

general, this commission is not aware of a worse pocket of poverty in Canada than the northern segments of the inland fishery". Fishermen in general were dissatisfied. "They are not happy, are not content, but are very discouraged".

McIvor concluded that clearing up the situation would take an export monopoly and more. With a single-desk exporting agency and no other change, any gains would disappear in the network of dealers and bring no help to the fisherman who should come first. He said, in effect, that the Government should take over marketing lock, stock, and barrel. It should buy the fish from the fishermen through its own agents, process the fish, and market it.

The six governments agreed, but only after taking another long look. They did economic studies, found that it would work, and finally in 1969 passed complementary legislation to set up the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. They all did this even though it went against the grain of a free enterprise society. Like many other governments in many countries, they finally decided that this fishery was a special situation which needed special action. They saw a chance for progress in terms of people and profits and they had the political will to work together to make it happen.

In addressing this bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question of process. Process is important in this matter, because, as I have said before, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation involves five other provincial partners; Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Northwestern Ontario, and the Northwest Territories. The legislation which established this corporation is effective because of companion legislation passed by those five jurisdictions. In addition, the federal Government entered into formal agreements respecting the operations of the corporation with the five Governments.

The House is already aware that the Government is deeply committed to improving the climate of federal-provincial relations. I would be concerned if we were to proceed on this matter in a unilateral fashion. In fact, the introduction of this Bill has already provoked reactions from four of the five governments. All four have expressed strong opposition to the intent of the Bill.

I move, seconded by the Members for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Valcourt):

That the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following therefor:

"Bill C-235, an Act to amend the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act, be not now read a second time but that the order be discharged, the Bill withdrawn and the subject matter thereof referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry."

● (1640)

**Mr. Suluk:** Mr. Speaker, I do not understand how the amendment will affect my remarks. My instincts tell me to support my hon. colleague for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson) and support the amendment. However, considering that I am a new Member, perhaps you may be able to instruct me as to the procedural matter involved.

### *Freshwater Fish Marketing Act*

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Chair cannot guide the Hon. Member and cannot participate in the debate. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Gander-Whillans (Mr. Baker) on a point of order, then the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary.

**Mr. Baker:** Mr. Speaker, if I heard the Hon. Member correctly, he was rising on a point of order and was not addressing the subject matter of the resolution. That means that he can still address the subject matter of the resolution and the amendment that is before the House.

With respect to his point of order, the Hon. Member, who represents the eastern riding next to the Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson), has probably had time to confer with the Member for Western Arctic and understand his position.

**Mr. Gass:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I appreciate the position of the Hon. Member for Nunatsiak (Mr. Suluk). I would advise him that there was agreement between the Parties to refer the subject matter to committee so that we could discuss in more detail some of the concerns of Members of the House. Possibly at that time he will be able to raise his concerns about this Bill.

**Mr. Thomas Suluk (Nunatsiak):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to make some comments concerning the Bill proposed by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Western Arctic (Mr. Nickerson).

There have been a number of objections raised by residents in my riding because the people in my riding have become more politically aware of the intrusion of federal and territorial governments into every aspect of their lives. This corporation is another example of that because it was originally designed to assist fishermen 50 years ago and may no longer be relevant today.

Some months ago I received a resolution from the annual meeting of the Keewatin Wildlife Federation, which is directly north of the Province of Manitoba. The Federation was requesting that I present on their behalf a resolution calling for the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation to get out of the business of marketing fish in our region.

As the Hon. Member for Western Arctic said, perhaps more eloquently than I can, the Board has too much of a monopoly. People in the North want land claims to be settled and aboriginal rights to be entrenched in the Constitution because they believe that Governments are beginning to intrude too much into the everyday aspect of their lives.

While Inuit may have been considered not knowledgeable of Government matters and unable to govern their own affairs 15 years ago, many are now saying that they are able to address these issues themselves. This is just another example of a corporation that is perhaps designed more to help fishermen in the provinces and is no longer really relevant to the people in the North.

The resolution by the Federation asks the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. Fraser) to rescind the provisions of the Board so that they no longer affect them. They would like to