

S.O. 22

The second Minister gave a billion dollars to bank depositors—some of them were even Canadian. With her little pen she showed the world that Canadian banks are not terribly well supervised. Not only did she cost the taxpayers over a billion dollars in bailout guarantees, but she sent a signal to all future foreign investors to avoid Canadian banks. That is billions of dollars that we will not get to use.

The third Minister used his little pen to overrule his food inspectors' advice on some rotting tuna. Military cooks would not use it. We would not let starving Ethiopians eat it, but he insisted on putting it on the market. Now nobody wants Canadian processed fish—not Canadians and not foreign buyers. By lowering our standards he, too, has cost us a billion dollars in lost sales and lost reputation because he did not pay attention to quality.

Quality counts. Canadians used to have it. With their three little pens, three Ministers took us from world class to bush league.

* * *

[Translation]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

BEHAVIOUR OF CERTAIN MEMBERS DURING PROCEEDINGS

Mrs. Suzanne Duplessis (Louis-Hébert): Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, as I was asking a question of great importance to the businessmen of my riding, the Liberals—and I hasten to say that the New Democratic Members were quite respectful—the Liberals were practically raising hell in the House. I am saying that because it was not the first such incident since we came back earlier this month.

Last spring only the odd Member behaved like that, but the attitude of the Liberals has deteriorated so much since last September 9th that those Members, bent on emulating the belligerent approach of their leader, keep shouting and kicking up a row, systematically opposing all interventions by Government Members. They no longer bother to listen to answers given to their questions by the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues.

It is not as if they were trying to defend the interests of Canadians. What matters to them is the political points they might score. The Gallup poll proves it and Canadians are not fooled. The moment they enter the House, those men and women follow their leader, forget all about good manners and behave like uncivilized people. This is a deplorable situation—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Hon. Member for The Battlefords-Meadow Lake (Mr. Gormley).

[English]

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. John Gormley (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake): Mr. Speaker, for ten days those of us in western Canada have witnessed the debate over the Canadian Commercial Bank. In this time Parliament has reached a new low in partisan irresponsibility. It is unfortunate that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Turner) has departed from his usual high role as a responsible spokesman and has chosen the rankest and most dubious kind of denunciation.

In the House, the Leader of the Opposition indulged in some wild flights of fancy of which the House should take notice. Furthermore, the House is entitled to an explanation. The Leader of the Opposition has levelled wild, unfounded accusations at the Government, its Ministers, high public servants, the banks, and everyone connected with the demise of this western Canadian bank. His statements and unfounded charges have done grave damage to public confidence and to Canada's banking industry at large.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to make public, away from the protection of the House, his destructive allegations. Parliamentary privilege has thus far protected the Opposition Leader in his wild accusations. It should protect him no longer. Surely the Leader of the Opposition will endeavour to rescue his tattered credibility and explain his allegations. If he fails to do so, with his credibility now reduced to a level even below that of the Rat Pack's, he should resign.

* * *

HOUSING

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT POLICY

Ms. Sheila Copps (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, in the near future the Minister responsible for Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation will be meeting with his provincial counterparts to sign agreements on the future of social housing in Canada. All signals indicate that the Government wants nothing more to do with providing adequate and affordable housing for Canadians. Co-operative housing associations, native Indian bands, social planning groups and labour unions have condemned the transfer of social housing responsibilities to the provinces as a foolish and costly mistake of the Government.

In British Columbia, where the Social Credit—read Conservative—Government was given responsibility for senior citizen housing in 1979, the Bennett Government cut housing starts from 1,700 in 1978 to 600 in 1979, to 350 in 1983. While the PC Government of Alberta spent \$128 per capita on housing last year, the British Columbia Government spent a total of \$13 per person. Giving the Bennett Government control of social housing would mean thousands more Canadians living in the streets with no homes to call their own.

I call on the Government to begin caring for Canadians in need of housing. Do not leave them freezing in the cold this winter without adequate shelter.