

*Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

the mismanagement of our fisheries resources by this government over the past ten years. Recently, a weekly newspaper printed a cheque stub from the pay cheque of an average wage earner in an east coast plant. The cheque stub showed 34.25 hours worked at regular time, \$3.90 per hour, and 12 hours of Saturday overtime at \$5.85 per hour. The gross earnings were \$207.53, while the net earnings were \$171.43. Even you, Mr. Speaker, might say that is not bad for a week's work. However, you would be adopting the wrong premise because the figures I have just quoted cover a two-week work period. It works out to \$85.71 per week. Out of this amount, he or she has to pay the rent, or mortgage, food, fuel oil, clothing, electricity, operate a car to and from work, plus gas and all the rest of a family's expenses. This, I say, is about average for plant workers as a whole.

This is a dismal record even in the Atlantic provinces. As I said earlier, during my trip with the transport committee the shabby way these people are treated by the government was confirmed, not only in the fishing industry but also the potato industry.

When there are no fish to process, the work force is sent home as the employees are paid only for the hours worked. The Anti-Inflation Board obviously did not take that factor into consideration when it made decisions about wage levels. The Minister of Fisheries and his officials obviously did not take it into consideration when they established fisheries quotas for 1976 and 1977, quotas which force the fisherman to limit his fishing activities, quotas which force him to spread out his fishing effort over a longer term. This action will in the long run spread out the economic and social hardship for shore workers over a longer period.

Recently the Minister of Fisheries was asked a question in the House about discussions he was having with the industry concerning quotas. He replied that he was hopeful that he could spread the quotas for the next year over a 12-month period. That, I know, was not an intentional statement by the minister. It could not have been. It shows a gross lack of knowledge of what happens when you encourage men who want to go to sea, men who want to work to the best of their capability to catch the biggest catch available to them, telling them to spread out their capability, spreading out the fishing quotas so that they will only land smaller quotas per trip. Think of what this is doing to the shore plant worker. I just gave a classic example of what is happening at present and has been happening throughout 1976, yet this year they are not promised more of the same, but even a little less of the same. The minister is, in effect, saying that \$85.71 a week is enough for a shore worker. Surely we can do better than that.

We are establishing a 200-mile limit, hopefully for the benefit of Canadians and not entirely for the benefit of foreign nationals. Hopefully, it will be for the benefit of shore plant workers in Atlantic and Pacific Canada. However, this is the ultimate result of the minister's action when he says we will spread out quotas. He is simply spreading out inefficiency. It is not encouraging initiative. It does not encourage people who are ambitious and want to work. This is making it more

[Mr. McKenzie.]

difficult for our people, both ashore and afloat, to earn an honest living. The fishing industry of Canada obviously requires a higher profile. It needs a spending priority equal to or higher than that of the CBC, since the fishing industry directly and indirectly affects the livelihood of so many Canadians. Unfortunately, Bill C-7 gives little or no recognition to the validity of many of the points I have raised. It does, however, grant the minister wide powers.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** It is 10.30 tonight.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order. Under previous arrangements the House sits until 10.30, the late show being from six to 6.30.

**Mr. Guay (St. Boniface):** Carry on reading.

**Mr. McKenzie:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, this bill does grant the minister wide powers, far too many powers.

Clauses 5(1) reads as follows:

The minister may undertake projects for the acquisition, development, construction, improvement or repair of any scheduled harbour or any fishing or recreational harbour to which this act applies.

Clause 8 provides:

The minister may, subject to the regulations,

- (a) lease any scheduled harbour or any part thereof to any person,
- (b) grant a licence to any person for the use of any scheduled harbour or any part thereof, and
- (c) enter into any agreement with the government of any province or any agency thereof for the occupancy or use of any scheduled harbour or any part thereof.

Knowing the character of the minister, and knowing the character of various members on this side of the House—one of whom, I believe, will be the minister of fisheries after the next election—I am sure these wide powers will not be abused. However, this does not mean they should remain on the books. I was always of the opinion, for example, that our harbours belonged to the public. I cannot understand how any minister could believe he had the right to lease harbours or any part of a harbour to one person. Surely, limits should be set on the application of Clause 8 when the measure is sent to committee.

● (2200)

Under this bill, the minister can build recreational harbours wherever he chooses, without regard for provincial or municipal desires. What has happened to the view that the provinces should be consulted on matters which affect their interests? I say to the minister most sincerely that lack of consultation over fisheries matters with provincial ministers is a major criticism of him, and that it is advanced not only by Conservative provincial ministers but by Liberal provincial ministers as well. The government is becoming increasingly involved in the building of recreational harbours. It has taken the path of shared-cost programs with the provinces; it pays up to 50 per cent of the cost, but only for breakwaters and dredging.