

*Canadian Saltfish Corporation*

word about the amendment. I have had a chance to reflect on it in more detail and wish to introduce a caveat at this stage. It seems to me, that the amendment goes beyond the scope of the amending bill. Since the amendment has been put to the House, however, I think all hon. members will probably agree that the House ought to decide on it. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. McGrath: On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The amendment is negated on division.

Amendment (Mr. Crouse) negated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is now on the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. McGrath: On division.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

**CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION****PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT—REGULATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL AND EXPORT TRADE**

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-175, to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and regulate interprovincial and export trade in saltfish, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-175, to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and regulate interprovincial and export trade in saltfish, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Davis moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, on the third reading of Bill C-175 the Official Opposition is following the same course it pursued on second reading, which was to declare our approval of the principle of the bill. Although in favour of the principle, we expressed doubts on second reading about certain aspects of the legislation. These doubts were confirmed when the committee

heard witnesses and received briefs on the bill from industry representatives, and when the minister appeared before the committee to explain the purpose of the bill and answer questions on its administration.

One concern ran like a thread through the evidence of witnesses and briefs alike. It was a concern that I expressed at second reading. That concern is the complete absence from the bill of any safeguards to soften the impact upon the fishermen and small processors who may be sacrificed for the sake of efficiency. However, all witnesses before the committee indicated their approval of the principle of this bill and no one in the saltfish industry denied the need for it.

There are, however, two ways of looking at this bill. The administration sees only efficiencies to be brought about by the application of the bill, but those who have lived in close proximity to the saltfish industry see the price that some of the fishermen and small plant processors will pay. In my view, unless this bill is administered in terms less cold than "necessary dislocation", "centralization", "redundancy" and similar bloodless but efficient words, that price will be high indeed.

There are still some questions unanswered in the bill. The most important of these is the question asked by the small plant owner who will, depending upon the manner in which the corporation operates, remain in business or become redundant. The bill spells out no responsibility on the part of the corporation to operate with less than the inhuman efficiency of a computer that has neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. The bill spells out no specific financial liability on the part of the federal government or provincial governments to assist the small plant owner who may be driven out of business if the corporation operates in a ruthlessly efficient way.

● (5:20 p.m.)

The minister was asked in committee about the procedure to be followed by the corporation when letting out its processing business. He replied that the corporation would call tenders for the processing of all salt codfish. It was explained that this course would be followed in order to bring about the maximum efficiency and returns for the fishermen. I have no argument with this reasoning, Mr. Speaker, but the course to be followed by the corporation does raise certain questions. For example, what becomes of the small plant owner and his employees who can get none of