

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

Of course, there may not be any. The wharfing system will not work any better than it has in the past. Boats may move in and move out, tie up and untie, and pay no charges whatsoever, as was the case in the past.

The Department of Fisheries and the Environment has a substantial staff already in place. Perhaps that staff could assume the responsibility of visiting harbours. Perhaps they could fulfil the duties of wharfingers. I am sure they would do their jobs on an equitable basis, rather than what has been done in the past. It might be necessary to have an extra person or two along the coast.

Someone asked what revenue would be derived from the charges imposed upon the fishing industry along the coast, and the suggestion was \$1,500,000. Someone asked what it would cost to put wharfingers in place. If my memory serves me correctly, the suggestion was approximately \$900,000. This means that the extra charge to fishermen, which is of no value as far as the security of their facilities is concerned, will result in a \$600,000 net to the department.

One significant thing was that the wharfingers would be entitled to travel expenses, which would be paid out of general revenue. The department was not prepared to estimate what those travel expenses would be, and therefore it was unable to indicate whether it would even net a nickel from hiring 300 wharfingers which would be handpicked by the minister, his staff, or by the member in the area concerned. This is another opportunity for the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment to act more on a political basis than on an administrative basis. I suppose one does not know whether he could find his wharfinger in Shediac or Moncton under the present minister. Because of the value of this industry, it deserves much better attention.

I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young), so I decided to take a look at what he said in committee. He was rather critical, and this is what he said, as reported at page 2:12 of issue No. 2 of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, dated November 15, 1977:

In the figures that I have just been given, your expenditures for 1975-76 over 1974-75 actually dropped from about \$2.9 million . . .

That is fairly significant. One must remember that 1974-75 was an election year.

● (1502)

He went on:

—and then they take a leap in 1976-77 up to somewhere in the \$4 million area. I would like to know if that \$4 million contains funds that have come from FLIP, from LIP, from Canada Works or transfers from Public Works, work that the Department of Public Works has undertaken to assist in co-operation. This is what I am trying to find out as a member of this committee, and what we had a great deal of difficulty trying to ascertain last spring.

Later he said:

—I expect—and I am sure every member who sits in the House passing estimates expects—that is the outline, that is the program, that is the goal to which one works.

[Mr. McCain.]

The goal is to know where the money comes from and how it is going to be spent. He could not find out. He went on to discuss the problems of getting a couple of projects in his constituency completed and he played up to the constituency that day and to the Prime Minister yesterday.

He went on to say:

I can tell them that my constituency has not seen a dime and, as a matter of fact, I can say to the department regarding the two projects that people would have liked to build in my riding; they have given up; they have just absolutely given up on departmental funding.

He was that critical of the department and its procedures in committee, and yet he was very supportive in the debate here yesterday.

It was interesting to listen to the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey) who, in turn, gave the opposition a dressing down for their behaviour and praised his minister. Let me quote him from page 217 of the proceedings of the committee of November 15, 1977. He said:

However, I, like Mr. Crouse, am disturbed at the downward trend of funds, having fought very hard to increase them. Newfoundland went up in 1974-75—

Like the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) in the election year.

—but down again in 1975-76.

He went on to say:

We have to look at our budgets to make sure that an appropriate amount is allocated to Newfoundland for its fishing needs because that, Mr. Chairman, more and more is becoming the economic basis of survival in our province and I think we have to look very closely at the trend that is developing there. I am not happy with it and I want to see a substantial amount of funds allocated to that province for small-craft harbours.

Let hon. members bear in mind that I have just quoted the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador. He went on to say:

I am disturbed at a number of other things though and that is the amount of repair that had to be done. It seems to me that in a number of cases we had to rebuild wharfs the second year. I am thinking of two, for example, now on the Labrador coast, in Forteau and L'Anse-au-Clair, where wharfs were built and breakwaters were built a couple of years ago and now, one or two years later, we have to go through the whole process again to allocate maybe a couple of hundred thousand dollars in each case because the job was not done properly in the first place.

Again that gentleman played up to the Prime Minister and failed to serve the interests of his fishermen in the House because he did not say publicly in the House what he thought he could say safely in the committee, where he would not be quoted and where he would not be found to be in disagreement with his minister and with the Prime Minister.

The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) who spoke on this bill complained seriously about the use of FLIP, LIP and other money, as I did. The department does not vote adequate funds to sustain itself and has to lean on other departments, borrowing and begging support from them. I complain about it not for the same reasons as did the hon. member for St. John's East, which were laudable and very proper, but because every constituency which has inland communities which may require certain services finds itself able to make improvements in the community by improving facilities