

Government Organization Act, 1970

sively on fishing. I suggest there must be a clear indication that members of all parties can effectively vote for our amendment which is an effort to get some status for the fishing industry of Canada.

The Chairman: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Harding: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say a word or two on the remarks of the parliamentary secretary.

The Chairman: Order. I recognize the hon. member and, of course, am anxious for him to speak to the procedural point if he wishes to do so.

Mr. Harding: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was going to speak to that. It seems to me when amendments are moved to bills by individual members they are moved with the feeling that they will improve legislation. I see absolutely no reason any amendment would be rejected merely for the reasons given by the parliamentary secretary. The amendment was before this House yesterday. We might well have voted on it yesterday or last evening before the estimates were tabled. I want to say that if this is the reason for turning down this amendment, it is one of the most silly reasons I have ever heard from the government side of the House. I wish to suggest that if there is a basic reason that the name should be changed, this Parliament should not hesitate to make that change, regardless of the estimates having been tabled today.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Chairman, I rise briefly to speak on the point of order raised by my colleague the hon. member for St. John's East. It is quite evident now, after a cursory study of the estimates tabled today, that the department of fisheries has been swallowed up and is losing its identity. We who come from Atlantic Canada have presented our views during this debate on the government reorganization bill and have been critical of this aspect of it. We now realize that our worst fears have been confirmed. We now realize the government, by its action, has literally ignored Parliament because it has assumed, rightly or wrongly, that this bill would be passed without any amendment, even though there is an amendment before the Committee at the present time which would radically change it.

Mr. Davis: It would only change the name.

Mr. Crouse: As the minister of fisheries has stated, it would only change the name. I have paraphrased it correctly. When the minister says it would only change the name, this is an indication of how little importance he attaches to the name, fisheries and forestry of Canada. When one says it would only change the name, this implies that the fishing industry is only a secondary industry and of no importance. This is the very gut issue we have been debating in this House. This is the very thing we, as members from Atlantic Canada, have feared since we first saw the government reorganization bill. I really do not know what members opposite can do to bring some sense to the present government. We really are asking only that the name be changed to the department of fisheries and the environment in order to give

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

recognition to this primary industry which has been recognized by the statutes of Canada since confederation. By abolishing the title department of fisheries, and by not giving the name recognition, I have said before and say again that we lose all the advertising value that would accrue to this industry if the department carried the name fisheries and environment.

Mr. Hogarth: What about forestry?

Mr. Crouse: All right. That is a very good point. I am glad to hear from one of the members sitting over there. Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I had thought that crowd had died. If the hon. member feels that way, he should move an amendment and we will support it. These members of the Liberal party—

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Crouse: I have the floor, if you will allow me to finish.

The Chairman: Order. With respect I think the hon. member may be dealing with the substance of the argument more than with the point of order. Of course, I will recognize him again but I would hope that after we have dealt with the procedural point of order, the Chair could rule and then we could continue with the arguments.

Mr. Crouse: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was answering an interruption by the hon. member for New Westminster. That is one of the fishing constituencies of British Columbia. I really believe he should express his concern on this matter rather than interrupt hon. members who are honestly trying to bring reason and order out of the chaos which has been created by the wording of this bill. I appreciate his interruption and I am willing, as I am sure my party is, to endorse the amendment which he proposed, that we should include forestry in the title of the department.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Hogarth: What about forestry?

Mr. Crouse: The hon. member says, what about forestry. If he moved an amendment that the title of the department should be fisheries, environment and forestry, or environment, fisheries and forestry, we on this side would support it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hogarth: What about the wildlife service?

An hon. Member: And what about renewable resources?

Mr. Crouse: We have had departments with lengthy titles before. We have the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and we have had departments set up in order to gratify the ambitions of one or more ministers of this government. If the hon. member wants to make it the department of environment, fisheries, forestry and renewable resources, I will say to him that we have tolerated everything else and we will tolerate that. So, I suggest to the hon. member that he go back to his own