

root of at least one of the amendments to the act proposed in the legislation before hon. members this afternoon.

In conclusion, I would like to indicate again that the reason for the changes that are before the House today, from a procedural point of view, stem from the ruling of the Speaker to which I referred, as reported in *Hansard* for June 12, 1981. The opportunity does permit me to talk about the fast-evolving complex but specialized and successful industry, of which Public Works has been a part.

I would like to point out that Public Works has been moving with the changing industry. Indeed, there are projects in ridings from coast to coast where this legislation will be of assistance, not only to the ministry and to the clients we serve, but as well to Canadians in metropolitan areas and in smaller communities. I hope that will be recognized by members on both sides of the House as they entertain discussion in examination of the legislation.

Mr. Scott Fennell (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here today. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cosgrove) and I were scheduled to be in my riding today, but I would much rather keep him here than allow him in my riding. There are not too many Liberals left in my riding and I would hate to have any pollution. As a consequence, I am delighted this bill came forward today.

First, I want to comment on a few of the minister's words. He talked about minor amendments. In my view, it is sad if the minister cannot read the legislation that is before us. However, I will deal with it. The minister talked about this bill being a housekeeping one. He said also that it was strictly a procedure for the chamber, and that we should get it right out of the chamber. That is the whole point. This bill removes the right of this chamber ever to get involved with these portions of the act. This bill takes the matter right out of the chamber. It is on this topic that I will be speaking very strongly.

The minister talked about Canada Post and having to get consent from Canada Post. There is no problem getting consent from Canada Post. All you have to do is tell the people they will not be getting their cheques next month. When it spends \$600 million a year rising to \$1 billion a year, they cannot say no. Therefore, that is a pretty poor argument of the minister's.

The minister got into a subject that we have been discussing here in the House the last few weeks. I thought it was amusing. The minister talked about how these lease-backs were building up the private sector. That reminds me of building up the architectural sector. I wonder if the same methods are used for selection of real estate companies, such as Bob Campeau's, as are used for architectural companies, such as Mr. Erickson's. It strikes me that the build-up in the private sector is nothing more than political pay-off. What it is is Liberal friends, Liberal pay-off. I cannot get too excited unless the minister can explain to us how the selection was made, whether it was done by tender or whether it was reviewed by committee and not cancelled by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

Public Works Act

We have lost a great deal of faith on this question of helping the private sector. It is not helping the private sector, it is just helping friends of the Liberal government. I was shocked that the minister would stand up in this House and state that; I think it is just a joke.

The minister talks about spending money to help the taxpayers. The taxpayers today are fed up with federal spending. They have had it right up to the eyeballs and more. This federal government has spent so much money that Canadians have been put in debt forever, including future generations of Canadians.

I will now deal directly with what this bill states. Clause 1 is an absolute disgrace. The minister knows my point of view about this. He agreed to an amendment and then backed off from it. The first clause reads:

1. Section 9 of the Public Works Act is amended by adding thereto the following subsection:

"(3) The Minister may, with the approval of the governor in council, incur expenditures or perform, or have performed, services or work in relation to

(a) properties belonging to Canada of which he does not have the management, charge or direction; or

(b) properties not belonging to Canada."

Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, that that clause removes the need for expropriation? Let me expand on that point. I happen to come from a riding which was partially destroyed by this government several years ago. It expropriated land to build an airport which has never been built and will never be built. This government has really resolved the problem. It spent a lot of money buying the land at Pickering. This government can pick any site in Canada and build an airport on it. It is just tough bananas to the guy who happens to have an interest in that land.

The minister has acknowledged this and I would have thought he would have made a change with respect to that. The minister talks about consent but there is no consent in this bill. If I had a piece of property, I would have no rights. That is a good point because it begs the question: Does this follow through from our charter of rights where our government has not included property rights? When I see a bill like this it makes me very nervous. I think it is part of the government's plan. The government has put this bill before the House which says that the government can build anywhere, that it does not need to expropriate land. In other words, the government can build towers, airports, recreational centres, it can do anything, and the owner of the land has no rights. That coincides completely with the lack of property rights in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This is a very dangerous clause and our party will be voting against it.

The minister asked if we could get this bill through the House in one day. I asked him how could we, on behalf of Canadians, agree to pass this bill in one day? We cannot do that because it is a dangerous piece of legislation. It is giving far too much power to the monstrous bureaucracy in the Department of Public Works. This bill goes beyond all the