

## S.O. 22

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair until two o'clock later this day.

At 1 p.m., the House took recess.

## AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

## STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S.O. 22

[English]

## TRADE

## WATER RESOURCES—STATEMENT ATTRIBUTED TO CANADIAN NEGOTIATOR

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Clark) misinformed the House yesterday when he denied that Simon Reisman's office had issued a statement on water. According to Don Whitely of the *Vancouver Sun*, Mr. Reisman said: "In my judgment water will be the most critical area of Canada-U.S. relations over the next hundred years", and, regarding water export: "My views on water were developed when I was a private citizen. I believe in it then, and I believe in it now".

The chief negotiator for Canada in announcing his personal views on water and implying that water might be a main factor in up-coming trade negotiations, thus obliquely putting on the table an item that should never be dealt with as a tradeable commodity by Canada.

Who authorized Mr. Reisman to make such a statement? Can he be an independent thinker on water matters, if, in the past, he did business with the Grand Canal Company interested in water diversions and exports? Should Canada's negotiator be someone with former ties to such an enterprise? In view of his self-proclaimed interest in water exports to the U.S., what credibility does he have in the eyes of Canadians? Should Canada's negotiator engage in making public statements about the possible content of the negotiating process without authority from his Government?

If trade negotiations are to proceed, Mr. Speaker, the Government should replace Mr. Reisman with a Canadian who understands that water and sovereignty are two sides of the same coin.

**Mr. Speaker:** I regret to advise the Hon. Member that his time has expired.

## CANADA POST CORPORATION

## LACK OF SERVICE IN URBAN AREAS

**Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North):** Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by both Canada Post and the Letter Carriers' Union in Winnipeg that there are more than 700 homes and businesses in the urban part of my constituency which lack door-to-door letter carrier service. This number is constantly growing as new housing is constructed, and residents are justifiably angry that they cannot receive the mail service that they previously enjoyed. This same anger is felt in most urban areas across the country. These residents had always been led to believe that the green mailboxes they must use were temporary, but now we learn that Canada Post is proposing "community mailboxes" which are intended to be permanent.

Canada Post is clearly wrong in telling urban dwellers that there will be two classes of residents and two classes of mail delivery in our cities. Thousands of petitions have been signed protesting this discriminatory treatment. The Marchmont Commission found that Canadians are willing to pay in order that daily home delivery service in urban areas be maintained. Clearly, Canada Post must maintain its service and expand its revenue producing activities if it is to gain the confidence of the Canadian public.

Canada Post must realize that better service brings with it more use of the mails and more jobs. The alternative of service cut-backs makes huge rate increases as inevitable as all the Canadians who are angry about the postal service they are not getting. I call on the Government to direct Canada Post to provide door-to-door mail service to all urban homes.

\* \* \*

## GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS AND GRANTS

## PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

**Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to address the subject of federal Government grants. There presently exists a long menu of discretionary grants made through many Government agencies, including Regional Industrial Expansion, Employment and Immigration, Secretary of State, and Indian Affairs, to name a few.

It is often the case that communities, local non-profit groups, and local entrepreneurs have ideas which they believe will merit Government support. However, these people are sometimes intimidated by the vast array of programs and simply do not know where to begin. As a result, they hire the services of a consultant to research Government monies and prepare proposals even before a project has matured to the point where such an initial expense is justified. This is not to say that professional advice does not have value in the success of projects that ultimately require expert assistance. However, information from the Government Departments involved is often quite adequate to provide initial advice and direction at little or no cost. Going first to the responsible Government