

Government Organization Act

from January 1, 1977. This has vast implications in terms of research alone.

We have heard from fisheries experts on the west coast, and I am sure the same is true on the east coast, that there are no statistics presently available to the research officials in the Department of Fisheries to show where fish stocks are being bred, what their migration patterns are, and when they are best caught. We have had fisheries services since the beginning of this country. On the research side alone much more attention by the minister is needed. He could talk with more authority to his cabinet colleagues, and in particular to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Andras).

On the question of surveillance I get the impression that the minister is anxious to follow up and is aware of the need, but is not being heard by the cabinet when he draws attention to the requirements in this area. The future food of the world could easily depend on the management which developed countries devote to their 200 mile limits as those jurisdictions are successively undertaken. The food needs of the world are increasing out of all imaginable proportions. The grounds are there for every reasonable person to see. I find it distressing that after all the resolutions which have been mentioned on the Liberal side in favour of a separate ministry of fisheries, we should now find a backing down, at least by the parliamentary secretary. I think he would find, if he were more concerned with the fisheries, that his time would be fully occupied by being parliamentary secretary to a minister of fisheries.

We did at one time have a minister of the environment and a secretary of state (fisheries). That was not a very satisfactory solution. It is of some interest to know that the value of the fisheries catch to Canada in 1972 was well over \$250 million and that it has grown in the last 16 years from just over \$100 million to this figure. This also argues in favour of having a separate minister of fisheries.

I do not wish to prevent the House resolving this question and I will therefore resume my seat so that we may proceed to it, hoping we shall determine the matter in favour of the motion proposed by my hon. friend.

Some hon. Members: Question!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Herb Breau (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry hon. members on the opposite side want to prevent me from speaking, for if they really wanted to study seriously this issue, they should certainly listen to what I have to say. First I would like to have more time to discuss such an important question, which was raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). As I do not have much time, I will try to summarize.

I think what is important is not the administrative or legal structure this government is going to give to fisheries. The only thing fishermen in my constituency are interested in is action. They want somebody to deal with their problems, somebody to intervene in the fish markets for a while so as to ensure that the prices are maintained, somebody to take care of their ports and wharves, somebody to take care that the fishing industry,

[Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich).]

as a whole, gets the attention it needs and deserves. Now whether it is the Department of Fisheries within the Department of Environment or another one, it does not make such a difference. What is important is the political attention which the government will be willing to give to fisheries. I know that many members in the past and again today have referred to the necessity of having a separate department, that is a legal structure with a separate administration, but I do not think that it is absolutely necessary.

I feel that the arrangement in effect for example in 1974 where a minister of state was responsible for fisheries within the Department of Environment has been quite successful because in fact, taking into account the different problems which we now encounter in fisheries, we can say that the government has given more attention to the fishery industry and its problems since 1974.

It is not the structure as such which is important, but the attention granted by the government, when its intervention is necessary either in marketing or other fields. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss that important problem at length, but unfortunately the time allotted to me has already expired.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business is now expired. Does the House agree to resume consideration in committee of the whole before six o'clock is being declared?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-22, to amend the statute law relating to income tax—Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale)—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Chairman: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

[*English*]

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Hamilton (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Chairman, when the committee adjourned at five o'clock I was trying to make very clear to the minister that in my view an