

In conjunction with other fishing nations we have also pioneered, and to a considerable degree succeeded, in bringing about management of our fishing resources, those out over our continental shelf and beyond our own exclusive fishing limits, onto a sustained yield basis. This is true particularly in the North Atlantic where there is raiding and indiscriminate fishing by long-distance fishing nations, which on other continents has been so destructive in the past.

Preparatory to the next Law of the Sea Conference we will be hosting a conference on fisheries management—a conference of the world fishing nations—in Vancouver, in February. This will deal primarily with management, not only to preserve the resources but to make sure our fisheries resources are in the best state possible.

Finally, let me say a word about the next Law of the Sea Conference. It will be first convened in New York in November, 1973; the subsequent meeting is scheduled for Santiago, Chile, in April, 1974. Not only have Canadians a great deal riding on the outcome of this very important conference, but so do many other countries where the people are becoming increasingly concerned about the viability of their fisheries and the quality of the waters which wash their shores.

Mr. Speaker, several important priorities were outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and I think I have touched on all of them in my remarks tonight. Pieces of legislation, and the program relating to our fishery areas, among other things, will expand job opportunities for Canadians. They can certainly help to increase the income of Canadians because they are highly productive. Because they add to our efficiency they should do something to ensure a greater measure of price stability in the country. This applies particularly in respect to fisheries legislation which does something about other areas of the country which are less fortunate from an income and employment point of view.

I hope that these pieces of legislation will be brought forward soon, Mr. Speaker, and that all hon. members will do their utmost not only to expedite their passage but to improve them during the course of debate here and in the standing committee on environment and fisheries.

• (2100)

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may I first extend my congratulations to you and to the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and immediately express my regret for having to bring to the House again a situation that detrimentally affects my own constituency.

As hon. members who were here during the previous parliament are aware, I have been putting forward certain objections and grievances. These finally culminated in a petition being placed before the House. It was accepted by Mr. Speaker and by the government, and referred to the justice and legal affairs committee for study. I and the people I represent, on whose behalf I put forward the petition, were delighted when the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs came down unanimously with a favourable report. In so saying, I remind the House that

The Address—Mr. D. MacInnis

the committee was made up mainly of lawyers; there were 12 representatives from the government side of the House and eight members from the other parties.

In view of this favourable report it is regrettable that the Cape Breton Development Corporation, known as Devco, failed to act and implement, on behalf of the people of my area, the provisions of the legislation passed unanimously by this House in 1967.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I should like for a few moments to review the details. I realize that it may be somewhat difficult for all members of the House to follow this. This legislation was introduced because of an ailing coal industry. It affects a somewhat localized part of Cape Breton, and because of that I doubt if some hon. members are interested. It would make about as much sense for some hon. members to be concerned about this piece of legislation as it would if I were to get up and, in opposition to four or five western members, try to speak on wheat. Nevertheless, I especially ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and members of cabinet present in the House to pay particular attention to what I have to say.

I have prepared a 25-page brochure which I will make available to members of the House in order that they may become familiar with the facts. The evidence is documented. Most of it involves the corporation itself and the justice and legal affairs committee. There is evidence from other committees before which Devco officials appeared. Once they have looked at this material, I am sure hon. members will realize that the way Devco officials implemented the legislation passed by this House in 1967 was not what was intended by parliament. I am appealing to parliament to take a close look at this matter, because we want what was requested in the petition and what parliament intended originally in its legislation.

To begin with, Mr. Speaker, having undertaken to rehabilitate the mines in Cape Breton, the authorities completely ignored them. I will send a copy of these documents to the Prime Minister. In this situation, I think it would make sense for the government to act. This House passed the legislation and a committee of the House fully supported the people of my area. I would therefore be interested in listening to him on this matter and in his doing something about it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Briefly, the situation was this. The committee made certain recommendations which Devco failed to follow. They have not been followed to their full extent by any means. Instead of attempting to rehabilitate the mines the authorities in the area initiated a pre-retirement leave plan. The legislation was to make available \$3,000 to a married man and \$2,400 to a single man. Yet immediately afterwards Devco turned around, contravened section 48 of the Unemployment Insurance Act and told the men, "We will give you \$3,000 but you must go down to the unemployment insurance office and pick up the money you are entitled to for the first 17½ months, and we will reduce or take that amount from the \$3,000 we will allow