

Supply

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Davis: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Vancouver South made a lot of sense. He said many of the right things. We must make environmental studies before we undertake major construction projects. If we had enough expertise, enough biologists around, we should carry out environmental studies in connection with everything we do.

The hon. member was president of the Garibaldi Olympics Association, and they were very active promoting a development in connection with the winter Olympics in a pristine part of British Columbia, Whistler Mountain. But they never did an environmental impact study.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Davis: However, in fairness to the hon. member, environmental impact studies were not in vogue in 1970. Today, people are looking further ahead and asking more important questions. All I want to say to the hon. member is that he must not take for granted that a decision to build a runway in a location is final, and by a date that is settled forever. If, over the next year, we come up with reasons, or others come up with reasons of an environmental character, telling us why this should be done and should not be done, we will have to change our plans. That is basic policy and that is what I believe will be done. And I know I will have the support of the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to do is to congratulate my hon. friend from Vancouver South for the tremendous contribution he has made in recent weeks to the debate on environmental matters. I am sure he exemplifies the quality of representation we need in the House of Commons. Second, I would like to congratulate my colleagues from western Canada who during the last few days while we have been engaged in discussion of the supplementary estimates have shown much initiative in displaying their concern about the direction being taken in rural Canada and about the problems being faced by our agricultural industry. If I were a voter from western Canada I would be very happy about the quality of representation being brought to the House of Commons by western members in recent days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: I wish to make, Mr. Chairman, what one colleague of mine in the provincial legislature once called a second maiden speech. This is my second maiden speech. It is the first time I have taken the floor this year except for a few points of order and a couple of questions during the question period.

I make this speech feeling there has been an area in this session of parliament which has been sadly neglected. I am, of course, referring to the fisheries of Canada. I know when I talk about the fisheries in this country I am talking about a topic which has never been high in popularity on the parliamentary menu of the House of Commons. In fact, I am reminded of the day when colleagues from my own province took part in a debate on fisheries questions and were mocked by members across the way. I remem-

[Mr. Fraser.]

ber the constant din that was set up by those hon. members, repeating the word "fish", "fish", "fish". I suppose one could only call it fun-poking at us for participating in a fisheries debate.

I must even admit, Mr. Chairman, that as I stand here tonight talking about fisheries I do not feel quite as much in order as I would if I were talking about other matters. I am sure that if I were a representative from, say, Toronto, I would feel more in order talking about something like Pickering airport, or perhaps Ste. Scholastique because those things are big, they cost something like \$600 million and everybody has come to understand that kind of importance. I suppose it is because this country has become a great big country. It has large cities, great concentrations of people, sophisticated questions about language and urban development, bilingualism, disunity, regional development and all manner of nonsense. But when you talk about fish, that is something which identifies only with little guys.

Mr. McGrath: Just a four-letter word.

Mr. Lundrigan: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just as my hon. friend from St. John's East has said, it is just a four-letter word.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lundrigan: Of course, the Prime Minister would understand that language, even though he might not know much about the fisheries.

But I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I first came to the House of Commons in 1968 I felt a great deal of pride in being able to identify with the fisheries. As many hon. members who have come here since then, as well as those who have been here a long time, will know, the fishing industry was what gave birth to what has become the Canadian nation.

There is documented evidence available which goes back to the year 1,000 A.D., ample evidence which goes back to 1497 and 1610 in Canadian history, showing the value of Canadian fisheries. It was the first staple industry ever to be established. It was followed by the fur trade, then the great concentration on timber because of the wars and the naval development in Europe. Later we saw the great migration to western Canada and the building of the railways. This was a great, exciting period. But it was only yesterday. Such developments have taken place only in the last hundred years. The fishing industry, however, was what gave birth to the Canadian nation.

I remember just a while ago, relatively speaking, we heard a statement by the Minister of the Environment that he intended to disband the ministry of fisheries. The province of Newfoundland joined the confederation of Canada in 1949. In 1867 the Fathers of Confederation saw fit to establish a Department of Fisheries. Now, in 1973, the man who sits across from me today calls himself the minister of the sexy department, but there is no longer a fisheries department.

• (2040)

Mr. Davis: You haven't asked a question this year about fisheries.