

Mr. Wilson (Etobicoke Centre): Wrong again.

Mr. Cassidy: Wrong again. Okay, I apologize.

Mr. Neapole went public, after agreeing not to do so, because of his frustration with the assistance he was getting from Government with respect to getting a partner for the Northland Bank. The Government has said that it did not want an open-ended commitment. However, it certainly appears from statements made by Mr. Neapole a week and a half ago that in fact the Northland Bank was less than justly dealt with in terms of its efforts to get a partner that would permit the bank to continue as a viable entity. I would like to ensure that that question is fully looked into and reported on by Justice Estey.

● (1600)

The third question is what in fact has the Government done to reinforce the capacity of the Inspector General of Banks since it was revealed in the spring that he did not have the staff. The fourth question is how much this will cost the taxpayers, both through the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation and also directly. Finally, with respect to the relationship between the United States and the Canadian parts of the CCB, it is my hunch that because the American regulators were vigilant, they bailed out before they had to compensate depositors in that particular bank and we are paying the price for a double failure because of assets that went from the Canadian Commercial Bank into the American bank. That subject should in fact be reported on. Why was no new management put in place? If the Minister could not find any directors, why did she not put some officials from the Bank of Canada or the Department of Finance in as interim directors and tell the CCB that she would remove them when they found some decent directors since she could not find any. I know my time is up, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

In all of this, one question is left unanswered. This will cost the Canadian taxpayers about \$70 each. One billion dollars was lost because of the mistakes of the Government and the mismanagement of these banks. We have to know who is responsible. Judge Estey must not be prevented from doing his job by a lack of information and his report must be made completely public.

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

DEINDEXATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition which came from a number of women across Canada who attended the Canadian Labour Council Conference of Affirmative Action last week. In this petition they say that deindexation of the universal family allowance and massive cut-backs in public commitment to child benefits are an unfair attack on women and families,

Order Paper Questions

especially single-parent mothers. They go on to say that family allowance deindexation will not be off-set by changes in the child tax credit and that cut-backs will mean about \$600 million taken from child benefits by 1990, and furthermore, that the cut-backs—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the Hon. Member knows that summaries of petitions should be very brief. I thank the Hon. Member. Further petitions?

Ms. Mitchell: Yes Mr. Speaker, I also have a petition from a group of mostly women who are connected with the Ottawa Council for Low Income Support Services. The undersigned ask the Prime Minister to restore full indexation to the family allowance and child tax credit as this Budget measure will take away \$50 million in family benefits by 1987.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise that question No. 132 will be answered today.

[Text]

NCC—DEFERRAL OF CAPITAL PROJECTS

Question No. 132—**Mr. Malépart:**

Will jobs be lost following (a) cutbacks within the National Capital Region (b) the deferral of capital projects and of the construction of an office building in Halifax (c) the deferral of capital investments for dredgers destined to the Department of Public Works (d) the re-examination of redevelopment projects for federal lands located in Montreal's Vieux Port and in the Chicoutimi marina and, if so, in each case, how many?

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council): I am advised by the Department of Public Works and the National Capital Commission as follows:

(a) The recent government spending reductions mainly affect the National Capital Commission's capital program and an estimated 203 person-years of labour will not be required in 1985/1986 in the National Capital Region. There will be no loss of jobs at the National Capital Commission.

(b), (c) and (d) There will be no actual loss of construction jobs for the projects deferred or cancelled. We are looking to a deferral only of approximately 280.5 construction jobs for the Government of Canada Building in Halifax, Nova Scotia and 200 construction jobs due to the one year postponement of minor capital works projects. No loss of jobs is anticipated due to the deferral of capital investments. There is a potential loss of 10 person-years in 1985/1986 in the shipbuilding, repair and support industries. The decision to recall \$2.9 million from Montreal's Vieux-Port will result in the loss of 36 direct and 22 indirect jobs in 1985-1986. Direct jobs refer to on-site employment while indirect jobs refer to those lost by suppliers. The decision will not affect permanent positions. With regard