

*Oral Questions*

understand that the statements the minister just made about what is going to happen are very nice.

The Prime Minister also stated in his speech: "Funding is important but it is not, in the end, the decisive factor in the war on child suffering. Political will is".

Would the minister explain the political will that gave us no child care program, clawbacks to family allowance, and a failure to act to protect children from child abuse to this point? Statements are not good enough. We would like to see some action. Is this the political will of which the Prime Minister speaks?

**Hon. Perrin Beatty (Minister of National Health and Welfare):** Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting contrast between the cynicism that is exhibited by hon. members opposite and the tremendous optimism that was shown in New York at the world's largest summit of its kind ever in the history of mankind. In the days—

**Ms. Mitchell:** How many years have we been asking for action?

**Mr. Beatty:** Mr. Speaker, they ask a question, but they do not allow me to answer.

In today's *The New York Times* Dr. Robert E. Black, the chairman of the Department of International Health at Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, said it was: "a significant achievement, a great event, to bring all of these world leaders together to talk about a very important issue". Indeed it was, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member asked about political will. It was indeed this government which showed the political will and the leadership to ensure that some 260,000 Canadian children have been able to escape from the low income cutoff since we came to office.

The Liberals talk. We want to see leadership on their part. Today the Liberal Senators are blocking about half a billion dollars in parental leave benefits and the unemployment insurance reforms that are currently sitting before the Senate.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

• (1440)

**HAMILTON HARBOUR COMMISSION**

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** Mr. Speaker, last March I advised the Minister of Transport that Mr. Peter Lush, chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission, was in gross conflict of interest in that Mr. Peter Lush while chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission was also acting as a real estate broker in the sale of \$10 million worth of property to the Hamilton Harbour Commission.

The minister promised to investigate. Mr. Lush promised to sever any business ties in the sale of the land.

Why did the Minister of Transport make the statement when, as I learned today, Mr. Lush was in fact paid \$400,000 in commission?

**Hon. Doug Lewis (Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend raised this matter last March, the investigation was in fact carried out and at that time there was no suggestion that there was any conflict of interest. It was looked at very carefully.

My hon. friend has just brought another allegation to the floor of the House of Commons. I will investigate that one too.

**Mr. Stan Keyes (Hamilton West):** My supplementary question is for the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker.

I warned the minister six months ago of this conflict. The government did nothing. In my possession is an internal company memo documenting the \$400,000 payment to Mr. Lush who was appointed by the Tory government as chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission.

Will the Deputy Prime Minister respectfully suggest to the Prime Minister that he immediately remove Mr. Lush as chairman of the Hamilton Harbour Commission, that he relieve the Minister of Transport of his responsibilities, and that he call the RCMP in to investigate the sale of the land to—

**Mr. Speaker:** I patiently went through that question up until the last part. That is a clear allegation of criminal wrongdoing and it just is not appropriate in Question Period. The minister does not have to answer.