

S.O. 21

POLITICAL PARTIES

POSITION OF PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE PARTY ON
NATIONAL ENERGY PROGRAM

Hon. Bud Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House that there has been some criticism of the Liberal policy on the NEP. I think we should look at the fact that the Tories have modified their stand on most issues according to which part of the country they are speaking from, or to what they think Canadians want to hear. The energy issue is no exception.

Last week in Calgary the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) outlined what his Party would do if it formed the Government. He said it would dismantle the "confiscatory and punitive provisions of the NEP." He said it would change the federal Government's exploration incentive program to include foreign companies. The Leader of the Opposition was not thinking of the good of all Canada. He was thinking about the gaining of western votes. Meanwhile a Member of the Tory Party was telling a group in Ottawa exactly what they wanted to hear. He said the Conservatives supported the Canadianization of the oil industry.

The next day in Edmonton the Leader of the Opposition decided not to repeat the controversial statements which he had made the day before in Calgary. Now the Tories own energy critic cannot outline the Conservative energy policy.

We would like to know where that Party stands on the energy issue. The Leader of the Opposition and his Party's members are doing a great disservice to the people of Canada by creating confusion about a National Energy Program that is working. Canadians are informed, and they want answers.

* * *

MEDICAL CARE

QUESTIONNAIRE CIRCULATED BY MEMBER FOR PROVENCHER

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg-Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Conservatives in this House have been noted for their silence about the concern that Canadians have about extra billing by physicians and user fees for medical and hospital care, and the need to preserve and strengthen the principles of medicare. This silence has only barely hidden the fact that the reason they do not call for action to stop these user charges is because they privately prefer the commercialization of health care for philosophical reasons.

The PC Party health critic, the Hon. Member for Provencher (Mr. Epp), has once again proven the old adage that it is better to be suspected of something than to open your mouth and prove it. In a recent report to his constituents he has clearly given away his Party's preference for extra billing and user fees by asking leading questions on both these topics.

On user fees he wants to know whether "heavier users" of health care, perhaps those who visit a doctor more than three times a month, should pay more. This is even more mean spirited than that which the Alberta Government proposed. It

is in favour of deterrent user fees that are charged only for the first few times. The Hon. Member for Provencher goes much further than this. He does not just want those who are mildly sick to pay for health care. He wants to put a special burden on those who are really sick and who may be asked by their doctors to come back often for close attention.

On extra billing the Tory health critic explores the idea of making extra billing acceptable by allowing it to be deducted for income tax purposes. This will be of no great comfort to the poor and others for whom regressive mechanisms like tax deductions are not beneficial—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Hon. Member's time has expired. The Hon. Member for Hamilton West.

* * *

ABORTION

OBJECTION TO USE OF UNION DUES IN SUPPORT OF
LIBERALIZATION

Mr. Stanley Hudecki (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine is employed by Canada Employment and Immigration and, as such, is a member of the Canadian Employment and Immigration Union, which is a component of the Public Service Alliance of Canada. The PSAC is affiliated with the Ontario Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress. Both of these organizations have passed resolutions urging the liberalization and legalization of abortion in Canada.

Since my constituent's moral and religious beliefs are totally opposed to abortion he has asked his union to divert his dues to a charitable organization, but it has refused. A section of the program administration collective agreement allows only people who belong to a religion which forbids membership in unions to divert their dues. As he is Roman Catholic he does not qualify under this section.

Mr. Speaker, it is of concern to me that the Canada Employment and Immigration Union would not allow my constituent to divert his dues to a charitable organization. Therefore, I would like to recommend that the Canada Employment and Immigration Union either withdraw its support for the abortion resolutions passed by the Ontario Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress, or seek to ensure that in future contracts members whose religion is opposed to abortion are allowed to divert a portion of their union dues to charitable organizations.

* * *

METRIC CONVERSION

NOVA SCOTIA'S RETURN TO HIGHWAY MILES PER HOUR SIGNS

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House that today the Premier of Nova Scotia, the Hon. John Buchanan, has made the decision to revert back