

*Oral Questions*

of the transfer of the Parks Canada regional office from Cornwall to Peterborough is not crass politics and pork-barrelling, and if the shift of the office to the riding of a Liberal cabinet minister in Cornwall is not barnyard politics of the worst kind, would the minister please explain to this House why a former Liberal cabinet minister, the hon. member for London West, announced the move from Cornwall in 1975 and why the entire Liberal cabinet confirmed this transfer of Parks Canada in 1977?

Would he also advise this House why a former cabinet minister from Peterborough announced the move in 1978? Would the minister please advise this House what factors have changed the government's position and decision on the move of Parks Canada from Cornwall to Peterborough, other than the fact that the Liberals lost the Peterborough riding?

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. John Roberts (Minister of State for Science and Technology and Minister of the Environment):** Madam Speaker, the answer to the first three questions of the hon. member is simply no, it was none of those three things. I explained to him and to the House the basis on which we took that decision. It was his government which took the final deferral.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Roberts:** It was the result of the consequences of that action on the interests and morale of the workers that I reassessed it and came to the conclusion that the interests of the workers of Parks Canada would be best served by rescinding the original decision which had been taken before his government came to deal with the problem.

**An hon. Member:** Not true.

**Mr. Roberts:** We have gone over these matters in the House a multiple number of times. I have explained the situation clearly. The hon. gentleman can continue to rise and try to stir up emotions about a very difficult issue, but the facts underlying the decision have been presented to him. I wish he would have the good grace to acknowledge that the decision is taken, and understand the reasons for which it is presented.

**An hon. Member:** Pork-barrel.

**Mr. Domm:** Madam Speaker, the reason I keep rising on the subject of Parks Canada is that the decision has been taken so many times. I would like to address my supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board: it also deals with the Parks Canada move.

In view of the fact that the Government of Canada is going to pick up the tab to move the Parks Canada families back to Cornwall from Peterborough, as well as the costs incurred in the leasing arrangements for the downtown section of Peterborough on a five-year undertaking, would the President of the Treasury Board advise this House how much that costs the taxpayers of Canada?

Second, will he also advise this House what assistance the government intends to offer the evicted tenants from the downtown section of Peterborough as it lays waste 40,000 square feet of office space? The government evicted the tenants in order to make room for Parks Canada, which it has decided now to move to a Liberal cabinet minister's riding.

**Hon. Donald J. Johnston (President of the Treasury Board):** Madam Speaker, one of the reasons Treasury Board supported leaving Parks Canada in Cornwall is that it is cheaper. It will cost the taxpayers less money to leave Parks Canada in Cornwall than to continue with the move to Peterborough which had been planned.

If I may, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman, whose question is placed in a broader context, that I was delighted to learn that the Minister of State for Mines received a congratulatory letter from the Progressive Conservative riding association of Algoma for her efforts in ensuring that Eldorado is located at Blind River.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Clark:** Her efforts?

**Mr. Johnston:** So much, Madam Speaker, for the pork-barrel.

\* \* \*

**UNFAIR LABOUR PRACTICES****ANTI-UNION PRACTICES OF CHARTERED BANKS—CALL FOR INVESTIGATION**

**Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour. As the minister is no doubt aware, the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women has just recommended that the federal government initiate an investigation of the anti-union practices of Canada's chartered banks. Can the minister confirm that this investigation will indeed take place and, if so, when it will begin and what will be its terms of reference?

**Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of Labour):** Madam Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question. He will, of course, be aware that I am not responsible for the status of women and that that responsibility falls under another minister.

In relation to unfair labour practices, if complaints are filed then, of course, my department will take cognizance of them and take the appropriate steps.

**Mr. Parker:** Madam Speaker, that reply is not adequate. In light of the fact that three-quarters of the workers in Canada's banking industry are women, and this government has given lip-service to women's issues in the throne speech, will the minister state here and now when he intends to proceed with this investigation?

**Mr. Regan:** Madam Speaker, I deeply regret that my initial answer was not satisfactory to the hon. member. I shall strive