

*Salt Fish Board*

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): I think the matter was considered by his honour the Speaker at the time, and the amendment was declared valid. I must admit that the matter has not been considered by the Department of Justice. In view of the remarks of my hon. friend I shall see to it that we have a definite ruling on a matter which is of considerable importance.

## UNITED STATES WHEAT SUBSIDY

REPORTED FIXING OF ADVANCE ON 1939 CROP AT  
87 CENTS MINNEAPOLIS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. H. BLACKMORE (Lethbridge): I should like to direct a question to the minister who is acting for the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Has the minister any information tending to prove or disprove the persistent rumour that the United States have set the first advance on the 1939 wheat crop at 87 cents a bushel, basis Minneapolis?

Right Hon. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Minister of Justice): There is no information. I do not think the Minister of Trade and Commerce has any.

## SALT FISH BOARD

## CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

Hon. J. L. ILSLEY (Minister of National Revenue) moved the second reading of and concurrence in amendments made by the Senate to Bill No. 130, to provide for the constitution of a salt fish board.

He said: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Michaud) has asked me to make a brief statement in reference to these amendments. The first amendment is a preamble. There is no objection to this preamble. It is intended, I think, to make it clearer that the objects of the bill are as stated by the Minister of Fisheries in the House of Commons and also by him again before the banking and commerce committee of the Senate. It is acceptable.

Mr. CAHAN: Is the preamble short?

Mr. ILSLEY: It is short, three paragraphs.

Mr. CAHAN: The bill has not been printed. Perhaps the minister would read the preamble.

Mr. ILSLEY: The preamble reads:

Whereas various causes of as well foreign as domestic origin have produced within the eastern provinces of Canada, with relation to fishermen, meaning fishermen producers, an emergent condition whereunder such fishermen are unable to obtain for fish intended for export prices sufficient to enable them to continue production of fish for such purpose;

[Mr. Stevens.]

And whereas the trade and commerce of Canada is, by reason of the premises, prejudiced and impaired;

Therefore, to the end that such fishermen may secure for their fish prices sufficient to enable continuance of production.

The next amendment provides that after the words "the chairman" the words "who shall be an officer of the Department of Fisheries" shall be inserted. There is no objection to his being an officer of the Department of Fisheries; indeed the minister stated in the debate in this house that the board would really be a branch or arm of the Department of Fisheries.

The next amendment provides that:

The other two members shall be appointed as representatives of the fishermen producers, whether cooperative or otherwise.

There is no objection to this. There never was.

The next amendment is that the word "produce" be changed to "producer." That was a clerical error and has been corrected.

Mr. STEVENS: Which amendment was ordered in this house.

Mr. ILSLEY: Yes, I believe so. The next amendment is to section 6, to insert at the beginning of paragraph (a) the words:

on such terms and conditions as may be deemed necessary to ensure that such assistance reaches the fishermen producers.

This amendment again is in accordance with the intentions in regard to the administration of the bill as expressed by the minister and by myself here. The only question that arises under this amendment is whether it introduces into the measure an element of rigidity of administration which will make it difficult or impossible on exceptional occasions to obtain or retain some foreign markets. But on consideration it is not certain that will be the effect, and the government have decided to accept this amendment on the understanding that if any difficulties of administration do arise the difficulty will have to be met by an amendment in due course at some future session.

The next amendment is to take section 9 out of the bill. It was probably an unnecessary section; personally I think it added nothing to the bill, and nothing is lost by taking it out. The other amendment is merely clerical, renumbering sections 10, 11 and 12 as 9, 10 and 11, so that all the amendments are acceptable.

Hon. H. H. STEVENS (Kootenay East): I merely desire to say that this is an excellent illustration of the value of having legislation from this house pass through another sphere before becoming law. Personally I believe