

Public Works Act

realms of possibility. It goes beyond the wildest dreams of Socialist International. It is taking away people's rights and property rights.

I get very upset by this type of legislation. Over the last two years I have sat in this chamber saying no many, many times. I have said no because every piece of legislation that goes through has a nasty, rotten thread running through it. It is a socialist thread to put all responsibility into the hands of the bureaucracy, to remove all responsibility from the House and, in turn, to remove all rights of the citizens of the country. This is a serious error. I pray to the Almighty that there will be an election soon and that we rid the country of that rotten mess which is destroying it.

● (1430)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Fennell: I hear laughing and joking on the other side. Wait until they are on this side of the House; they will see the results of what they have done. Perhaps it is only three or four of them who are trying to destroy the country, but when they are on this side of the House they will realize what they have done. The country is a ship without a rudder; no one is running it. There is a triumvirate—Michael Pitfield, Ian Stewart and Mickey Cohen—who are running government. Backbenchers opposite are in no worse a position than the second row of cabinet ministers; they are being run by a bureaucracy which is destroying the country.

Clause 2 of the bill deals with Section 39 of the act. If we vote for it, we are not representing the people of the country. I feel very strongly about it. The argument of the minister was not factual. I have checked up on titles and mortgages and have found that his argument is not factual. I maintain that this clause was included in order to give the Department of Public Works total control. In part Clause 2 reads:

—the proceeds of such sale or lease shall be accounted for as public moneys—

We do not know where public money goes. When it is mixed up in the general accounts, we lose track of it. We no longer have the ability in Parliament even to challenge ministers or to find out the facts. Public accounts have become somewhat a farce. We receive part of the truth and there is a whole battery of bureaucrats to protect the ministers' butts. There is no justification in that clause alone. It continues:

—but such public work shall be so sold or leased by tender or at auction after public advertisement—

This is reasonable, but then it goes on to indicate the classic inclusion in every bill—that Michael Pitfield can authorize with a rubber stamp. It reads:

—unless it is otherwise authorized by the governor in council.

That wipes out everything.

We have a problem in the country today about which I am worried. There is a shortage of money, there is a shortage of cash. Dome Petroleum is bankrupt. It cannot pay its bills, so the federal government will set up a Crown corporation and inject \$1 billion to save Dome. Government members may need to find that \$1 billion. They could travel around Canada

and pick out particular office buildings—and there are hundreds of thousands of square feet of office space which could be sold—to be sold to Bob Campeau, at a very attractive price to him, and then lease it back. Some people would argue that that is a good solution, but it will increase the cost of government spending. It will increase the estimates, it will increase the debt, and it will get the country into more trouble.

I maintain that they cannot include such a clause and remove the one saving grace that they may not sell or lease land which is otherwise required for public purposes. If a piece of property is required for public purposes, it should be kept and used. They may be inefficient in the way they operate it, but we are straddled with that problem now. They should continue to use it. We should not give them the permission to sell any building they want, whether or not it is required; that is absolutely immoral and against the beliefs of every Canadian citizen. Heavens, the next thing they will do is go to the U.S.S.R., sell the Parliament Buildings to Russia and then lease them back. That could happen, that is their attitude; then we would be truly working in a communist hall. I am really worried about this. If a building is required for public purposes, I believe it should be retained by the government of the country.

Bill C-91 also refers to paragraph 4(1)(a) of the Public Lands Grants Act, the pride of the country. We are talking about all the national parks which have been built over the years and all the land rights under the Parliament Buildings. We are also talking about Dorval, which I want to use as an example. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the government from going out and selling the land rights at Dorval. No one would know anything about it. There could be a one-year lease, and then the government would announce in the House that the problem with Mirabel had been solved because Dorval had been closed and all airplanes were going into Mirabel. This is how broad the legislation is. This is an indication of the kind of damage the government could do. Perhaps it is not such a bad idea because Mirabel is a white elephant.

Government members tried to impose the same thing on my riding, but fortunately there was the group known as POP, People Or Planes, to fight these monsters. They did not get their way and the land is still in its original state. I should like to touch on that question later.

I plead with the minister to pay attention because there are 700 farmers in Quebec and I have calculated—believe me, it is difficult to figure out government estimates—that it is costing somewhere between \$250 and \$500 per year per acre to maintain the 80,000 surplus acres in the area. Most of that land was bought for \$80 per acre, and it is now costing somewhere between \$250 and \$500 to maintain it. These farmers were thrown out of their homes, thrown off their land. They pleaded with the minister. They sent delegations to Ottawa to see the minister and to see their Member of Parliament. They have had absolutely no co-operation. Their first ray of hope was when they attended the tenth anniversary of POP, of which, incidentally, the minister used to be a member. They