

**Mr. Crouse:** Well, it is a feeling that is shared not only by me, not by one, not by two, but by three provincial fisheries ministers who have examined and re-examined what the minister did in an effort to determine the justice and the fairness of his policy. They have come up with a statement that they printed in the press, which indicated that they found this policy wanting to the tune of \$2 million, wanting to the tune of taking away direct employment, shore employment, for the people of Atlantic Canada, some of whom I represent in this House.

**Mr. Rompkey:** That's the only thing they agree on.

**Mr. Crouse:** Well, the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Rompkey) says, "That's the only thing they agree on". This is his view, but I am referring today to something that is of basic economic importance to Atlantic Canada. All I am asking for is a just and fair policy to put all of us upon an equal basis.

They have also asked that any participating foreign vessel be granted a permit from the respective provincial authority to fish in their own zone. I submit that possibly this is a request that would be endorsed again in agreement by all of the provincial premiers. I point out that this request was made by provincial fisheries ministers, but I feel certain that prior to meeting, prior to making these requests public, that they did so following consultation with their premiers and with the members of their own cabinet.

**Mr. LeBlanc:** Not Newfoundland.

**Mr. Crouse:** Well, the minister states, "Not Newfoundland". I have no way of judging whether consultation was held between the fisheries minister of Newfoundland and his premier—

**Mr. LeBlanc:** He refused to gang up on me.

**Mr. Crouse:** The minister says that Newfoundland has refused to gang up on him. I will let him argue his case.

I submit to you that the present minister of fisheries, with his Gallic attitude and his keen intellect, is quite capable of taking care of himself, whether it be Newfoundland or Nova Scotia or New Brunswick or even tiny Prince Edward Island. No matter which group decides to gang up on the present minister of fisheries, I feel that he is quite capable of taking care of himself.

**An hon. Member:** Not out west.

**Mr. Crouse:** My colleague, said "Not out west." All I am saying is that there is obviously considerable unrest in that part of Canada over present policies.

We felt, when the 200-mile limit was established, that we would gradually phase in Canadian operators, Canadian fishermen, whether they be inshore or midwater or offshore, and as we gradually phased in Canadians we were hoping that the government would gradually phase out the foreigners because, after all, the agreements were that we, as Canadians, would make fish available to foreigners that were surplus to our

#### *Fisheries Improvement Loans Act*

needs. Unless we adopt a policy which will permit the construction of some freezer trawlers, and the conversion of some of our existing trawlers so that we can take the offshore squid and the silver hake and the capelin and the other soft species, the round nosed grenadiers—to name a few—unless we adopt a policy that will enable us to take these quantities of soft species, I submit that they will always, and for ever and a day, be surplus to our needs, and there will always be this requirement to give, not part of them, but all of them, away to others.

Under the leadership of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) when he was prime minister, we did start on a policy of licensing some freezer trawlers to take advantage of these soft species. The start was made, but all too little was done in the brief period. Time just simply did not permit a follow through—as I would have preferred—under that administration.

I mention these things, in closing, as some of the problems which should be examined very carefully by the minister, and I hope that when this bill is before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry we will have an opportunity to study the proposals and, I hope, some of my own suggestions, in more detail. Aside from the concerns I have expressed, I want to go on record as agreeing in principle with the bill and with its reference to the standing committee.

● (1640)

**Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni):** Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to be speaking on Bill C-28 today. As a matter of fact this is the first fisheries bill which has come before the House since the period of time before the last two elections. It is an important bill, not in its effect on fishermen but in its effect on banks. It would seem that this bill is more important to the banking community which insists on having loan guarantees to fishermen, small businessmen and farmers, rather than it is to the fishermen themselves.

I am pleased the minister recognized the increasing cost of equipment and vessels in the industry, and therefore has raised the ceiling on these loan guarantees to \$150,000. In speaking on the Bank Act, my party was very critical of the banks for their failure to meet the needs of primary producers and small businessmen. With this increased loan guarantee, I think we may find more acceptance on the part of banks to lend money to fishermen who find meeting costs and high interest rates more and more difficult each year.

The purpose of the bill is to encourage, through taxpayer guarantee, the banks to help fishermen purchase or repair vessels, to buy new equipment or make necessary repairs, or to construct shore facilities. The minister referred to the number of claims against the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. It was an impressive figure. Only three-quarters of one per cent have been claimed by the banks in Canada over the 24-year history of this program.

However, I should like to look at the history a little bit and relate it to what is happening at the present time in the fishing industry. From the beginning of 1955 to March of 1979, \$857,573 was paid to the banks in defaults under this loans