

*Freshwater Fish Marketing Report*

213 of report No. 11 of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry the minister said:

To designate certain persons as representing a certain interest is apt to produce the wrong atmosphere and attitude on the board.

In his commentary the minister stated he was in favour of having fishermen on the board.

**Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt):** Will the hon. member permit a question? The hon. member has referred to the minister's statement. Would he indicate whether he was talking about the board as such referred to in clause 7 of Bill C-148 or whether he was referring to the advisory board?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. B  chard):** I have to get this in order. The subamendment should be put first. It is moved by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich, seconded by the hon. member for York-Simcoe, that the amendment be amended by inserting therein, after the word "be", the following words: "persons or representatives of persons".

**Mr. Lundrigan:** I am prepared to refrain from commenting until we vote on the subamendment. It is my understanding that we can debate the amendment.

**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** The motion as amended.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** The minister posed a question, Mr. Speaker. The minister asked to which board I was referring, the advisory board or the corporate body. I will clarify this for him. The comments I have been making are in relation to the minister's statement on the advisory board. It is my understanding this is what the amendment is about. We would like the minister to write into the proposed legislation that fishermen will be represented on the board. This would give a guarantee to the fishermen of Canada that they are worthy of political involvement in this great participatory democracy at this point in time. The minister said, "You have my word this will be done." Later I felt the minister did not really mean that. I quote again from the minister's remarks at page 213 of report No. 11:

To designate certain persons as representing a certain interest is apt to produce the wrong atmosphere and attitude on the board. I would not really want to see six people coming there and saying: "I am the fishermen's representative and those guys are for someone else." I think that is the wrong approach. The men who are on the board are to advise the industry as a whole,

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

not to be representative of a particular interest, but to have a background that makes some good representatives on the advisory committee. I think that is a matter of general issue.

At one time the minister indicated these people should be on the board and at another time that it would be wrong. I am happy that the minister and the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich have realized these people are necessary on the board, that they do have expertise in their own right, are aware of problems involved in the fishing industry and are capable of advising the academics who make political decisions which are now costing \$13.6 million as shown in the estimates.

I think there will be more confidence in the corporation which may have an effect on prices in the fishing industry. I feel greater benefits will accrue to the people doing the greatest amount of work to produce the primary product. I am certain hon. members will support this amendment, which was defeated in committee and about which some hon. members were annoyed. Apparently the same amendment is now being accepted by these hon. members. Those who made disparaging remarks about the fishermen of Canada should now go on record and say they misunderstood. I am not going to speak any longer. I would just like to say I am happy hon. members have seen the light.

**Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio):** I am not really surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) is not familiar with the attitude of the committee which discussed this bill clause by clause. Because of the atmosphere after the first couple of hours the hon. member walked out in high dudgeon.

• (2:40 p.m.)

He referred to a general principle which I still think to be a good and general point of wisdom. However, it is perhaps not the most important one and indeed he might have noted it was the last point of several to be made in connection with the earlier debate. Several of the earlier points showed up as changes in the form of the amendment which was proposed to the house on the order paper. The difficulty with any amendment of this form frequently lies in choosing words which will not in fact create technical difficulties. I think the words which have now been proposed by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson) are satisfactory in this regard and this, with the other changes which were made by the hon. member for South Shore before placing his amendment on