

complicated and far-reaching manner that even the production of eggs, spat and other things were affected. The Hon. Member was referring to the reorganization of fisheries, which touches on the matter of regulations, and the amendment deals with how closely the regulations deal with every aspect of fishing. Of course, that is what we are working toward removing.

**Mr. Gass:** Mr. Speaker, I have listened very intently to the previous Member and he never once mentioned the word "larvae".

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I am sure the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands (Mr. Manly) will make his comments relevant to Motion No. 1.

**Mr. Manly:** Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to discuss the issue of larvae. As a preliminary, I believe it is important to recognize that the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans made a fairly lengthy speech, but he did not refer to larvae. He referred to the New Democratic Party and said that it was reckless and irresponsible. He referred to our Leader as being reckless and irresponsible, as well as the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly). However, I did not hear the Minister speak on the question of larvae. I would be glad to continue, if I may, to make several prefatory comments.

I have three concerns regarding the Bill: first, the failure to consult prior to the drafting of the Bill; second, the fact that the fishing industry on the West Coast is already subjected to over-regulation; and third, that the Bill gives too much power to the Minister. My third point goes back to the comment I was making before I was interrupted by the point of order, which is that we have already seen what resulted from that kind of situation through the Davis plan.

There has been a failure to consult with the fishing industry on the West Coast and there has been a refusal to recognize that the people who are most involved in the fishery are the people who could arrive at the best solutions. One of the jobs of the Minister should be to sit down with all the people who are involved in the industry and establish a comprehensive program which would result in long-term solutions for the fishing industry, instead of telling us that the whole issue is so complex that only the Minister and his advisors can deal with it.

If we look at the treatment which Indian witnesses received, we get a very good idea about what the failure to consult in drafting the legislation meant. When the committee was considering the Bill it decided that it would not hear Indian witnesses. The Conservative Party decided against hearing Indian witnesses. However, the Indian people wanted to be heard. They sent a deluge of telegrams, letters and made numerous telephone calls to pressure the committee, together with the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River and the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Fulton).

Finally, the Conservative Party saw the light and felt that it should change its previous position. So, the decision was made to hear Indian people, but what happened? The Indian people

### *Fisheries Act*

were brought to Ottawa and subjected to an around-the-clock process. They were required to appear all evening before the committee. Ed Newman, President of the Native Brotherhood of British Columbia, told us that he travelled some 3,000 miles to appear before the committee and then had to speak to a group of empty seats. He felt that the Indian people were being treated very shabbily. When I visited the committee I was surprised. Of the 11 Conservative members on the Committee only the Parliamentary Secretary and the Chairman were present. Members from the New Democratic Party and the Liberal Party were present, but only one Conservative member was present.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Brampton-Georgetown (Mr. McDermid) on a point of order.

**Mr. McDermid:** Mr. Speaker, I believe the Hon. member's remarks are completely out of order. Attendance in the House or in committees is not to be mentioned in the House of Commons. In addition, the work of the committee should not be mentioned. I would ask the Chair to rule that those remarks are completely out of order.

**Mr. Rodriguez:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point or order. It has been the practice—not to single out any Member in the House, or to say that that Member was not in the House or was not in committee. But, never in my experience have I been aware of the fact that it is unparliamentary to say that Tory Members, Liberal Members or NDP Members were absent. There is nothing wrong with mentioning that. Indeed, I believe it is quite correct to mention that the Conservatives who are so concerned about the Bill have a sparse attendance in the House. There is not one Tory from British Columbia in the House. We have not specifically named anyone. I noticed that I was very careful not to name anyone. That is a very important—

● (1250)

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I think the Hon. Member has made his point.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Maily:** I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Gatineau (Mrs. Maily) on a point of order.

**Mrs. Maily:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the same question, I thought that the remarks of the Hon. Member were not altogether relevant.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Quite true with respect to the relevance of the speech of the last speaker.