

*Oral Questions*

## REQUEST THAT MINISTER WITHDRAW BUDGET MEASURE

In answer to the hon. member's question, I must tell him that I met with representatives of the trollers. I would point out that all segments of the fleet are a bit nervous at the present time because we are considering adjustments for the coming season. The same day that I met with the trollers I received a telegram from the vessel owners' association cautioning me not to make concessions to one fleet type at the expense of another. This will be the subject of the usual discussions, and there have been some discussions already. I will try to keep the impact on all segments of the fleet very much in mind before management decisions are made. This may not be as simple as it appears, because in some cases trollers are targeting or by tradition have targeted on fish which are in rather difficult shape. We will keep this in mind, as we usually do.

## GOVERNMENT POLICY ON ALLOCATIONS

**Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Madam Speaker, I wonder if the minister could return to the question that I put to him. What will the policy of the government be with respect to these coastal communities and, most specifically, with respect to the allocations? Because trollers will have to move off the threatened chinook and coho stocks, what consideration is the department giving to allowing trollers to have some share of this year's Adams River sockeye run?

**Hon. Roméo LeBlanc (Minister of Fisheries and Oceans):** Madam Speaker, that very question is being discussed now. I had a chance to discuss this very issue with the representatives who met with me last week.

\* \* \*

## FINANCE

## TAXATION OF NORTHERN ALLOWANCES—REQUEST THAT MINISTER MEET UNION REPRESENTATIVES

**Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West):** Madam Speaker, I have a brief question for the Minister of Finance. For several months officials of the United Steelworkers have, without success, repeatedly requested a direct meeting with the minister to discuss the impact of this coming November's termination of the tax moratorium on negotiated northern benefits and the need for a longer, more flexible transition to and consultation about his as yet undefined new regime north of 60. Will the minister finally agree to the oft-repeated and reasonable request for a face-to-face meeting? If so, when? And, if not, why not?

● (1450)

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, of course in principle I accept the hon. member's invitation. I have quite a number of delegations which I must see in coming weeks, and of course I will attempt to give the group he mentioned the priority he wishes.

**Mr. Lyle S. Kristiansen (Kootenay West):** Madam Speaker, I hope the principle turns into a reality very soon. Both construction workers and loggers in my constituency and elsewhere across Canada have calculated that the government's new taxes on employer paid benefit premiums, and camp room and board will cost each of them an extra \$3,100 to \$6,400 a year in taxes, driving some net incomes below the poverty line. Will the minister please consider dropping these new taxes before they cause irreparable harm to industrial relations and the economy, ceasing his experiment with "Dickensian" economics, and stop driving proud workers into either the poorhouse or on to the dole, as some of them are talking about doing?

**Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, I would really like to meet with a representative of the group reaching those extravagant conclusions, because there was nothing in the budget measures which would produce the annual tax increase of that amount.

\* \* \*

## NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD

## AWARDING OF CONTRACT TO JAPANESE FIRM—REASON FOR CONFIDENTIALITY

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transport. It is supplementary to a series of questions put by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings which related to the deliberate awarding of a contract to a Japanese manufacturer over the Canadian Stephens-Adamson company, at a significant loss of Canadian jobs. On February 16 the minister said that he had arranged a meeting at which a full explanation of the decision would be given. Nothing at that time was said about confidentiality. When the company came to the meeting, it was told that it would be given an explanation only if it agreed in advance not to use the information to cause re-evaluation of the decision. Why was that condition imposed, and exactly what is it that the minister is trying to hide about the decision, which is costing Canadians jobs?

**Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Transport):** Madam Speaker, the reason for the confidentiality given by the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition, that is to cause a re-evaluation, is a personal one of his. I will find out about the real reason, which probably concerns commercial confidentiality. In answer to the hon. member who previously asked the questions, I more or less hinted that, if he were to suggest it, I would try to produce from the National Harbours Board an explanation in general terms as to the reason for the decision. Again I return to the basic difficulty I had. I had the choice of imposing my view on the subject or the view of experts. Had I gone the other way and had the project been a failure, the Leader of the Opposition would have been the first one to dump on me.