now close to 500,000 licensed sports fishermen in British Columbia. A few small, fragmented groups claim to represent them all, but clearly that is not the case. None of the groups which appeared before us produced membership lists which indicated that they represented 50,000 or 75,000 members.

I was interested in hearing the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans say that he had the Liberal Party penned up in a room doing exactly what he wanted. The Minister accepted one amendment, the addition of the word "larvae". All scientific experts who appeared before the committee said that the addition of the word "larvae" was not necessary, that to describe it as the juvenile stage of fish was perfectly adequate. I see that the Parliamentary Secretary is present. He knows that this was a puff piece, adding the word "larvae" to the Bill. It makes no significant change. I challenge him to produce a single scientist or biologist who said that this was the greatest and most necessary legal addition possible to the Bill.

Let me return to what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans is saying. He proclaims himself as a prima donna representing only British Columbia interests. That in fact is not the case. When the fishing industry appeared before the committee, it made clear that it did not want the Bill passed in this form. The New Democratic Party takes that seriously. We have attempted to have included, as contained in Motions Nos. 2 to 9, a consultative or protective mechanism for those 500,000 sports fishermen, native people in British Columbia and those who operate on seine vessels, gill-net vessels and the troll fleet. We have tried to introduce some semblance of sanity into the legislation.

The Tories are always talking about consultation. Why did we go to British Columbia for two weeks? Why did we sit from eight o'clock in the morning until midnight, with no lunch break or dinner break, to take evidence from fishermen? I challenge the Minister of Fisheries to rise in the House today and say that he has read that evidence.

I should like to deal now with the Government of New Brunswick. When representatives appeared before the committee just a couple of weeks ago they said that the Bill was both illegal and unconstitutional. Although those representatives could not speak for the politicians in New Brunswick, they made clear that the Bill, as presently drafted, would be challenged in the Supreme Court of Canada. What does the Minister of Fisheries have to say about that? Why has he not come forward and told us how he will deal with the very real concerns of the Province of New Brunswick, going back to the 1880s and the Robertson case, the famous fly-fishing case which went to the Supreme Court of Canada? The Minister of Fisheries has not dealt with that.

Motion No. 12, in the name of the Hon. Minister, reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed so as to abrogate or derogate from any existing aboriginal or treaty rights of the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

He is trying to tell aboriginal peoples that Section 35 of the Constitution is empty. That section is not empty, it in fact contains rights. What about the proposal which came forward from the Nishga Tribal Council?

I see the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie) present in the Chamber. I hope he will rise in the House and tell aboriginal peoples whether he supports the inclusion of the Minister of Fisheries that Section 35 is empty. The proposal which the Council put forward is very clear and supports that of the Government of New Brunswick. I always thought there was a Tory Government in New Brunswick. I guess that is not the case any longer; I guess it is just another little group to be swept aside.

Motion No. 2 is very clear and to the point. It reads:

—to provide for the proper management and control of the inland fisheries of Canada and for the allocation of those fisheries, subject only to:

(i) the constitutional jurisdiction of the provinces—

That is why the Government of New Brunswick came here and argued its case forcefully and openly. The Minister of Fisheries does not want to deal with it. Having been through the constitutional process myself, I believe we should respect the constitutional jurisdictions as put forward by the provinces. The motion continues:

(ii) the constitutional rights of aboriginal people to the fishery;

We live in a country where rights have to be respected. We cannot just pile drive this through. The Minister of Fisheries says that we must have Bill C-32 because of the Collier decision in British Columbia. I urge the Minister of Fisheries to read the Collier decision and to look at the progress which has occurred in British Columbia with the Mac Committee. There were no problems in this year's herring fishery. There was an agreement on the part of the Department, the Minister and the existing fleet to come forward with a rational plan. Some very sensible amendments were put forward by the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) to entrench within the legislation that for which people have been crying for decades—a consultative mechanism to protect existing allocations and to ensure that before the Minister comes up with a new management plan for a season he has consulted with the trollers. He cannot just say that he will give them 13 per cent this year and 4 per cent the next year. He cannot simply say that there will be "shinners cubes" for the sports industry and all that gobbledygook.

The Minister of Fisheries pleaded his case. He said that the media misunderstood him, that he was a good guy, that it was only the NDP which was holding up the Bill, and that the Liberals had their "larvae" amendment accepted. He wants to throw this bone to the aboriginal people and say that he will sort of recognize their aboriginal rights. What was the constitutional process all about? I think the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is the one Member of this House, as the Crown representative of the aboriginal peoples, who should be fighting for them.

This is one of the oldest Acts in Canada; it was written in 1867. This is the first time in many decades that a proposal has come forward to put a purpose section in the Act for the interpretation of the courts. There are many fisheries cases involving aboriginal peoples, gulf trollers and others which will end up in the Supreme Court of Canada. We will have a purpose section without the recognition, as it should be writ-