this environmental pollution and a recent political pollution which has also crept northward from the United States. On the one hand, we have an environmental pollution which, through an accident of human engineering, threatens to move northward, wreaking considerable havoc on the economy of Manitoba. This environmental pollution would take the form of vastly increased

amounts of chemicals in the water, harming community water supplies, farming industries and food processing industries, among others. It would also come in the form of those two previously mentioned voracious garbage fish.

The parallel political pollution promises equally horrible results for Canada. This pollution is the new wonder child of the government opposite, the philosophy of neo-conservatism. This political pollutant had its birth in the murky waters of the United States, as did Garrison's garbage fish. And like those fish, neo-conservatism has moved northward, devouring much of what is good in our country. Indeed, I can expand the parallel. The neo-conservative—

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member because I am very much interested in hearing about the problems surrounding the Garrison diversion and the effect it will have on the very important Manitoba fisheries, but I suggest that the hon. member is breaching the rule of relevancy when he goes into a tirade about neo-conservatism.

The Chairman: Well, actually I cannot be a policeman and be on my feet on every remark. However, and this does not really touch on the point raised by the minister, I am concerned because the hon. member was talking about the environment more than anything else. I was looking through the schedules to see whether the Department of the Environment is involved, and I can find no such reference.

Although the hon. member began on schedule A last night, I hope that his remarks will relate in some way to schedule D or to one of the items in schedule D.

Mr. Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, I will leave this subject for the time being since it is touching nerves on the opposite side.

Mr. McGrath: Just get on to the fisheries.

Mr. Sargeant: I will change the direction of my comments right now, and speak about a couple of matters of concern to inland fishermen, who may very well be falling victim to this nasty neo-conservatism. The first of these was discussed at some length last evening by the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador with regard to offshore fishing. I would like to address the same problem as it applies to the Manitoba scene. In particular, I am referring to the 35 per cent subsidy on fishing boats. As the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador said last night, this has now been put in a holding pattern, and for some months none of the fishermen in Canada have been getting this subsidy.

In Manitoba at the present time this poses a rather serious problem. There are some 90 fishermen who have made representations to the department to get this subsidy. The total amount they are applying for this year is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$140,000 to \$150,000. So far this year only \$20,000 has been spent under this program in Manitoba. Last year \$280,000 was spent, and in the previous year \$180,000 was spent. Manitoba is getting the short end of the stick this year, as I see it. Furthermore, the problem is exacerbated in Manitoba because the Manitoba Credit Corporation will not