

*Committee Reports*

Darling), to name Members from all sides of the House, would have been totally in support of the Bill and would have encouraged immediate consideration of legislation rather than the adoption of these regulations behind the curtain of the secrecy of Orders in Council.

A regulation is the wrong vehicle for Government. Whether or not there is legal basis for it is in question and obviously the report carries contradictory legal statements as to whether or not the committee should in fact have made the report that it did with the finality of the type of comment it made.

There has been a discussion of secrecy in today's debate. I would like to point out to the Hon. Member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Baker) that he sat on the Fisheries Committee with me on many, many occasions since 1972. Among other requests that were made by the Fisheries Committee was a list of licensees in certain areas of the fishing community of eastern Canada. My motion was seconded by a Liberal Member, the then Hon. Member for South West Nova, I believe, but that information was never forthcoming and has not to this day been received. I am again making efforts to get it. I find that the bureaucratic rigmarole which exists is denying me that information to this day. So there are items in this structure which should not be confidential which, in fact, remain as confidential, to the detriment of the better Government of this nation.

● (1520)

To a degree, secrecy is imperative in Government. For instance, when we talked about the expropriation or creation of Crown corporations, such as de Havilland, there was no information available to the House of Commons about the terms and conditions under which that was taking place. There was no notice given to the Government of Canada, or to the people of Canada, that this would take place. It was not given the consideration which the sale seems to require by members of the Opposition. We have a total situation of inconsistency. There is a time and a place for items to be placed before the public. To request some of the information which the Government is declaring as excessively secret is just not in the best interests of Canada. It is pretty nearly time that the people of Canada recognized the false pretenses which are being put forward by the Opposition when they were the artists of secrecy and those who denied us information, even under the Access to Information Act, and under other sources through which Members of Parliament should have been privy to information.

I wish to discuss the regulations with which we are presently dealing. During the debate there were two former cabinet Ministers sitting in the House who also participated in the debate and whose names should appear as having attended cabinet meetings when these regulations were created. They were created for environmental purposes of national and international consequence. I am just not sure what the long-term effect of a greedy Opposition using this as a subject matter for discussion in this House at this point or at any point in time will be. This is a subject matter which could have been

discreetly and properly discussed by conscientious Members of Parliament with the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Mulroney), the Attorney General (Mr. Crosbie) and Solicitor General (Mr. Beatty), or with whatever source this should have been discussed. However, under any circumstances, this should not be the discussion of a debate, as it is presently taking place.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not serving Canada well. I hope the consequences which might flow from this do not, in fact, result. I hope that it may be so far back in the past that it is no longer consequential. However, this is an abuse of the education which they received when they were in Government as they are trying to stall. This is a weak excuse for the absorption of time at this or any other moment in the House of Commons. It serves Canada very poorly, as poorly as they are now held in the opinion of the 450 people who are out of work at Christmas for no valid reason.

For instance, the regulations were presented to the House and should have been enacted. As I said before, they were presented to Cabinet and passed by Cabinet in the best interests of 5,000 fishermen, fishplant workers and families who depend upon the fishing industry in that area for their livelihood, which was threatened if these regulations were not effected. They were made to protect a unique ecology of an area which favours more marine biological research. It is one of the areas in the Atlantic Ocean which is a source of information unlike any other within another 1,500 miles of that location—the Bay of Fundy. It has a proliferation of marine species which is just unheard of along most of the Atlantic Coast of North America. The Deer Island archipelago was designated as a natural area of Canadian significance. That is why those regulations were passed. It is one of the most important tourist areas in eastern Canada. Campobello on Campobello Island and the Roosevelt-Campobello International Park represent a bi-national memorial to the late U.S. President. The regulations dealt with the degree of navigation risks associated with the continuous year-round supply of crude oil and product distribution from the proposed refinery which was seen to pose a serious threat to the ecology of the region, not to mention anything about the livelihood of it.

This is what we are putting before Canada as an example of a regulation which was approved by a Cabinet in which two former cabinet Ministers were members and who are still present in the House, one of whom was the Solicitor General and who should know better. He is the proponent of this debate. I have no objection to bringing important matters of Canadian Government before the House and debating them publicly. However, I do object to bringing any subject matter before the House which may be of major detriment to Canada in the long run. That is precisely what those graduates of delay are using as a subject matter for further delay in the House and for which they should be condemned publicly and privately.

There are Hon. Members who have spoken in this debate, such as the Hon. Member for Glengarry-Prescott-Russell (Mr.