

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) made reference to the fact that the department will not abandon wharf facilities and that, indeed, there have been very few abandonments of wharf facilities. I hope that the assurances given by the hon. member, who is the parliamentary secretary to the minister, have some ring of truth to them because the record is very sad in terms of the management of wharves and other similar facilities while they were under the care of the Ministry of Transport and the Department of Public Works. If nothing else, at least now we have some cohesion being demonstrated.

I also expressed concern about the proposal put forward by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni regarding remote wharves on the west coast and the east coast, and the fact that there will be an opportunity for fishermen to manage these wharf facilities and small craft harbour facilities themselves. That is fine, but what assurances are there that there will be regular maintenance? Who will cover the cost of that regular maintenance? What assurance is there that there will be an ongoing inspection of these facilities?

During the period of time in which we addressed ourselves to this particular bill at the standing committee level, I made reference to the fact that I have some very serious concerns about clause 10 at page five, which deals with enforcement officers. In the bill it is stated that an enforcement officer may be any person who is, in the opinion of the minister, qualified to be so designated, and the minister can furnish that person with a certificate of his designation. It really does not identify the type of person, the role that person is expected to play, or the qualities necessary to carry out that role.

There were the same expressions of concern with regard to the Ocean Dumping Control Act. The minister had the same opportunity to appoint inspectors and other officials on an ad hoc basis without any indication as to what the background of those individuals must be, what their skills and abilities must be, whether they would be political appointments or whether they would be genuine appointments based on some knowledge of what these people were supposed to do. I note that clause remains unchanged.

● (1412)

I note also that in clause 11 on page 6 of the bill there is provision for an enforcement officer not only to board any vessel—which I can accept—or enter any vehicle—which I can accept—but also to enter premises where or in respect of which he reasonably believes there may be evidence of such non-compliance and that he may make any inspection he deems necessary. That is the point about which I am concerned. We have the assurance of the minister in committee that this refers only to the premises or fishing shacks, or what-have-you, immediately adjacent to the harbour. If that is so, why is it not stated in the bill, or does the minister intend to put it in the regulations? I say it is a gross intrusion to allow an enforcement officer, who is not a law officer, to enter the premises of any Canadian citizen. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said that the government does not belong in the

Fishing and Recreational Harbours

bedrooms of the nation; I say the enforcement officer does not belong on the premises of fishermen. For these reasons I must object to this particular clause, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt) expressed some of the same concerns that I have about the bill. For instance, it says that the minister may appoint and fix the remuneration of such officers or employees as he thinks proper for the operation. The first thing that I wonder about is whether the remuneration will be in the same form as that for rural postmasters or postmistresses. Will it be an inconsequential sum to be paid those dedicated people, or will it be payment on the basis of the ability, skill and worth of the individual? On the other hand, will it be the subject of pork-barrelling at a very low level? This gives me great concern, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for New Westminster told the House that the fishermen's union on the west coast has sent a telegram to the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc) to delay the bill until they have an opportunity to go before the standing committee. I am surprised that this was not provided for, since the bill goes to the very heart of matters that concern fishermen on both coasts, and in all fairness I think they should have had that opportunity.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that many things in Bill C-2 are good but, like other government legislation, there is much that is questionable. That is why I cannot support the bill. Of course, I do not think that lack of my support will materially affect its passage, but I hope that some of the concerns I have expressed will be noted, and amendments introduced.

I hope that the minister and officials in his department will address themselves to the problems of small craft harbours which in the past have received little federal support. It is all well and good to pay attention to the east and west coast fisheries—that is of the first order and I accept it—but I have pointed out to the minister, as has the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) that there are other areas of the country which lie within his jurisdiction and have been ignored up to now.

I should like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on Bill C-2. I have no further comments at this time.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate. My colleague, the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Leggatt), speaking in this House on February 1, admirably set forth the major objections we had to the legislation. We are not saying the legislation is all bad; we are saying there are some aspects of it which have adverse implications for a group in which both the hon. member and I are very interested, the commercial fishermen on the west coast.

I would have been perfectly satisfied to leave the criticisms advanced by the hon. member to speak for both of us. When the hon. member sat down, however, both the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Anderson) and the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Young) proceeded to take him to task for those criticisms. At that time I sought to follow those two hon.