

*Oral Questions*

**Right Hon. Brian Mulroney (Prime Minister):** Mr. Speaker, let me repeat for the record. My name is not John Carnell Crosbie.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

• (1500)

**Mr. Mulroney:** I had an opportunity just before I left to meet with the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans and we had approved, I think, a \$39 million program in favour of that—

**An hon. member:** Only for Newfoundland.

**Mr. Mulroney:** My friend from Nova Scotia says “only for Newfoundland.” What is wrong with that? This is a program to help Newfoundlanders. Are the Liberals opposed to us helping Newfoundlanders? Here we are trying to help Newfoundlanders with \$39 million and the member from Nova Scotia says “only for Newfoundlanders”. I say that is not enough for Newfoundlanders. We are trying to do more, and we are also doing a lot for Nova Scotia.

\* \* \*

**THE CONSTITUTION**

**Mr. Greg Thompson (Carleton—Charlotte):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister Responsible for Constitutional Affairs. During the past number of weeks, many members of Parliament have held town hall meetings and round table discussions in their ridings to hear the views of their constituents on the country's future, more specifically, to hear views of their constituents on the government's constitutional proposals. My question is this.

What mechanism can be used or will be considered to allow individual members of Parliament to report their views, the views they receive from their constituents, to the committee and to Parliament?

**Right Hon. Joe Clark (President of the Privy Council and Minister responsible for Constitutional Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate members from all sides of the House who are conducting those kinds of discussions in their own constituencies. It is another means to help us consult the public of Canada and also to improve the proposals that are on the table.

I think the hon. members makes an excellent suggestion, that we should seek to find a means—and I will undertake to meet with the members of the special joint committee to do that—by which the summary reports of

some of those consultations can be made available to the special joint committee so that they will have the benefit of the advice of interested Canadians as they make recommendations as to how to improve the proposals we have put before Parliament.

**TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY**

**Mr. J. W. Bud Bird (Fredericton—York—Sunbury):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. There is no development need in the maritime provinces quite so important for long-term success, both for prosperity and service to citizens, than is reconstruction of the Trans-Canada Highway, particularly through the corridor province of New Brunswick.

It is obvious that fulfilment of this goal involving more than \$2 billion can never be attained without major participation by the Government of Canada.

Will the minister please advise us about the state of negotiations and planning with respect to the Trans-Canada Highway. Is it the top priority in the national highway policy and will progress on its construction be seen in the foreseeable future?

**Hon. Jean Corbeil (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, it is precisely because we recognize how important these highways are that my department has been consulting with our provincial and territorial colleagues in order to plan a new national highway policy.

The hon. member certainly knows that since 1978, Transport Canada has contributed nearly \$207 million toward highways in New Brunswick and there are more under way. New Brunswick has decided to spend most of that money on the northeastern region. We are still consulting with our provincial counterparts to arrive at a national highway policy.

\* \* \*

**PETROLEUM INDUSTRY**

**Mr. Ross Harvey (Edmonton East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. If during the 1980s the foreign controlled companies in Canada's petroleum industry had reinvested their cash flows at the same rate as Canadian-controlled companies, another \$8 billion in new investment could have resulted. That could have saved many of the 60,000 jobs, more than 40 per cent of the total, that were lost from Alberta's oil patch since 1985. But they did not. They sent \$23 billion out of the country.