

*Summer Recess*

the formative stages of the cartel about its legality and the best lawyers in Canada were consulted by the uranium cartel. The government had its lawyers and it was not unnatural for the Government of Canada to ask Mr. Henry who was head of the combines investigation branch what his opinion was. Why can the Government of Canada not now produce the opinion that was given so that we can all see it and can say once and for all whether or not the government was aware of the domestic consequences that would be visited upon Canadians, particularly upon the people of Ontario, as a result of the establishment of this cartel?

I defy anyone on the other side to stand in his place in the House of Commons and give a reasoned answer as to why the opinions of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Chrétien) at the time and Mr. Justice Henry's opinion cannot be tabled so the people of Canada can understand. It is the refusal to make these opinions known and a refusal to rescind the gag regulations which will keep people, such as myself and every member on this side, asking question after question until we get the answers.

One problem has been pointed out by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey), namely the problem of innuendo and insinuations that will occur in circumstances when the government is not forthright with respect to this matter.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Eva Côté (Rimouski-Témiscouata):** First of all, Mr. Speaker, allow me to say that I am glad to take part in this debate. However, may I say as well that the reasons which explain our presence here this evening fill me with sorrow. I was elected on February 18, 1980, to participate along with all members in the administration of the affairs of my country. At that time I admit I thought I would be sitting here to do my share in building something or continuing to build something. Unfortunately certain events have shown me that people can also destroy just as illogically and, to my mind, that is distressing.

If we consider the work of a parliamentarian we realize that it can be extremely challenging and enriching, especially if we are concerned about doing it positively and objectively. Mr. Speaker, for one year and a few months now I have been participating in various experiments, if I may put it that way. I had an opportunity to deliver a speech on the constitution. I have listened to a lot of speeches about the bills which have been introduced, but rarely did I hear objective and constructive remarks from members opposite. That puzzled me, and I wanted to know just what was the Canadian reality and especially what sensible Canadians thought of our performance in the House. So I gathered some very interesting statistics. In 114 years, from 1867 to 1981, we have had three different governments, that is three political parties which have administered the affairs of Canada: a National Union Party during four years, the Progressive Conservative Party during 35 years and the Liberal Party during 75 years. Does that mean that the party of the official opposition does not

know anything about the Canadian reality? Is it really unable to understand what Canadians want, wish for and would like to see being accomplished in their country? Are we here to build or to destroy? Are we here to go forward or to go backward? Above all, Mr. Speaker, I was altogether astonished when I heard my colleague opposite state that the most absurd aspect is that we are debating what we called closure and that this motion has been moved by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Ouellet), the head of a department which was established to protect the interests of Canadians. If I may say so, that does not surprise me, particularly when we bear in mind the fact that the House of Commons is costing Canadians \$300,000 a day and that during five days spoke of nothing but matters about which the government properly discharged its responsibilities. In other words, we spent \$1.5 million of the Canadian taxpayers' money wasting our time here.

● (1810)

As concerns the postal strike, I believe that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Regan) said that there is a collective agreement, that there are standards and regulations, that we are living in a democracy, that Parliament has given the right to strike to these workers and that they may therefore use it. There are also mechanisms which provide for mediation, conciliation, and everything necessary to settle a strike. The government has seen to it. As for the uranium cartel, what has been done this week, except to try to tarnish the reputation of certain individuals and to prejudice decisions which could be made by our courts? I have the impression that in addition to wasting the time of the House, the opposition has dealt with the issues in an ignorant manner, and I do not know if this term is parliamentary or not, but in any case, as an hon. member opposite pointed out this week, we have been listening to people who speak with forked tongues.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I had been elected to represent my constituents and to participate in the administration of Canadian affairs, as I have already noted. We have work to do in the House with regard to legislation. We must also sit on committees, because this is important. We must take part in the proceedings of the House and we must also work in our constituencies. Moreover, unless we were brought in by the stork, we also have a family, and for my part, I believe this is important even though we have not talked about it very much.

As I was saying, in our constituencies—it should also be said that the House of Commons sits five days a week, including three evenings, and that we must be here. This is perhaps not quite as important when you are in either party of the opposition, but when you are a member of the government and you want to live up to your responsibilities, you have to be here. If you want to represent your constituents, you must also be in your constituency to know what is going on. I would not want to speak about the problems of Elliot Lake because I am not from there, but it would be a terrible thing or a lack of