

a practising lawyer that this used to cause a great deal of difficulty.

● (1600)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think it is very useful that the hon. gentleman keeps in touch with the law. He may need it again, one never knows, and that goes for all of us, including my parliamentary secretary and myself. The Department of National Revenue needs some sort of evidence of separation unless it is reduced to some form of writing. At one time they had to do it by decree, but the hon. member knows that we extended that a few years ago.

Mr. Baker (Grenville-Carleton): Yes, it has been broadened.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Four o'clock.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps we could pass clause 28 as we can deal with the same subject under clause 31.

Clause agreed to.

Mr. Stevens: Madam Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. I believe the minister unintentionally misinformed the House in respect of clause 12. I was wondering if he would review his answers to some of my questions so that perhaps we could have a clarification on Tuesday. I was simply asking about the difference between two types of reserves and I do not believe the answer was clear. It seems that really there was a slight misleading in the answer we got from the minister.

The Assistant Deputy Chairman: It being four o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to consider the bill again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions, public bills and private bills.

Mr. Lefebvre: Madam Speaker, I think you will find there is a general agreement to take private members' notice No. 18 standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath).

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin): Is that agreed, and that the other motions will stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Fisheries

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

[English]

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION ACT

SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of bringing in legislation to amend the Government Organization Act providing for a separate Department of Fisheries.

He said: Madam Speaker, as a result of the amendment to the Government Organization Act passed by this House early in 1971 Canada has no department of fisheries. Up to that time a separate department of fisheries had existed in this country going back to the time of Confederation. And rightly so, Madam Speaker, because not only back in the early days of the history of our country, but right up to the present time, the fishing industry has assumed an important place in the over-all economy of our country and, more particularly, in the economy of the Atlantic provinces of Canada, the eastern portion of the province of Quebec and the Pacific coast.

As a result of the Government Organization Act amendment in 1971, what was known as the department of fisheries was merged with the new Department of the Environment. That department assumed as well responsibilities in a number of other areas of concern and for a number of other statutes which up to that time had been the responsibility of other departments of government, such as the Department of Transport and the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, just to mention two.

We opposed that aspect of the Government Organization Act because we felt, and put forward arguments in support of that feeling, that as a result of the merging of the responsibilities of fisheries with those of another department, which would have other responsibilities as well, this would diminish the relative importance of the fishing industry in the over-all governmental structure in Canada. This was especially true at a time when the fishing industry was facing very serious problems arising from the development of new technology which made it possible to harvest large quantities of fish never before possible, and at a time when it suddenly appeared that the great infinite fishing potential of the northwest Atlantic was threatened with virtual extinction. I might say that subsequent events have proven that our fears were well founded.

To illustrate the importance of fisheries and the need for a separate department, let me just glance at the estimates for the Department of the Environment for 1974-75, which indicate that out of a total budget of \$351 million, the fisheries and marine services of the department, as it is now known, accounts for \$164 million, or over half of the budget for that department.

It is true that we now have a Minister of State for Fisheries as a result of an announcement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and an order in council passed on August 8, 1974, setting up a separate Minister of State for Fisheries; but that minister does not preside over a department of fisheries. He is not responsible for the budget of a