

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

We have already considered and passed clause 3, but with the consent of the committee I would like to reopen clause 3 and propose an amendment thereto which I think will give effect to the representations of the hon. member for St. John's East and enable him to withdraw his amendment.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Does the committee agree to stand clause 2 and the amendment thereto at this time and revert to clause 3?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.  
Clause 2 stood.

**The Deputy Chairman:** The committee will now study clause 3.

On clause 3—*Department established.*

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Chairman, for the reasons I have indicated, and in accordance with the order of the House, I would like to move:

That Bill C-207 be amended by adding thereto immediately after subclause (2) of clause 3 on page 1 the following subclause:  
“(3) The Minister of the Environment is the Minister of Fisheries for Canada.”

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, before I put forward my arguments I wish to suggest to the President of the Treasury Board that in order to be consistent it will be necessary to bring in an additional amendment to clause 4, because otherwise we will have a Minister of Fisheries and no Deputy Minister of Fisheries. Is he prepared to take that into consideration?

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Chairman, it was not proposed, as I understand it that we should have a Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and in order to have a Deputy Minister of Fisheries it is necessary to have a Department of Fisheries. This does provide for a minister, but not for a Deputy Minister of Fisheries as such. If one amends clause 4, then I suggest it would be necessary to have a Department of Fisheries.

**Mr. McGrath:** Mr. Chairman, that is really the crux of the matter. That is what prompted me to move my amendment back on February 16. An amendment had been moved earlier by my colleague from South Shore asking for two deputy ministers and it was subsequently defeated by the committee. It seems to me that if there is to be a Minister of Fisheries, as the amendment calls for, it follows that there should be a consequential amendment to clause 4 stating:

The Governor in Council may appoint an officer called the Deputy Minister of Fisheries... to hold office during pleasure.

The minister says there will be no Department of Fisheries. As I understand it, the department shall be known as the department of the environment. But there shall be a Minister of Fisheries, and surely he must preside over something. He must be a Minister of Fisheries not in name only; he must be a Minister of Fisheries presiding over a Department of Fisheries. I am not trying to be difficult, Mr. Chairman, and all I am suggesting is

[Mr. Drury.]

that one follows on the other. If by this amendment you are going to create the office of Minister of Fisheries, then it follows that the Deputy Minister of the Environment shall also be known as the Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

Our reasons for putting this forward have been outlined. They are a matter of record but it might be worth while to bring the question into focus by referring to the events that have transpired since the amendment was first introduced back on February 16. What we have experienced since that time has caused us to be concerned over the direction of the government with respect to the fishing industry. For example, I think it is logical to raise the question: What is to become of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry? Does the nomenclature of that committee change to the “Standing Committee on the Environment”? Is this House to be deprived of a Standing Committee on Fisheries, something it has had for the past 100 years? That is particularly important, Mr. Chairman because we have been occupied in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry for the last few weeks with a bill which has absolutely nothing to do with fisheries. The committee has been engaged in a clause by clause study of the clean air bill, a very important bill but one which properly should have been referred to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

● (5:40 p.m.)

We find ourselves today in the position of having had only one full day in which to examine the estimates of the department. Under the new rules we will probably get only one more day, and we have been told that it is unlikely we will have an opportunity to examine the estimates. Under the new rules they must be referred back to the House, therefore without proper examination and debate.

If this is what we can expect in future, Mr. Chairman, then I am afraid our fears are well-founded and that this industry which faces so many problems today will not get the attention it deserves. Granted, we will have an opportunity as a consequence of this amendment to direct questions to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry in the House and there shall continue to be in Canada a Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, albeit one who wears two hats. He will be preoccupied with his responsibilities as minister of the environment. By virtue of that preoccupation and the responsibilities that the new department has taken unto itself, I suggest that very little time will be given to the fishing industry.

Before passage of this bill I hope we can extract from the government House leader an undertaking that there will be no changes in the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry and that it will continue to exist and have responsibility for examining the estimates, that it will continue to have the privilege of having before it the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry in order to examine fisheries policy.

The question is, who will look after the interests of the fishing industry with respect to the International Com-