

*Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

ing him thought that the regulatory powers would be ones that very ordinarily should belong to the governor in council. I cannot make an assessment offhand this morning, although I would, if people were interested, get the best advice I could on the matter of the regulatory process and ensure that that information was shared with the members of the committee who examine the bill.

However, there is one provision for regulatory powers that I think could not only have unexpected results, but might land the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment in difficulty, and that is clause 9(d) which deals with the control of pollution at any scheduled harbour. That might involve the minister in all sorts of regulations that were not primarily intended for the basic purposes of the act, which are to deal with fishing and recreational harbours, but might make him set foot beyond wharfs, piers or breakwaters, in inland topics more properly to be dealt with under some other act of parliament. So I question whether that subclause does not go too far.

Finally, I give a warning: Never fish from a derelict wreck. If you do, and the officials appointed under this act came along and saw you fishing peacefully, they might think that you appear to be in charge of the vessel, as set forth in clause 14(1), and get you embroiled in a long legal process that not only may cause you to spend a great deal of money but may also ruin your whole morning as a fisherman.

**Mrs. Holt:** That could give lawyers a little business.

**Mr. McCleave:** Both our hearts are in the right place—it would give lawyers some business, unless they happened to be the persons sitting there peacefully fishing from a wreck in some small harbour and the enforcement officer tapped their shoulders. I am mainly concerned about the need for an annual report, and I hope the government will consider it and we will not get into a protracted row in committee when the matter comes before them. Also, I think there should be an exact definition of “the minister responsible”, and I hope officials of the department will be good enough to advise me as to whether the four small fishing communities I mentioned can fit in within the act and not be part of some strange jurisdictional dispute involving the National Harbours Board or the port of Halifax commission.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to participate at this stage of the debate on Bill C-7, but I will not become involved in any protracted debate. As I understand it, the subject matter of this bill was first set out in legislation way back in 1895, and somewhat revised in 1937. Since then there has been no fundamental change in the harbours, piers or wharves administration. So certainly a bill such as this, on fishing and recreational harbours to consolidate and, in the words of the parliamentary secretary, to rationalize many of the problems in the administration of the small craft harbours, is undoubtedly relevant.

I must say that when I heard the parliamentary secretary use the word “rationalize”, I thought he used it not glibly but lightly. All bills must have regulations that come forward later

[Mr. McCleave.]

and, as the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) suggested, if his suggestion is accepted there will be annual reports stating what took place in the administration of small craft harbours, and unfair and perhaps contradictory regulations can be corrected. What concerns me very much, coming from the area to which the parliamentary secretary referred—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Order, please. It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

---

**AFTER RECESS**

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

---

**ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS**

[English]

**INFORMATION**
**SUGGESTED INQUIRY INTO ALLEGATION GOVERNMENT ATTEMPTING TO INTIMIDATE NEWS MEDIA—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43**

**Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River):** Mr. Speaker, I have a motion under Standing Order 43. The urgent and pressing circumstances which appear in the motion are particularly prompted by recent alarming events which indicate an intent within the government to intimidate the news media. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Hnatyshyn):

That this House, deeply concerned by certain recent dangerous events, such as public comments by the Prime Minister and supporters against CBC in connection with reporting on Quebec, the implied threat by a Cabinet minister to the broadcasting industry that they might be called to account before a Royal Commission and in particular the alleged serious action on behalf of the Minister of Transport to prevent publication of *The Canadian Magazine* in Saskatchewan last weekend, and a statement by a supporter of the government, the hon. member for Maisonneuve-Rosemont, referred to in today's *Globe and Mail*, that there is “a phobia in Ottawa to domesticate this power of the press . . . to harness it”, calls for an immediate inquiry into these events by a committee of this House or under the Inquiries Act.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Presentation of such a motion pursuant to Standing Order 43 can be done only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.