

Member for Eglinton-Lawrence (Mr. de Corneille), who joined in the debate and who put some of the positive contributions of the Government into perspective.

I would like to return to the remarks of the Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Burnaby (Mr. Cook) who, as the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on Regulatory Reform, worked very diligently. He worked side by side with us to try to bring in a responsible and responsive report which would deal with the real problems of regulation. As he stated, that committee worked as a non-partisan group. It logged more hours than any other committee, it was done at less cost than any other committee, and the report was brought in on time. The committee consulted with Canadians from the public and private sector right across Canada.

I think the Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Burnaby will acknowledge the tremendous debt we owe to our excellent research staff, to the clerk and to others who worked with us. It was a very worth-while experience because we learned how to work on a non-partisan basis very, very quickly. I detect from the Hon. Member's voice a great sense of pride in the accomplishments of the task force on regulatory reform. His frustration arises from the fact that all of the recommendations have not been implemented or have not received serious discussion in the House. I share a great deal of his frustration. But I think he has overstated the case about tenfold. He said that very few of the recommendations have been implemented.

Let us go back to some of the specific recommendations. There were two major thrusts which we were trying to bring forward. One was that if regulators had to consult with the regulated, with the private sector, before they introduced those regulations, we would have much more responsive regulations. We would then be taking into consideration the actual fall-out of what we are doing here in the towers of Ottawa, and the fall-out it would have on ordinary business people in Canada. That was a term called "consultation". I think that the task force accomplished a great deal in terms of bringing the word "consultation" to the fore.

The Hon. Member may not recall that four years ago the word "consultation", was not very much in evidence. It has now become the buzz-word used around Ottawa before anything is done. We have two stellar examples of this: the Budgets of the

Regulatory Reform

Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde). He has adopted this type of consultative process which we opted for. But what have we done as a Government in terms of making the consultation easier? We have implemented—and it was one of the major recommendations in the committee's report—the recommendations to have a regulatory agenda and to announce what regulatory measures we are contemplating. That allows for an early-warning system to the private sector. They can come forward and consult with the government. That is an openness which encourages the consultative process better than anything else. The Hon. Member talked about—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Hon. Member for North Vancouver-Burnaby (Mr. Cook) wishes to rise on a point of order.

Mr. Cook: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the Hon. Member accept one small question?

Mr. Peterson: Yes.

Mr. Cook: My question is this: If he wishes to use the Budget of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde) as an example of what has been accomplished through the brilliant work he, I, others and a first-rate staff did on that report, may I ask him to comment upon the consultation that took place with the Budget of the Hon. Member for Cape Breton Highlands-Canso (Mr. MacEachen) which came out two years after we finished our work?

Mr. Peterson: I do not know where the Hon. Member gets his facts. As I recall, the Budget to which he is referring was presented to the House on November 12, 1981, and our report was tabled in the House on December 19, 1980. How he gets two years out of that, I do not know. This is the type of hyperbole we have seen in terms of the criticisms. If we are to work together constructively in this House to achieve meaningful measures, it will have to be done in an atmosphere of co-operation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being five o'clock, consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 2(1), this House stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 22, 1984, at 11 a.m.

At 5 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.