

*Supply*

come to Ottawa to get the adequate attention of their Member of Parliament. But this is it.

Now on the eve of the arrival of this large delegation the opposition Party has decided to bring the topic here before the House of Commons on a Friday afternoon when most Members of Parliament have to travel back to their constituencies. It gives you an idea, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of that issue to members of the opposition Party. It takes a visit to Ottawa of a very important delegation from the west to move on that topic. It takes that important event to start asking for appointments with my office, and what they choose is Friday afternoon which, as everybody knows, is not the most suitable time to attract the attention of the House.

**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):** The Government selected Friday afternoon.

**Mr. Huntington:** Speak to the Member who sits next to you.

**Mr. De Bané:** It shows you the hypocrisy. When I hear their carping, I know I am hitting the right button, Mr. Speaker.

The Opposition wants to pretend it is doing its job in opposition. This pretence is to ride on the back of the serious problems of the Pacific fishery. The ambition for power has become such an obsession that the pretence of doing a job in opposition has simply become a corollary to the pretence that it will bring forth a coherent policy, about which it will only tell the people after it is elected, if it is elected.

At the outset of this debate, let us clearly understand what it is about and what is its purpose. A delegation is coming to Ottawa next week and the Tories want to pretend they are concerned with people when they are really only concerned with power. Today we are engaging in Tory-style smoke and mirrors grandstanding.

I am well aware of the statement made by the Hon. Member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie). He said: "We will not tell the Canadian electorate our policies because we know that if we tell them we will never be elected". That is becoming clearer and clearer during this debate. We are aware of the spurious planning of this charade between Mr. Fraser and Mr. Hicks and their final meeting with their leader yesterday on this strategy. Now we all know what it is about. I hope the people of Canada, and especially those in B.C., are watching closely and seeing the kind of alternative they will be offered in the next election.

This leads me to the next point. While this spurious planning was being undertaken, the Opposition knew very well that an important meeting was scheduled to begin today in Vancouver with the Minister's Advisory Council. This meeting is being attended by my senior staff and officials and is one which I would have liked to attend, but I must be here in readiness for crass shams and behind the curtain tactics of a desperate Opposition.

**Mr. Huntington:** Who wrote this for you, Keith Davey?

**Mr. De Bané:** Nevertheless, I shall retain the dignity of the Government and simultaneously shame and grace this disgraceful opportunism by raising the real issues. I will ask that Opposition to state its position on the issues. I will ask Members opposite to tell us what they believe should be done on these very important issues. I will be pleased to take those views into account, along with the final positions pronounced by his sector representatives on the Minister's Advisory Council, which I might add and repeat have not yet been made.

To begin with, in yesterday's motion to have this debate today, the Opposition reveals its ambition for power and its inclination to rule rather than govern when it condemns this Government for having accepted the request of the people who will be most affected by it.

On February 18, 1983, after consultation with the Minister's Advisory Council, I announced acceptance of 76 of the recommendations made in the report by Commissioner Peter Pearse and rejection of 12 others. At that time I also agreed to a request by the Minister's Advisory Council that final decisions on the key issues of fleet reductions, allocations to the Indians and sports fisheries, improved fishery management and consultative arrangements not be taken until the Minister's Advisory Council had had an opportunity to try to develop a consensus position on these matters and make its own recommendations.

It was agreed the MAC would report to me by November 30, 1983. Since then, MAC has requested that it continue to be involved in the process of developing appropriate measures in these areas and that there be continuing dialogue. I have respected that request and made certain that the Minister's Advisory Council has had the resources and the opportunity.

When the Opposition condemns this Government for not acting unilaterally before now, what it is doing is actually condemning the Government for respecting the wishes of the people it serves. By so doing, the Opposition condemns those same people for asking the Government not to act on those issues before now.

I am fully and painfully aware that the social and economic values inherent in the Pacific fishery represent more than mere numbers and statistics. They represent life styles, community well-being, cultural and family traditions, and I am profoundly sensitive to all of these. They also represent the purest kinds of environmental values, the conservation and husbandry of a living resource of great value and vital, social trust.

As painful and difficult as it may be, as Minister it is my duty to try carefully and conscientiously to find and implement a balance between the demands of the groups who depend on this resource and the biological capacity of this resource to meet those demands. That is the fundamental question which the Parliamentary Secretary had put and I think he is absolutely right. The first duty of the Minister of Fisheries and