

Freshwater Fish Marketing Report

hon. member asked me specifically about the purpose. Here is what is set out:

The Corporation is established for the purpose of marketing and trading—

“Marketing and trading” are the words used there.

—in fish, fish products and fish by-products in and out of Canada—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would invite the hon. member to return to the specific issue before us at the moment which is the amendment.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the hon. member who has just spoken does not know, but I believe most people in this house know the purpose of the bill. Perhaps this is the reason he has made an error in his attitude toward the bill. He does not understand the purpose and therefore does not understand who should be on the board.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Again I would remind the hon. member that we have before us a specific amendment. I would invite him to restrict his remarks to that amendment.

Mr. Lundrigan: May I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker? I suggest it might be in order to allow the hon. member to continue because what he is saying points up the arrogant attitude some people have toward this measure.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for being the cause of your displeasure. I recommend to every member of the house that he read the purpose and powers which are set out on page 4. The amendment would completely tie the hands of the Minister of Fisheries in respect of appointments. If, for instance, each province decided to appoint someone to this board from the fishing industry it would then be impossible for the federal government to appoint marketing experts to the board. One can see the problem with which the minister would be faced if he did not have control over the appointments. If the provinces decided to appoint experts in fishing as opposed to experts in fish marketing, it would then fall upon the federal Minister of Fisheries to rectify the composition of the board in order to restore the balance and make sure that experts in the field of marketing were appointed to the board.

I could go into this matter at length but I believe the point is relatively simple. It destroys the arguments in respect of the need for

[Mr. Anderson.]

the amendment. I shall therefore sit down, but before doing so I would urge all members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, may I say that last week the fisheries committee met for a total of five hours. Report No. 11 contains the evidence taken at that committee. A number of hon. members were on that committee, not including the hon. gentleman who just spoke. We deliberated for five hours before that committee the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. If the hon. member does have a point of privilege, possibly he would get to it quickly.

Mr. Lundrigan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is necessary that I point out the background in order to establish the point of privilege. The hon. member said that I do not understand the purpose of the legislation. We spent five hours before the committee on that matter and the hon. member was not even present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I recognize the hon. member for Lambton-Kent (Mr. McCutcheon).

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. I was not present at the meeting of the committee on that day because I had been taken off in view of the fact that I was in my riding on the west coast. I did, however, take the opportunity to look at the evidence taken before the committee.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It might be in the interests of our deliberations on this bill if we heard the hon. member for Lambton-Kent.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure my contribution will be that great but I appreciate the introduction. I am a little concerned about one matter. Is this a social measure or is the corporation to be a true marketing board? If it is the latter, then I feel that this amendment certainly should be welcomed by hon. members. Just because a person happens to be a fisherman, I see no reason that he should be precluded from being a member of this corporation. Indeed, I think some members from the trade definitely should be on this body. My point is that the general statement of the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) that there will be fishermen on this corporation would not mean anything in a court of