

This is the stage at which we are at the moment. Then of course Cabinet will have to go through its deliberations. I hope that in the very near future the decision of Cabinet will be made public.

• (1510)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): As the question period is finished, would the House agree that we extend it somewhat to allow the Hon. Member to speak? There was some misunderstanding as to who was going to get the floor. Do I have consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Miller: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues in the House for their consent. The Minister's speech today was one of the great condemnations of the way this Government functions in the fishing industry, rather than a valid defence of the policy of the Government. We have had nothing from the Government other than delay. In three years we have had one other opportunity to debate fisheries in the House in terms of another motion moved by the NDP and one minor Bill. We have had no opportunity to really discuss in any detail the matter of fisheries in the House. The way that the Government functions in the fishing industry is through Orders in Council and regulations. We have no opportunity to debate them. When I requested some time ago that the Minister table in the House the Pearse report, the Kirby report, and the Cruickshank report so the committee could deal with this issue in some detail, he refused to table them. Today he indicated that on January 31 another working paper went to the MAC. This is another committee which functions in secrecy, not only from the rest of the House of Commons but from its own membership.

In view of the Minister's request in his speech today for some input from the Opposition Parties to help resolve a very serious crisis in British Columbia, would he be prepared to table in the House his proposals to the MAC of January 31 so that the Fisheries and Forestry Committee can function with those recommendations as well as the MAC? Will he make that information public?

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly give proper consideration to the suggestions of the Hon. Member. If there is no objection, I will gladly make it public as quickly as possible.

Mr. Ted Miller (Nanaimo-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise in debate, even on a Friday afternoon, to discuss an issue which is very critical to the British Columbia fishermen. I was not aware of the debate until this morning when I looked at the Order Paper and saw that, as the Fisheries critic for the NDP, I was going to take part in a debate. In fact, I arrived from British Columbia at 10.30 last night simply because that was part of my schedule. I could

have easily missed this debate. I share the Minister's concern that we did not have very much notice that this important debate was going to occur.

I agree that the Official Opposition has some responsibility to lay out some of its proposals in terms of what it sees for the British Columbia fishing industry. Although I have a lot of confidence in my hon. friend, the Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser), when he sets his own fisheries policy, I do not have the same kind of confidence in his Party. Although I can support much of what he has outlined as his policy today in the House, I am not certain that that is the kind of economic and fisheries policy we would find coming from a new Government.

In the headlines yesterday we saw that the Progressive Conservative Party is already developing a hit list of members in Government and Crown corporations. I anticipate that those on the hit list will simply be replaced by Progressive Conservative Party hacks. I am not confident that a change in Government and a change in officials in agencies of the Government is going to have any effect on the fishing industry and the policies set forward there.

There are some questions we should be asking the Progressive Conservative Party. That Party is committed to private industry and therefore privatization of some of the Crown corporations. We can look at the fishing industry and some of the concerns that fishermen have been expressing as a result of ad hoc Liberal policies in terms of future use of hatcheries. It is not too difficult to believe that the Progressive Conservative Party might concern itself with privatizing some of the hatcheries or spawning channels and turning those over to its friends in the corporate sector. Can you imagine Amway running the Robertson Creek or Capilano hatcheries? I, Mr. Speaker, believe that that is possible.

The other aspects of the fishing industry that we are concerned about, if the Progressive Conservative Party achieves the position of Government which it is anticipating at the moment, are the questions of maximizing profits and reducing budget deficits. Would the Progressive Conservative Party be looking at terminal fisheries? We know that they would be more cost efficient, but that is not going to encourage any confidence in the fishermen of British Columbia who at the moment are struggling for their livelihood. Would the Progressive Conservatives consider a terminal fishery, reducing the troll fishery and gill-net fleet significantly in favour of the larger, more overcapitalized seiners, and therefore drastically reducing the number of fishermen in the industry and thus affecting coastal communities? What is the commitment of the Progressive Conservative Party to employment opportunities in the coastal communities in British Columbia? I do not think that has been adequately answered. What would the Conservatives do in terms of their relationship with Alcan and the Kenano completion project, or, as it is more aptly called by the United Fishermen and Allied Workers, the Kenano deple-