

tance and value of other sites, equally interesting and equally valuable to Canada today and in future.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order please. Is the House ready for the question?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

\* \* \*

### FISHING AND RECREATIONAL HARBOURS ACT

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN HARBOURS

The House resumed from Friday, December 10, 1976, consideration of the motion of Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent) that Bill C-7, respecting the administration and development of certain fishing and recreational harbours in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Is the minister not present?

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I was slow to rise because I thought one or two hon. members opposite wanted to speak on the bill. Unfortunately, the minister cannot be in the House this morning because of prior commitments but will try to attend in the House later to close the debate. Although I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to close the debate. I know that several hon. members still wish to speak on the bill.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Surely such an important bill seeking to confer significant powers of enforcement on officers, under certain conditions, merits a statement from the minister. If the minister cannot be here this morning, perhaps we could put off the introduction of the bill until this afternoon and so allow the minister to explain the bill and why these extensive powers are proposed.

**Mr. Fleming:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. With respect, we are continuing consideration of the bill. When it was introduced on second reading last December, the minister opened the debate, after which some six or seven members spoke on it.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order please. When the House finished its consideration of the bill on December 10, the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Smith) had the floor. He is not present this morning; therefore, I recognize the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro).

### *Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

**Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to read why the minister requires the extensive powers sought in the bill. I find it odd that we should debate a bill of this sort, an important bill, and the sort of bill which we have just finished debating, in order to fill in time near the end of the session. I find this particularly odd since other questions of consequence for this country need debating; for example, the income tax measure which has caused considerable perturbation. I ask, why did the government decide to bring forward for discussion at this time this bill?

I notice that this bill would confer powers on the minister to produce regulations and make definitions. Normally, definitions are written in clear language. According to clause 2, "goods" means "tangible personal property other than vessels." Presumably that definition could include fish on board a vessel, or any other goods or chattels. However, on page 2 of the bill one finds that "scheduled harbour" means "any fishing or recreational harbour included in a schedule prescribed by the regulations". Once more we see regulations rearing their heads. Mr. Speaker, in our history this parliament will be known as the parliament which passed many regulations and which tried at the same time to review regulations and statutory instruments in which are enshrined many of our legislative enactments. This parliament will be remembered for the number of regulations we were obliged to approve. Here we have a definition defined through regulations which are not actually in the bill.

● (1210)

I think of one particular harbour that might very well fall within this definition. It might be prescribed as a scheduled harbour within the regulations. We have had trouble with this harbour before. It is within Indian territory. An attempt was made to create a marina there. The Indian band rose up against the particular movement. The municipality in which the band finds itself also rose up against it. I understand there is a further movement to have a second crack at this particular harbour in order to convert it into a marina. There have been marinas in the area of my constituency. Some have had rather sad histories. This particular one was investigated by a developer, up to a point. He thought it was in the bag until pressure developed to have his project put on the back-burner. I thought it was not only put on the back-burner but out into the woodshed and into the archives. However, I gather there is talk at the moment that it might come forward again. The bay I have in mind is Saanichton Bay. It should be mentioned. We ought to serve warning that developments of this sort should not take place under cover of regulations which we do not see.

There is something else that concerns me in another part of this bill. I will come back to Saanichton Harbour in a minute. Clause 5 reads:

The minister may undertake projects for the acquisition, development, construction, improvement or repair of any scheduled harbour—