

### *Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

not consult the fishermen who knew the winds, the tides, the currents and the way the water would flow. After building the cheap one, to which the fishermen objected for years as they waited, the minister is now being requested to build another one in the same harbour because the first one was not built properly.

Ottawa engineers do not know the water, nor does the fellow sitting in some grand office in Saint John. Dollars and cents do not make a good harbour unless they are properly spent. They can be wasted in large or small sums. Fishermen want to know whether they are going to be consulted so that they can have proper harbours instead of wasted public funds. Will that consultation result from this bill? I could not get any answers in our committee, so it is my responsibility on behalf of the fishermen in my constituency to say that this is bad legislation and I have to vote against it.

A harbour in my constituency has needed dredging for three years. The fishermen knew it would cost \$50,000 to fix that harbour. When I was visiting there I noted in a little piece in a paper that it cost the government \$200,000 to appoint a minister without portfolio, to give him a staff and to put an executive assistant and a constituency secretary in his constituency. It cost \$200,000 to set up the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). That money was budgeted from nowhere. But when we asked for repairs to be made to wharves, it was easy for the government to say it was out of money.

We noticed too that the minister of fun and games—excuse me, the Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) (Mrs. Campagnolo)—had no budget at all, but it was estimated that it cost \$20,000 for the first safari she made across Canada. A little harbour could have been put into perfect condition for \$20,000. I was asked how that minister could get \$20,000 for a safari when boats were grounding out and when they could get into their harbour only under certain tide conditions.

**Mr. Béchard:** What was the answer?

**Mr. McCain:** The answer was that the minister of fun and games had priority. It does not make any difference how money is spent or whether it is voted as long as their is benefit to the Liberal caucus. However, it does make a difference to a fisherman if he cannot get into a harbour. We are talking about an industry which is of inestimable value and of growing value to the Atlantic coast. It has been mismanaged to a degree which is absolutely deplorable.

If the minister can be given credit for anything, I suppose it would be for taking the helm of a department which had previously been thoroughly mismanaged. Stocks had been thoroughly neglected. International agreements had given our wealth away, to the detriment of our people. However, something had to be done, and something was in the process of being done when the present minister took over. He took over a department which had finally taken the advice of members of the opposition that we should have a 200-mile limit. He took over at a crucial time when fisheries had been so neglected by the Trudeau administration that they had nothing but better to hope for. He took over at a time when the former minister had

[Mr. McCain.]

begun to consult with fishermen. Committees of sailors co-operatives, fishermen and organizations from the east and west coasts were invited to the former minister's office and into the committee. Their expenses were paid, and their advice was taken. The minister inherited the fruits of the labour of his predecessor, who stumbled along for a long time but in the last days of office finally took the advice of members of the opposition and people in the field.

Plans were on the drawing boards when this minister took over, and he has coasted ever since. There is much left to do. If fishermen have to pay bigger fees, they want to know if they will get more licences and broader fishing privileges or whether they are to continue to be restricted.

**Mr. McGrath:** That is another application of user pay.

**Mr. McCain:** These proposals must have been copied from those of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang). I wonder if that is possible, or perhaps they too came from the Prime Minister.

● (1522)

The fishermen want to know what to do because we are losing a generation of fishermen. It is all very well for prairie members to grin at that statement, but if they were to visit the coast and see these young people with nothing to do, no licence to fish and their inheritance taken away by regulation and mismanagement, they would not find anything to smile at. This is a serious situation.

In committee I asked how much of an impression it would make on the stocks of the sea if we allowed inshore fishermen more extensive licences and more species to fish. I have not received an answer yet. I know of a father and four sons who all want to fish, but with just one licence the father cannot keep those four sons busy. There is no way they can get a boat, no way they can get a subsidy, and no way they can get a licence even if they had the boat. Fishermen on the east coast want to know if they will get more licensing privileges if they pay larger fees. They want to know, if more wharfingers are appointed, if that means they will be allowed to catch more species and have more flexibility.

A man who had a 70-foot carrier in the Bay of Fundy wanted to know if he could have a fishing licence. He no longer had a job because the fishing industry which he served had been reoriented—and properly so; I have no quarrel with that step. The carrier, who brought the fish from the offshore fishermen to inshore, did not have a job, however, because he could not get a licence to fish anything. So his 70-foot boat, which would cost a couple of hundred thousand dollars minimum today, is tied up and rusting.

I have heard it said that the minister is a good one, Mr. Speaker, but I submit to you that he is a cruel minister who will move young people out of my constituency through regulation without having any proof that the stocks will be seriously depleted if those young people are allowed to make a living at home. Instead they are added to the ranks of the unemployed;