

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the emphasis in the Speech from the Throne on the single pensioner and the fact that the supplement for single pensioners will be increased is needed. The GIS did not take into account the single pensioner living alone and with expenses similar to those of the two-income pension family. I am glad to see that this injustice will now be remedied for the more than 700,000 single pensioners in Canada. This Government has produced good legislation over the last three and a half years. We have seen the programs and they have been for the benefit of Canadians. The Speech from the Throne gives the direction for this Government to follow. The future is there for all Canadians, and I am sure all Canadians will work to make Canada better.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I have a very brief question for the Hon. Member. I listened with considerable interest to her comments, especially as they applied to the fisheries legislation, the restructuring Bill as it was called, Bill C-170. At the time this Bill was debated in the House, examined in committee and brought back to the House for third and final reading I distinctly remember moving two amendments which would have dealt very closely with some of the concerns the Hon. Member expressed today. One dealt with accountability, which would have protected the investment by the Canadian public in this massive monstrosity, this controlling company being established in Atlantic Canada, and the possibility of a second one to be established now in our native Province. I ask the Hon. Member why at that time she did not speak out forcefully, as she is endeavouring to do today in support of my amendment?

Second, I would like to know just what happened between November 25, I think it was, when that Bill was given third and final reading, and the present time to make her change her mind and literally condemn the Government, as she is doing, in one breath for bringing in this type of Bill which is restrictive on private companies, and then in the second breath sort of congratulating the Government on the words in the Throne Speech. This puts her in a very contradictory position. I would like a further explanation of what happened to her when she got home and the independents contacted her, because obviously something has occurred which is putting her right in the middle of the fence, which is a very awkward position to be in.

Miss Campbell: Mr. Speaker, I think the Hon. Member is most unfair. He is well aware of the questions I asked witnesses in committee, the speech I made on second reading, and my answer to one of his proposed amendments. I have no qualms as far as my constituency goes about my feelings on Bill C-170. However, everyone in this House knows that sometimes there are more powerful forces than one Member of Parliament. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) comes from Central Nova, a small fishing constituency, and he said that they would pass the Bill in one day. We have the NDP, which said at first it was supporting the Bill. At the last minute in the House NDP Members came up and said no, they could not support it because of the banks. My concern was

The Address—Miss Carney

that I could not find five Members to stand up and vote on that day because there was an agreement among the parties not to have a vote. I have no qualms in saying that, yes, I can represent the concerns of one area in Canada, but there are 281 other Members in this Parliament to be considered. Whether it is a province or a Member of Parliament, I think that is what democracy is, where at least the concerns can be registered.

As far as the Hon. Member's question as to what has happened since is concerned, not too much has happened since. At the last committee hearing, we heard the Deputy Minister from Nova Scotia say that, yes, he wanted guarantees on fish resources written into the agreement between Nova Scotia and the federal Government. We also know that Newfoundland and Nova Scotia want these agreements or they would not be sitting down. There were other ways this could have proceeded. The provinces want these resource allocations for five years to protect the two new supercompanies. That, to me, starts the whole ball rolling where people ask what the Governments are doing in saying how much quota is needed when those companies being restructured have not even been able to manage the quotas they have had for the last number of years. Why did we have the problem to begin with, the soft markets and so on, if they could have marketed good quality fish, all the fish that was out there? Do they need more now in order to make them economically viable? I do not feel that should be written into the agreement.

● (1640)

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Mr. Speaker, in discussing the Throne Speech today I was relieved that the Minister for Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien) took his extension of time to talk about energy policy. I thought that up to that point in the speech he gave the House he was on the campaign trail. He spent most of his speech discussing the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) made in the House last Friday. I can only say that if his comments on the Leader's speech are typical of what he hopes to say on the campaign trail, we can understand why the polls in Quebec show the Leader of the Opposition head and shoulders above the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources as a potential Prime Minister of Canada.

I was also interested in the Member for South West Nova's (Miss Campbell) comments just now on the number of grants and job creation programs that she has in her riding. Some of us on the Opposition side are not in such a happy position. For instance, in my Canada Works Program this year the grant allotment for my riding was cut by more than half. Instead of the \$330,000 we received last time, we were cut to \$147,000. This is in one of the largest urban ridings in Canada. It is the headquarters of just about every volunteer or cultural organization in British Columbia. It was credited with an unemployment rate of 5 per cent, which is ridiculous considering the high unemployment in B.C., particularly among youth, many of whom live in my riding. It is ridiculous to try to cope with \$4 million worth of applications when you receive a grant of \$147,000 I can only conclude that the Liberal Members of this