

that by itself is a great omission. What is this Minister supposed to do?

At the same time I would like to congratulate the new Minister of State for External Relations (Mr. Pepin). I hope he will do well in his role, whatever it is. At the same time, I would like to congratulate him for the way he handled the initial news about the Korean airplane incident. As we are all aware, that was a horrendous event and a terrible thing to happen in modern day society. Unfortunately, I still feel that we do not know many of the things about the event. Even today as the papers come in and television reports are made, we receive more information which leaves doubts in people's minds about what was actually happening. For instance, how could a modern airliner with its three navigation systems get that far off course? These questions still have not been answered.

● (1150)

When the news first came out that this tragedy had taken place, that lives had been lost and Canadians had been involved in an international disaster and had died in a terrible incident like this, the Minister of State for External Relations kept giving us whatever information he had but left the door open for further information. I congratulate him for that. There was no immediate closing down of the question.

At the same time, I would like him to rise in the House to explain what his job is, because I do not know what it is and it is not described in the Bill. I can see great conflict arising between the two roles, if they are necessary at all, unless they are clearly defined and divided so that we know the purpose of each. While I think I should know that, I and I am sure most Canadians do not know why there are two Ministers dealing with international affairs or relations.

I will end my remarks by saying that I believe this particular Bill, from an international point of view, causes me grave concern because the whole question of trade, profit and commerce will play too big a role in the judgments made by the Minister of State (External Affairs), other very important conditions to international life, such as human rights and development assistance, and how we deal diplomatically with other nations in the world could be very strictly limited.

Second, I would like the Government or the Minister himself to define for us the role of the Minister of State for External Relations and how it both differs from and relates to the role of Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen). Whom are we to believe if their statements and views differ?

Miss Jewett: Mr. Speaker, as the New Democratic Party critic for CIDA, does the Hon. Member know that the new president of CIDA, I understand, will be reporting directly to the undersecretary rather than the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen)? If that is the case, what are the implications of that change?

Mr. Ogle: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Hon. Member for the question. I had been forewarned that this was a possibility.

Government Organization Act, 1983

The new president of CIDA is Mrs. Margaret Catley-Carlson. I would like publicly to congratulate her on her appointment at this time because CIDA has been without a president for nearly a year. It had been rumoured that the new president would have to report to a lower level in External Affairs. I checked with CIDA to make sure that would not happen. Mr. Jack Shea, the person from CIDA who monitors the House, informed me this morning that she will be reporting to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Are other Hon. Members seeking to ask questions? If not, the Chair recognizes the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology.

Mr. Jim Peterson (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of State for Economic Development and Minister of State for Science and Technology): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today particularly to have the opportunity to respond to many of the criticisms that have been levelled against the regional economic aspects of this particular Bill. However, I must confess that I am not particularly pleased with what I have heard in the House so far today. The reason is that it will have a bearing on our capacity as legislators from every Party in the House to deal with the very difficult economic challenges which Canadians face in the days, months and even years ahead.

Let me be more specific. At a time when we have so many opportunities and challenges ahead of us, I would have hoped that we would see a concrete, positive and upbeat approach by the Opposition showing that they are prepared to work in a constructive manner toward proposing concrete alternatives to the situation that we face today. We did not see this.

The Hon. Member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson) gave a perfect example of small, partisan bickering, bringing to the House no new alternatives and looking to confrontation rather than constructive alternatives. He may say that these are many charges, but let me substantiate them by repeating what he said.

First, he said that he is concerned that we are making increased funding available to the most depressed regions of our country. He said that this is merely a political move. One may call any move that we make a political move, but the question is whether it is a move that is in the interest of the people in a particular region. Personally, I do not apologize for our Government's posture in increasing the funding which we are making available to the poorest regions in Canada. Did the Hon. Member have a constructive alternative in this case? Absolutely not.

Second, he is concerned that the new federal economic development co-ordinators who are being appointed in each Province of Canada to deal specifically with economic development problems at the local level will not be able to respond to regional economic problems, or he suggested that they will respond to regional pressures. If that is his criticism, I gladly accept it. If the voices of the regions which reflect the needs of