

S. O. 21

Prior to the enactment of the Canadian Citizenship Act in 1947 there was no such thing as Canadian citizenship; there were no such persons as Canadian citizens. As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, we were all British subjects in those days. With the passage of that Act of Parliament we took a great leap forward in affirming our uniqueness and independence among world nations.

● (1410)

I remember very well when the value of that citizenship was shown to me. I was much younger and backpacking my way through France. One day, as I sat by the side of the road in Calais, I was approached by a middle-aged Frenchman. He asked me if I had a place to stay, if I was hungry, and if everything was all right. I asked him why he showed so much interest in a traveller. He then pointed to the red maple leaf on my packsack, Mr. Speaker, and said: "During the war, I had a Canadian friend".

Our soldiers fought for Canadian citizenship and all that it represents. We have much to be thankful for. This week, during National Citizenship Week, we have much to celebrate.

* * *

FINANCE**HOUSING TAX DEDUCTION APPLICABLE TO ISOLATED POSTS**

Mr. Geoff Wilson (Swift Current—Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, the February, 1986, Budget extended to all permanent residents of isolated posts an additional tax deduction in respect of housing costs. According to a December, 1986, release the Finance Department considers Treasury Board guidelines, which have been used for many years for providing northern benefits to federal employees, to be the appropriate criteria for ascertaining which locations qualify for the new benefits.

The December list of isolated posts included several prairie towns in populated areas within a few miles of the U.S. border. Area farmers and residents of other nearby towns are asking why they would not also qualify, while residents in the designated posts remain uncertain as to whether they really are eligible. Everyone wonders why federal government employees should have a special deduction not enjoyed by other residents.

Clearly, the intent of the February, 1986, proposals is good but the criteria for designating what is an isolated post need a thorough overhaul. I call on the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) to issue clarification at an early date.

FINANCE**DOMESTIC PETROLEUM TAKEOVER—REQUEST FOR ADVANCE TAX RULING**

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, in July, 1984, the former Liberal Government approved a special \$1 billion tax remission for Dome Petroleum which was confirmed by the Conservative Government in February, 1985.

The Auditor General said that he was disturbed by this remission because the House of Commons was neither informed nor given the opportunity to debate the matter. He said: "There is something very wrong with a system that allows a \$1 billion policy decision to be made by way of a tax expenditure with Parliament having so little information on the transaction".

We have now learned that Dome Petroleum has received a takeover bid from TransCanada PipeLines which will be worth between \$4 billion and \$5 billion and which is likely to involve new and major concessions from the Canadian taxpayer.

I call on the Government to turn its back on past practices, to heed the advice of the Auditor General, and to ensure that all the details of any proposed multimillion dollar corporate tax ruling be laid before Parliament and the people of Canada. We must not give billions of dollars for this particular takeover without Parliament being informed and having a chance to give its consent.

* * *

HARBOURFRONT**MORATORIUM ON TORONTO WATERFRONT CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

Mr. Alan Redway (York East): Mr. Speaker, Toronto Harbourfront Park property is an exciting public resource, treasured by all of the people of the Metropolitan Toronto area. Although Harbourfront is federally owned, the City of Toronto through its official plan, its zoning and building by-laws, controls construction, density, heights, and building permits on the property.

For many months now residents have been extremely concerned about the city's planning and development process. Forty-storey buildings are proposed where 10-storey buildings were planned, densities are shifted from one site to another, minor variance approvals increase building sizes by as much as 15 per cent, and construction has been proceeding on some sites without building permits. Because of this, residents welcome the Government's announced construction moratorium pending a federal review. Hopefully this means a total freeze and a review, with full public input and participation.