

*Fisheries*

delighted that the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) could come into the house for a few minutes to participate. I was surprised that he had the temerity in those few minutes to comment upon the attendance of a number of ministers who attended while he was not here. Also, he did not seem to know what was in the bill since he did not seem to know that the prime object of the bill, to be found in part in clause 23, is to increase returns to fishermen. That is the whole object of the bill, of the establishment of the corporation and of the introduction of regulations into this part of the industry.

I was also interested this afternoon to hear one of my compatriots from Saskatchewan, a socialist. I must say I would ordinarily not use that word, having thought that hon. members in that corner of the house, generally speaking, had abandoned the term. Since the hon. member styled himself as a socialist, I take the opportunity to describe him that way.

The hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thompson) made the very wise observation that the success of a board of this sort, which is a crown agency, will on many occasions depend on the kind of minister who is behind it. I was a little surprised to hear that.

**Mr. Lundrigan:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I hate to be petty because I am sure the Minister without Portfolio did not intend to mislead the house. However, I have been in the house for the entire debate. I was here until five o'clock this afternoon. The hon. gentleman indicated I had not been present throughout the debate and I am sure he did not mean to say that. He has completely misrepresented the true situation. This is a minor point but it is the kind of misrepresentation of a situation that ought to be clarified immediately.

**Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to accept the statement of the hon. member opposite. I did not misrepresent the fact that he did not seem to know what was in the bill. I concluded, naturally, that he would have known if he had been here during the debate.

The hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley congratulated me on several aspects of the bill and suggested that it represented some kind of conversion to the socialist cause. He does not seem to appreciate that there is a fairly fundamental distinction in the ways in which socialists and Liberals over the years have come to enact measures of this kind.

The distinction lies in the nature of the men in charge of efforts like this. The socialists tend to take over ventures that are going and efficient concerns, nationalize them because that seems to be their prime objective, and run them into the ground. The Liberals use such weapons, as well as many other weapons, in order to do something for an industry or area where there is real need for improvement, as there is in this particular case.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt):** There were several comments this afternoon and this evening about the area involved and the scope of the bill before us. The bill mentions certain specific areas that are involved. Some hon. members who know about the intentions of the participating provinces have referred to a portion of Ontario as being involved. It is, of course, largely a matter of negotiation; it is for the provinces themselves to opt in or out, in total or in part, of the provisions of the bill. Hon. members opposite, therefore who were critical of some of the aspects of the bill should look elsewhere for the responsibility in this regard.

**Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):** To people like Mr. Roberts.

**Mr. Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt):** Hon. members have also said that certain provinces are not mentioned at all in the bill. The cause of that has a similar root. This corporation developed from the involvement of the provinces in the conference of dominion and provincial fisheries ministers. This corporation is to cover a particular area of the fishery.

It is noteworthy, however, that the area of the fishery covered does include by far the greatest part of the specific species of fish which are enumerated in the schedule. The proportion of fish in any area coming within the scope of the bill, compared with the total produced in that area, varies from 90 to 100 per cent because of the variety of species enumerated in the schedule. So, in fact, the corporation will be in a position to deal with the great bulk of the fish which are caught.

There were some questions about the operation of the corporation with regard to buying and selling. It is clearly the intention of the bill to make it the duty of the corporation to enter into direct relationships with the fishermen or their agents to buy fish.

● (9:00 p.m.)

The expectation is that the fisherman will be paid as close to market value as possible