fisherman who is going to borrow from the corporation an interest rate of nine or ten per cent or even higher, because those are the interest rates being paid today in Canada.

I have indicated, for example, that there is no mention here of any government assistance in an emergency situation. Also, there is no mention of fishermen. Having read this proposed legislation, I wonder if it is designed to set up a corporation or if it is designed to assist fishermen. There is an important difference. I have a feeling, for example, that the only important thing in this bill is the corporation, and that is just another way of providing a few jobs for a number of people who are not already earning $25,000 or $30,000 a year. This is the sort of thing with which I am not too happy.

As the hon. member from Prince Edward Island said today, there is no mention here of the actual fishermen involved. There is no advisory body to help the board to gain a knowledge of the industry, and thus aid in the decisions of this corporate body. There seems to be no indication of guaranteed prices and no guarantee that the fishermen will receive a return from their labour investment which is the procurement of fish. I see no indication here that the fishermen are the focal point of interest, and that is all I am concerned with. I do not give a darn about the corporation. The corporation is only a means to an end which is to benefit fishermen, and we are in favour of this. However, I see little evidence in this proposed legislation of interest in the man who is the prime reason for the existence of the corporation, namely the fisherman.

My last observation is about the confusion which seems to exist regarding jurisdiction over the Canadian fishing industry. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries will be happy to hear what I have to say on that subject, or at least my feelings on it. Early in the last session on a number of occasions I and a number of members of the house, even some members of the Liberal party, asked questions of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding the marketing of fish. On a number of occasions the minister made eyes at the Minister of Fisheries regarding the latter's position, and although he might have had a keen interest in the marketing of fish he did not seem to know too much about it, at least I did not receive much response. Several times the minister indicated he would answer my questions tomorrow but as yet I have not received any answers from the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding government action to stimulate the fishing trade in North America. Now, we have this bill before the house. Originally, I thought it would be presented to the house by the Minister of Fisheries, but then I found it was to be proposed by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

I am wondering now whose responsibility the marketing of fisheries products is. On inquiring I found that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is responsible for marketing fish outside Canada and the Minister of Fisheries is responsible for the marketing of them within Canada. There is ample evidence in the bill that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is responsible for the marketing of fish outside Canada as well as for interprovincial marketing. There seems to me to be a measure of confusion here. I would like to see the ministers responsible put their heads together and specify exactly who has the jurisdiction over the Canadian fishing industry. I would like to see the Minister of Fisheries have this responsibility, which I do not think he would shirk. We are talking about the same product and we are talking about it in Canada. This is not an export problem but rather an inter-provincial or an intra-Canadian problem. Consequently, I do not see any reason for the confusion which is evident here.

It is obvious that the Minister of Fisheries has a keen interest in this matter since he has been the only minister present in the house today since debate on the bill commenced. So, I would like to see the minister responsible give some consideration to this matter and seek to eliminate the confusion.

I could go on for quite some time making specific observations about a number of other sections of bill C-148 but I think other hon. members commented on most of the points to which I would have made reference. I would certainly like a reaction later on the viability of the Canadian fishing industry.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): As a member from western Canada and as a member from Saskatchewan I welcome the legislation that is now before the house. As a member from western Canada, I welcome it because I think it extends some hope to those people and to those communities having a vital stake in the future of the fishing industry. In western Canada there are many communities and many fishermen who have found themselves at the mercy of a small number of people who have controlled the buying of the fish