

*Government Organization Act, 1970*

various parts of Canada and they have contributed in many fields, not the least of which is the fishery. In any event, the fact is the department of fisheries in British Columbia is a major department. This industry is a major one in British Columbia's economy. In the various prairie provinces where the fishery does not have a position of great priority it is, of course, a recognized feature of the economy of some areas in terms of the freshwater fishery.

I remember reading about the impact of the fresh fish marketing board and the legislation introduced by the Minister of Fisheries, which I believe was piloted through the committee inadequately by an hon. member who is sitting in the chamber tonight. Then we come to the province of Quebec where there is a minister of fisheries, and Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island which also have ministers of fisheries. Newfoundland has a minister of fisheries. In that province this title was assumed over the last 20 years. I am trying to point out that in all these provinces this is a major aspect of the economy. Now we are to have a downgrading of the fisheries department to the point where it will no longer exist even on the Prime Minister's roster which is open to a great deal of question.

When we became part of Canada 22 years ago we did so with the understanding that there would be at least some initiative on the part of the federal government in respect of fisheries. I do not doubt for a moment that it is questionable whether constitutionally the federal government can move toward eliminating a department of government which has responsibility for a major part of our economy, without consultation with the provinces.

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

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Lundrigan:** Mr. Chairman, some members of the Liberal party are not satisfied with that suggestion. I raised this matter in the House of Commons some time ago. I asked the Minister of Fisheries what consultation had taken place and he said that we do not interfere with their legislation so why should they interfere with ours? He said that if we want to have a department of the environment and eliminate the Department of Fisheries, what does that have to do with the governments of Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick?

I remind the minister that when we entered the Canadian confederation we assumed that fisheries would occupy a priority position in this nation. I say right now that the hon. member who says we are being double-crossed is right; this is what is happening. A major part of the economy in our province is the fishery. The hon. gentleman who sits on his fanny down in the rump and does not say anything day after day—what is his name; would someone place his name on the record? He sits here day after day and does not say a word. What is that gentleman's name? This hon. gentleman sums up the concern of members opposite for the fisheries, and that is not very much.

We came into confederation on the assumption that the government of Canada would pay some attention to the

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

problem of our environment and our economy. Out of 75,000 workers in Newfoundland there are 20,000 in the fishing industry. Am I to stand up here as a member representing these people and see fisheries go out the window? Would that be responsible behaviour on my part? Should I not accept the amendment of the hon. member for St. John's East and the arguments of my colleagues from Nova Scotia?

As a member of a confederation of 22 million Canadians, representing 75,000 Newfoundlanders in this House of Commons—and this should apply to a member from any province in Canada—I cannot permit this kind of legislation to pass, because it will downgrade the role of one of our major industries to a level where it will never be heard from again in this House of Commons.

I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Chairman.

Progress reported.

\* \* \*

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Ricard:** Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board what the business will be for tomorrow.

**Mr. Drury:** Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue the filibuster.

**Some hon. Members:** Shame!

**Mr. Ricard:** Will the minister be the first speaker?

● (10:00 p.m.)

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

INFORMATION CANADA—REPRESENTATIONS FROM  
PUBLISHERS OF ORIGINAL CANADIAN BOOKS  
RESPECTING ASSISTANCE

**Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 27, as recorded at page 2820 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Information Canada whether he had received representations from Canadian publishers of original Canadian textbooks requesting government assistance and, if so, whether the government had given consideration to those requests, and also when the House might expect a statement on government policy concerning this matter. The question of making viable the Canadian book publishing industry is one which must interest any Canadian concerned about the continued existence of this nation.

In the autumn of this year W. J. A. Gage Limited, a Canadian publishing company, was taken over by U.S. interests and the government did not utter a peep. In answer to a question which I placed on the Order Paper, question No. 270, I was informed that in 1968, at the time when W.J.A. Gage was still Canadian-owned, 22 Canadi-