

It is some hours since the amendment was proposed and I should like to remind hon. members that the committee should now be considering that subject. I will not read the amendment, but it is essentially a proposal to change clause 2 of the bill in order to incorporate the word "fisheries" in the title of the new department of the environment. With great respect it seems to me that we should try to relate our remarks to that matter and the question of whether the word "fisheries" should be incorporated in the title of that department. I would ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, I always have the greatest admiration and respect for your person and your office. Perhaps it has not become apparent that my remarks relate to the amendment presently before the committee and I will hasten to abide by the rules of the House and direct my remarks to that subject. I know other hon. members wish to speak on this matter so I will direct my remarks in a relevant way, as Your Honour has proposed to the amendment.

Mr. Alexander: You are right on, John.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, what I am really saying is that the designation of the minister responsible for the Wheat Board and for immigration—

An hon. Member: And statistics.

Mr. Lundrigan:—statistics, unemployment and manpower, and the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister for Regional Economic Expansion are all involved with rural development. How would hon. members from western Canada, including the hon. member for Peace River, the hon. member from Camrose, the hon. member for Vegreville, the hon. member for Vermillion—

Mr. Paproski: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

Mr. Lundrigan:—the hon. member for Edmonton Centre, hon. members from the great province of Manitoba and from the great province of Saskatchewan, feel about the government deciding to eliminate the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the Department of Agriculture and the Wheat Board and create a department of rural development?

An hon. Member: They don't have to; they are fragmented into non-existence anyhow.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Chairman, I am getting all kinds of side remarks. How would these hon. members react to such a change? How would these hon. members who are on the bandwagon of the right hon. gentleman—I suppose I can still call him the right hon. gentleman—react to a bill changing the name of those departments? I have in mind the hon. member from western Canada who attended a Liberal organization meeting in Regina. He is concerned with unemployment in Canada. I wonder how the eminent gentleman from Assiniboia would react to a change in the name of the Department of Agriculture. I wonder how the hon. gentleman from the Prairies and the hon. member from the Gaspé—I almost left him

Government Organization Act, 1970

out—would react to such changes? That hon. member is a distinguished Canadian who is in favour of retaining the word "fisheries". I should also like to know the reaction of the hon. member who now holds the position of parliamentary secretary. How would the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria react to the creation of a department of rural development through the elimination of some departments which have been in existence for years? I should like to know how hon. members from the province of Quebec would react to this change. How would they resign themselves to the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce being eliminated and having in its place a department of manufacturing? What would they say if we put all aspects of economic development, in terms of manufacturing, under one department? How would those hon. members react to the creation of that kind of a department as a subsidiary of another department? I would like those hon. members to stand in their places and indicate how they would react to that kind of situation. I raise this suggestion in the hope that my friends from the rural parts of Canada will indicate how they would feel about that kind of distinction being made in respect of government departments.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Of course, we have not yet reached the stage where we can have a major voice in the Canadian economy. Members from various Canadian provinces have expressed concern today. Our concern about the degradation and downgrading of the Department of Fisheries is not a minor concern; it is a major concern. When Bill C-207 becomes legislation over our dead bodies—

Mr. McGrath: Over the dead bodies of the fishermen.

Mr. Lundrigan:—over the dead bodies of those who are concerned about the fishing industry in Canada, we will represent the only part of Canada which has no department of fisheries. Can you imagine, Mr. Chairman, the federal government taking an initiative to downgrade fisheries to this point? In British Columbia there is a minister of fisheries. His colleague is now visiting Washington, but he will be back and I have great confidence in his ability to show the Canadian people his concern for the fishing industry. We have many members from British Columbia. Last year, as a member of the fisheries committee I visited the southern part of British Columbia and Vancouver Island, as well as some parts of the great constituency of the Minister of Public Works for whom I have great admiration.

The point I wish to make is that I also visited the northwestern part of British Columbia and the area of Prince Rupert. I remember running into a gentleman there who is a member of the Legislative Assembly. I refer to Mr. Britt who comes from Prince Rupert. Some members are acquainted with him. He was not only a member of the British Columbia Legislature but he also became a great mayor of the municipality of Prince Rupert. This man was born in Fogo, Newfoundland and in the constituency of Gander-Twillingate.

Of course, this is how we have contributed to Canadian confederation: we have exported our great men to the