

Urbanization has resulted in an effort on the part of a growing number of people to find relaxation and renew their physical and mental health in less populated areas. In British Columbia, roads have reached the point of such congestion—and this is true of other regions—that people hesitate to go out on them on holiday weekends. Nevertheless, more people than ever are finding their way to the waterways, lakes and camping areas and it is essential to provide wharves, marinas and ramps to meet their needs. Accordingly, I believe the inclusion of recreational facilities as one of the benefits of this bill is understandable. My own province would benefit not only directly but indirectly through the tourist industry. We should be looking not only at the present but to the requirements of future development.

There are several features in the bill which are causing apprehension and I should like to refer to some of them. They have already been dealt with to some extent, perhaps to a considerable extent, by my hon. friends, but I should like to associate myself with what they have said because they have been expressing the concern of a great many people across the country.

Reference has been made to the fee structure. The uncertainty with respect to this feature of the bill is a major problem. I realize that in the debate in which the minister took part he pointed out, as recorded at page 2414, that he did not intend to take any precipitate action, that nothing was contemplated at the present time but that at some time in the future consideration would have to be given to the imposition of a fee schedule so as to provide income for the various programs contemplated by the department.

This is not a sufficient assurance. It has been pointed out on many occasions that no matter how well intentioned the minister of the day might be no one knows when the situation will change. Some new minister might come along and say: "This is a matter which should have been taken care of during the debates on Bill C-2; we shall impose a fee structure without further delay." This is what is bothering those in the industry. I believe the minister should be more specific in outlining his intentions for the future as far as a fee structure is concerned.

He has indicated there will be a varying set of fees; in other words, that fees will not be the same across the country. This type of thinking is all too prevalent in the government's planning. We see it in tariffs, in transportation and in other directions. It is a source of real resentment among the people of British Columbia who feel they are treated differently from people in other parts of the nation. It is irksome. People are wondering when the government will come to the conclusion that British Columbia is an integral part of the nation. If national unity is to be maintained the government will have to look upon British Columbia as being an essential part of Canada and act accordingly.

I notice that as reported on page 2414 the minister said:

The nucleus of the proposal we will bring to the fishermen is how we can best devise a fee system which will not only recognize market demand and relate to the level and quality of services provided but which will recognize regional

differences. Obviously this means we are not going to be illogical enough, particularly in the case of east coast fishermen, to subsidize on the one hand and take it back through an unreasonable fee structure on the other.

We have no objection to consideration being given to the problems facing the fisheries on the east coast, but I believe if we are going to consider fees on that basis we must also take into account the needs of fishermen on the west coast. Speaking in another debate some time ago I pointed out that the industry in British Columbia was facing almost insuperable obstacles in its fight to maintain markets in the centre of the nation because of subsidy programs, lower wage rates and lower transportation costs in the east. I suggested that, as a measure of justice and equity, some form of compensation ought to be provided. When we come to the imposition of a fee structure, this aspect has to be taken into account as well.

I should like to refer now to a letter, a copy of which was sent to me, having to do with a statement made by the federal Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc) to the Vancouver *Province*. The minister said that while details of the licensing arrangements still have to be worked out he is committed to the principle of a tax to cover some of the cost of salmon enhancement programs. The problem, the minister said, was making sure the cost of an enforcement of the program did not eat up the benefits. There would be some enforcement but it was not desirable to let the administrative produce so much ill will that it had to be changed.

Replying to this statement, the minister of energy, transportation and communications of British Columbia wrote to the minister under date of January 25. I wish to quote one or two passages from that letter. He said:

We looked into this matter carefully when I was Fisheries Minister and the cost of the scheme was comparable to the revenue produced. And the research or statistical value was just about nil. You don't get a complete record of the number of fishermen involved and you don't get any data on the number of fish caught. So it won't help us to manage the fishery either.

This is the opinion of one who was minister of fisheries here in Ottawa and who is now minister of energy, transportation and communications in British Columbia. He pointed out that these matters were considered, but that it was not worth the work, the time nor the animosity which would be stirred up because the revenue produced would be spent on operating the program. Also he pointed out the problem in regard to the fee structure. The closing paragraph of his letter reads as follows:

● (2132)

So I again urge you to treat us the same way that sports fishermen are treated in other saltwater areas of Canada. Keep the federal bureaucracy to a minimum and we'll all be better off as a result.

The minister should take cognizance of this particular reference which was made by one of his former colleagues. Perhaps there is some question as to the application of fees, but the real thrust of this letter is the unequal application of the program on the west coast as compared to elsewhere.

The degree of consultation was a matter brought to the attention of the minister. The government is not noted for its willingness to engage in productive consultation. Rather, confrontation has been the order of the day. It is not necessary for