

Fisheries Ministry

direction the minister is heading in with regard to the building of marine facilities in small harbours. For example, this year the minister's small craft harbours branch is operating in conjunction with the Department of Manpower and Immigration and in some cases providing funds through LIP to meet the labour portion of the cost, and in this way wharves and breakwaters are being built. Even when the minister was a private member he was talking about this kind of approach whereby the building of such facilities is put in the hands of the people who will be using them later. That is a sensible approach, one that is making the building of marine facilities in small harbours more labour intensive. It is putting money into the pockets of our fishermen, at the same time giving them the required facilities. That sort of thing has been happening this year and is an approach that I personally endorse.

Another example of the way in which the government has given fisheries a priority is in the attempt to obtain a 200 mile limit. Let us not forget in all this talk of a 200 mile limit that it was a Liberal government that raised the idea in the first place. While others were talking of a 50 mile limit the Liberal government was talking about 200 miles. It was the people in the Department of Fisheries and in the fisheries branch of the Department of the Environment who drew up the mechanics of our argument, in conjunction with the external affairs department, which was presented at the Law of the Sea Conference. So let us not forget that this was a Liberal initiative.

The question is not so much whether we should have a limit; the question, of course, is how to get it. There we differ. Members on the other side of the House are saying that we should get it unilaterally, that we should go out with the gunboats and start shooting and running people down. I think events lately have shown a possible course, that what we have advocated is a wise course. We showed we meant business, in closing the east coast ports and, following that closure, in the later discussions which brought about a 40 per cent reduction in the catch. That is effective action, action, that is meaningful. It is action that people in my riding see and appreciate.

A 200 mile limit is not going to solve all our problems, and I do not think we should think that it will. I should like to list some of the problems that I became aware of as a result of recently travelling around my riding. For example, a 200 mile limit is not going to solve marketing problems, a real source of concern at the present time. There are fishermen in my riding who are throwing away herring and mackerel because they cannot get people to buy them. I do not know whether the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) has found the same problem in his riding; he has the same geographic area I have, but certainly it is a problem in my constituency. I hope that he will talk to his colleague in Newfoundland and impress upon him the necessity of having a good, sound marketing organization in the province, particularly along the northeast coast, to look after fishermen in small communities who are now throwing away part of their catch.

As I say, the problem is a marketing one, and if individual businesses cannot improve their marketing policy so that the situation is taken care of, the government will have to step in and create some sort of market-

ing board, or extend the jurisdiction of the Salt Fish Marketing Corporation so as to include other species.

Experiments along this line have been tried. The Salt Fish Marketing Corporation this year is buying species other than salt fish, but I should like to see it focus on that portion of the province, the northeast coast of Newfoundland, and the coast of Labrador, where some sort of marketing organization is needed to dispose of those species with which the fishermen find difficulty.

A 200 mile limit is not going to solve the income support problems of the fishermen. There are fishermen in my riding this year who made as much as \$400 to \$600 a month as a result of the \$50 million subsidy program that I alluded to earlier which the minister provided. The federal Liberal government this year for the first time put money directly into the pockets of the fishermen. Heretofore we subsidized the companies; this year we subsidized the fishermen directly. The fishermen see the value of that money, and it is a program that we should continue.

I have already talked of the small craft harbours program. A 200 mile limit is not going to solve the lack of holding facilities. The federal government now has a program that puts up 50 per cent of the cost of such facilities. Again this is sorely needed by many fishermen. A 200 mile limit will not supply marine service centres, as DREE has in many parts of the Atlantic provinces and on the west coast. Once again more of these centres are sorely needed.

I have been referring to the kind of policies that we have and that we need. Changing the structure of the department, talking about various organizations and the Department of the Environment I do not think will solve the problems of the fishermen on the east and west coasts. What these fishermen are saying is that we should get on with the job, that we should produce the policies required. Evidence that this is being done can be seen today, but the point is that changing the structures is not, to my mind, as important as the policies themselves. We have done a lot as the federal Liberal government for fisheries in Canada, but we are going to do more.

● (1630)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): This is a Newfoundland afternoon.

Mr. Marshall: Madam Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), for again focusing attention on fisheries. I guess the hon. member for Gander-Willington (Mr. Baker) is getting a little embarrassed by the commendations that are being offered, but I too want to offer my congratulations on his appointment.

If I recall correctly what the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) mentioned about marketing, I fully agree that marketing is particularly important to Newfoundland. Is this not all the more reason for having a deputy minister directly concerned with fisheries in order that he might get into that part of the job and also do something about the income support