

*Oral Questions***FISHERIES****CHINOOK SALMON FISHING RESTRICTIONS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—NEGOTIATIONS WITH U.S. AUTHORITIES**

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta): Madam Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. In his policy of shutting down the Fraser River to gill-netters and in his answers in the House yesterday, the minister displayed an appalling lack of the understanding of the geography of the lower mainland of British Columbia. The salmon destined for the Fraser must swim through American waters where, during the season, the American fishermen fish seven days a week. Why does the minister not strike up discussions with the United States to shut down the American fishermen, rather than the Canadian fishermen?

Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Madam Speaker, the very purpose of the agreement which we are trying to reach with the United States on the whole issue of salmon interception is to deal with this type of problem. As the hon. member knows very well, the treaty which governs the management of the Fraser River is not the creation of this administration. That treaty goes back some years and we are attempting to have it changed. In fact I hope everybody, including the United States, will accept the reality that the chinook stocks have been over-exploited, that they are endangered and that we have to take difficult and painful measures to deal with the problem. I believe I would be irresponsible if I did not ask all elements of the industry to share equally in this effort of conservation.

Mr. Friesen: Madam Speaker, that is my point; all elements are not sharing equally. I would like some assurances, rather than merely statements of hope, that the Americans will not continue to fish for those salmon destined for the Fraser River while the Canadian fishermen are not allowed to fish. Would the minister give the House the data on which he based his policy of curtailment of the sports fishery? Would he publish the studies on which he based that policy?

Mr. LeBlanc: Madam Speaker, the hon. member likes to have it both ways. On the one hand he supports the policy that all elements of the fishery should share in the constraints of conservation measures and, on the other hand, he seems to be arguing that we should not have asked that the sports fishermen also have some restrictions.

Mr. Friesen: I did not say that.

Mr. LeBlanc: The reality is that the chinook salmon, especially the Fraser River chinook, have been decreasing in numbers quite dramatically. This is a trend which must be arrested, especially if we are ever to enhance the Fraser River and bring it up to its potential. We hope to take over direct management of the system. This situation is known by all the advisers. The difficulty in this situation can best be described in a phrase which I will borrow from the Minister of Justice—"Everybody wants to go to heaven, and nobody wants to die."

PUBLIC SERVICE**INTRODUCTION OF NEW MANAGEMENT CATEGORY**

Hon. Ron Huntington (Capilano): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board, who was the former chairman of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts and a hard-working member of the House while he worked on the whole matter of accountability which was launched when the Auditor General of Canada said that government spending is out of control.

In the proposed management structure which Treasury Board is bringing down to correct the situation and bring spending under control by putting in place value for money concepts, is the minister's plan, both phase one and phase two, an actual means whereby Treasury Board is raising the membership of the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada, and is he using this management structure to amend the Public Service Relations Act through Treasury Board regulations rather than through legislative introduced in this chamber?

Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. I have noted accusations in the press made by some of the unions with respect to this new management category. I pointed out when this policy was initially introduced last July, I believe, that there would be no raid in this phase on any union groups whatsoever. To do so would require amendments to the act in question. Effectively, what we are doing is creating a management category consisting of the executive group now in place, and other members, particularly the PM Seven Group, who at the moment are effectively excluded from bargaining units. So there is no raid on the Professional Institute ranks as suggested by some observers in the press.

Mr. Huntington: Madam Speaker, would the President of the Treasury Board then assure us that phase two will not be a mushroom in the growth of another level of bureaucracy whereby the management group tries to compete with the science, professional and trade groups in terms of pay and numbers? I hope that the minister will not create another level of bureaucracy in his attempt to bring financial management under control and put systems management into place. I hope that the fear the Professional Institute has of phase two, that some 11.3 per cent of their membership could be removed from the union category, is unfounded. Surely the government will not create a bureaucratic category whereby management will compete with our top professional scientists in terms of pay. For instance, hospital administrators do not expect to compete with doctors.

● (1200)

Mr. Johnston: Madam Speaker, as I indicated, the establishment of this management group is something, as the hon. member knows, which has been recommended by all independent observers—the Auditor General, the D'Avignon Commission and the Lambert Commission. We are in the initial stages of it, if you like, almost at an experimental stage. I think we all