

Fisheries Act

never heard the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Turner), speaking on West Coast issues. I hope he will speak on this particular Bill today.

I would like to deal with another aspect mentioned by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Skeena; that is the part of the Bill which relates to native people. The Hon. Member for Skeena indicated that it almost seems as though this Bill and its amendments were drafted without considering Section 35 of the Constitution. Section 35 of the Constitution establishes existing aboriginal rights of the native peoples of Canada and is an important part of the Constitution. Hon. Members might as well accept that now. We have to deal with it. It is no good to put in an amendment indicating that we will acknowledge that section. We must deal with it in more detail.

I remember when we were dealing with Bill C-48, the oil and gas measure, in the Energy Committee. At that time, the Liberals proposed the same clause that is proposed as an amendment to this Bill. It is not good enough to slip in a clause that says we will not do anything with existing rights. My colleagues, the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River (Mr. Skelly) and the Hon. Member for Skeena, have many native people in their ridings and have specifically proposed certain amendments to this Bill. With respect to Hon. Members, I think those amendments are worth examining.

We do not apologize for not dealing with larvae amendments and for presenting more substantial amendments. We do not apologize for holding this Bill up until we can get a better deal for the fishermen on the coast. Fishermen are unique. They are the last real hunters of Canada. The fisheries industry is unique, and what these bureaucrats do with it affects these people's lives. That is why we want to make sure that the bureaucratic power is restricted as much as possible. That is why we want to make sure that the users, the trollers, the seiners, the gill-netters, the sports fishermen and the native fishermen are consulted. That is why my colleagues were prepared to sit up all night in committee. That is why we are speaking in this House today.

As much as we like the Minister of Fisheries personally, we will not accept it when he says that we are guilty or that our Leader is only a central Canadian. We are standing up for the rights of the fishermen in Canada and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mr. Waddell), and other Members of our Party, I was rather distressed to hear the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) who described the actions of our Party regarding Bill C-32 as being reckless and irresponsible. We in this Party believe that Bill C-32 is reckless and irresponsible because of the kinds of powers it gives to the Minister. We feel that the Bill is irresponsible and fails to listen to what the fishermen of the Pacific Coast have had to say.

The committee went to a great deal of effort to travel to British Columbia to listen to what the actual fishermen had to

say. The committee returned to Ottawa and found that really nothing about the Bill has been changed. We are still giving *carte blanche* to the Minister to do whatever he wants to do.

When the committee travelled, the majority of witnesses who appeared before it made it very clear that they did not want this Bill passed in its present form. As the Hon. Member for Vancouver-Kingsway pointed out, what we have in the Bill is a form of overkill in reaction to a court decision.

● (1240)

I do not believe that it is reckless and irresponsible of our Party to insist that there should be proper consultation before the Bill, in its final form, is passed. I do not believe that it is reckless and irresponsible to insist that a consultation process should be built into the Bill in order that different user groups on the coast could have a say as to how the resource should be allocated. That is exactly what the Minister promised when he was fisheries critic for the Official Opposition before the election. But it would seem that elections change views. Elections not only change the Government, they change the minds of some individuals who form the Government.

I regret that the Minister has changed his view. Before the election he appeared to be very open to the idea that all user groups and all people who had a basic interest in the fisheries should be involved in making decisions. However, now the Minister is standing in the House and telling us that we are reckless and irresponsible because we refuse to give him *carte blanche* to make all sorts of regulations without the requirement of consultation.

I remember, as do other Members, when the Davis plan was introduced to limit the number of people who would be involved in the fishing industry on the West Coast. That plan was introduced some 15 or 16 years ago. I think all sides of the House would agree that the plan was a disaster. At that time we had yet another instance of "Minister knows best". The Davis plan was dreamed up by the Minister and his advisors. It had nothing to do with the actual people who were involved in the industry. Those people attempted to raise their voices and point out the problems inherent in the Davis plan. But, the Minister knew best and the plan went ahead. Now we all recognize that the plan was a complete disaster.

I have three basic concerns regarding the Bill in its present form.

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

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member for Malpeque (Mr. Gass) on a point of order.

Mr. Gass: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering to what motion the Member is speaking. I thought it was the motions to which we were speaking and not the whole Bill.

Mr. Skelly: Mr. Speaker, had the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Gass) read the amendment and understood its import, he would have recognized that the Davis plan, in fact, affected the fishery in such a