

Coastal Fisheries Protection Act

seems to me there has to be some particular enforcement provision.

I found a problem in the Minister's Vancouver office. People have visited me in my Vancouver office and told me there is a problem with staffing. The problem revolves around the large amount of contracting out which is done for some reason or another, and that disturbs some of the employees. It is more expensive in the long run to contract out. You can end up using personnel agencies and you have to pay them 20 per cent of the fee. Perhaps the Minister could take a look at that. Maybe he could save some money and have the staff feeling better if they were employed on permanent contracts rather than on the basis of contracting out. I am not familiar with all the internal workings of his Department; he is probably much more familiar with that than I am, but I wanted to tell the Minister, who is here in the House, that that matter came to my attention.

With respect to increasing the number of fish, we have to do more in that area. We have to talk about enhancement, in particular salmon enhancement on the West Coast. We have to talk about protecting the environment from competing uses. We have to talk about enforcing our fishing treaties and so on. This Bill deals with that matter.

I want to point out to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) and to the House that the environment critic for the New Democratic Party, the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton), has raised with the Minister the launching of an inquiry into the dumping of tailings into a northern British Columbia fjord by Amax of Canada Ltd. That is a measure which could be looked at to protect the environment.

I also draw to the Minister's attention the Kemano II project which Alcan proposes in British Columbia, the problem that will raise concerning the threat to salmon and the threat of diverting rivers in British Columbia.

There is another matter I draw to the Minister's attention which has been raised in this House a number of times by the Hon. Member for Nanaimo-Alberni (Mr. Miller), our fisheries critic. On February 3, 1984, he raised various matters with the Minister, including funding for habitat protection, increasing enforcement and for salmonid enhancement. He asked the Minister to make a real commitment to this renewable resource which can provide jobs forever and ever if looked after properly. Those were the words of our fishery critic.

In British Columbia we always face the problem of competing uses—forestry affecting the fish, oil and gas affecting the fish, and so on. This is something with which we have to come to terms. I hope the Minister will be an advocate of the fishery against these alternate uses when they are in conflict.

I want to conclude by reading a telegram which I think sums things up very well. It was sent by a Mr. Erik Larsen, the Mayor of the beautiful coastal community of Ucluelet on the West Coast of British Columbia. This is what we in the NDP feel our fisheries policy should be. The telegram was sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and reads:

I have today sent telegrams to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans requesting them to review present and proposed policies regarding the fishing industry, with the industry and communities affected. Privatization of a resource, halting of the Salmonid Enhancement Program, mandatory instead of voluntary buy-back program, lack of control over depredation of the resource by other countries, and a proposed harvesting in terminal fisheries only spell economic disaster to Ucluelet and many coastal communities dependent on the fishing industry. Widespread unemployment and social upheaval will result. We urge you to take all steps possible to see that there is more consideration given these facts before new policies are allowed.

I close by saying the Minister should take that message to heart. This Bill is a beginning. We support it.

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There have been discussions among the Parties. It has been agreed that after speakers from all three Parties we proceed to put the Bill into Committee of the Whole and then through third reading stage as well. Would it be possible at this time, Mr. Speaker, for you not to see the clock, to proceed to Committee of the Whole and finish the Bill before we break for the luncheon adjournment?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): This will require unanimous consent. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) is rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, that is quite acceptable to us if it is amenable to you. We would be prepared to give unanimous consent.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): First, we will require unanimous consent to amend the motion of the Minister that the Bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and instead referred to the Committee of the Whole. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Second, we will require unanimous consent not to see the clock. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): Mr. De Bané, seconded by Mr. Pepin, moved that Bill C-4, an Act to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, be now read a second time and, with unanimous consent, be referred to a Committee of the Whole.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt this motion?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

• (1300)

[English]

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and, by unanimous consent, considered in Committee, reported, read the third time and passed.