

*Order Paper Questions*

that question No. 915 be deemed to have been made an order for return?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Text]

## LANGUAGE PROGRAM—EXPENDITURES

Question No. 915—**Mr. Gauthier (Ottawa-Vanier):**

Since the beginning of the Programme in 1970, what was the total amount spent in support of the Secretary of State's Language Programmes Branch for (a) bilingualism in education (b) bilingualism in public administration (c) bilingualism in the private sector (d) language acquisition development?

Return tabled.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## STARRED QUESTION

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call starred question No. 1,020?

[Text]

\*POWER SHUTDOWN AT BIG CHUTE ON TRENT-SEVERN WATERWAY

Question No. 1,020—**Mr. Rynard:**

1. Was any agreement made with the Province of Ontario for the loss of electric power due to the procedures necessary in the building of the new marine railway at the Big Chute on the Trent-Severn Waterway and, if so, what was it?

2. Was the electric power cut off due to such procedures and, if so, for how many days?

3. Was any compensation paid and, if so (a) to whom (b) by whom?

[Translation]

**Mr. Yvon Pinard (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council):** 1. No, not as between the federal government and the province of Ontario. However, an agreement was made between Ontario Hydro and the contractor performing the work, to have the hydroelectric power facility at Big Chute shut down during the construction of the lower coffer dam.

2. While the power facility itself was shut down for a period of four weeks and two days, hydro power was not cut off in the area but was supplied by the provincial hydroelectric grid system.

3. Yes: (a) to Ontario Hydro; (b) by the contractor.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker.]

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

## FISHING AND RECREATIONAL HARBOURS ACT

MEASURE TO PROVIDE FOR ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CERTAIN HARBOURS

The House resumed, from Wednesday, February 1, 1978, consideration of the motion of Mr. LeBlanc (Westmorland-Kent) that Bill C-2, respecting the administration and development of certain fishing and recreational harbours in Canada, be read the third time and do pass.

**Mr. Bob Brisco (Kootenay West):** Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday when I called it six o'clock I was expressing concern, along with other members of the House, regarding the nebulous assurances of the minister and the motherhood protection that he will be able to provide under Bill C-2, as has been demonstrated under Bill C-38. In light of the fact that the clock now shows three minutes to one o'clock and that I would welcome the opportunity to speak more fully on Bill C-2 without the interruption of the clock, may I now call it one o'clock?

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner):** Is that agreed?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

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

At one o'clock the House took recess.

● (1402)

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

**Mr. Brisco:** Mr. Speaker, earlier in speaking on this bill I indicated my concern about the fact that, while giving assurances to east coast and west coast fishermen that under regulations or decisions made by the minister or his officials there would be no onerous charges for wharf facilities laid on the shoulders of the fishermen of each coast, the proposal advanced by the minister has not been acceptable to members of the opposition, and their concern has been expressed not only by me but also by other speakers. I have already indicated to the minister that we received similar assurances from him when Bill C-38 went before committee and, as I think anyone can recognize, that type of assurance is not satisfactory, in light of the fact that the minister may be the minister for a relatively short time, even though he has indicated to me in correspondence that he expects to continue in his present role up until 1979. To quote the minister himself, that assumption is a demonstration of political arrogance. I believe he used that term when he referred to his decision to move a department from Moncton to Shediac.