

*Oral Questions*

[Translation]

**SOVEREIGNTY FOR QUEBEC**

**Mr. Nic Leblanc (Longueuil):** Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, the Prime Minister tried to convince us that federalism made economic sense for Quebec. What does he take Quebecers for?

The existing federalist monetary policy is disastrous for Quebec. Hundreds of businesses are going bankrupt because of the exchange rate. The furniture industry is in crisis. Pratt & Whitney is laying off more than a thousand employees.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the federal regime breeds economic instability in Quebec. Only if it were sovereign could Quebec demand a monetary policy promoting economic stability and growth in the province. Therefore, only in sovereignty can Quebec find the assurance of stability and growth.

\* \* \*

[English]

**CHILD HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**Mr. Ken James (Sarnia—Lambton):** Mr. Speaker, the 1989 report of the Canadian Institute of Child Health cited preventable injuries as the leading cause of death for Canadian children between the ages of five and fourteen.

All members will agree that the health of our children is everyone's concern. All sectors of society must work to propose innovative ways to address the causes of these injuries.

The Sifton Safety Home, promoted by the London, Ontario, board of education is a good example. The concept encourages home safety and seeks to reduce or eliminate child injuries in the home.

In the safety home, children are accompanied by teachers and parents. They move from room to room and are encouraged to identify and recognize household dangers.

For the 3,000 children who will visit the safety home this year, the experience offers first-hand reinforcement of what to look for and not to do within the home.

Programs like The Sifton Safety Home, a private sector and public sector sponsored project for children's safety should be lauded. Hopefully, it will be expanded into a children and youth educational program in the future.

**ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

[English]

**THE ENVIRONMENT**

**Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Deputy Prime Minister about the government's handling of the Rafferty-Alameda situation.

Last Thursday, the government's own lawyers went to court in Saskatchewan and asked the court to delay for six days, until this Wednesday, the government's request for an injunction to prevent the province of Saskatchewan from completing the Rafferty-Alameda project until there had first been a complete environmental assessment.

Now we learn that the federal Minister of the Environment has left the country and will not be back until the following week, November 13. This means he will not be available to be cross-examined on his affidavit. This means he will not be available to be a witness in the court proceedings that are starting, supposedly, next Wednesday.

In the light of these facts, how can the government be taken seriously when it says it wants to have the Court of Queen's Bench in Saskatchewan issue an injunction to prevent the Rafferty project from going ahead and not being completed before there is an environmental assessment, when it has allowed a key witness to be out of the country for two weeks and to be out of reach of the court proceedings for that entire period?

**Mr. Lee Clark (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment):** Mr. Speaker, there are several facts that the hon. member should be aware of, if indeed he is not.

Late last week the representatives of the Saskatchewan government filed very detailed and somewhat voluminous affidavits in the court prior to the hearing, which was scheduled for Thursday. As a result, the lawyers representing the Government of Canada quite appropri-