

ings I have ever had the pleasure to attend—and I give full marks to some officials who had the intestinal fortitude to expose themselves to the public in that way.

That was two or three years ago, but as a result of the meeting and the tour we were able for the first time to get some decision so that at least five Fundy areas were selected and funds were allocated to them so that work could be done, in some cases fundamental repairs and in other cases a better maintenance job for the existing facility to protect it. But even with that effort made two to three years ago there have been at least three other small ports in my area that have lost their wharfs, and in one case in Harbourville the department says it will cost over \$1 million to put a similar facility in place because not only the wharf but the breakwater has gone.

I am prepared to admit—the officials do not have to tell me—that in many of the cases you cannot justify the expense by the landed value of fish. I say there has to be something more than the landed value of fish when you try to assess the life of a small community. I hope we will be able to explore this matter in committee. I do not know whether there is sufficient power under the bill before us, but I believe there is power for the minister to become involved jointly with the province in enterprises where not just the landed value of fish will determine where a facility goes. I hope a joint program can be established with the province to integrate the landed value of fish and other considerations in that community.

I admit that many inshore communities are not as vibrant today as they were years ago. We have just extended our shore line by 200 miles, and fish is a renewable resource. Let me say to hon. members that if they do not eat fish, they should start doing so because it not only gives you brains but it gives you protein. It is a lot better to eat fish from the sea than to eat fish from our polluted rivers inland. But that is a digression. I can see a situation where it would be in the interests of the federal government to contribute to a program linked and merged with recreation, tourism and highways. In several areas in my constituency the road into the community is dependent upon the maintenance of the breakwater, because when the breakwater goes, the road goes.

That has already occurred in some parts of my area. Yet you get the department of highways saying, "Good gracious, we cannot maintain the road because we have lost the breakwater, and that is a federal responsibility". The federal people responsible for the breakwater will listen to the complaints and say, "we cannot rebuild the road because that is a provincial responsibility". The upshot is that regardless of whose responsibility it is, the reality is that the persons in the community do not have a road.

I hope that with the powers under the bill, and using a little imagination, an intergrated approach can be developed, merging the fish function with recreation, tourism and highways. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether you have been privileged to drive along the shoreline in my constituency, but if you have you will have seen that there is quite a difference between a fishing community with an even small wharf facility, with

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

recreation boats and a few trawlers, and another small community farther down the shore where you do not even have to look to see whether they have a wharf because you can tell by looking at the state of the houses and the fact that the one store they have is closed to know that it does not have a wharf. So I hope there will be some discussion of that matter in committee.

There is one further matter regarding the allocation of funds that I would like to mention. I am not sure how much time I have left, and I know that our time is restricted. I say this in an inquisitive way and I hope that we will have an explanation of this in committee. When you speak about rationalization and the life of communities along the shore, whether it is on the east coast or the west coast, I would like to know what formula will be used for the allocation of funds, and I hope the minister can explain it in more detail.

Some hon. members who have been here longer than I have always been suspicious about how funds are allocated. Is it really the landed value of fish that determines it, or is it sometimes the landed value of votes? I think that in the past, to be fair, the landed value of votes was a much more realistic factor than the landed value of fish. But if you could carry both, if you had both fish and votes, you were guaranteed your wharf facility. To be fair, I think that fortunately this was more the case in bygone days.

Now, in Nova Scotia, different zones and regions are allocated different funds. There are budgets for certain zones. You try to work with that budget to do something within your area. But then there are larger zones. I do not know how many hon. members appreciate the fantastic value of fish in Nova Scotia. We hear about Newfoundland all the time, and about British Columbia and their romantic salmon, which certainly catches the imagination more than the basic Atlantic fish that we catch in Nova Scotia. A couple of years ago I was surprised to hear that in 1971 the report of the department of fisheries for Nova Scotia stated that Nova Scotia had a higher landed value of fish than the province of British Columbia. Taking all the Atlantic provinces together, the landed value of fish far outranks that of British Columbia.

For a couple of years Nova Scotia was the leader in the land in that respect. It was ahead of British Columbia. It is not number 1; it is usually number 2. I am talking here about \$60 million plus, compared with \$58 million for British Columbia. So we have a fantastic potential value for the economy. It is also part of the export trade. But I will not belabour that. Two years ago I was very interested in trying to get funds for the restoration, maintenance and erection of wharf facilities in my area, and I found that department officials would admit privately, and show me on charts, that we were not getting our fair share in terms of the landed value of fish anywhere in Nova Scotia. That was in 1971-72 and 1973-74.

I want to put this on the record in the hope that the minister will have a chance to review this matter and give us a more detailed explanation in committee. I would like to know what the formula is. I have before me figures regarding allocation of funds for harbour development programs. These figures are for