

pleasure of the House that the President of the Privy Council shall have leave to introduce the amendment?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

BROADCASTING, FILMS AND ASSISTANCE TO THE ARTS

EXTENSION OF REFERENCE ON FARM BROADCASTING TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): As hon. members are aware, the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts has been considering the question of farm broadcasting. Their term of reference has expired so that they have not been able to make a report. In response to a number of requests from members of the committee I should like to move:

That the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts be authorized to consider the subject matter of farm broadcasting and that the evidence adduced thereon in December 1976 be referred to the said committee.

The hope is that once the committee has received this reference it will produce a report in the remaining days of the session.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) seeks the consent of the House to introduce this motion. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: There being no further business, I do now leave the chair pursuant to an order made Monday, June 27, until eight o'clock this evening.

At 1.08 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Fisheries Act

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

FISHERIES ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND THE ACT AND THE CRIMINAL CODE IN CONSEQUENCE THEREOF

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-38, to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State (Fitness and Amateur Sport) for the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment) moved:

Motion No. 3

That Bill C-38, an act to amend the Fisheries Act and to amend the Criminal Code in consequence thereof, be amended in clause 8 by adding immediately after line 11 at page 11 the following:

"(4) Where the minister or a person designated by the Minister proposes to make an order pursuant to subsection (2), he shall after to consult with

- (a) the governments of any provinces that he considers to be interested in any such proposed order, and
- (b) any departments or agencies of the government of Canada that he considers appropriate,

but nothing in this subsection prevents the minister or a person designated by the minister from making an interim order pursuant to subsection (2) without such consultation where he considers that immediate action is necessary."

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly on motion No. 3, which is before the House. I feel it is only proper that I put on record some of the concerns expressed by the provinces as well as those expressed by industry when this measure was before the committee for detailed study.

The motion moved for the minister is identical to one which was rejected by the chairman of the committee, but I am pleased to see that it has been introduced to the House once again. When we examined the original amendment in the committee, the concerns of a number of provinces were registered. It is not my intention to burden the record tonight with all of the objections, but I think some of them should be recorded in *Hansard* so that the positions of the provinces will be there for everyone reading *Hansard* to see. Starting on the Pacific coast, the brief submitted to the committee by the government of British Columbia reads in part as follows:

The proposed amendments to the Fisheries Act (Bill C-38) have been brought to my attention by a number of ministries within the British Columbia government, as well as representatives from major industries in the province. All are concerned with the effect the proposed legislative changes will have on existing co-operative arrangements between agencies of our two governments dealing with environmental protection and pollution control. They are also apprehensive about the potential effect of these proposals on resource and economic development.

The mutual objective of avoiding duplication of government regulations, particularly in relation to resource-based industries, will not be furthered by the proposed legislation. The close co-operation we have enjoyed in the environmental field may be jeopardized. The proposed legislation is oriented to a single resource—albeit of considerable importance to this province—but is out of step with the multiple resource use essential to the development of a healthy economy in British Columbia.