

### Oral Questions

on a unique federal regulatory system. The bill is almost ready to be tabled.

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

\* \* \*

[English]

### MINING INDUSTRY

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. The Finance Minister's budget terminated a \$126 million mining incentive program, breaking a 1988 promise to maintain the Canadian exploration incentive program until the end of 1990.

Why has the minister's government broken its promise and why is it turning its back on the Canadian mining industry?

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the hon. member asked me that question because yesterday in a question to me she said that this year's energy Estimates show that a \$246 million cut for conservation and alternate energy was in place.

Quite frankly, the hon. member was wrong, dead wrong. I do not know what kind of research she does, but the following were the cuts in the Estimates: There was a change to CDIP, which was the forerunner of CEIP, of \$215 million; there was a change to CEIP of \$20 million, and that goes back to the question she asked today. There were others relating to energy savings in alternate energy, which had been announced 18 months before, of some \$10 million.

Suddenly the \$10 million mushroomed yesterday to \$246 million. The hon. member was dead wrong then and her numbers today on CEIP are also wrong.

**Ms. Catherine Callbeck (Malpeque):** I certainly would like to have a copy of those figures, because we researched this very thoroughly.

My supplementary question is for the same minister. The government not only breached a promise, but a legislative guarantee. Why did the minister not provide the required legislated six months notice provided for in the Canadian Exploration Incentive Program Act to exploration firms before cancelling the program?

**Hon. Jake Epp (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to send the hon. member those figures. She will find them in the Esti-

mates tabled by my colleague, the President of the Treasury Board.

**Some hon. members:** Yesterday.

**Mr. Epp:** Well, I was asked the question yesterday, that is correct. It was wrong yesterday and it is wrong today. I guess if she insists on it, it will be wrong again tomorrow.

On CEIP, the effective date was February 19. The Minister of Finance and I are looking at examples of those who are caught within the framework regarding how we can handle the obligations they have in the market-place. We will grandfather it.

Obviously, this comes down to one issue. By the way, if the hon. member reads the various editorial comments, most importantly in *The Northern Miner*, she will find that even people who know the mining industry, who are in the mining industry, who first of all criticized CEIP, then said that we should get rid of CEIP because it was not working and often seen more as a tax saving process than actual work for the industry. It is for those reasons that it has been done and it is for those reasons we will grandfather it in a fair way.

\* \* \*

### WOMEN'S PROGRAMS

**Ms. Margaret Mitchell (Vancouver East):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Employment and Immigration. I have two suggestions that will not cost her a cent and will help women greatly.

Despite Canada's support for UN conventions that oppose discrimination, she will know that immigrant and visible minority women in Canada still experience double discrimination right here in Canada. Domestic workers face exploitation and abuse and low paid jobs with little time off and no future.

Will the minister introduce enforcement mechanisms to protect domestics from abusive employers? Will she also make it easier for domestics to become landed immigrants?

**Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, as usual the hon. member is a little bit out of date. As I have announced publicly, we have already undertaken a review of the foreign domestic program. The foreign domestic program is an improvement over the kind of entry level job that we had before it was introduced. It is not working as well as this government would like it to work even though there is provision in the program for upgrading of