

own made monumental strides forward in its ability to overcome and override many of the differences inherent in its diverse, composite make-up.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this condemnation by the Conservatives is also a downright insult to those sectoral representatives who have persevered through the pains of an extremely difficult growth and development state and, needless to say, I reject it outright. Indeed, by contrast, I take this opportunity to congratulate those participants, even if they continue to be concerned and apprehensive about the immediate impacts of a restructuring they recognize as necessary. I thank them for their dedication on behalf of their respective memberships. I thank my officials as well for their role in fostering and co-operating with that process.

This process and approach to issues of this magnitude may not be perfect, and it may not reflect the kind of political grandstanding by which Hon. Members opposite measure their own standards of performance, but it reflects a caring, careful, responsible and progressive approach to problems of great magnitude besetting a sector of the Canadian economy which, unfortunately, and because of its coincidence with other factors, has been one of the most severely victimized by the recent worldwide economic recession.

This is why, Mr. Speaker, I did not hesitate last week to express publicly our dissatisfaction with the way the United States has governed its negotiations with us. I have made it public that we cannot accept its backtracking on concessions which have already been made. To think that I am going to impose restraints on Canadians while it is going to allow its own fishermen to fish without restraint is absolutely unacceptable. This, Mr. Speaker, has been a responsible approach by a responsible Government. We are anxious to hear a responsible proposition from a responsible Opposition, not the unfounded mewlings of desperation, nor the crass political posturing and obsession with power. Does the Opposition believe that the Minister's Advisory Council will believe that yesterday's motion, which was brought to my attention at six o'clock p.m., is the proper way to advise this House of the importance of that debate, choosing a Friday afternoon when most Hon. Members go back to their homes and constituencies, and on the eve of the arrival of a very important delegation?

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Parliament sits from Monday to Friday.

Mr. De Bané: Members opposite had three years, Mr. Speaker, to bring forward that debate. Do they think the delegation next week will be so naive as to fail to see through this empty exercise? Do they think the Canadian people will be duped by this no account charade, much less impressed with the Tory policy of no policy? We on this side of the House think not, Mr. Speaker, and we reject entirely their false and unfounded condemnation. The condemnation which is really called for, Mr. Speaker, is a condemnation of the use by the

Supply

Opposition of this blatantly crass, transparent and wrinkled-up, old play. In this debate we ask Hon. Members opposite very simply and directly to give us substance or silence.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I appreciate Hon. Members want to put questions or comments. Nevertheless, may I be allowed to make an observation at this point? I believe it is incumbent upon the Chair to comment. The House generously extended time to the Hon. Minister basically to conclude his remarks. Of course, I do not want to single the Minister out on this occasion. However, I feel it is the Chair's duty, nevertheless, to recall to all Hon. Members that when time is extended, the Hon. Member should, as quickly as possible, come to a conclusion of his remarks. That is the general idea of the courtesy. In this instance, the speech went on for another 10 minutes. I believe, if I may be allowed to say so—and I invite Hon. Members to reflect on my comments—that may be a slight abuse of the courtesy of an extension of time. Questions and comments.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I am tempted, of course, to ask the Hon. Minister, who is unduly upset today, just which Party has been the Government for most of the years during which the salmon stocks in British Columbia have declined to these very severe and difficult levels. The Minister knows the answer to that, and so do we all. I have to ask him this question. He says that by raising this issue in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, we are insulting all those people who have supported his consultative efforts. He says that he and the Government he represents should not stand condemned. Let me read to him from the report of Dr. Pearse, whom the Minister's predecessor commissioned, and Commissioner Pearse's comments on the policies of the Minister's Government and ask him if he agrees with them. In Chapter 1, page 3 of the Pearse report, Dr. Pearse said:

• (1500)

The lack of cohesive, consistent and forward-looking policies and programs with respect to fisheries management, enhancement and environmental protection is the single most important criticism of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans' activities on the Pacific Coast.

The Department's policies are listed as being passive or reactive rather than purposeful. Dr. Pearse quotes witnesses who appeared in front of him who said:

It is obvious to us that fisheries management and fish will continue to lose under a continuation of the reactive system.

At present, who amongst us can truthfully say what is the objective of the fisheries?

What has been lacking is a comprehensive long-term plan that specified particular goals—

The myriad of special problems that are facing the Pacific fisheries today . . . have arisen from a lack of policy and firm practices—

I ask the Minister whether he agrees with that criticism and whether he thinks that, while his Government was in power, the Opposition could have done anything about the accusations