

Oral Questions

If the Minister is interested in the facts, why did he not get the facts that were available to me through Environment Canada? He appears to be unable to get those same facts.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I obviously do not know what site the Hon. Member inspected but my information is to the effect that the car is in an isolated area, located on a track which is fenced and patrolled regularly. More importantly, the car has been inspected and is secure, with no leakages.

REQUEST FOR STORAGE REGULATIONS

Mr. Bill Blaikie (Winnipeg—Birds Hill): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped we would not have to argue about whether something is fenced or not. The fact of the matter is that on one complete side of the North Transcona yards there is no fence. Anyone with eyes to see can see that. I am surprised the Minister would get up and maintain that. It is beside a track which is the main lead into the CP railyard in North Transcona. The switch leading into it is not locked. There are all kinds of things that could have been done to make that a safer storage site that were not done, and Environment Canada says the guidelines were being adhered to.

Are these guidelines going to be reviewed so that these kinds of cases will not occur again? Are there going to be regulations, because we know there are no federal regulations with respect to the storage of PCBs? The Bill the Minister referred to has only to do with spills after they occur. It has nothing to do with storage. There are no regulations and it is about bloody time there were.

Hon. Pierre H. Cadieux (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the facts themselves, I am informed again that the information I have been given is what has been seen on the site. Of course if the Hon. Member—

Mr. Blaikie: Then you are stupid, because there is no fence.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cadieux: Of course—

Mr. Blaikie: I walked in there myself, you idiot!

Mr. McDermid: You walk through fences!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: It was your ego that walked through.

Mr. Cadieux: Of course, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Blaikie: I don't walk through fences. I could if I had to.

Mr. Cadieux: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I personally did not go there. Therefore I will take the Hon. Member's comments as notice and I will check with the appropriate people who have given me the report with respect to the fact that this car was fenced and was being patrolled. I can assure this House that, if that is not the case, not only will it be done but some people will probably be answering those questions for me.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East.

Mr. Thacker: Why didn't you say something about it sooner? You sat on it all weekend!

Mr. Andre: Why didn't you do something Thursday about it—

Mr. Blaikie: I did.

Mr. Andre:—if it was so life threatening?

Mr. Blaikie: I didn't say it was life threatening.

Mr. Speaker: The Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS OF PERSONS EMPLOYED BY THEIR SPOUSES

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Employment and Immigration.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent judgment the Federal Court of Appeal confirmed a ruling of the Canadian Human Rights Commission that spouses who worked for their mates should not be denied unemployment insurance benefits. Since the Unemployment Insurance Commission may still appeal this judgment to the Supreme Court of Canada, will the Minister state today whether the Government has agreed to accept the judgment of the Federal Court and forgo any appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada? In other words, will the Government accept the ruling of the Canadian Human Rights Commission that spouses should have the same right to unemployment insurance as all other Canadians?

Hon. Barbara McDougall (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it is early days yet on this decision. The Department of Justice and my Department are reviewing the decision and once we reach a conclusion we will be able to report back to the House.

PARENTAL BENEFITS—FEDERAL COURT HEARING

Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East): Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly clear-cut matter. I had hoped we would have a decision before the end of this week.

Will the Minister also tell the House whether the Government has decided to accept the Federal Court decision in June that parental benefits under the Unemployment Insurance Act should be available to natural parents in the same way as adoptive parents, that these benefits should be available to both father and mother, and that they should be distinct from