

*Supply—Fisheries and Forestry*

**Mr. McGrath:** Yes, of course.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my answer was not clear enough before for the hon. member. The words used were, "Please do not count on any new program." I think those were the exact words used. I believe the Minister of Fisheries, as I said, was wise to put it in that form. I suggest, however—and I suspect the Minister of Fisheries would be willing to confirm this—that this does not preclude the introduction of something earlier if a formula can be devised. The whole emphasis I was putting on it was the difficulty in finding what that formula should be.

**Mr. McGrath:** The fish trades in their brief of November 13, to which the minister referred, made it very clear to the government that unless some aid program was continued the industry would collapse. If that was not sufficiently clear to the minister, they pointed out again to him in the telegram of last Friday that unless aid was forthcoming they would have to take decisions tantamount to the collapse of the industry. Is the minister prepared to take the consequences if the groundfish industry in Atlantic Canada collapses because of the lack of action by the government?

Is the Minister of Defence Production prepared to take the responsibility, in relation to the people of Newfoundland, if the groundfish industry in that province collapses, because of inactivity on the part of the government of which he is a member? Surely he must accept this responsibility. He tried in the house today to defend the government's inactivity. My time is limited, but I hope the minister will say something positive and definitive before the house rises today, because it seems to me there is very little wrong with the groundfish industry that the government cannot tackle in a positive way. The answer is overproduction, markets that are oversold, and a government that does not give a damn.

**Mr. Jamieson:** That is the problem. You have not given any answer.

**Mr. McGrath:** The minister said I have not given any answer. I would like to refer briefly to the fact that when the Minister of Fisheries opened his remarks today he requested members of the opposition to make suggestions, because he obviously did not have any. Now the Minister of Defence Production says the same thing. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is the responsibility of the government of Canada, and the Minister of

Fisheries and the Minister of Defence Production as members of the cabinet, to bring in solutions to this serious crisis. It is not my responsibility as a member of parliament.

**Mr. Jamieson:** Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, I did not say anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman put words in my mouth and I am sure he did not intend to do that. I simply suggested to him that he had made a statement that the answer was overproduction. That is not the answer. I said these were the problems and suggested that he should put forward solutions to them.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, that smart alecky reply will not help the situation at all. This is the kind of frivolous approach on the part of the minister which tries to downplay what is in fact a serious crisis facing the basic, stable industry of our province. All the minister can do is stand in the house and make frivolous suggestions, as he has just done.

**Mr. Jamieson:** You do not like facts, do you?

**The Chairman:** Shall vote 1 carry?

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, before vote 1 carries, I am sure the committee would agree that the minister should be given limited time at least to answer some of the questions that have been raised today.

**Mr. Davis:** Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say in as emphatic terms as possible that I recognize we have a serious situation in the Atlantic fisheries. We certainly have a serious situation in respect of the ground fishery in the Atlantic area, and particularly in Newfoundland. I do not think anyone who has any knowledge of that area, and particularly of the ground fishery, would say otherwise.

There have been references to band aid treatments. There have also been references to the need for a whole medicine chest. I suggest there is also need, long term anyway, for a little surgery as well. I think we should face facts. What hon. gentlemen opposite are really saying is that an industry which has had difficulties over the years, and a great deal of support from the Canadian taxpayer, wants more support; it can get this support in band aid fashion in terms of millions of dollars with few or virtually no strings attached. That is perhaps the bluntest definition that I can give of the band aid treatment.

Certainly we need a longer term policy, and a longer term policy really points to the