

*Government Orders*

to intellectual properties because it seems to me it has all the property but not much intellect.

**Mr. Steve Butland (Sault Ste. Marie):** Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague for his usual incisive speech. He has obviously studied this bill where others have probably feared to tread. It is a kind of daunting bill and I know the Official Opposition House leader called it an ominous bill. I know he meant to say omnibus bill but conceivably it could be ominous because we are not quite sure what exactly is in the bill.

I will say perhaps my colleague went a little too far when he suggested the member from Kingston was astute. I took exception to that at that particular time. Some might suggest this might be a housekeeping bill but after having gone through the bill I notice CITT, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal. That is our answer to the American commerce department.

Not only do Canadian firms have to deal with negative rulings from the American side, we have had to deal with considerable negative rulings against Canadian companies by our own Canadian trade group which is really quite disconcerting to all of those Canadian companies.

At first blush one would think this perhaps is totally innocuous and it has no impact upon anyone. I suggest after further review of this bill that it could be considered not innocuous but noxious.

I think the member rightly pointed out that in all likelihood there was no consultation on this bill whatsoever. I do not know if I have a question for the hon. member. Perhaps he could comment. Tell the Canadian people who are watching out there if this is a consequential bill or inconsequential as the government would have us believe.

**Mr. Whittaker:** Mr. Speaker, in response to the question I think it is very clear that there is a lot hidden within this bill. There are some things that could be looked on as housekeeping such as the Veterans Land Act. I do not necessarily look on it as a housekeeping bill. What it does is essentially fold in the Veterans Land Act under the Deputy Minister of Veterans Affairs.

• (1450)

Perhaps if we looked at the number of people left after the two wars and the Korean War who qualified under

VLA, the numbers did not warrant keeping the Veterans Land Act. If that is correct then I suggest that maybe that is the route to go. There should have been substantial consultations to make sure that people understood, that veterans did not feel threatened when they heard that their VLA was being shut down. In their golden years they should be feeling secure.

Look at other things—the Solicitor General was here—with respect to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. It is fairly substantial what it is doing. I cannot disagree with the thrust of the changes because it seems to me that it is taking two boards and making an independent external review board out of them. That perhaps is positive but it is a fairly substantial change. I think it is a change that should be discussed and considered. There should have been a little more consultation.

Therefore, I think the member is correct when he says that it is a fairly substantial bill, not inconsequential and not simply a housekeeping bill.

**Mr. Peter Milliken (Kingston and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to debate Bill C-93 arising out of last year's fateful budget.

We have had two budgets in the last 12 months. The economy is in a mess. Clearly the first budget was wrong, as we said at the time. I remember in the budget debate we made the point that the government was overly optimistic in all of its projections and had done nothing to stimulate the economy, which we felt was essential at that time.

The minister disagreed and said that everything he was doing was stimulating to the economy. We now know that was false and wrong.

We have had a second budget delivered this week which is called an economic statement, but nevertheless it had all the trappings of a budget. It indicated how wrong the minister was when you see what the deficit has done; increasing by something like \$9 billion since his original projection last February. It is hard to imagine that the finance minister could have been more off base than this one has been although his predecessor was not much better.

**Mrs. Maheu:** He is a Tory.