S.O. 21

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 21

[Translation]

SHIPBUILDING

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEASURES TO HELP CONSTRUCTION OF CANADIAN SHIPS

Mr. Gaston Gourde (Lévis): Madam Speaker, not long ago, the Canadian Government announced a number of measures aimed at assisting Canadian shipbuilders. These measures include a broader application of Canadian Customs and Excise legislation as it concerns goods used for the purpose of resource exploration and exploitation beyond the present twelve-mile limit; maintaining subisidies to promote production in the industry and extending a production subsidy for ships finished and delivered before July 1, 1985; and adopting a coastal shipping policy to encourage greater participation by ships sailing under the Canadian flag.

I find it rather strange, however, that Opposition members suddenly seem to have dropped the subject, especially since between November 4 and December 13, 1982, they rose seven times to speak to this matter. Since the new policy was announced, the subject was brought up only once, on January 19. It must be because of the favourable reception this policy has received in shipbuilding circles.

[English]

HEALTH CARE

SUGGESTED REFERRAL OF PROPOSED BILL TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Jim Hawkes (Calgary West): Madam Speaker, we have a conflict in the House. The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) has indicated that she is negotiating with the Provinces regarding the proposed Canada Health Act. Yet when we talk to provincial Ministers, they indicate they have not met with the Minister for many months.

In the meantime, Madam Speaker, concern about the contents of the Bill is growing.

People in the health care profession, labour organizations, and consumer groups, want to voice their concerns about Canada's health care system and the proposed Health Care Act. They are concerned about issues such as over-crowding in hospitals, lengthy waiting lists, and the need for trained personnel. They have asked repeatedly that the Minister meet and talk with them so they can make their views known. No such meetings are taking place.

Then there is the matter of how fast we are being asked to pass this legislation. The Government has been sitting on this legislation for months. It came running into the House before Christmas demanding that we pass the Bill immediately. The Government will come into the House in a few days and say that in the interest of those who will be receiving money back, it has to have this legislation. The Government will say it is the Opposition that is not allowing these people to have their money. That is what this Government does with every piece of legislation that comes into this House.

This is very important legislation which requires a lot of consideration by members on all sides of the House. The Government says it will not make any income tax refunds until the Bill is passed. That will not sell. There is no difference between this Bill and the Bill to cut the Family Allowances. They cut the Family Allowances first and then passed the Bill later. We on this side said that was illegal and should not be done. The Government can take money away from those receiving Family Allowances, but cannot reimburse others until the legislation is passed. What a hypocritical move on the part of this Government! But it will not work. The Government says we must pass this Bill quickly because of the uncertainty among taxpayers. Do you know what causes that uncertainty?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair hesitates to interrupt but the time allotted to the Hon. Member has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Parker: Mr. Speaker, do you know what that uncertainty causes? You get uncertainty when Cabinet Ministers start babbling about the tax system, as the Minister of State responsible for the Status of Women did. I would like to read some excerpts from letters that appeared in our local newspaper—

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I hate to say so, but I was one of the people who said no to the request that this inane diatribe continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There does not appear to be unanimous consent. The Chair did not hear it at the time. The Hon. Member for Ontario.

Mr. Fennell: In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call it one o'clock?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.