

for athletics, social functions or community social affairs. I submit that the coastal communities are entitled to the same amenities as inland communities, but when federal funds in make-work projects are taken from the make-work opportunity for social purposes and placed into a wharf on the coast, those coastal communities are denied the services so generously afforded to the inland communities, and vice versa. Both inland and coastal communities are equally entitled to these amenities. When the government is not prepared to allocate adequate money to a department and when that department must go begging to others, it means that the government is not acquainted with the importance of the industry to which we are referring at present.

To give the House an example of the degree of begging and borrowing that the department has done, let me turn to page 1:13 of the committee proceedings of November 10, 1977 where Mr. Reid is reporting to the committee. He said:

This is in sharp contrast to the expenditure levels in recent years which have been as follows: 1973-74, \$22,369,800; 1974-75, \$30,621,800; 1975-76, \$28,848,300; 1976-77, \$42,758,000, approximately.

That \$42 million which he claims to have spent and with which he hoped to appease fishermen from coast to coast was not voted for the Department of Fisheries in total because \$5 million of it was from a special agreement with Quebec—I do not quarrel with that, do not misunderstand me—\$5,500,000 was from LIP, and \$5 million from FLIP. So actually for 1976-77 the minister was voted less money than in any of the three previous years mentioned. At no time, except for that jump in 1973-74 from \$22 million to \$30 million, has there been an increment in expenditure in that department which has kept pace with inflation; and at no time has enough money been voted, as would have been voted 25 years ago, to maintain reasonable standards in the port facilities of our country.

Let me quote again, as I have quoted probably four or five times in the House, the words of a high official in the Department of Public Works who was questioned directly some time around 1973 and asked how much money was being spent in terms of real dollars as compared to what was being spent in 1950. That public servant—this does not come from me or from any other member—said: "Today we are spending about 25 cents in real dollars as compared to the dollar we spent 25 years ago".

Since that time, we have not caught up in real dollars. There is no awareness in the Department of Fisheries of the needs which exist in the industry. The fishermen are asking what will result from these extra fees and what will result from the hiring of more wharfingers. Not a thing has been mentioned. People on the Fundy coast are asking how many haulouts they will get, since a haulout has not been built by the Department of Fisheries for so long that they cannot even find the wrecks of those that had. There is not a place where they can bring their boats for painting, repairing, refurbishing or improving, so they are asking whether they will get a haulout when the fees are larger and when we have all these wharfingers.

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

● (1512)

I have not heard a word from the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Landers) on this subject. I assume he is being asked whether people who pay these larger fees will get winter harbours. We once had a winter harbour, but we were kicked out of it by the National Harbours Board. Now we have to pull our boats out on shore, and they deteriorate at about twice the normal rate when they sit on the shore for the winter. We want a winter harbour, and I would like to have the support of the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster and the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc) for that project. If I had that support, I would be able to agree with the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) that the minister is a good minister. However, the 200 boats which were kicked out of the harbour by the National Harbours Board are now dragged up on the beach for the winter to deteriorate at about twice the normal rate.

Are we going to get prompt wharf repairs? In the fall of 1976 a little harbour in my constituency suffered some damage in a storm. The sheathing was coming loose, and the fenders were coming loose. This was reported to the proper office. I went back to that same little harbour the next spring, and the fenders were still loose, the sheathing was looser and nothing had been repaired. People are asking whether their harbours will be fixed more quickly. I went back to that harbour last fall, a year after my first visit, and the fenders were still loose, the sheathing was still loose and the harbour was not repaired.

My constituents want to know whether harbours are to be fixed early and cheaply, or will they be fixed late? Will money be wasted, and will the government wonder why it cannot fix two harbours for the price of one? That is what my constituents are asking about this in light of this new charge and all these wharfingers. There are some harbours at which there is light. At those harbours boats can be moored and their batteries charged. Are we going to have lights at every harbour? There are harbours where there is fresh water. Are we going to have water at every harbour, or will there be lights here and wells there but neither at all harbours?

Are facilities going to be improved in exchange for this extra charge? The roads to some of our fishing harbours, which are the responsibility of the Government of Canada, are in terrible shape. In some cases we have to stop short of the wharves and carry our equipment, water, food and oil aboard when we should be able to drive right up. Are we going to get those roads fixed more quickly?

My constituents are asking whether they will have adequate wharf facilities. At the moment boats are tied up five, six and eight tiers deep along piers, and we do not have adequate breakwaters. We have to move our boats at night. Will there be improvements? If so, that was never mentioned in any discussion of this bill.

My constituents are asking if they will be consulted before wharves are built. Is the minister going to spend \$500,000, as was done in my constituency where there were three sets of plans and blueprints drawn up? The minister took a look at the three sets and decided on the cheapest plan. However, he did