

Fisheries Improvement Loans Act

important industry which is practically nationwide.

● (2:50 p.m.)

The fishermen of Newfoundland are just as anxious to take advantage of this federal legislation as the fishermen of British Columbia. Could the trouble be with the approved lenders? If that is the case why doesn't the department talk to approved lenders and encourage them to make loans to fishermen? Whatever the trouble, Mr. Speaker, the legislation in its present form is of no use to us.

On second reading the minister said that perhaps the reason this legislation was not being used was because fishermen in Newfoundland were taking advantage of provincial legislation. The best advice I can get is that the provincial legislation is of no particular value right now because no loans are being made under it.

I am sorry to see the Minister of Defence Production (Mr. Jamieson) has left the chamber. I had hoped that he would take part in this debate instead of being content just to speak to the Liberal party in Newfoundland. I hope he will have something meaningful to say about this bill before the debate ends.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with a portion of the minister's statement on third reading. It is to be found at page 5353 of *Hansard*. It is a most extraordinary statement, and many of us are baffled as to why it had to be made in the first place. I quote briefly from it:

This proposed amendment was incorporated in a notice which I sent to the Clerk of the House on February 5, 1969. I also commended it to the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry during the course of its deliberations on Thursday, February 6, as many hon. members present know. The notice I sent to the Clerk of the House of Commons was to the effect that after Bill C-151 had been reported back to this house I would propose under Standing Order 75 the following motion—

Then he went on to read his amendment. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that his amendment went to the Clerk of the House on February 5. It is also interesting to note that the minister said he commended the amendment to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry on Thursday, February 6. Yet five or six days prior to that the minister, referring to Bill C-151 in a speech to the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union

[Mr. McGrath.]

in Vancouver, on February 1, said, and I think this is worth putting in *Hansard*:

You can borrow up to \$25,000 from any bank, or credit union, or insurance company. And you will be able to borrow this money at a lower rate of interest—

A little earlier on he said:

This act, which has recently been up-dated, is geared to finance loans of up to \$25,000.

He did not say that this was proposed, or that it was planned. He said, "is geared to finance loans of up to \$25,000." Yet when he spoke there was no amendment before the house.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I believe the document to which the hon. member is referring is prefaced with the statement "notes for an address" to be given at the annual meeting of the United Fishermen and Allied Workers' Union in Vancouver. These were notes, and I actually used terms which were appropriate to the circumstances. I said the legislation was under consideration. Certainly the fishermen there were very well aware of it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether this is a question of privilege. In any event the hon. member who has the floor should be allowed to continue his speech.

Mr. McGrath: All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this is the speech which was circulated by the minister's office with the minister's approval after he made the speech, and if he had any corrections to make to it he could have called it in or sent the corrections out. To the best of my knowledge no such corrections were made and consequently we must accept this document as an accurate report of what he said in his speech.

I point out that the minister commended the amendment to the standing committee on Thursday, February 6, six days after he made his speech in Vancouver, six days after he referred to the amendment, and six days after he referred to it in such a way as to indicate that this bill had already been passed. I point out to the minister that the bill is still before this house, that it is not yet legislation, that it is not yet law nor will it be until it has received third reading in this house, until it has passed all stages in the other place and receives Royal Assent.

Notwithstanding the fact that the government has a majority in this house I submit