### Government Orders

### Ouestion No. 109-Mr. Riis:

For each fiscal year since 1985, did the government retain the services of private law firms in Kamloops, British Columbia, and, if so, in each case, what was the name of the firm and the amount received?

Return tabled.

Mr. Cooper: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

## **GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

• (1050)

[English]

# **BUDGET IMPLEMENTATION ACT, 1991**

#### MEASURE TO ENACT

The House resumed from Monday, December 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Mazankowski that Bill C-20, an act to amend certain statutes to implement the budget tabled in Parliament on February 26, 1991, be read the third time and passed; and on the amendment of Mr. Walker (p. 5662)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): When we ended debate, the hon. member for Restigouche—Chaleur had five minutes remaining in his debate, plus 10 minutes questions or comments.

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say from the outset that this is probably my longest speech since I started last evening at about 5.45 and here I am a day later still going. I can assure my constituents that I did not speak throughout the entire night. I am not that long—winded.

I must say, as I mentioned last evening, that this is a very complex and technical bill. I want to continue where I left off when I was speaking last evening about transportation in my riding as it applies to the bill and as it may be affected. I mentioned the Charlo airport in my riding and how important it is to the riding and how we have lost the weather station at that airport, although another weather station was located at another airport. I want to say from the outset that I am not against improvements in other areas, other communities, but I do not believe we should rob Peter to pay Paul. I believe when there is a new item to be taken and new programs coming out, everyone should have an equal opportunity,

but where there are existing facilities in place they should remain and not move at the expense of that community.

I mentioned about the ports of Dalhousie and Belledune and also about our high unemployment, saying that the federal government has not played a major role in the promotion and development of those two ports. It should because they are federal facilities. There is no on-site manager as such at those two facilities and I think that is a necessity if we are going to promote those two ports and develop some type of strategy for them.

I would like to also mention this morning the changes as they may impact on UIC. I want to go back to the 1989 budget in which the then finance minister pledged that, and I quote: "The government will continue to contribute to the financing of the program in difficult economic times when it is inappropriate to raise premiums and prudent to allow deficits to build up in the unemployment insurance account".

I guess no one has to preach it to the world that that is another one of the broken promises of this government. Bill C-21, the budget, everything has indicated to us that there will be increased premiums. As far as I am concerned and my constituents are telling me, especially those who operate small businesses, this is another form of tax, it is an attack on small business and it is an attack on employees because they have to match those increased premiums as well.

Therefore, it is certainly a negative impact on small business in my area and on employees.

### [Translation]

Bill C-20 is a deliberate attack on Canada's rural population and on Canadians in general. It is certainly not acceptable to the vast majority of Canadians. This legislation will actually force provinces like New Brunswick, my own province, to make some very difficult decisions. The people of New Brunswick realize their government must resort to such decisions because Ottawa is cutting back on its fiscal arrangements program.

At this critical time in Canada's history, the federal government should take steps to promote national unity and reduce regional disparity. However, if the federal government keeps reducing cash payments, it will intensify regional disparity. Residents of the poorer provinces will have to accept a lower standard of health care and