

Supply

ourselves and give resources to those areas of management where things are being done very well.

Mr. Tobin: This is your motion.

Mr. Huntington: If there had not been a motion put forward by this Party, Mr. Speaker, there would have been no opportunity to bring some of these things to the floor. All of the key reports that the Government has hired and paid for have never been allowed into the committees of the House. That is the problem. The Hon. Member complains about the motion coming forward on a Friday. All the Opposition has to do is to wait for the Government House Leader to indicate which day is going to be an Opposition Day. We then decide upon what the subject matter will be. Forgive us if we have to look after our political hides, as you do. We then select a subject matter which is timely for the day and the hour, and we give notice of it by the proper time, otherwise we do not get the debate or the motion. So that is a red herring if I ever heard one.

The point I would really like to make in the minute or two I have left is that I think Canada has come to a point in time when we have to realize that the Government, like the people, has become soft through affluence. It is time to start tightening up a little bit instead of shovelling money at everything. It is time for managers within the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to get back out into the field and start working. It is time to deliver some of the youth opportunity programs to the international salmon commission so that they can clean out gravel beds that have silted in. It is time to start clearing streams. I have seen university students with donkey equipment clearing streams that are jammed because of logging. Right in the middle of clearing a jam they get a call to come back in because the commission is out of money. That is the tragic thing that is going on. There are fishermen tied up at docks when there is closure. With a good species and conservation management, there is no reason why they cannot be taken out on work programs into the streams and gravel beds which are so important for the fish that are returning to those particular areas.

The one other thing that we need more than anything, on the West Coast at least, is an emphasis on quality. That is, we need harvest equipment. If we are reflecting ourselves, and recapitalizing ourselves, we need to have technology that allows us to harvest the fish, clean and bleed the fish immediately on harvest so that we have the best quality product in the world. High quality fish products sell at demand prices all over the world. It is when we try to get away with less than good quality and try to can fish that come closer to the spawning grounds that we begin to get into serious trouble.

● (1640)

As well, one of the reasons why our fish packing industry in British Columbia is in so much trouble is the botulism scare that was caused by an Alaska cannery. We are peanuts compared to the Alaska harvest and Alaska Fishery, but the overflow of the botulism scare from Europe found in an American

packer's cans caused great problems and heartaches to canners on the West Coast.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault): Questions, comments and answers? Debate.

Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak on the fisheries crisis that exists in British Columbia today. It has been building for a number of years.

As I listened to the debate which took place this afternoon, it became obvious that the basic question we face is whether or not we can protect both the fisheries resource and the fishing industry. It is very obvious that we cannot save the industry without the resource; that is taken for granted.

It is important that we recognize just how crucial that industry is to British Columbia in terms of individual jobs, a way of life that is traditional for many people in British Columbia, and in terms of the economic foundation of many communities up and down the B.C. coast. Our Party believes that we can indeed save the industry along with the resource but not with the present policy.

The industry will not be saved by a policy of neglect or sell-out. It will not be saved by Orders in Council or regulations that are drafted without full and open consultation with the people who are involved in the industry and with Members of Parliament from both sides of the House. This industry will not be saved without a massive allocation of funds. British Columbia needs the kind of funding that we have seen allocated to the fishing industry on the East Coast.

The first step is to take a positive approach to our fishery, instead of simply trying to save the resource by squeezing fishermen out through a combination of government policies, high interest rates and high fuel costs. First, we need a policy of habitat protection. This must be a priority. Existing legislation must be enforced while scrapping the nonsense and phoney "no net loss" policy that the Minister has been talking about during the last few weeks and months.

In effect, the so called "no net loss" policy is simply a means of legitimizing the destruction of fish habitat. Let me raise a hypothetical situation, which is not so hypothetical when one considers that Alcan is going ahead with its application for Kemano II. How would the "no net loss" policy apply to such a massive project that will affect the entire northwest of our Province? How can there be a "no net loss" policy when the fisheries would be impacted so directly and massively by a megaproject such as Kemano II?

Let me refer to another case, which is on a smaller scale but equally important because it is repeated over and over again throughout the Province. It involves the Cowichan estuary in my own riding. When members of the Cowichan Estuary Preservation Society raised questions about what was happening in the area, the Minister responded by talking about the "no net loss" policy. On December 20, 1983, as reported at page 358 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister: