

people who are making their living from it sweep these bays out. Where you used to be able to go in and jig for your bait and put it on a hook and catch your salmon, there are bays now where you cannot jig for herring because there just are not any herring there. I took to my colleague on this side of the House, formerly the Minister of Fisheries, a series of letters expressing deep concern from residents on the coast as to what had happened to that little bay and this little inlet and this little area here that historically had had herring in it. That herring had now gone because they had been swept out.

We just cannot remove that feeder source for our salmon from the Gulf of Georgia, and I make an appeal to the minister that we look at it very hard, that our very talented people in fisheries out there should really be devoting themselves to the protection of the resource.

When I presented these letters and this concern to the former minister of fisheries in the last Parliament, I got a letter back, very detailed, but it was pure bureaucratic pap, sir. Even the former minister has had to realize that the concern which was being expressed in the letters that I submitted to him has turned out now, in fact, to be true. Yet there was a defensive letter written for him that he passed on to me, that I passed on out there, and of course I got it back with comments on it that would not be fit to repeat in the House.

I would plead, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, that we give very serious concern to what we are doing to the feeder stocks out there. This also moves into the lack of common sense—or perhaps there is common sense to it, but nobody on the west coast can understand why the department of fisheries was asking the previous minister to put a limit on 20 inch fish. In other words, if you caught anything under 20 inches in the sports fishery, you had to throw it back. That makes no sense at all, and if there is scientific rationale for that kind of regulation to be placed on the people on the west coast, we have to understand the reasons why. I think that if people are given the reasons why these regulations are drafted and needed, and if they can understand them, particularly in light of the call from people like Mike Crammond, who, for 20 years has been warning us that we are wiping out the herring fishery of the Gulf of Georgia. That call in the wilderness has always been denied by the officials in the department of fisheries, yet I think that if you are going to be honest with yourself today, and you go out on to that coast, you will find that the herring population inside the gulf is indeed threatened and must limit the availability of feed for the fish returning to the spawning grounds.

I would urge, through you, sir, that the minister look seriously at resolving the dispute with the International Salmon Commission because there are engineers sitting there, frustrated, waiting to implement some of the technology that is sitting there, in terms of hatcheries, in terms of improving the breeding of species. Every time I sit down in a boat or on a dock or in a yacht club, I hear these frustrations, and I think that there would be unanimity in this House, from all parties, in urging the minister to move and deliver resource into hatcheries and start protecting the feeder systems that these returning salmon need in order to mature in the gulf.

Fisheries Improvement Loans Act

Surveillance has been mentioned on the east coast. I would say that we also need to look seriously at a merger or an overlapping of responsibilities between the resources of the Department of National Defence, the Department of Transport, the Coastguard, and the Department of Fisheries. I think we can make far more effective use of our physical plant if we get into a merger there. True, the inspection process now, for the new international role we are playing in trying to protect the species, and hence, the continuity of harvest within the 200 mile limit, requires that we be equipped in a modern and efficient manner.

In terms of marketing, if I might come back to that subject, why is the SaltFish Corporation now being moved into the marketing of frozen fish? Is the information that reaches me true, that they have received some \$15 million for their involvement in this? Is there a legal status for the SaltFish Corporation to enter into the frozen fish market? Perhaps the minister, in reply in the second reading debate, could shed some light on that, because I seriously question why a Crown corporation that was put in place for a specific need should have its marketing activities expanded when the private sector is equipped and is equipping itself, and is quite capable of handling that aspect of the fishery market.

An hon. Member: No \$15 million.

Mr. Huntington: No \$15 million? That is good news, then. Perhaps the minister will just advise us why that corporation is being expanded and, if it is not \$15 million, are there any dollars being put into that aspect?

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

● (1800)

Mr. Howard Crosby (Halifax West): I recognize that Mr. Speaker is entitled to see whom you will in their place, but I want to point out to the House that when the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. McCain) completed his intervention and took his seat, I rose in my place to be recognized. If I am not mistaken, I believe I was the only one who had risen, and Mr. Speaker did not see fit to recognize me. As I say, I realize that is for Mr. Speaker to determine, but I wanted to report and record that fact.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Order, please. To pay due consideration to the comments of the hon. member, throughout this afternoon the Chair has been having some difficulty because reports have reached this place that, on the one hand, there was a disposition to put this bill through second reading before six o'clock, and on the other hand, increasingly larger numbers of members have approached the Chair to be on the list.

As to the problem raised by the hon. member for Halifax West (Mr. Crosby), I think he will find, if he consults with members of his own party, that he will have the explanation as to why he was not recognized at that time.

It being after six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock pursuant to Standing Order 2(1).

At 6.01 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.