

*Supply*

**Mr. LeBlanc:** The footnote does not destroy what I have been trying to say. Let us look at the arithmetic for Newfoundland which is the home of a lot of the large vessels. Again, the minister's own document shows "Offshore—Hauturier", 121,956 in 1974; in 1975, 122,758; in 1976, 156,451; in 1977, 159,204; and in 1978, 154,353 metric tons. We know that in 1979 the large offshore trawlers have been doing very well and I suspect the amount will be away above this.

It is the inshore fishermen who need to be protected by the only person who can do it. The minister must protect the fragmented and disorganized inshore fishermen of the east coast. I have one simple difference of opinion with the minister.

There are other figures that have to be put on the record which are also taken from a document issued by the department. These figures relate to the stern trawlers, the poor forgotten element of our fisheries, and show the average yearly landings per trip. In other words, if there are a lot of fish, they take a lot on every trip. In 1976 the Newfoundland stern trawlers were taking an average of 176,000 pounds per trip; in 1978, they took 216,000 pounds per trip, and by 1979 they were taking 263,000 pounds per trip. That figure only covers January to August, 1979, so it will go much higher.

This week the Nova Scotia trawlers organized, but it is interesting to note that the inshore fishermen were not represented. The provincial minister, Mr. Cameron, said they had been "suckered" into this movement. Maybe the small fishermen of Nova Scotia know about the figures. In 1976 the large stern trawlers that had been complaining they did not get enough fish, were taking an average of 207,000 pounds per trip. By 1978 they were getting 276,000 pounds per trip. In 1979, the year of disaster when they need help—when they came to see the minister, aided and abetted by the provincial minister—these large Nova Scotia stern trawlers landed 286,000 pounds per trip.

The minister has to make difficult decisions, Mr. Chairman, and I recognize that he is subject to many pressures. As I said last night, however, at some point he will have to make up his mind if he is going to defend those who do not have a strong voice. I heard him say again, this afternoon, that the industry also needs strong voices. Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to hear the voice of the industry, especially the large companies—

**Mr. McGrath:** You are misrepresenting. I said it needs to speak with one voice.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** I have never noticed the industry silent on the issues, Mr. Chairman. In fact they can afford to advertise, and from the figures I have just quoted for landings, I can see why—

**An hon. Member:** At taxpayers' expense.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** I have given the figures for the offshore fishermen in New Brunswick and should like now to turn to the figures for the inshore fishermen, also taken from the

[Mr. McGrath.]

document the minister tabled this week at the committee. In 1974 the inshore fishermen of New Brunswick were taking 3,329 metric tons; in 1975, 3,079; in 1976, 3,737, but by 1978 landings had dropped to 3,144 metric tons. These are the people against whom the minister is now deciding to send large, offshore trawlers, who have done as well as I have indicated. I hope I can leave enough time for the minister to answer these questions. I should like to hear his explanation of why he has done this.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, I welcome the opportunity to reply, although I have less than 15 minutes to do so. I had hoped to be given the full 20 minutes because the hon. gentleman who just took his seat has had two interventions. He spoke last night, and today repeated essentially what he said at that time.

**An hon. Member:** I am going to get up on a point of order if you talk like that.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, that is the hon. gentleman who likes to call me a pussycat. I have been around here long enough to know that a pussycat is a reasonably ineffectual fellow—

**An hon. Member:** Exactly.

**Mr. McGrath:** I like to look upon myself as a tom-cat because a tom-cat has the ability to survive. That is the important thing.

**An hon. Member:** What else does a tom-cat do?

**Mr. McGrath:** The question is about cod in zone 4T. It is basically a question of philosophy. I have listened to what I can only call, regretfully, the hypocritical intervention of my hon. friend opposite. I was saddened by the hypocrisy of my predecessor. He asks why I opened the Gulf and why the 100-footers were allowed in the Gulf. The hon. gentleman could answer that himself, because he closed the Gulf in 1976. When he did so, he issued a statement to the effect that the prime objective was to protect the small vessel fisheries, and the economic foundation of many coastal communities in the Gulf, while making allowance for larger vessels from elsewhere which traditionally fished there. There was a clear implication in that statement that when the fish stocks recovered, the larger vessels would be allowed back in. That is what they read into it.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** Your arithmetic does not prove that they have recovered.

**Mr. McGrath:** If the hon. gentleman wants to talk about arithmetic, I would draw his attention to the fact that at the time of the closure of the Gulf the TAC was at 15,000 metric tons and today the TAC is 49,000 metric tons. It has recovered to the point that we can now allow the larger vessels to go back in there.

When the hon. member for Gaspé spoke this afternoon he talked about "sharks". These sharks were supported before the