

Government Orders

plan to increase the fish population of the river. He said: "The objectives will be achieved through stock rebuilding, protection of the habitat base". There is no talk about how they are going to protect the habitat base.

I at least hoped they would mention the Surrey Bend in there as one of the major habitat areas under threat. I do not even think that the government knows about the Surrey Bend and what the threat is or what impact it will have.

In conclusion, the New Democrats support some of the things in Bill C-74, but we are frightened that unless there is a change in the will of this government, something far more forthcoming than what has been vaguely outlined in the green plan, this bill is not going to protect the fish in the Fraser River or elsewhere. What is really needed in this country is the political will. I have not seen the political will in Bill C-74, or certainly not in the green plan.

Mr. Cooper: Madam Speaker, you will find consent for the following motion:

That tomorrow at 5 p.m. debate on government business No. 25 and on any amendment thereto be deemed completed and voting on such be deemed deferred to 7 p.m. Monday, December 17.

Mr. Dingwall: Yes, Madam Speaker, there have been some discussions with the various House leaders of the respective parties, and we would grant our consent both to the introduction of the motion as well as its contents.

Mr. Gardiner: Madam Speaker, our party agrees with the motion as well.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Brian L. Gardiner (Prince George—Bulkley Valley): Madam Speaker, I compliment the hon. member for Surrey North for putting some excellent comments on the record in terms of his concerns about Bill C-74, respecting fish habitat protection, and about the Fraser River, a major river in British Columbia. I know all members of this House are aware of it and how it relates so importantly to the questions we have been debating in this legislation.

The question or comment I would like to put to the member is actually a reference from a document to which I referred yesterday, I believe it was, in the House when we started debate on Bill C-74. This document has been prepared by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans on the Fraser River. I would like to read briefly

from it and ask the hon. member to comment on it. I think it is an indication of what many of the witnesses had to say in committee on this bill and a lot of the comments members are making about the political will to ensure that the good deeds we are likely to pass today in this bill are in fact followed and carried out.

Page 18 of the report reviews the Fraser River. It takes a look at productivity in terms of salmon production of all species. It reviews from top to bottom some of the concerns of the department about the river. In fact, as I said yesterday, it is a very controversial document and actually a very revealing one.

I would like the hon. member to comment on the reporter wherein it refers to the Fraser River and the lower Fraser from Hope to New Westminster, that part of the river. It comments on the present status and reads: "The lower mainland supports over 50 per cent of the B.C. population and the impacts of constant industrial and urban development have taken a significant toll in production in many urban streams and the Fraser River foreshore. Past diking of rivers and hydro development has caused great losses to the resource".

There is the comment about the future of the river: "With present development practices a loss of salmon production in the urban areas will inevitably continue and the streams will eventually cease to be productive. Urban development, land use practices and technologies must change. All streams must be protected by buffer zones and not be considered storm sewers. Urban run-off must be treated".

Could the hon. member comment on that in relation to his experience with issues in his riding related to the Fraser River, on what the expectations may be arising out of Bill C-74, and if there are some hopes that the announcement of the green plan, if and when we get some specifics, may in fact result in some action from this government?

Mr. Attewell: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I compliment the member for the way he spoke. It was very calm and I could hear. However, when the member for Surrey North replies, I wonder if he might just think of some of us. I must say, without any offence, that my ears are sore from his shouting. We have a very good sound system here. I went outside and turned down the TV when the member was speaking because it was too loud. He should feel free just to speak in a normal