Government Orders

For example, he has waxed about fishermen. I have not seen trustees or receivers appointed for fishermen. Perhaps he would enlighten us about that.

Mr. MacAulay: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

Only 10 cents. It is very unfortunate when you impose a 10 cent tax. It automatically seems to become \$10 then \$50 and whatever. A prime example is inspection fees in the seed potato industry. We agree with wage protection if it comes out of the product that is liquidated. It should be a super priority. That is what we feel.

Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Minister of State (Agriculture)): Mr. Speaker, I think you will find that *Hansard* for yesterday shows that when I was last on my feet, it was on questions and comments.

The clock should begin now on my opportunity.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I have taken that into consideration. I know that the hon. member was on questions and comments. This is debate. He has 20 minutes plus 10 minutes questions and comments.

Mr. Edwards: I appreciate that clarification, and I am grateful for it.

I am very privileged to have an opportunity to rise before this House to speak in support of Bill C-22 which, as you know, introduces long awaited amendments to the Bankruptcy Act and other statutes.

Judging from the relatively strong consensus that emerged during pre-study that the proposed reform package represents a balanced approach to deal with the competing interests that arise in insolvency situations, I am confident that this Parliament will make every effort to ensure quick passage of Bill C-22 into law.

All members of this House recognize the over-arching responsibility which they have to update laws that impede economic growth and prosperity and to ensure that business and consumers are treated fairly in the marketplace.

Through Bill C-22 we have been given the opportunity to help build a stronger Canada, and it is an obligation we must accept with pride.

Before discussing these reforms, I would like to take a moment to place them in their proper context.

Since our election in 1984, this government has always espoused the position that to support and invigorate the economy, economic framework legislation has to be adapted to the needs of the modern marketplace.

That is why in the intervening years we have systematically sought to overhaul our economic framework legislation, those essential tools of commerce that set the ground rules for a fair, competitive and orderly marketplace.

For example, in almost every field within the purview of consumer and corporate affairs—copyright, trademark, corporations, competition, patent legislation and now bankruptcy—outdated and inadequate rules have been modernized and where necessary, new laws have been enacted.

We have taken these measures because we know for a fact that the interplay of market forces in a setting where there is a fair chance to compete is the foundation upon which a dynamic, prosperous economy can be built.

As a recent discussion paper prepared for the recently established prosperity secretariat makes clear: "Canada's long-term productivity and competitiveness depends on complimentary and coherent laws and regulations governing the domestic marketplace. Framework and regulatory policies must meet their objectives while, at the same time, enable firms to compete successfully at home and abroad".

We also know that a healthy economy is a prerequisite for maintaining and improving the social safety net of which Canadians are so justifiably proud.

While there may not always have been unanimity about whether the right medicine was being administered, there has always been a consensus that thoughtful and firm action was warranted.

Bill C-22 represents a continuation of this ongoing process of reform. It is a thoughtful, firm piece of legislation designed to better protect the interests of wage earners and consumers, and to help preserve jobs by assisting viable businesses in financial trouble to get back on their feet.

As was evidenced during pre-study of these reforms, all members of this House have strong views about the