

committee by two very important trade unionists, a representative of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers Union, and the president of the Canadian Seafood Workers Union. They represented Canadians who derive employment from—

**Mr. LeBlanc:** One company.

**Mr. McGrath:** It does not matter whether it is one, two or three companies; the fact is that these people are employed and depend upon these companies for a living, as do the people employed in the plants.

I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys, and was most impressed with what he had to say. I do not know whether it was his maiden speech or not. He spoke of the danger of provincializing cod stocks. I see that as a clear danger. The moment you provincialize cod stocks, you balkanize the east coast fishery, the Government of Canada has lost control, and there is no way it can adjudicate between the provinces. In fact there is no way to effectively manage that stock.

It is interesting to note the representations made to the committee by the government of Nova Scotia. It referred to the provincialization of cod stocks and rejected that as a concept. If we were to keep the Gulf closed to offshore trawlers it would mean, in effect, that the southern Gulf would be exclusively open to inshore fishermen from Cape Breton and New Brunswick. The same argument can be applied to any cod stock. The important thing is that there was a clear understanding at the time the Gulf was closed that trawlers would be allowed back in—

● (1550)

**Mr. LeBlanc:** When stocks justified it and the inshore fishermen had taken a fair share.

**Mr. McGrath:** The inshore fishermen were consulted, and determined that they could take an additional 4,000 metric tons of the new TAC. That is what they were allocated, and that is what they got. That left 9,000 metric tons, and 6,000 of that was allocated to the trawler fleet. This was not done because of any pressure from Nova Scotia. There was none. This was not done because of any pressure from the large processing companies of whom the hon. gentlemen are trying to paint me as their great advocate—indeed, I had not heard from them. There were no representations from them whatsoever. The allocations were made. The hon. gentleman knows full well—he sits there smiling with that self-righteous look upon his face as though he was the only one in this House who cared about the inshore fishermen. That kind of hypocrisy does not become him because he was a good minister of fisheries. I suggest he should not sit there and pretend he is the representative of all that is right and good with respect to the fishery.

The hon. gentleman from Gloucester made a great rhetorical intervention in this debate. I read what he had to say and discovered there was nothing in it. There was just 20 minutes

### Supply

of bombast and rhetoric. He made no substantial contribution whatsoever.

The question of section 4T cod has been gone over in committee. It has been dealt with in the House during the course of the question period. The hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador surprised me when he said he was against opening the Gulf. Let the hon. gentleman go to Burin-St. Georges and defend that position. I would like to see how long he would last if he went there. The fish plants on the south coast of Newfoundland depend to a large extent on that fish stock. He knows it. Indeed, of the 17 or so trawlers operating in section 4T in the southern Gulf today, 15 of them are from southern Newfoundland fish plants.

**An hon. Member:** What is going on in Burin-St. Georges?

**Mr. McGrath:** What is going on in Burin-St. Georges? The hon. member who asked me that knows full well that a byelection is to be held. I am afraid the NDP will come in as a very poor third. Their candidate is not doing well. If he was, hon. gentlemen would be helping him out today. Because they are not, it tells me everything about it.

I listened very carefully to the remarks made by the hon. member for Westmorland-Kent. He did have some substantive and important remarks to make. He talked about the 200-mile limit and what it meant to the resurgence of the fish stocks as well as the new pressures it has created on fisheries management. As a result of the growth of the stocks, new complex problems have been created. The hon. gentlemen then went on to talk about freezer trawlers. A picture was painted that there has been some great change in policy on freezer trawlers. There have been no changes in freezer trawler policy. We are still operating under the same policy. The only freezer trawlers that were licensed were licensed by the hon. gentleman opposite when he was minister of fisheries.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** To catch northern shrimp.

**Mr. McGrath:** To catch northern shrimp, and with unrestricted groundfish licences.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. McGrath:** With unrestricted groundfish licences.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** Not unless it was a replacement.

**Mr. McGrath:** No. There are no restrictions whatsoever on these freezer trawlers which are now operating. To catch northern shrimp they have unrestricted groundfish licences. The hon. gentleman should admit that. These are the only freezer trawler licences that have been issued. In effect, what I am saying is that with all the inherent faults with fisheries management today we are essentially operating under the same policy put together by my hon. friend but with one very notable exception. That is, the hon. gentleman opposite likes to present himself as the champion of the inshore fisherman. I do not quarrel with that, but when he does it to the exclusion of the rest of the industry, it can only create confrontation. It is