

*Oral Questions***NEW EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM****SIGNING OF AGREEMENT WITH SASKATCHEWAN**

Mr. Simon de Jong (Regina East): Madam Speaker, I note that the Province of Saskatchewan and the federal Government have signed an agreement under the NEED Program, and I congratulate the two Governments for taking action in establishing a job creation program in Saskatchewan. However, there are some basic and valid concerns by workers in Regina, and in Saskatchewan generally, where they are afraid that many of the jobs to be created are jobs now being done by organized workers, and that the salaries provided under the NEED Program will be half of what they are getting now. They are afraid that the NEED Program is just another instrument to be used to reduce the people's standard of living. Can the Minister of Employment and Immigration give us any assurance that the jobs created under this Program are not jobs now being done by organized workers?

Hon. Lloyd Axworthy (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Madam Speaker, I would be very pleased to give the Hon. Member that assurance. The guidelines of the agreement we signed with Saskatchewan enunciate, first, that the group of people eligible for employment under the Program are those who have exhausted unemployment insurance benefits. Secondly, the work projects are incremental to work now going on, not replacement of existing work. Thirdly, there is the opportunity to top up the basic \$200 average wage we are putting forward. Municipalities or other organizations have the opportunity to go beyond that to a higher wage level if it is in their interest to do it. We have absolutely no interest in trying to replace those on the job; rather it is to provide additional work for those who have exhausted UIC benefits and who want to go back to work rather than simply go on welfare.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS**BANFF LAND EXCHANGE—REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION**

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Right Hon. Prime Minister I will direct my question to the Deputy Prime Minister. Referring to the post-employment conflict of interest guidelines which demand that former Ministers not be involved in commercial operations connected with their former portfolios for two years, and given that the hon. Judd Buchanan was involved in a land deal in Banff involving Lot 17, on September 17, 1980, and Lot 23-2 on August 25, 1980, and given that Mr. Buchanan was President of the Treasury Board from November 24 to June 3, 1979, will the Government now freeze this project and order a complete investigation of this matter by a parliamentary committee?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Deputy Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, I do not see any reason to freeze this project on the basis of what the Hon. Member has said.

Mr. Taylor: Madam Speaker, most Governments would investigate before they came to that conclusion.

ROLE OF TREASURY BOARD

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Madam Speaker, my second question is directed to the Hon. Minister of the Environment. Treasury Board refused to approve the land exchange in Banff in December, 1981. Why was the land exchange executed in November, 1982, not referred to Treasury Board?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of the Environment): Madam Speaker, I have already answered that question in the House, perhaps in the absence of the Hon. Member. It is because there were substantial changes negotiated as a result of the view which Treasury Board took of the transaction. Those changes were so substantial that Parks Canada officials were satisfied that it was in the interests of Parks Canada and the town of Banff to proceed with the new arrangement, which was entirely within their power to do.

REASONS FOR NOT CONSULTING TREASURY BOARD ON SECOND TRANSACTION

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the Minister of the Environment has missed the point. The first transaction required Treasury Board approval. Treasury Board refused the first transaction. It was not given the opportunity to refuse the second transaction. Why was Treasury Board not called upon to judge the second transaction after it had been called upon and refused to accept the first transaction?

Hon. John Roberts (Minister of the Environment): No, Madam Speaker, the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Treasury Board approval for the first project was not required, but given the disparity in the values of the land exchanged, the Parks Canada officials decided to seek the opinion of Treasury Board, which they did.

Mr. Nielsen: Exactly.

Mr. Roberts: Treasury Board gave that opinion. The officials then went back, as I have already indicated, and negotiated a substantially different arrangement. On that substantially different arrangement Parks Canada officials did not feel a need to consult Treasury Board again. They were sufficiently confident that they did not feel the need to seek a second opinion.

Mr. Clark: Madam Speaker, what the Minister has said is that, so long as Treasury Board was obedient, Treasury Board would be consulted. But when it became clear that Treasury