

Freshwater Fish Marketing Report

from the ranks of those who have had experience in operations of commerce. It is important for the participating provincial governments, which will appoint five of the directors, and for the federal government to have as much freedom of action as possible in appointing at any time persons most suited to undertake the work of directors. That freedom of action would be destroyed if the amendment were to carry. I am therefore opposed to the amendment.

I find difficulty in interpreting the words of the proposed amendment. Is it intended to exclude men who have recently been active fishermen but are not now engaged actively in fishing? If the amendment were to carry it would make much more difficult the appointment to the board of men qualified to handle the business of the corporation. The corporation is to be set up on the lines of a commercial venture and it is designed to serve the best interest of the fishermen themselves. I might add that I have had difficulty in finding line 14 of the clause referred to in the amendment. I presume line 6 is the line intended to be referred to.

Mr. Crouse: No. It is line 14 on the page if one presumes counting at the top of the page.

Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt): I thank the hon. member for his explanation. We wish to be flexible in our choice of prospective directors. If the amendment were to carry we should lose that flexibility and eliminate the possibility of choosing exactly the right directors for the job. It is important for our fishermen that the board function adequately.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): It is important for hon. members to understand, Mr. Speaker, that under the legislation responsibility for fish marketing is to pass from the private sector of our community to a corporate body set up by various governments. The amendment provides that on the body to be set up there shall be fishermen representative of Canada. Fishermen from various parts of Canada will be asked to serve on the board.

As the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) indicated, the amendment before the house was one of the amendments moved in committee. It did not pass in committee. I will not take up the time of the house by explaining in detail what happened in committee; it is enough for me to say that if hon. members read the committee proceedings they will see how totally inadequate is our

[Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt).]

present committee stage in the legislative process.

The proposed amendment seeks to make certain that active fishermen are appointed to the board. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) said, "Oh, you can take my word for it. On this corporate body there will be representatives of fishermen. I give you my guarantee that this will be so." We wanted a commitment of this kind from the minister so that the fishermen of Ontario, the prairie provinces and other parts of Canada would know they are going to be represented on the corporate body. As I say, the minister gave his word, or we interpreted his remarks to mean that he had given his word. In view of that commitment we thought the minister would support the amendment that has been moved. Unfortunately, in the discussions before the committee on this point we learned that the government does not intend to appoint fishermen to the board. We learned that they want on this corporate body people who are experts in marketing, in commercial aspects of fisheries, in finance, negotiations and so on. Although he had given his word, the minister turned around and argued that there was a need to appoint experts to the board and that fishermen might not be able to fulfil the requirements.

Another point which was raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) was that fishermen were not well enough educated to occupy positions on the board. That remark left me thunderstruck. I was really taken by surprise.

Mr. Osler: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a question of privilege?

Mr. Speaker: Before I hear the hon. member on a question of privilege I must warn the hon. member who now has the floor that he cannot review in the house the debate that took place in committee. This would further complicate matters. It is elementary to the rules of this house that we cannot have a duplication here of proceedings which took place in committee. Having said this, I will allow the hon. member to state his question of privilege.

● (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Osler: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is very difficult to present correctly something out of context. I think the point at issue at the moment is the definition of a licensed fisherman. It would be possible for a group of semi-literate fishermen in a far away community to fall into the hands of unscrupulous