

### *Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

reasonable figure and not held up to ransom as they have been. As a matter of fact, it is the kind of service which they should be provided with by the Government of Canada. People use airports which are supported by the government. People use other facilities which the government provides for the public in general. There is no reason why commercial fishermen should not be provided with this service. If they are going to pay, surely it ought to be on the basis of a clearly defined schedule of fees which is reasonable and fair. That has not been done.

In his speech the other day, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni made a great deal of the fact that there has been adequate consultation with the commercial fishermen in British Columbia. As reported at page 2448 he stated:

—I do not accept the statement that those in the fishing industry have not had an opportunity to make their views known.

Further on he stated:

Surely it is not the role of parliament to send out invitations asking every Canadian if he wishes to appear before a standing committee.

That statement is as amazing as it is stupid. Nobody on this side of the House, least of all the hon. member for New Westminster, was suggesting that every Canadian should be notified that a bill is going before a committee. However, any government that has an understanding of participatory democracy, about which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) used to make speeches, would recognize that when you draft legislation which affects certain groups of people, a draft in the form of a green paper or white paper should be sent to those organizations. They should be given an opportunity even before the legislation is formulated to express their views and to advance their opinions. They should also be notified when the legislation is referred to a standing committee of this House so they will have an opportunity to appear before that committee and set forth their views with regard to the legislation as it affects their members. That has not been done.

I have here a telegram which I understand was sent to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment on February 1. It reads:

● (1442)

Thirty-third annual convention of the UFAWU urgently requests you withdraw Bill C-2 until proper consultation with fishermen and industry organizations. We resent ramrodding tactics. We demand meaningful consultation prior to passage of any legislation affecting livelihood of fishermen. Bill C-2 not consistent with your pledge to UFAWU executive of equitable reasonable wharfage fee.

Jack Nichol, President

So it appears that at least one organization representing the commercial fishermen on the Pacific coast feels it has not been adequately consulted. The telegram goes even further and says the legislation is not in keeping with the commitment made to the fishermen with respect to wharfage fees. This is inexcusable.

The government says the legislation has been before the House for two years. Surely in those two years there was ample time in which to consult with the fishermen—if the minister could not do so in person, then the deputy minister, the parliamentary secretary or some other responsible person

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

could have done so. It is unfortunate that at a time when this legislation is passing through its final stages, the people who are likely to be most affected on the West coast are protesting that they have not been consulted and that the legislation is inconsistent with the commitments they believe the minister made to them with respect to wharfage fees. For this reason I do not feel I can support the legislation, having in mind the interests of the commercial fishermen I represent.

**Mr. Fred McCain (Carleton-Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, the bill before us gives me a great deal of concern. I wish to repeat the warning given by the last speaker with respect to the idea that we are holding anything up. It is obvious that we have a Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc). It is obvious that authority over small craft harbours has been transferred to him, that the votes and expenditures of moneys have come under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Fisheries, and that the Department of Public Works is the agent for the Minister of Fisheries with respect to moneys spent and wharves and harbours.

What this bill is intended to do, therefore, is to establish by law what is already the case in practice. If we debated the measure from now until this time next year the practice would still go on. The bill before us will change little, if anything. It is, therefore, unworthy of a member of this House to state that delay in passage of the bill is holding up anything with respect to fisheries or harbours. It is merely a ploy used to downgrade the interest of the opposition in legislation introduced into the House, and it is not an honourable ploy. It is a deceitful ploy intended to mislead the public and persuade it that the opposition is extending unnecessarily the time required to do a good job.

I am reminded of an old gentleman who was quite a craftsman in my community. One day he was doing a little job when I happened to be around and one of his workmen came up to him. The employer asked how things were going. The chap who was working for him said, "Oh, I think it is good enough". The old craftsman looked at me and said, "I am sorry. I have got to go because when my man says to me he thinks it is good enough, I know there is something wrong with it; it means it isn't right." Mr. Speaker, when the opposition sees legislation which it feels is not right, it then becomes the obligation of the opposition to take such time as it may choose to try to make that legislation right and proper and fit the purposes for which the legislation was introduced in the first place.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. McCain:** That is precisely what every party on your left, Sir, has tried to do in connection with the bill before us, but with little or no result.

I am concerned about the bill because people in the fishing industry have complained to me since I have been a member of this House that they do not know today whether they are fishing legally or not. They knew they were yesterday. But they do not know today because regulations may change.