

S.O. 21

● (1410)

[English]

**ENERGY****IMPACT OF GASOLINE TAX ON TOURISM**

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Madam Speaker, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has given us all a long song and dance about the made in Canada price of gas and how it is at 75 per cent of world price. Only the Liberal Party of Canada could, at a time like this, argue about how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, because that is what the Liberals are doing. The so-called world price could not matter less to the Canadian man on the street. What he is interested in is the price at the pump, not some hypothetical price which comes to far less than half that amount, and which does nothing but serve as a shelf upon which Governments can stack tax upon tax.

The fact is that at the present time, in many parts of the country, Canadians are paying twice as much for gas as are their American neighbours.

The fact is that when I put in just ten gallons—if Hon. Members will forgive the expression—of gas in my car, I am paying \$8 directly to the federal Government in the form of one tax or another.

**An Hon. Member:** What are you driving?

**Mr. Darling:** The fact is that, because of the unconscionable tax load imposed upon all that it sells, the tourist industry, our second largest employer, is looking forward to a year of unparalleled disaster. The fact is that the Government could breathe new life into the tourist industry, and thus, millions and millions of dollars into the economy, just by cutting back on its unconscionable tax take.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

\* \* \*

**ABORIGINAL RIGHTS****OUTCOME OF CONSTITUTIONAL TALKS**

**Mr. Rod Murphy (Churchill):** Madam Speaker, in the last few days Canadians have watched the historic meetings between the First Ministers and the leaders of aboriginal Canadians. Canadians are pleased that there was an agreement to continue the process with a guarantee of future discussions. Canadians were also happy to see the strong and forthright statements made by the native leaders. Canadians hope that, in future talks, Government representatives will be able to come to agreement upon issues which profoundly affect and concern native people.

As New Democrats our concern centres on the fact that the federal Government did not provide the leadership which should have been present at the Conference. The Prime

Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Cabinet deliberately downplayed these talks. The Liberal Government failed to use its position to work toward an acceptable agreement on aboriginal rights and self-government for native Canadians. In contrast, the New Democratic Party Government of Manitoba prepared and defended these concepts by presenting arguments for a statement of principles and a model framework agreement. These Manitoban documents not only discussed self-government, aboriginal rights, land claims, equality, and the need for consent by the natives for changes affecting them, but they also provided the direction for future talks.

By refusing the role of leadership, the federal Government has allowed the minority of Provinces, represented by the Governments of B.C., Saskatchewan, and Alberta, to derail a possible agreement.

**Madam Speaker:** Order, please.

\* \* \*

**HEALTH****UNION REPORT ON HOSPITAL VIDEO DISPLAY TERMINAL OPERATORS**

**Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock-North Delta):** Madam Speaker, earlier this week the Hon. Member for Churchill (Mr. Murphy) presented a statement to the House with regard to the so-called harmful affects of VDTs on the employees using those machines. His statement was the following, in part:

Sharma found an abnormally low rate of pregnancies among the women of child-bearing age and, of the 14 VDT operators who became pregnant over the past year, ten had miscarriages or gave birth to babies with defects.

The Hospital Employees Union used Surrey Memorial Hospital as the basis for its study. It submitted its report to the federal task force on July 5. I would like to say for the record that at no time did it consult with the medical staff of the hospital and, to this day, even though it has been requested by the medical staff of the hospital to provide evidence to substantiate its report, it has not submitted any findings to the medical staff.

Presumably, the medical staff has at least some kind of passing interest in the health of the people who work there. It seems to me that, as part of their profession, they would care about their employees. If the union is so interested in the health of its members, why does it not co-operate with the medical staff to provide that evidence so that the medical staff can provide help to its employees?

The union leader, although he has been requested to provide that evidence, refuses to give it because he says it is privileged information. Three independent studies have been done in that hospital on this matter, all have indicated there is no problem.

**Madam Speaker:** Order.