

clause three of Bill C-38. It takes clause three of Bill C-38 and repeals it, and I think the intention probably was to add on these two paragraphs dealing with sections 10 and 11 of the Fisheries Act. Instead of that, it is replacing the present clause three with the proposed amendments to sections 10 and 11 which means that clause three of Bill C-38 is lost. I am sure that was not the intention.

It seems to me all intentions would be more accurately served if the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Rompkey), seconded by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) were to put forward what they now describe as a new clause three as a new subclause to the bill, which would become clause 3.1. Without touching the present clause three, it would deal directly with sections 10 and 11 of the Fisheries Act just as described. This, because of its procedural irregularity, would be done by consent of the House. The procedural irregularity is still well within the principle of the bill, bearing in mind that it does amend the Fisheries Act, as is sought to be done here, and does set out to regulate several areas of fisheries dispute as is also sought to be done here. It seems to me that the procedural aberration is no greater than we have allowed many times in the past and therefore if it meets with the approval of the House perhaps the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador could seek the unanimous consent of the House to introduce his motion.

**Mr. Rompkey:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps you could advise me whether it is necessary for me actually to introduce the clause as suggested or whether I am now at liberty to debate the motion.

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador seeks the consent of the House to introduce by way of a new clause to the bill a motion at the report stage which would propose the addition of a new clause 3.1 and which would read as follows:

3.1 Sections 10 to 12 of the Act are repealed and the following substituted therefor:

10. No one shall with boat or vessel or in any other way during the time of fishing for seals knowingly or wilfully disturb, impede or interfere with any seal fishery or prevent or impede the shoals of seals from coming into such fishery or knowingly or wilfully frighten such shoals.

11. Disputes between occupiers of seal fisheries concerning limits and the method of fishing or setting nets shall be decided summarily by any fishery officer or justice of the peace, by whom arbitrators may be appointed to assess damages and any damages so assessed or arising out of a repetition or continuance of the difficulty ordered to be remedied may be levied under the warrant of any justice of the peace.

The seconder is the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall).

Does the House give unanimous consent to the introduction of this motion?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** The motion is therefore deemed to have been introduced.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

### *Fisheries Act*

**Mr. Crouse:** On a brief point of order, Mr. Speaker. When the hon. member addresses the House on this motion, would he explain the reason for using the words "shoals of seals" rather than "herds of seals"? It is my understanding as a lifelong Lunenburg that when you went sealing you looked for herds of seals. I have never heard the expression "shoals of seals", in my life and I wish the hon. member would explain the terminology.

**Mr. Speaker:** Even to my unpracticed ear the expression sounds strange. Nevertheless, it is the language already used in sections 10 and 11 of the Fisheries Act.

**Mr. Goodale:** What about "flocks of seals"?

**Mr. William Rompkey (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure I can give a satisfactory explanation of the term. I can only say that the terminology used in the amendment goes back to a previous day. Like the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) I am used to the term "herds of seals". However, "shoals" is the word which was used back in the dim pages of history and the people who drew up the act decided they would use this terminology. Perhaps the hon. member and I can discuss the point with the fisheries experts later on.

I want to make a few brief remarks on this important motion. There are two things we have to do on behalf of the sealing industry and on behalf of the sealers. One is legal and the other is political. I am using "political" in the broad sense of the word. What we are doing today is, I think, entirely legal, entirely in order. It is certainly not proper for anybody to go into the woods and interfere with a logger in the course of his work. Nobody is allowed to go down into a mine and interfere with a miner in the course of his work; nobody can go on the water and interfere with a fisherman, take up his nets, damage his boats. Yet last year on the ice floes off St. Anthony we saw people locking themselves to chains, stopping ships, taking clubs out of the hands of sealers and throwing pellets into the water. In other words, they were doing away with the means by which these people make their livelihood. After all, these sealers are engaged in an entirely legitimate pursuit, as are loggers, fishermen and, for that matter, office workers.

It is not our intention to keep away from the seal hunt those who go there for a legitimate reason. We do not want to keep away the press, for example. The press has gone to the seal hunt for the last several years and I think those reporters who are conscientious and reputable have given honest accounts and related the facts. Indeed, I think that from the small "p" political point of view the tables are turning on the side of the fishermen. This is due to the work of those responsible journalists who have written their stories and related the facts as they saw them. We do not want to keep such journalists away from the hunt. Nor do we want to keep away those who are engaged in research or even those who simply wish to go there as spectators to see what goes on.

In the past, however, people have gone there with the avowed intention of disrupting the sealers in the course of their