

to visit it a number of time. I even worked there for a short time one summer way back.

It has been interesting to have the comments of the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Siddon) made back in 1980 read into the record. Not only was that interesting but I do not know what the Hon. Member for York South—Weston was doing when he was admonishing him about being inconsistent. I am thankful that the Minister has changed his view and that he is not as stupid as he was in 1980. I am thankful that finally he seems to have grown a brain cell or two when it comes to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. The fact that the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) is still on the same level as the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans was in 1980 is something to be regretted. I hope that the difference between what the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans said in 1980 and what he says now is not hypocrisy but a sign of some development, education, a coming to appreciate reality. I hope that is the case.

Might I also say that it makes me nervous that we can still have Conservative back-benchers moving these kinds of Private Members' Bills. It makes me nervous because we are in the middle of a larger debate in this country right now which will start tomorrow concerning the free trade agreement.

A contentious issue in the free trade agreement has been the role of marketing boards and orderly marketing. It makes me nervous, and it should make all Canadians nervous who are attached to the principle and value of orderly marketing, whether it be the orderly marketing of grains through the Canadian Wheat Board or the orderly marketing of fish through the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, that the Government, which assures them that the role of marketing boards is not at risk as the result of this free trade agreement, is a government that has in its caucus people like the Hon. Member for Western Arctic and the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. In 1980 he said that the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board was an example of communism. That is part of the problem with the context in which reassurances are given by the Government with respect to how much it wants to protect orderly marketing in the free trade agreement.

• (1740)

We know that within the Conservative Party, there are long-standing enemies of orderly marketing. There are people over there who have always despised orderly marketing. Yet these are the people from whom we are supposed to accept reassurances that they have gone out of their way and done everything possible to protect orderly marketing in the free trade agreement.

We know full well that, at least on the public record, Members like the Hon. Member for Western Arctic are still trying to kill the principle of orderly marketing. There are many others who are perhaps not as—I do not know exactly what quality to ascribe to the Hon. Member for Western Arctic, but I will be polite and say, people who are not as

Freshwater Fish Marketing Act

persistent and up front about their beliefs but nevertheless are looking for every opportunity that presents itself to erode one of the fundamentals of the Canadian economy, the principle of orderly marketing.

Enough said about that. We hope that we can dismiss this Bill this afternoon and move on to more important things in the hope that, after the next election, there will be a new Member of Parliament from Western Arctic who will have a much different attitude toward orderly marketing.

Mr. Dave Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in this debate in support of my colleagues who are in opposition to the private Member's Bill put forward by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson). In entering this debate, I must underline what appears to be a very serious break within the Tory caucus in regard to this particular Private Member's Bill.

We have heard from a member of the Government in support of this agency and we have heard from Members on this side, but I find that the divisions across the way are very telling indeed. I heard my colleague from Newfoundland talk about some of the aspects of this agency. I heard my colleague from the New Democratic Party being very eloquent in support of change, talking about the substance of this particular Private Member's Motion, something that is quite unusual for him. I must underline that the divisions across the way, as telling as they are, leave many Members on all sides of the House with a very fishy taste when it comes to the intent of the motion.

In essence, the intent of the motion is to gut an agency which I believe has served Canadians rather well. There is no question that there could be improvements made to it. Opportunities for improvements are important to any piece of legislation passed by Parliament, but to suggest that gutting the effectiveness of this agency will in some way improve the situation is, I think, not in order at all.

On that note, I must say that I would be in opposition to the Hon. Member's motion.

Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that has gone on since five o'clock on Bill C-211 proposed by my hon. colleague from Western Arctic. The Hon. Member is proposing that the House amend the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act and refer his Bill to a legislative committee.

After hearing the comments from all sides of the House, I am appalled that Hon. Members would not allow this Bill to go to committee for study. First we heard from a member of the socialist Party, the NDP, who said that they will kill it in committee and it shall never come up again before 1999. Is that an open mind?