

I will leave the fate of this amendment in the hands of the committee. However, I will then feel bound to warn the committee that we must be very careful not to cause prejudice to the position of the board in any of the possible future cases that might arise, where the only worthwhile recourse of the board for damages caused to its property would be by seizure of the vessel, because in some instances it might happen that the agent has no physical assets and then any recourse against him would be futile.

Mr. WINCH: The reason I asked that is to find out—and I think it is a matter of procedure, sir, which would help us—in view of the statement that the department cannot consider any change in clause 1 and in view of the fact they have a recommendation concerning clause 8, is it possible or permissible that we have some indication of what the change will be in clause 8?

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Perhaps we would be anticipating the discussion on clause 8, but I have no objection and I am in the hands of the committee.

Mr. GREEN: I think it is a little premature for the parliamentary assistant to say that no matter what the committee might wish the department will not change—

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): I did not say that. On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I said that we would have to object to any amendments along the lines suggested this afternoon to clause 1 and that is a statement of policy of the department.

Mr. GREEN: We are an independent committee of the House, and we are not in a position to be given an ultimatum of that kind.

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspe*): Mr. Chairman, I must object to that on a point of order. The honourable member is putting words into my mouth which I have never spoken. As I said, as a representative of the minister and as a member of this committee, all what I have said is that I would have to oppose any amendment to clause 1 along the lines suggested this afternoon leaving the final decision to the committee. I am entitled to say that.

Mr. GREEN: I do not think you are. This is the first time I have ever heard a minister, let alone a parliamentary assistant, come into a committee and before we are finished hearing the representations for considering a revision, we are told that the department is not willing to change and I am quite sure that the Honourable Mr. Chevrier would not take that position because—

Mr. LANGLOIS (*Gaspé*): I never said anything of the kind—

Mr. GREEN: —we are here to study this bill which went through the House with practically no discussion on the understanding it would be given adequate study in this committee. It is not a political matter at all. There are no politics in it for anybody, but believe me, for some of the ports in Canada it is a mighty vital bill and I know this bill is extremely important to my own port of Vancouver, and we are far more concerned about retaining the shipping business there than we are about giving the National Harbours Board extra powers. I presume every one of the national ports will be in that position. It is the business that goes through the port that is important and not the giving to the board of a club to handle the people who are doing the business which goes through the ports. I would like to ask Mr. Finlay, in the first place, how much the National Harbours Board has lost by reason of failure to recover for damages done to its property by vessels?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Could you answer that, Mr. Finlay?

Mr. FINLAY: The answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is—

Mr. CAMPBELL: Please speak a little louder.