

time he gave the answer to the House that he had spent three-quarters of a million dollars on his own flights. Therefore, if he is being so forthright in admitting the cost of his own department and his use of aircraft, and since he is the minister responsible for all ministers who use these aircraft for flights of a personal nature, then I think he should be just as open and just as free in giving information to the House about the Minister of Agriculture, (Mr. Whelan), for example, who has made 32 flights, and maybe more, on government aircraft for private visits with members of his family at the expense of taxpayers.

In conclusion, having raised this matter on a number of occasions, rather than being told these things are going to be answered soon, some time or probably never, I think the parliamentary secretary should now have the decency to rise and tell this House when we are going to receive answers to questions which have been outstanding for over a year.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Orders of the day.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

### FISHING AND RECREATIONAL HARBOURS ACT

#### MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN HARBOURS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent) that Bill C-7, respecting the administration and development of certain fishing and recreational harbours in Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

**Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley):** Mr. Speaker, just before the noon adjournment, I was speaking about some of the comments made by the parliamentary secretary and the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Dionne) regarding the plans, thoughts and philosophy behind Bill C-7, the Fishing and Recreational Harbours Act. The minister pointed out earlier that this bill is really a culmination of several studies within the department. It flows from the original government harbours and piers act, which was fundamentally the bill back in 1895 and was revised in 1937. Obviously, there is some necessity to give some legislative framework to the order in council which has gathered the administration of small craft harbours under the Department of Fisheries and the Environment from the two previous departments which looked after it, the Department of Public Works and the Department of Transport.

The parliamentary secretary used the word "rationalization" rather freely. This is one of the areas of real concern to those of us from coast areas which have small craft harbours in their constituencies. Many of us have heard before the phrase "rationalization of rail services". We all know that the

*Fishing and Recreational Harbours*

potential rail line abandonments in smaller places in the west and in the east have caused a good deal of concern in the rural or smaller areas of the country. Prior to that we had a rationalization of postal services under the then postmaster general, Mr. Kierans. All across the country from coast to coast under the logic of a cold efficiency and obviously, I guess, a dollar economy of rationalization, small post offices in the rural areas were wound down and closed out.

● (1550)

While I admit freely that this may be more efficient—although now in view of some of the activities of the Post Office Department we do wonder about that—what you can never put on an economic chart, Mr. Speaker, is the social distress that closure of a small post office in a rural area creates when a common meeting place, a place where you see your friends when you get your mail at a certain time, is eliminated. A little part of the heart and soul of that community is eliminated with it and you have a conflict going on, a paradox. The new social order gives lip service, anyway, to trying to broaden the urban base but, especially among the young people of this land, there is a very definite migration from the urban areas to rural areas. In terms of lifestyle, getting back to the land and to nature, you do not only have to eat granola in the morning, wheat germ in the afternoon and celery sticks at night-time to appreciate that there is inherent in an awful lot of Canadians a desire to move out of the concrete jungles and get back close to the land. Yet, when you get close to the land, you have a problem with post offices and in many areas of the country—and the Hall Commission reported on this not too long ago—you have a little problem with rail lines which have a potential to give rapid transit to people, let alone goods, wheat and raw resources, that no other mode of transport possesses.

So we come to this bill and we hit the word "rationalization" with reference to small craft harbours. Mr. Speaker, my riding in large measure runs along the Bay of Fundy in Nova Scotia. We all know that the Bay of Fundy has the highest tides in the world, which makes maintenance of wharves and piers that much more difficult. Members are surely by now aware of fantastic power potential there is in the Bay of Fundy tides. We are still talking about a review of the review of the review of the task force as to whether there is to be a Fundy tidal power project. This is a renewable resource, a free resource, and we still have not got too far off dead centre on it. But that potential power, especially in the storms, creates fantastic havoc with the facilities in these small ports.

Thus, I can see the reason why there has to be some reorganization in the administration of small craft harbours to involve, now, the recreational boater, which was certainly not a feature back in 1895. It was not valid, perhaps, in 1937. But I do caution those who will be implementing this Act not to use just the cold broad yardstick of efficiency and economy in deciding where facilities are to be maintained and/or built anew because we all know in Nova Scotia that under a policy of benign neglect fewer and fewer villages along the shore have any wharf facilities.