

party seem so anxious for me to sit down that I think I will say a few more things.

We are tired, after a period of only six months, of having this government use public funds for purposes of patronage rather than progress. If these ministers, who were such tigers when they were in opposition, would present on behalf of the people for whom they now have responsibility the same kind of vigour and determination that they displayed in opposition, when they constantly complained that the government of the day was not providing enough for them to do the very thing which I am trying to do this afternoon and for which I am now being chastised by the government, then the fishermen of eastern Canada would be a lot better off.

Mr. LeBlanc: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions that I would like to ask, especially since the well-dressed Minister of Employment and Immigration is with us. The President of the Treasury Board has disappeared, but I am sure that somebody will report to him.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt, but I had hoped that the hon. gentlemen opposite, to whom I have listened with great respect and patience, would allow me an opportunity this afternoon to reply to some of the remarks which they have made over the course of today and last night. If it is their intention to go into other areas, I will be denied that opportunity.

Mr. LeBlanc: Mr. Chairman, had the minister been a little more patient, he would have realized that I was trying to come to his help. What I wanted to ask the Minister of Employment and Immigration and the President of the Treasury Board is whether or not they would allow funds, which are intended for creating employment, to be allotted, for example, in modest amounts for equipment and material to the budget that the minister has for small craft harbours. The paper which was given to the departmental officials in committee this week indicated that in one year alone some \$44 million in combined Canada Works and small craft harbours money was allotted to improve the facilities that fishermen use. I would like to know if the minister has been able to convince his colleagues that something should be done in this area.

I can think of no better way to contribute to a community than by having the fishermen themselves participate in the building of some of their facilities. These fishermen have done some remarkable work in the east coast provinces. Members of Parliament, I am sure from both sides of this House, have supported the idea of giving fishermen funds to improve their own facilities. I am not talking about building huge wharfs. I am talking about improving facilities such as bait sheds, and community stages which, with the help of modest amounts of money, can simplify the lives of fishermen.

I would like to ask the minister if he has been successful in convincing the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Employment and Immigration, who particularly has a large amount of money in his budget for job creation, to consider the replacement of small wooden boat vessels as a

Supply

great source of employment on the whole east coast. In the fiscal year 1978-79 our administration added \$7.5 million to the vessel subsidy program to bring the total up to \$10 million. This year, in addition to the normal \$2.5 million in the budget of April, we decided to add an additional \$6 million or \$7 million. Can the minister tell us whether that money has been frozen or whether it has been allocated?

The improving of the fleet of the fisheries is a very important priority, especially the smaller vessels, because these non-incorporated fishermen do not have the tax write-offs and other advantages that the major corporations have.

I would like to say a word about the decision to allow the large trawlers to return into the Gulf. I have listened to the minister's arguments and to the debate, and I wonder if the minister bases his decision on the arithmetic on the landings of different parts of the fleet. I know that some of these decisions are difficult. I have scars to show for some of my decisions while I was in that portfolio. The scientists alone cannot carry the responsibility. They may make a judgment, based on the arithmetic and possibly on some abstract laws of economics, that it perhaps might be better to have all the fish caught by a very small number of vessels such as large factory freezer trawlers, but what would that do to our communities?

I have with me the figures on the landings which were given to the committee this week. The large vessels which will come in and compete for a modest amount of fish are mainly from two provinces, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. In Nova Scotia inshore fishermen in 1974 had landings of 39,000 tons. In 1975 they had landings of 36,000 tons; in 1976, 35,000 tons; in 1977, 35,000 tons, and by 1978 they had only reached 44,000 tons in landings. However, the large offshore vessels, which through their representatives this week before the committee were crying that they were hard done by and which have paid spokesmen to lobby for them, in 1974 had landings of 122,000 tons; in 1975, 122,000 tons; and in 1976, 125,000 tons. The takeoff point is 1977 where they had landings of 130,000 tons.

● (1540)

Listen to this. These poor, bereft, forgotten, large boat owners from Nova Scotia landed a 161,000 metric tons in 1978. These gentlemen have not done too badly from what they used to call the "disastrous policy". They used to advertise in the *The Globe and Mail* because they could afford to do that.

Mr. McGrath: That includes inshore fishermen.

Mr. LeBlanc: I can only read from the minister's own department's document—"Offshore—Hauturier" for 1974, 122,527 and for 1978, it is 161,026.

Mr. McGrath: Read the footnote.

Mr. LeBlanc: If the figures are wrong, I am quite willing to make the correction.

Mr. McGrath: Read the footnote.