

years and years or will steps be taken to have them answered in a reasonable period of time?

Mr. Evans: Mr. Speaker, I can only refer the Hon. Member to the numerous occasions on which we have dealt with the starred question issue. A starred question only means that the answer will be read in the House but gives no precedence as to timing. I will as always consult with the Minister and see if we cannot get an answer to the Hon. Member at the earliest possible opportunity.

It would appear to me as if the Hon. Member has an answer to his question. If that is the case, then it would seem that under Standing Orders, if the information is publicly available, and the Hon. Member has just made it publicly available, it is no longer appropriate for the House.

● (1510)

Mr. McKenzie: Mr. Speaker, I would like it confirmed officially whether Mr. Zarry is receiving \$1,500 a day or \$2,000 a day. If I knew it was \$2,000 a day, I would not have to put a starred question on the Order Paper. I would like it confirmed by the Government exactly what this man is being paid.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

CANADA DEVELOPMENT INVESTMENT CORPORATIONS ACT

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Bussièrès that Bill C-25, an Act respecting the Canada Development Corporation, Canada Development Investment Corporation and certain other corporations, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee of Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Harvie Andre (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before the lunch hour, the address which was given by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Calgary South (Mr. Thompson), in kicking off second reading debate on this Bill covered the salient reasons for which any reasonable person would strenuously object to this legislation and help defeat it. I do not want to go over all of the ground covered by my colleague, but I would like to elaborate on one point which has been of interest to me in the past.

The provisions of this Bill give CDIC a mandate to permit it to carry up to \$3 billion worth of debt as an agent of Her Majesty. That debt is precisely the same as a direct debt of the Government. In other words, the taxpayers of Canada are

Development Investment Corporations Act

obligated for that debt. The Bill also provides \$1 billion in equity. As my colleague pointed out, it seems like an excessive amount of both debt and equity for a company which is supposedly being created for the purpose of privatizing certain Crown corporations. That is the statement which Senator Austin, among others, has made, but given the history of statements and actions by this Government and the diversity of the two, we would be fools to take it at face value.

Of more concern to me is the provision which would allow the Government to raise the debt and equity ceilings by a \$1 item in the estimates. For a number of years this Government has adopted the practice of legislating through the estimates, legislating through the Appropriations Act. In fact, VIA Rail, which is another monstrous Crown corporation, was created by a \$1 vote under the Appropriations Act. The Appropriations Act over the years has been full of examples of improper legislating by \$1 items. That approach has been objected to strenuously by myself and many other Members of the House for a number of years. I would invite Members to recall the words of Mr. Speaker Lamoureux, Mr. Speaker Jerome and Madam Speaker Sauvé who pointed out the impropriety of that approach. They pointed out how wrong it is and what an offence it is to our parliamentary traditions to legislate through the Appropriations Act. It is an absolute offence to 800 years of parliamentary history to attempt to legislate in this way. Three years ago, Madam Speaker Sauvé ruled that that process had to stop. After many warnings from successive Speakers—warnings unheeded by that contemptuous bunch opposite—Madam Speaker finally ruled that it was improper to legislate in that fashion.

What do we have before us now from the Government in Bill C-25? We have a move to make that activity legal. It is utter contempt for parliamentary traditions and for the proper way of doing things. It is utter and complete contempt. Coming from Jack Austin, that is not surprising. He is contemptuous of everything in this place. However, we would fail completely in our responsibilities and we would be ignoring the traditions and values of parliamentary democracy if we did not fight at least that provision with every ounce of strength we have.

I call upon responsible Members wherever they are to take a good look at what the Government is trying to do, and to think a little bit about parliamentary traditions and their responsibility to future generations who will look to this Parliament to retain our democratic system. We must ensure that Jack Austin, Ed Clark and the rest of those folks who find Parliament a pain in the backside are not allowed to get away with this. We must ensure that this terrible Bill goes to the trash-can, where it deserves to go.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Herbert): There follows a ten-minute period for questions and comments. If there are no Members wanting to put questions, for continuing debate, the Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone).

Mr. Arnold Malone (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, it is very important that Bill C-25 be debated now because as long as