

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

Mr. Paproski: Explain it to him; he is not too clever.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I will explain it for the hon. member through you, Mr. Speaker. I am talking about reciprocal fisheries agreements between the government of the United States and the government of Canada.

Mr. Dionné (Northumberland-Miramichi): That has nothing to do with small craft harbours.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Well, fishing harbours are used by fishermen. It is as simple as that. If there were no fishing harbours, there would be no fishermen. This particular agreement is being worked out in a manner which will result in there being no fish, and thus no fishing harbours. Therefore, I suggest the point of order raised by the hon. parliamentary secretary has no relevancy to the present argument.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): It has more relevancy than your referral to diplomatic agreements.

Mr. Paproski: Go back to sleep.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): There is relevancy in the particular line I am pursuing at the moment. We have had little opportunity to discuss the problems of west coast fisheries in this House. There are problems on the west coast relating to the division of fish caught there by Canadian and American fishermen. The United States federal court, in the State of Washington, made a ruling in 1974 concerning certain Indian tribes being provided with an opportunity to take one-half of the available salmon harvest in the United States. These salmon may be brought in to a fishing port or harbour. That ruling of Judge Boldt has led to further rulings which run counter to this particular agreement.

I would like to cite one particular clause of that agreement which can be found in article II(3), which indicates that the fishing by nationals and vessels of each party in the zone of the other shall continue in accordance with existing patterns, with no expansion of effort nor initiation of new fisheries. I mentioned this section in an earlier intervention which I made on amendments to the Criminal Code. One might ask how I got fisheries into the Criminal Code. That occurred as a result of the amendments to the Criminal Code under the Fisheries Act. At that particular time I was concerned, and I am still concerned, that the ruling of Judge Boldt, as agreed to by the United States regional consultative committee on fisheries, should have run counter to the particular clause I have just mentioned. It alters existing patterns and changes the effort—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. I regret to inform the hon. member that his allotted time has expired. He may continue with unanimous consent. Does the hon. member have unanimous consent of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Paproski: Did Dionne say “No”?

[Mr. Alexander.]

Mr. Maurice A. Dionne (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Yes, I did. I am glad the hon. member is aware of that fact.

An hon. Member: We all said “No”.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Just as one of your members said “No” to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Lessard) the other day when he was speaking on a very important matter with regard to his department.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): He probably deserved it.

Mr. Dionne (Northumberland-Miramichi): Mr. Speaker, now we will get back to Bill C-7. The hon. member who has just concluded his remarks is concerned with the regulations governing fisheries harbours and pleasure craft harbours in this country, and that these regulations are not known at the moment. If he will look at section 9 of this act, he will see that the areas in which regulations may be made are very specifically defined. I suggest it would be a great burden to the House if every time the status of a small craft harbour were changed, or every time some measure concerning the supervision or regulation of those harbours were to be introduced, a bill had to be passed through the House of Commons. We would get even less legislation passed, in those circumstances, than we do now.

● (1240)

It is well known that though the government proposes legislation, the opposition disposes—and this opposition has not been disposed to make any great progress in that regard. I invite hon. members to look at clause 9, where we see what may be controlled by regulation. The subjects concern the maintenance of order, the safety of persons and property, the form of tickets which may be issued, and so on. I am sure the House would be excited at the prospect of designing the tickets which were to be issued.

To my mind it is important that the bill should be before the House now. Perhaps it should have been brought in earlier, but it was not. I say this because it is time the small craft harbour situation was rationalized. The coastline of Atlantic Canada is dotted with small craft harbours. They are all important, for various reasons. They are important for the development of tourism and also for the work of the boat construction industry.

As opportunities for leisure increase, increasing numbers of people have the time and the money to take up pleasure craft sports and recreation. There are, as well, the fishing harbours, and these possess an importance to many communities in Atlantic Canada which cannot be exaggerated. These communities grew up around the fishing industries in the early days. In fact, it was the abundance of fish which brought many of the early explorers from Europe to our eastern shores. The communities which have developed on the basis of fishing have a very strong attachment on historic grounds to the sea and to the products of the sea, and these harbours are very much a