## Fishing and Recreational Harbours

and does not include provisions for the development of those harbours.

Further, when program and administrative responsibilities for these harbours were transferred to the Department of Fisheries from the Department of Public Works and the Ministry of Transport in June, 1973, it was done by order in council. When the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications visited the maritimes recently, we read almost every day in the newspapers about some government policy pronouncement concerning this field. The Department of Fisheries claims that the minister suffers because his authority over small craft harbours has been derived from an order in council rather than a legislative enactment. For example, one transport official on the west coast refused to acknowledge the transfer and refused to send his files to fisheries until September, 1976.

The budget of the small craft harbours branch in fisheries is \$35 million for the fiscal year 1976/77. Most of the money is used for repair and modernization of the government fishing and recreation wharves on the east and west coasts. There are approximately 2,300 government wharves, with twice as many fishing as recreational wharves, covered by the branch. These facilities are valued at three quarters of a billion dollars.

## • (2140)

One of the major criticisms of the bill is the widespread powers being granted to the minister in Clauses 5 and 8. Clause 5 reads:

The Minister may undertake projects for the acquisition, development, construction, improvement or repair of any scheduled harbour or any fishing or recreational harbour to which this Act applies.

## Clause 8 reads:

The Minister may, subject to the regulations,

- (a) lease any scheduled harbour or any part thereof to any person;
- (b) grant a licence to any person for the use of any scheduled harbour or any part thereof; and
- (c) enter into an agreement with the government of any province or any agency thereof for the occupancy and use of any scheduled harbour or any part thereof.

According to the branch, Bill C-7 is wide enough for the minister to do it alone or in concert with the provinces and the municipalities. This is especially true in the area of recreation where existing legislation is not clear. Bill C-7 seems to allow the minister to build recreational harbours or wharves wherever he chooses, regardless of provincial or municipal desires, at a time when that party has been advocating greater provincial responsibility and rights. This bill goes against that sentiment. Therefore we urge that it be amended so that the minister will have to work in concert with the provinces.

Mrs. Holt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In view of the fact that the hon. member's colleagues, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), make such an issue in this House about reading speeches, I suggest that if the hon. member is going to read his speech he at least read it in a manner that is not a mumble.

Mr. McKenzie: As a minimum, the minister should be forced to announce his intentions concerning recreational harbours. The government has been becoming more and more involved in the financing and construction of these harbours. Recreational harbours have been increasing while fishing harbours, for example government wharves, have been decreasing in numbers. As a result one might ask whether recreation will supersede fishing in importance in the Small Craft Harbours Branch. To further emphasize this point, if you have a government wharf that is in need of repair in your constituency, that might be pointed out as a glaring example of government disregard for our fishermen.

Since Bill C-7 is partly concerned with financing recreational harbours, one might question one aspect of the government's marina assistance program which was established to encourage the construction of new marinas by local municipalities and private developers.

## Mrs. Holt: Are you talking in your sleep?

Mr. McKenzie: The federal government pays for the construction of a breakwater and for dredging while the municipality and/or developer pays the other costs, plus upkeep. Government participation is limited to 50 per cent of the total cost. However, despite paying up to 50 per cent of the project, the government receives no future compensation for its contribution. Why should the government help private developers line their pockets with taxpayers' money? Does the government at least ensure that the marina will be open and available to all boaters at reasonable cost?

The branch would like to abandon or destroy about one half of its fishing and recreational wharves because they are either not being used or they are in utter disrepair. For fishing, it would like to have an area served by one central government facility. Since many of the government fishing wharves are essential to the livelihood of many small fishing communities, will the minister announce his intentions regarding the future of government fishing wharves so that the affected communities can react?

Mrs. Holt: Which official language are you using? We cannot tell from here because we cannot hear you.

Mr. McKenzie: Tune in. Don't show your ignorance. You made your point. I have a bit of a cold. I have a husky throat. If you ever get to speak with a husky throat, I will shout you down good and clear.

There are presently wharfage charges on the books. However, as there are only about 200 wharfingers to collect these charges, out of the 2,300 government facilities, most fishermen have become used to paying nothing for the use of these wharves. Under Bill C-7 the government plans to appoint zone managers to look after these government facilities and it plans to institute a licensing program for the use of these facilities. The plan now being discussed would require a fisherman to purchase a licence based on the length of his vessel, \$1 per foot. This would be an annual licence and it would allow the fisherman to use any government facility. Fisheries expects