# HOUSE OF COMMONS

## Thursday, November 9, 1967

The house met at 2.30 p.m.

• (2:40 p.m.)

# BROADCASTING, FILMS AND ASSISTANCE TO THE ARTS

## CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Robert Stanbury (York-Scarborough) moved that the first report of the standing committee on broadcasting, films and assistance to the arts, presented to the house on Monday, November 6, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

#### FINANCE

# REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF REGULATIONS RESPECTING INTEREST DISCLOSURE

On the order: Government notices of motion:

November 7—The Minister of Finance—That the regulations made pursuant to section 92 of the Bank Act and section 80 of the Quebec Savings Banks Act, tabled on October 12th, 1967, be referred to the standing committee on finance, trade and economic affairs.

**Mr. Speaker:** Pursuant to section 2 of standing order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the house.

#### FISHERIES

### CLOSING OF PACIFIC HERRING FISHERY-MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT UNDER STANDING ORDER 26

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond, to move the adjournment of the house under standing order No. 26 for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely the closure by the Department of Fisheries of the herring fishery on the Pacific coast, the unemployment arising therefrom and the need to find alternate employment for those affected.

**Mr. Speaker:** Perhaps the hon. member for Skeena would advise the Chair as to the urgency of this matter for debate.

**Mr. Howard:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. In light of what Your Honour said the other day regarding another motion under standing order No. 26 perhaps I should preface my remarks by stating that this is of such urgency it cannot wait for debate until the next supply motion is presented to the house, whenever that may be.

Everyone knows that the estimates have passed this house. Earlier I asked the Minister of Fisheries whether he was prepared to move an appropriate motion to have this matter referred to the committee on fisheries so it could be dealt with there. The minister declined to accept that suggestion and stated there had been closures of this type before, and that this was not a new situation. Never before to my knowledge has there been a complete closure of the herring fishery on the coast of British Columbia. Certain areas have been closed, but never before has the entire area been closed.

There is urgency in respect of this matter because of the economic impact it will have on approximately 1,000 people, fishermen and shore workers, who will be denied the opportunity to fish herring as of January 7. Even then it is anticipated there will be only a partial opening of the area which is closed. There is urgency also because a great number of fishermen are not even able to fall back upon the benefits accruing from unemployment insurance because they do not have the required number of stamps, namely 15, in order to qualify.

I understand that Your Honour permitted such a motion when the announcement was made by Dosco that it intended to close its operations at Sydney. I submit that just as the proposal by Dosco was important in so far as Nova Scotia was concerned, and there was urgency of debate at that time, so is this question equally important so far as British Columbia is concerned.

The same arguments that prevailed with respect to the economic impact and unemployment in the Dosco situation apply here; in fact they apply even more forcefully because in this case the decision was made by a department of government. I refer to the decision to close the entire British Columbia coast to the herring fishery until at