

*Freshwater Fish Marketing Report*

law. If he has in the back of his mind that there should be fisherfolk appointed to the corporation, then I see no reason that he should object to the addition of a couple of practical fishermen at least.

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak very briefly on the amendment being proposed at this time. I have no hesitation in supporting the amendment 100 per cent. For many years I have said that we have too many governmental agencies on which there are no practical people. As time goes on the gap becomes wider and wider. I believe the amendment is quite in order and should be supported by members on both sides of the house because it tries to spell out the idea that we must have practical people on this body.

It has been suggested that the fishermen are capable of catching the fish but cannot be of assistance in marketing it. I am sure the hon. member who made that statement should realize, if he does not, that in every industry there are practical people who actually are doing the work in that industry. These people make themselves aware of the problems affecting their industry. I am sure the same holds true in the fishing industry as in the building industry, the transportation industry or anything else. There are some very excellent people in this industry who have as much expert knowledge in the field of marketing as any university graduate. I respectfully suggest that in this case many individuals could be named, I am sure, by members from the Atlantic provinces, who could do an excellent job in marketing.

● (12:40 p.m.)

It is not in keeping with what we know to be the facts in this country for any member to suggest that the government must have absolute authority in the making of these appointments. The minister has suggested that this amendment might limit his choice of individuals. The bill spells out very clearly how many people will be on the board of directors. I am sure there is ample scope to choose some members from among people who are experts in fishing. The four additional members, as the amendment suggests, should be actively engaged in the freshwater fishing industry as fishermen. This does not necessarily mean individuals who go out with nets and lines, but it does mean that they must be actively engaged in the industry at the time of appointment, doing exactly those things which give them knowledge of the industry with which they are concerned.

29180—334½

I suggest that the amendment does not attach strings to this part of the bill as the minister suggests. It spells out that there must be people on the board with practical knowledge of the industry. I do not suggest for one minute that the university graduates who invariably end up in these positions are not qualified. However, on a number of occasions in the agricultural industry we have experienced the appointment of people to particular positions who were not qualified in a practical way and could not keep track of what was taking place in the industry at a particular time.

The proposed clause 3 indicates that these individuals shall be appointed for a period not exceeding five years. This makes it very clear that the people appointed by the Governor in Council are not permanent. If they are not doing their jobs they can be removed, and I suggest that if they do not do the job they should be removed. Very often people are appointed to commissions and boards who are unable to represent the industry they are appointed to represent. Very often they continue in their positions, for reasons with which we are all familiar. I urge members on both sides of the house to accept this amendment which will not undermine in any way the authority of the minister in charge of this department.

**Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East):** Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to understand why the government cannot accept this amendment, particularly in view of the fact the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis), during meetings of the committee that studied this bill, gave assurance that the fishermen would be represented on the board. What happens when the minister leaves his present portfolio? Perhaps he might be moved to a portfolio more suited to his talents. We may have a new minister of fisheries who would not have the same regard for the representation of fishermen on the board. In view of the minister's attitude it is difficult to understand why the government refuses to accept this reasonable amendment which merely ensures that people who are actively engaged in the industry will have some say and influence as to how the fruits of their labour will be marketed.

The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) referred to the fact that fishermen were successful at catching fish, in fact, too successful because this board had to be created. He implied that all fishermen are good for is catching fish. I suggest to the hon. member that this is an outmoded concept.