

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, the previous Liberal Government got out of block funding and gave the provinces money with no strings attached because it was responding to the will of the provinces which did not want the federal Government messing around in their affairs. Therefore we said "We will give it a try. Yes, we will give you the money and we will see what you do". Now we have seen what has happened. The provinces have taken money that was supposed to go into education and it is being spent on roads, sidewalks and other things. It is time that a national government stood up for national priorities.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, just for the record I want to tell the Hon. Member—I see the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia) s here and he will know that what I am saying is correct—that the only party in Parliament which opposed that mistaken, terrible decision of the then Liberal Government to change the way things were done was the New Democratic Party and its members. When the Liberal Government brought forward that proposal, it got the support and the votes of the Conservatives.

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that I was not here at the time that that decision was made. I take the Hon. Member at his word that the New Democratic Party opposed the move at that time. I wish that the New Democratic Party today would have the same principles which it had seven, eight or nine years ago.

Mr. Nunziata: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to ask a question in the last minute remaining before lunch. I would like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Laurier (Mr. Berger) for his speech. The people of Laurier and the people of Canada are well served by the Hon. Member.

There were two points on which the Hon. Member did not touch during his comments; first, regarding appointments to the Senate of Canada and second, regarding appointments to the Supreme Court of Canada. In the 30 seconds remaining, would the Hon. Member for Laurier comment on those two points?

Mr. Berger: Mr. Speaker, in the brief time that I have, I can simply say that there is certainly a case to be made for formalizing the consultation process that has existed for sometime with respect to Supreme Court appointments. With respect to Quebec, which has a different legal tradition than the rest of the country, something had to be done to provide the Quebec Government in a formal manner with input into those appointments.

With respect to the Senate, I feel that there is a need also to ensure provincial input into appointments to the Senate, but the formula that we have come up with in the Meech Lake Agreement really hands over the whole matter to the provinces and leaves no room whatsoever—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I regret that the Hon. Member's time has expired. The period for questions and comments has expired.

S. O. 21

It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock this day.

At 1 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2.00 p.m.

STATEMENTS PURSUANT TO S. O. 21

[Translation]

TRADE

CANADA-UNITED STATES FREE TRADE AGREEMENT CATEGORIES OF AFFECTED WORKERS

Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, given the Free Trade Agreement signed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the statements he made yesterday, when he admitted there were losers and winners in that Accord, he unfortunately did not name the losers. I would have liked the Prime Minister to name a few categories of Canadian workers he traded off to sign that Agreement. Are they men and women working in the textile industry? Are they workers in the footwear industry? In the knitting industry? In the leather industry? In agriculture? In rail transportation? In shipping, in shipbuilding?

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with this and I would like to know—the East end of Montreal issue, the *Comité de la Relance* is requesting a special grants committee to modernize Montreal's industrial East end, to designate the East end of Montreal . . . Now with free trade, the East end of Montreal goes down the drain the way that agreement was signed by the Prime Minister.

* * *

[English]

DECENTRALIZATION

LABORATORY CENTRE FOR DISEASE CONTROL—OPPOSITION TO RELOCATION

Mr. Barry Turner (Ottawa—Carleton): Mr. Speaker, in this great city of Ottawa the rumour mill is a stable industry and one of its recent products is news of the potential relocation of part of the Laboratory Centre for Disease Control to Winnipeg.

Ottawa has been the grab bag, to quote Regional Chairman Andy Haydon, often enough in the last few years. Ottawa Mayor Jim Durrell has written to me saying that any potential gain for Winnipeg will be a loss for Ottawa. They are both right.