

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, April 29, 1983

The House met at 11 a.m.

● (1105)

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[Translation]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

REQUEST THAT PETRO-CANADA SIGNS IN QUEBEC BE REVISED

Mr. Hal Herbert (Vaudreuil): Madam Speaker, in the past few weeks, I have received a steady stream of complaints from my constituents regarding Petro-Canada and the fact that its signs in Quebec are in French only, unfortunately. My constituents are indignant about the fact that this is a Crown corporation, which is supposed to deal with all Canadians, whether they are Francophones or Anglophones. It is understandable, to a certain extent, that the people who rent the signs never stopped to think about this aspect, because of Bill 101, but it is hard to accept from Petro-Canada, which seems to be ignoring a potentially large number of anglophone customers. I agreed that the Government should urge Canadians to fill up at Petro-Canada service stations, but the Corporation could at least meet their language requirements. I therefore hope, Madam Speaker, that this unfortunate situation will be corrected.

* * *

[English]

AIRPORTS

MIRABEL—LITIGATION SEEKING RETURN OF EXPROPRIATED LANDS

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Madam Speaker, admittedly the Minister of Public Works (Mr. LeBlanc) is charming, but his continual attitude of *je ne sais quoi* on matters relating to the expropriated lands at Mirabel antagonizes the people of the Province of Quebec. Yesterday the Minister made an obviously defensive statement implying that my concern with Mirabel is misplaced, based, as he said, on a very narrow and very limited spectrum.

The membership of this so-called very narrow and very limited spectrum is a group of more than 500 expropriatees who are endorsed by the Liberal Opposition and the Government of the Province of Quebec. This group is issuing a writ and will confront the federal Government in Federal Court to obtain the retrocession of 50,000 surplus acres of land.

The people of Mirabel are totally exasperated with a Government which has supplied Public Works Ministers who are incapable of answering any legitimate questions. The decision to take the federal Government to court has grown out of 14 years of frustration with the Government. My vision, which is neither narrow nor limited, is supported by the majority of the people of "la belle Province".

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

BENEFITS SOUGHT FOR ADOPTIVE PARENTS

Mr. Cyril Keeper (Winnipeg-St. James): Madam Speaker, it is well known that our unemployment insurance legislation has a number of inequities involving maternity benefits, including the magic ten rule, Section 46, and provisions dealing with adoptive parents. Not only the New Democratic Party but also women's groups, a Government task force, and the Canadian Human Rights Commission have been calling for changes in this area.

Last night the Minister offered to legislate in this matter with a one-day debate. If the Minister was serious, rather than just playing a parliamentary put-down game, I would ask him to table this legislation in the House or, on private member's day, to pass the legislation proposed by my colleague to change this law as it affects adoptive parents.

* * *

HOUSING

BANK PENALTIES ON HOME OWNERS RENEGOTIATING MORTGAGES

Mr. Jack Burghardt (London West): Madam Speaker, recent announcements that short-term mortgage rates have fallen below the 10 per cent mark for the first time in almost ten years, actually 9.25 per cent, together with the announcement that the rates on three and five year mortgage terms are expected to fall one to two points, to the 11 per cent range, before the end of the year, are extremely encouraging. This news is of great benefit to prospective home purchasers and for home owners who are in a position to renegotiate mortgage terms. However, this very good news must be tempered with the realization that there are many home owners who are not in a position to take advantage of these developments.