

Freshwater Fish Marketing Report

representatives who had taken a licence. I was in no way reflecting on the intelligence of the fishermen.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member this is not a question of privilege but a point of debate, and he will have the opportunity to take part in the debate later if he so wishes.

Mr. Baldwin: On the point of order Your Honour raised in regard to the question of the debate in the committee, I do not think this is the time to debate the point of order involved in the ruling by Your Honour. I think your point of view is quite correct, but I would point out that one of the possibilities envisaged at the time the new rules were introduced and debated in the house was that on the report stage an amendment might be moved by reason of certain discussions and statements made in the standing committee. In other words, an amendment such as the house is now considering may have to be based upon certain aspects of the proceedings in the standing committee. The direct point Your Honour made is of course quite acceptable, but we hope it will not rule out the possibility for a member of this house, in moving an amendment at the report stage, to base his support for the amendment on certain facts disclosed in the standing committee.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I join with the hon. member for Peace River in asking Your Honour to study this matter in the event it arises again, as I am sure it will. An amendment moved and defeated in the standing committee can be moved at the report stage; surely that should carry with it the right to put forward the same arguments here in the house. I recognize Your Honour's view that we should not revive debate on extraneous matters, but in the old days bills went to the standing committee and then came back to Committee of the Whole. It was a very common practice to read evidence from the minutes of proceedings and evidence in an attempt to win a point in the house which had been made and perhaps lost in the standing committee.

I think the general proposition which Your Honour is making is valid. Debate should not be revived, but I would hope this would not rule out the right to read evidence in the house from the minutes of proceedings and evidence, when necessary, to support an argument. Your Honour is perfectly right in trying to keep us to the subject matter of the proposed amendments, but surely arguments

related to those amendments should be in order.

Mr. Lundrigan: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that both hon. gentlemen took the words right out of my mouth on that last point. I think it is in order for me to make reference to the point about the level of education of fishermen. So as not to misquote the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre I will quote from page 218, report No. 11 of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry:

I am not a specialist in fishing, but as a tourist going to the fishing areas I see the quality of education of many of these people and I submit that there would be a danger in stipulating exactly how many people had to be on the advisory committee—

This was an indication by him that there was a lack of education and this was his argument against utilizing people in an advisory capacity from the fishing sector of the population. I am sure all hon. members who are interested in the welfare of the fishermen of Canada are in favour of this amendment. It is a refutation of the argument of expertise presented by the minister and other hon. members.

On page 4 of Bill C-148 there is an indication of the purposes and powers of the proposed corporate body, which go far beyond the level of expertise that would indicate that the people in question would have to be marketing experts and financiers. The terms of reference of the corporation include everything from taking the fish from the fisherman's boat to putting it on the plates of the consumer. This is the whole gambit of the fishing operation. The only thing in which the corporation is not involved is the actual catching of the fish. Clause 7(a) states that the purpose of the corporation is to:

—buy fish and dress, fillet, freeze, package or otherwise prepare fish for market;

This is an indication of a process which is a far cry from the type of expertise which the minister indicated in his argument. Clause 7(b) states:

—buy, manufacture or produce fish products and fish by-products and package or otherwise prepare fish products and fish by-products for market;

All eight subclauses of clause 7 indicate that the purposes of the corporation takes in the whole gambit of the fishing operation. My contention is that fishermen occupy a very important segment of the total fishing operation in that they are the people who are expert in the actual catching of the product and bringing it to the point of departure for