

Tirol Dehydraters, in a recent letter to the CTC which was copied to the Minister, and I am sure the Minister did receive that copy, had this to say:

We spent 10 years developing the market to Japan. If we have to pay anything over and above the new W.G.T.A. rate, we may as well cut back our production and lay off staff because we won't stay in business very long.

The railways are obviously playing games here, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister please look into this matter once again?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I concur with the Hon. Member's sentiments. I think the railways are finding ways to get around the rules. However, in this case there is no doubt that the claim that containers are in fact subject to the railways' own discretion under the provision of the Railway Act is something we are looking at in terms of its legality. I have had legal officials in my own Department examining that, but at the same time the Canadian Transport Commission quite clearly has the authority to rule on the matter by declaring that the containers fall under the provisions of the Western Grain Transportation Act. I will immediately pass on the concerns of the Hon. Member to the Chairman of the CTC so that the CTC will come down with the ruling which, of course, we would both hope would be a favourable one.

* * *

FISHERIES

DISPLACEMENT OF FISHERMEN FROM VANCOUVER WHARF

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans who told the House more than two weeks ago that, within a day or two, he would tell us what arrangements he had made for the 60 fishermen who were displaced from a fishermen's wharf in Vancouver when the Minister issued a private, individual, an exclusive lease for a wharf that the fishermen usually use. I am aware that the Minister may have issued this lease in good faith and that he may have been misled regarding the nature of the support for the lease. However, my question is quite central to the issue of conflict of interest. How can the Minister justify issuing an exclusive lease to a member of one of his own advisory councils, particularly when the advisory council itself never dealt with the issue in any sort of forum?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, as the Hon. Member has said, we do have a Minister's Advisory Council on the Pacific Coast, which is composed of about 18 people who are actively involved in one aspect or another of the fishing industry. It is precisely because they are active in the fishing industry in one way or another that they are members of that advisory council.

Regarding the particular case referred to by the Hon. Member, the reason why I approved that proposal was because many people, organizations and, if my memory serves me correctly, even the City of Vancouver, supported that project

Oral Questions

which, as the Hon. Member knows, was designed to help the fishermen sell fresh fish on the market. As well, we have taken measures to ensure that all fishermen will have proper berthing facilities in one way or another.

LEASING OF WHARF

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is addressed to the same Minister. The Minister's answer has shown that he still fails to understand that he issued the licence for the lease on the basis of support which was not there. He issued it on the basis of a misleading petition which was signed in good faith by people like the head of the union and representatives of the vessel owners' association and the gill-handlers' groups, et cetera, none of whom knew that the result would be the issuance of a licence to a member of the Minister's Advisory Council and the displacement of 60 commercial fishermen. Since these fishermen will now be issued summonses by the Minister's own Department in violation of an agreement to find other facilities, will the Minister order his Department to cease and desist in the issuance of the summons until he and his advisory council can review this issue? Why does he not call for the resignation from his advisory council of the man who is benefiting from having access to the Minister?

Hon. Pierre De Bané (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans): Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member would agree with me that we cannot condone vandalism and illegal vessel tie-ups at a float. I am sure the Hon. Member would agree that the law of this land applies to everyone and that under no circumstances can vandalism be condoned.

Miss Carney: What vandalism?

Mr. De Bané: Second, I cannot agree with the Hon. Member when she is insulting the intelligence of all those who signed that petition who, as she said, were union leaders and representatives of fishing organizations. I cannot believe that the City of Vancouver and the other organizations to which the Hon. Member referred supported that request, while today the Hon. Member is saying that they did not know what they were signing. I would never be tempted to have such little consideration for the intelligence of our people.

* * *

MEDICARE

PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSALITY—DEFINITION OF A RESIDENT OF ALBERTA

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and Welfare and deals with the indication by the Government of Alberta that it may try to get around the universality requirements of the Canada Health Act by changing the definition of a resident of Alberta. I was wondering if the Minister had any views on this latest run-around of the Canada Health Act by the Govern-