

*Fisheries Act*

resources of Canada against the wasting effects of pollution. However, the ubiquitous and malevolent Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has again reached out his tentacles. This time he has done so at a stage of the proceedings when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) have lectured this House that amendments, once proposed in committee, should not be proposed again.

We now have before the committee a series of amendments moved by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry which in effect completely alter the work of the committee. We did not oppose these amendments, Mr. Speaker, because we were endeavouring to co-operate with the government in speeding up the business of the House. The amendments put the word "waste" back into the bill in order to keep it in tune with and subservient to the Canada Water Act. During the discussions in committee we pointed out that the word "waste" was inadequate. We suggested that the word "pollutant" be used because the government obviously did not like the words "deleterious substance" which were in the original bill. It was subsequently suggested by a government supporter that the words "injurious substance" would be better than the words "pollutant" or "waste."

We then went one step further. We went full circle in playing our game of ring-around-the-rose; we went right back to the words "deleterious substance." In other words, we are back to the words used in the original bill, namely, "deleterious substance" words which have stood the test of time for over 100 years. We said in committee that these words should be retained, with one exception—the use of the word "waste" in some of the amendments that have been approved by the House this afternoon. We have been sailing around in circles on this bill and its amendments. I repeat my original claim that it is unfortunate that the government has so fragmented and divided its pollution control authority. It will be most difficult, if not impossible, to enforce proper pollution control in this country. These are not my views alone, Mr. Speaker. I could give many examples. I will quote just one from the June 29 edition of *Time* magazine which reads as follows:

Says zoologist Donald Chant, the mentor of Toronto's Pollution Probe: "The public is at last aware of the dangers of pollution. What I am afraid of now is that they will become so appalled by reading one story after another that, in self-protection, they will turn themselves off."

Further on in the article we read these words:

Says Chant: "There was a very adequate bill passed in 1843 which prohibited putting anything in the waters of Canada that is harmful to fish. It would have done the job very well if we had chosen to make it effective."

That is the answer, Mr. Speaker. That bill was the Fisheries Act. We did not choose to enforce it; we did not choose to make it effective. As a result, our rivers and lakes have become polluted. We do not have to look too far to see this; all we have to do is look out of our window and see what has happened to the Ottawa River because we did not have the intestinal fortitude to enforce the Fisheries Act in its entirety.

I noted with interest the minister's stand as indicated in a letter to me about clause 2 of this bill and the repeal of section 31 of the act, which relates to the catching of fish outside Canadian fisheries' waters when the catching of such fish is prohibited inside our territorial seas. This matter has been resolved by the vote this afternoon as it relates to catching of offshore lobsters. What has not been spelled out is the effect of some of the amendments in the bill as they relate to other types of fishing. For example, on page 9, clause 6 of the bill, we note that subsection 2 of section 55 of the Fisheries Act is repealed, together with subsections 3 and 3a of section 55. The clause provides that the following be substituted therefor:

No such vessel shall carry on fishing operations from or to any Canadian port or ports, unless it restricts its fishing operations to waters that are at least 12 miles distant from the nearest shore on the Atlantic coast of Canada; the proof that such fishing operations are so restricted at all times lies on the captain of the vessel; but this subsection does not apply to small draggers operated by in-shore fishermen if exempted from the provisions of this subsection by special permit, which the minister is hereby authorized to issue for that purpose.

We may ask, "What is wrong with that regulation?" Nothing would be wrong with it if we had a party in power which did not believe it was ordained by the Almighty to rule. Nothing would be wrong with it if we had a Minister of Fisheries and Forestry who consulted with the fishing industry before making major changes. Quite frankly, this section gives the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry almost dictatorial powers over the fishermen on the Atlantic coast—or perhaps I should say dictatorial powers over our Canadian fishermen. Under these powers the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry can make uni-