

Routine Proceedings

This interim report is aimed at ensuring Canada's Armed Forces have the ability to monitor and to respond to threats to our maritime sovereignty. Although tensions between east and west have subsided dramatically in recent months, it should be borne in mind that Warsaw treaty nations retain a formidable military capacity and that Canada remains committed to collective security with our North American ally and with other members of NATO.

Just as important, our Armed Forces are essential to protect against contemporary and increasing threats to Canada's sovereignty. We must defend against the traffic in illegal drugs that weaken the fabric of our nation. We must assure the security of our fisheries and other ocean resources. Canada must protect against foreign and domestic polluters who disregard Canadian environmental regulations and we must have a capacity to defend Canada from illegal immigrants.

We should note and be prepared for the fact that most international terrorists are trained in military procedures and use military equipment. Canada must always have a capacity to undertake surveillance of these activities and respond in the name of sovereignty.

Some of these challenges are new. Nevertheless they threaten our sovereignty and Canada must have a capacity to respond effectively.

To counter these threats and others that may emerge in the future the committee believes that Canada should have the capacity to monitor and react to incidents on our coasts, not just with surface ships and helicopters now being acquired, but also with underwater detection capability and a sufficient number of maritime patrol aircraft to provide adequate coverage to our vast ocean territories, the world's longest national coastline.

The committee firmly believes that the dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces should have the tools to do the job Canadians expect of them, protecting our national sovereignty, thereby securing our future which is an essential role of our Canadian Armed Forces.

Finally, all members of the committee—

Mr. Speaker: I think the hon. member has certainly made the point that the committee wished to make, and probably has said it in a longer way than is usually needed in the House.

[*Translation*]

PRESENTATION OF FIRST REPORT OF STANDING
COMMITTEE ON MULTICULTURALISM AND CITIZENSHIP

Mr. Jean-Pierre Hogue (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the first report of the Standing Committee on Multiculturalism and Citizenship concerning the 1991 census.

PRESENTATION OF SECOND REPORT OF STANDING
COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND CULTURE

Mr. Jean-Pierre Hogue (Outremont): I also have the honour to table, in both official languages, the second report of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture.

The committee's unanimous report recommends adopting legislation on the status of the artist. The legislation would give associations of performing artists such as ACTRA, Actor's Equity and the Union des artistes the right to negotiate collective agreements on behalf of their members.

This report was prepared by the Sub-Committee on the Status of the Artist which I have the honour of chairing. I would also like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to thank all members of the sub-committee and those of the standing committee for their totally nonpartisan co-operation. I would also like to include the staff by whom we were so well seconded.

[*English*]

The committee requests that the government provide a comprehensive response to this report in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 109.

Mr. Dorin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in response to remarks made a moment ago by the chairman of the public accounts committee in presenting his report. He suggested that two complicated solutions had been put forward and not been acted upon by the government. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the reason they were not acted upon is that another committee of this House, the finance committee, found them to be unworkable and reported that back to the House and that view was shared by all three parties and it is a misleading—

Mr. Speaker: I am not so sure that is a point of order.