

As the Minister of Transport knows, these agreements are usually reached on the basis of an understanding and a \$1 per year rental fee. Municipalities use that land in certain cases, and private industry in a lesser number of cases. Provincial government agencies are the major users for industrial parks and other purposes.

To generate revenue automatically from the lease of land that has been granted for a specific purpose violates long-standing agreements. Imagine what would happen to industrial parks around airports. They would obviously have to increase charges to users. We are talking here about provincial government agencies. If that airport uses a municipal water supply for which a set rate is paid, the municipality could well increase the charges to the federal government Department that is increasing the charges for the use of the land. It could go so far as to dispute the grants in lieu of taxes paid on airport-related buildings and properties.

It is not a simple matter of a revenue-generating source. We must consider who will be influenced. There was no consultation with the provincial Governments before this decision was taken. I am sure of that. It was handed down from high to be initiated by the Minister of Transport. The transportation commitment of this Government given in Halifax, Nova Scotia, on August 2, 1984, was to accelerate the construction of airport and other federal transport-related projects. All we see in the financial statements are cuts and increased revenue generated from the leasing of those facilities.

At the same meeting on August 2, the Government announced that a fund would be set up to finance the cost of a submarine cable between the mainland and the Island of Newfoundland. I do not see the cost of a cable from Labrador to Newfoundland in this financial statement. I do not see it in any statement made after this Party came to power. A cable is needed. You have to do something. You cannot put it over the Gulf of St. Lawrence because that would be an awfully big bridge. You cannot put it on top of the water because that would damage shipping. I suppose you could put it under the straits. That was tried. This is why I raise the matter today.

We saw the history of this commitment over television a few years ago in Newfoundland. A Conservative Government announced it would put a cable under that section of the Atlantic Ocean. It said it would build a tunnel through which cars as well as the cable could pass through. They even set off the blasts, both at the same time, one on the mainland and one on the Island. The television cameras were there to record the big explosions. The holes are still in the ground. The Conservative Party still has not given up on its promise. That is exactly what it is, a promise.

There is no mention of a cable in the financial papers. The cable will go the same route as the tunnel. It is just a promise. I could go on to list 380 other reasons for stopping the present legislation from being passed by the House.

### *Constitution Act, 1982*

## BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

### WEEKLY STATEMENT

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. With regard to House business, in the exchange earlier today, I indicated that discussions had been initiated by the New Democratic Party with respect to the borrowing authority Bill, Bill C-11. It has not been possible for the Minister, who is in Cabinet at the present time, to carry on those discussions. In order to allow for the discussions to carry on, I propose to change the order of business for tomorrow. We will reverse the business by starting tomorrow with Bill C-12, which deals with the Excise Tax Act, followed by Bill C-11, the Borrowing Authority Act, after Bill C-12 has been disposed of at second reading.

• (1700)

The other business for tomorrow will be the same as I announced previously, and this will be true with respect to Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday of next week as well. However, tomorrow we will deal with the Excise Tax Act and will allow discussion to continue on the borrowing authority Bill.

**Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques):** Mr. Speaker, indeed we have been consulted regarding this move and are ready to agree to it. In fact, we are ready to do anything to help the Government reflect on the situation of Bill C-11. We will co-operate.

[*Translation*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Order, please. It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private Members' business, as listed on today's Order Paper.

---

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS— MOTIONS

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Shall all orders and items preceding No. 150 stand by unanimous consent?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

### CONSTITUTION ACT, 1982

#### ADVISABILITY OF AMENDMENT TO INCLUDE PROPERTY RIGHTS

**Mr. Don Blenkarn (Mississauga South)** moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should amend the *Constitution Act 1982*, to include property rights and, that the Governor General issue a Proclamation under the Great Seal of Canada to amend section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights so that it reads as follows: