

Oral Questions

That is the answer of the United States trade representative. Water is not included. We agree with his statement. Both parties to the agreement agree that water is not included.

We know that bottled water is included as a tariff item in the schedule. We know that compressed air is included as a tariff item in the schedule. However, that does not mean that Canada must sell its air to the United States, although some of it, particularly that surrounding the hon. gentleman, might well be sold to the United States.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, quoting Mr. Yeutter on any aspect of the agreement as it pertains to Canada is like a chicken listening to a quote from Colonel Sanders and believing it.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MINISTER'S POSITION

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Yeutter is so convinced that water is not included, and the deputy chief negotiator for Canada, a former civil servant, has said that water is included, why will the Minister not put this question to Mr. Yeutter? If he is convinced water is not included, why will he not agree to a change in the agreement?

Hon. John C. Crosbie (Minister for International Trade): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has not been here every day and perhaps he did not hear my answer of some days ago. Mr. Frank Stone of the Institute for Research on Public Policy, who was one of our major negotiators at the GATT and is very experienced, said in an article:

The free trade agreement . . . has nothing at all to do with the diversion or inter-basin transfer of water.

He said:

Water diversions have never been discussed in the GATT and any suggestion that GATT covers water diversions or inter-basin transfers would be hooted down in Geneva by the GATT member countries.

The hon. gentleman should not bother with chicken. He should bother about those who go around the country crying wolf when all they are trying to do is spread alarm and fear.

* * *

CHILD CARE

ACCESSIBILITY—NATIONAL OBJECTIVE

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. The Government has abdicated its responsibility and failed to ensure national standards through the Canada Child Care Bill. Yesterday the Minister of National Health and Welfare told this House that it was impossible to ensure national standards, that even the Canada Health Act did not have national standards but merely objectives.

Well, one of these objectives is accessibility, an objective sorely missing from the Canada Child Care Bill which does not mention children from lower to middle-income families.

Since the Minister chooses to play with words, will he commit himself and his Government to amending the Canada Child Care Bill to include the national objective of accessibility and to ensure a place for every child in this country?

• (1440)

Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Canada Child Care Act substantially increases the number of subsidized spaces in Canada by 200,000 over a seven-year period. The Hon. Member should recognize and acknowledge that. If she wants to compare it, for example, to health care, it has been a principle between the federal Government and the provinces that everyone should have access to health care.

The other point I think she should understand is that we developed a child care policy, and many Canadians do not agree that the same comparison either exists or that every child below a certain age, say six and under, should have a place or that there should be a formal day care space for it.

I think the Government, given its fiscal capacity and considering its agreements with the provinces, has moved this forward very substantially this year. The number of spaces has increased by 200,000, involving an increased expenditure of \$6.4 billion, and the only people I hear who say it is not enough are the NDP and Liberals and those who wanted to see a different child care system, namely, a universal system fully paid for by the taxpayers. That is supported by less than 10 per cent of the public.

[Translation]

REQUEST FOR GUARANTEE DAY CARE CENTRES IN
EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES WILL BE SUBSIDIZED

Mrs. Lucie Pépin (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid we definitely do not agree on the statistics, because these 200,000 spaces over a seven-year period mean 28,000 spaces per year, shared among twelve provinces.

Mr. Speaker, it is a fact that 57 per cent of children between the ages of six and fourteen are without supervision after school. Quebecers is one of the few provinces that allows the use of school premises after school to supervise these children, and the Government of Quebec is concerned about this Bill. Why? Because the Bill tabled on Monday makes no mention at all of children between the ages of six and fourteen, and because they are actually excluded from the legislation, and I quote: Does not include any service relating wholly or substantially to education.

Will the Minister therefore guarantee that school day care will be subsidized in his new Bill?