forward. This is an historic document for Canada's children, and one that if the NDP and the Liberals or their friends down the hall block is one with respect to which they will have to pay the price and answer some tough questions from Canadians in the next general election.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): Are there questions or comments? The Hon. Member for Vancouver East.

Ms. Mitchell: Madam Speaker, I certainly listened with interest to my friend's remarks. It is a good thing that the Hon. Member for Kamloops—Shuswap (Mr. Riis) made a speech, otherwise I do not think that the Hon. Member would have had anything to say today. He certainly used that speech as his background.

Since the Hon. Member was on the Special Committee on Child Care and also on the legislative committee and must have been very involved in the government planning for child care, why did the Government decide to put a seven-year limit on this program? Why are capital funds only going to be available for seven years? Why are they grandfathered at that point?

There is a great need for child care across Canada. Every indication is that that need will increase and not decrease, particularly if employment remains up—and members of the Government have been bragging about employment which means many more jobs for women. It goes without saying that the need and demand for child care will increase. I want to ask the Hon. Member this question. Why has the Government limited the amount of money that it will provide to only 200,000 spaces over seven years? That really is not very much. Why did the Government just pluck an arbitrary figure out of the sky?

If members of the Government were to look at the information from the Day Care Information Centre, which is a branch of Government, they would see that the figures that were provided show that this would not even meet 25 per cent of the need for child care in Canada. Children are not going to go away. We are going to have more and more children of working mothers, fathers, and single parents who will need child care.

When there is such a need and when that need is going to increase, I am wondering why the Government has put these two limits on—the seven-year limit and the 200,000 spaces. There is another limit in the Bill which is very subtle. The poorer provinces, the Atlantic region in particular, had no representation at committee to speak about this matter, nor did the two territories. Yet we know that they are very undeveloped as far as child care services are concerned. There are many caring people in those communities, but there exists mainly an informal type of baby-sitting arrangements. The people we heard from when we toured those areas indicated they wanted to have training programs. Some provinces do not even have a basic training program for child care workers. They certainly need to get decent wages and need to get licensed centres and licensed family day care homes so that they will be able to have good quality, affordable care and pay decent wages.

Why also is the Government at the end of this seven-year program saying that it will reduce the top-up in the variable cost sharing for the poorer provinces and territories? Again, that seems quite unrealistic. Many of them will just get organized about half-way through this period and will not be able to have reached anywhere near meeting their needs by the end of seven years.

The questions are three. Why just seven years? Why is there this arbitrary figure of just 200,000 spaces? Why is there a reduction in cost sharing for poorer provinces at the end of seven years?

Mr. Nicholson (Niagara Falls): There is a lot there, Madam Speaker, and I see I do not have much time.

Let me pick up on one of the points I would like to clarify for the House. I refer to the the Hon. Member's comments which would leave the impression that somehow people from all areas of the country were not heard on this particular subject. That is nonsense. As a member of the Special Committee on Child Care, of which she was a member, I think that committee heard more witnesses, had more briefs, and we did more research on this—

Ms. Mitchell: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I think the Hon. Member should be factual. This was a legislative committee with experts who were here on this Bill. This Bill was not before us when we had the Special Committee on Child Care. There were no Members from the Atlantic regions or the North, and only one from most of the other provinces.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Champagne): I realize the Hon. Member for Niagara Falls may want to continue to respond to the comments made by the Hon. Member for Vancouver East, which could be done after Question Period. There are five minutes left in the period for questions and comments.

It being 1 p.m., I do now leave the chair until 2 p.m.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[*English*]

AIR CANADA

TRANSPORTATION OF PCBS ON PASSENGER FLIGHTS

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, this weekend it was revealed that Air Canada transported 27