

Government Organization

make sure that the expansion of our resource industries takes place where it is most likely to be profitable to the owners of companies and more particularly to those who work in the industries and earn a wage either in the mills where forestry is concerned or as fishermen.

● (8:20 p.m.)

In other words, there will not be a conscious policy of directing new industry and investment to metropolitan areas. But I must also tell the hon. member that we shall be very concerned about improving the efficiency of both the forest industry and the fisheries industry in order to make them commercially viable, able to stand on their own feet and to get along with less federal aid in the form of subsidies in the future.

Finally, I should like to refer to the comments made by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) who talked about national objectives as distinct, so to speak, from departmentalised objectives. I agree we must always have national objectives and goals. These goals are unlikely to be spelled out under the names of departments such as that of Fisheries and Forestry. I think the principal objective of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry should be more comprehensive. Conservation in the sense of good management is such a goal; in other words, keeping the future in mind so as to yield the greatest possible return to those who use these resources, and at the same time minimize the burden on the Canadian taxpayer.

The management of fisheries, forestry and wildlife resources should be carried out in such a way as to extend their commercial use as much as possible and to increase their other values like recreation which only now are coming into focus as more and more Canadians are able to take to our woods and waters.

I have covered only briefly the activities of this department. I believe the department can expand in a meaningful sense in the direction of conservation and resource management. In the case of remote communities which may be abandoned in the future, small ones mostly, there is a great future in tourism and in recreation. My experience on the west coast has been that the abandoned fishing communities of a decade or so ago have now been occupied by a wave of tourists from the United States and by Canadians who are getting to know our coast better. I am sure this will

[Mr. Davis.]

happen not only on the west coast but on the east coast and on our inland waterways as well.

Mr. Crouse: I welcome this opportunity to speak on Bill C-173 which will be known as the Government Organization Act, 1969. I listened with interest to the comments just made by the Minister of Fisheries and I hope a little later to make a few observations on them.

There are 15 clauses in this bill calling for new departments and amendments with regard to existing ones. We on this side are not asked to deal with these items on an individual basis; it seems to be the purpose of the government to bring in measures in wholesale fashion grouping fish and chips, telecommunications and postage stamps, industry, trade and commerce—which, we believe, should never have been separated by the Liberal government in the first place—and so on. The bill before us calls for the establishment of a Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, authority for which should have been sought in a completely separate measure in view of the vast area covered and the many complex problems involved.

The bill also calls for a Department of Supply and Services, amendments to sections of the Consumer and Corporate Affairs Act, a substitution for the National Health and Welfare Act, the establishment of a Medical Research Council, the establishment of a Science Council of Canada, the granting of corporate powers to the Royal Canadian Mint, an amendment to the Ferries Act, amendments to the Government Companies Operation Act, increases in the salaries of ministers and members of the Privy Council, plus changes in the Senate and House of Commons Act and transitional changes in ministerial functions.

As far as I am concerned, this bill is a legislative nightmare. It is impossible to deal with it in its entirety. It is the product, it seems to me, of a confused and uncertain government which can do no better than bring this hodge podge of legislative proposals to the house and dump it in our laps, saying, in effect: this is the best we can do.

Though it is true the present Prime Minister has only been in office since 1968, Canada has had a Liberal government ever since 1963 and the present bill is a sorry admission on the part of the right hon. gentleman of failure to organize the administration, in particular the various ministries, into an effective unit.